

# Semiotic translation: A new theoretical framework for the implementation of pedagogically-oriented subtitling

**Sergio Torres Martínez**

Department of Foreign Languages  
Universidad de Antioquia  
Medellín, Columbia  
e-mail: surtr\_2000@yahoo.es

**Abstract:** In this paper, I explore a new type of semiotic translation in the context of Audiovisual Translation Studies (AVTS). To that end, a set of formulaic sequences bestowed of pragmatolinguistic value (*hedging strings*) is analysed. It is argued that the semiotic analysis of conversational features in English may contribute to facilitate their pedagogical exploitation in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. This analysis builds theoretically on a semiotic translational framework termed *Semiotic Translation* (and its subset, *Semiotic Subtitling*) predicated upon three types of translation: (i) *Metaleptic translation*; (ii) *indexical translation*; and (iii) *translation as dynamic discontinuity*. The translational rationale thus arrived at is deemed to account for what it is that binds together linguistic signs with other sign systems.

**Keywords:** EFL, Peircean semiotics, hedging strings, AVTS, semiotic translation, semiotic subtitling

## 1. Introduction

This essay seeks to develop, justify, and substantiate the implementation of *Semiotic Translation*, a new theoretical approach merging several disciplines, namely translation studies, applied linguistics, and Peircean semiotics, into a coherent whole.

More specifically, this multidisciplinary focus can be summarized by way of three major principles introduced by Kline (1995: 34):

- (1) Specialized disciplines cannot account for the growing complexity of human knowledge.

- (2) *'Emergent properties'* in complex entities or phenomena are the result of the interaction of sub-systems.
- (3) The introduction of a multidisciplinary mindset supports interdependent approaches to collaborative work.

As I hope to demonstrate in the main body of the article, semiotic translation may accommodate the above tenets. The potential of this multidisciplinary framework is explored as a way to connect linguistic signs with other sign systems.<sup>1</sup> For the sake of clarity, I have selected a set of formulaic sequences, *hedging strings* (henceforth HSs). These are described from a semiotic perspective. It deserves stressing at the outset that the selection of these formulaic sequences is rooted in practicality. As is well known, nativelike proficiency is a much appreciated asset among learners and instructors in the Columbian English Language Teaching (ELT) context (see Vélez-Rendón 2003; Torres-Martínez 2009; Sampson 2012), as English nativelikeness serves as a gatekeeping mechanism providing access to economic success and higher status, a common trait in the construction of the linguistic self in the so-called *Expanding Circle*<sup>2</sup> (Kachru 1997).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I briefly discuss the Columbian ELT context and some of the prevailing assumptions underlying language instruction in the country. In Section 3, I review some of the tenets of Peirce's universal categories of Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness. It is argued that a paradigmatic shift in this taxonomy is required in order to bypass excessive abstraction and idealization. On this reading of Peircean semiotics, I privilege a construction of the translated text as a semiotic complex in dynamic connection with other sign systems. Section 4 contrasts the concepts of *Semiotic Translation* and Gorrée's *Semiotranslation*. My desire to push the limits of a corrective response to the theoretical paucity represented by the semiotranslational approach introduced by Gorrée will force me to take a critical stand towards some of her insights and emphases. In Section 5, I introduce three modes of semiotic translation: metaleptic translation, indexical translation, and translation as dynamic discontinuity. Finally, in Section 6, I outline some of the technical considerations and pedagogical implications of *Semiotic Subtitling* in the EFL classroom. This type of subtitling embraces the notion that novel, semiotically-informed approaches to translation can contribute to the formation of productive learning communities.

---

<sup>1</sup> No sharp distinction between "linguistic" and "non-linguistic" signs is made here. However, for the sake of precision, linguistic signs are treated as a sign system in its own right.

<sup>2</sup> The Expanding Circle corresponds to the countries and territories where English is spoken as a foreign language. The term is used by Kachru (1997) in his concentric circle model.

## 2. English Language Teaching in the Columbian context

The expansion of English on a global scale has seen the emergence of a number of assumptions, perceptions and concerns about the role of this language as a tool for transnational communication. However, the increasing lack of clarity regarding the future of English in both the Outer and the Expanding Circle has resulted in a number of misinterpretations and theoretical feud, for example, with regard to the contribution of both ELF (English as a Lingua Franca [cf. Saraceni 2008]) and EFL (English as a foreign language) in the development of English. In this rarified academic context, even the assignation of a name capturing the elusive nature of English has been problematic (see Rajagopalan 2012). Nevertheless, whilst no consensus about the appellation of emergent varieties of English has been reached, there seems to be a series of efforts to lay the foundations of new branches of linguistics drawing on the transcultural dynamics of English, namely *World Englishes Studies* (cf. Seargeant 2012).

Certainly, much has happened since the inception of the *Three Circle Model* (Kachru 1985), a classification of countries according to the role English has in them: (1) *Inner Circle* (native, norm developing); (2) *Outer Circle* (post-colonial, increasingly norm-developing); and (3) *Expanding Circle* (non-native, norm-dependent). Notably, while this taxonomy was initially successful for the understanding of the dynamics of the evolution of English around the world, it has been evident in recent decades that this model falls short of providing a clear picture of the current socio-linguistic situation. More recently, a framework proposed by Schneider (2003, 2007) has focused on Postcolonial Englishes by means of a *Dynamic Model* drawing on four core parameters: *historical background, identity, sociolinguistic conditions, and linguistic effects*. This model has proven highly relevant for determining the evolutionary dynamics of English in the Columbian context as its five stages of variety emergence accurately predict the way some Expanding Circle countries attempt to force the emergence of local varieties of English. Hence, in Stage 1 (*foundation*), an artificial bilingualism is promoted via linguistic policies, as well as large-scale delocalization and city marketing. In Stage 2, *exonormative stabilization* (involving settlers' contact with the "indigenous population") is fostered via increasing contact with native speakers (such as native speaker ELT practitioners). Finally, *nativization, stabilization, and differentiation* (stages 3, 4, and 5, respectively) are expected to emerge from the combination of the first two variables. Although these efforts are mainly unstructured and not explicitly stated by policy makers, they reflect the instrumental and always problematic role of English in Columbia (as well as in other Latin American countries), which often results in ambivalent attitudes towards English-speaking countries like the United States (cf. Vélez-Rendón 2003; Torres-Martínez 2009). In this vein, some authors have seen the increasing interest of the

Columbian government in free trade agreements as a conscious strategy to “manufacture Columbian citizens’ consent for foreign intervention” (Valencia 2013: 27).

From a more practical perspective, I endorse the EFL baseline as a suitable rationale.<sup>3</sup> The reading I propose draws together the steadfast preference of Columbian teachers and students for native models of English and the explanatory power of semiotics applied to subtitling. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the teaching of native speech functions is not a fits-all-size strategy in “social grammar” instruction, and “teachers need to give learners the strategies necessary to negotiate their own ‘hybrid’ pragmatics for each interaction and whichever interlocutor they engage (...)” (Murray 2012: 321).

### 3. What’s in a name? Defining *Semiotic Translation*

Before getting to the main argument of this section, I must draw attention to what semiotic translation is not. To begin with, my semiotic programme is not rooted in any inalterable theoretical framework. However inspired by Peirce’s semiotics, it comes out of the experience of translation and semiotics blended. This is perhaps seen nowhere so clearly as in its rejection of any fixed taxonomy conferring an absolute status to a *trichotomous mindset*, for instance, the notions of Firstness, Secondness and Thirdness, as determinants of hierarchical and predictable sign relations (Sign-Object-Interpretant). Elaborating on this account, semiotic translation defines these categories as *semiotic elements* not necessarily issued from, or confined to, a given “*irreversible*” semiosis. A relevant consideration here is that, although translation is a conscious act embedded in the broader process of interpretation, semiotically, it is a sensory-driven process of sign transformation engendered in *pre-Firstness*. Under this view, the translative process is defined as a transformative, borderless interplay of interlocking sign systems, and not as a bestiary of sign species struggling to yield up meaning in a containerized semiotic Umwelt.

Second, semiotic translation is construed as a purposeful, socially-driven activity that stresses the social character of our concepts progressing away from the action of specialized translation agents. A few points of clarification are in order at this point. First of all, in the context of semiotic translation the target culture is no longer

<sup>3</sup> Although research on learner preferences regarding native speaker norms has provided evidence in support of the native norm baseline, such results should be taken with a pinch of salt given the unpredictability of learners’ preferences (cf. Subtirelu 2013). On the other hand, the notion of “desire in English learning” (a concept closely related with learner preferences) elaborates on a complex network of factors: for example, desire is co-constructed and situated intersubjectively; it can be both conscious and unconscious and serve, when used ethically, as a tool for liberatory pedagogy (cf. Motha, Lin 2013)

perceived as a recipient onto which the translation is projected, since many translation users are increasingly involved in the translation process themselves. Secondly, translation and translating are detached from any literary or high-brow cultural paradigm whereby “translation is in the practical hands of intelligent (skillful, knowledgeable, artistic) translators, a literary art” (Gorlée 2012: 37). On the other hand, it might be wondered whether characterizing translators in such a way that they become a mere canvas for semiosis is fair at all: “The translator is presumed (*sic.*) and assumed in semiotic processes, but is at the same time generalized (i.e., de-personalized, and de-emphasized)” (Gorlée 2004: 101). Furthermore, semiotic translation is not an inchoate project existing only in comparison to non-existent theoretical frameworks. This is paradoxically the way some Gorlée’s followers characterize semiotranslation: “The Peirce-inspired conception of translation ought to be approached primarily as a theoretical proposal and mind-broadening conceptual exercise” (Hartama-Heinonen 2012: 120).

Hence, a healthy wariness about the value of the above definitions can arise from reviewing these arguments in real-life contexts where overrated theoretical discussions are of little use. That theoretical inquiry must be continuous with current interest is attested by my approach to translation semiotics: so long as our focus remains firmly fixed upon solving specific semiotic conundrums, the merit and structure of semiotic translation is readily apparent.

Fittingly, semiotic translation is driven by its own *Skopos* (purpose, aim). In the words of Reiß and Vermeer (1991[1984]: 101) “[f]ür Translation gilt, ‘Der Zweck heiligt die Mittel.’” [In translation, the end justifies the means]. *Prima facie*, this seems like an accurate definition of my account. This requires more thorough discussion, though, since translation should not simply be subjected to the rules of effectiveness and, consequently, to a blind and instrumental rationality.

Admittedly, there is a closer connection than one might initially expect between the notion of semiotic translation and the action of a subject. However, it is most important to note that, considered within the context of semiotic translation, the subject is a *social actant* and not an idealized agent transmitting invariable meaning. In this sense, one of the important innovations of semiotic translation is a more variegated view of its *skopos* as emergent, usage-based meaning which liberates translators from devoting themselves to identifying equivalence only by becoming passive mediators enabling the text to “*realize itself*” (Gorlée 1994: 137).

In laying bare the sociocultural conditions of translation, as well as the constraints imposed thereto, semiotic translation reinforces both functionality (i.e., effect, potentialities), as well as forms of self-representation and sign transformation triggered by specific *skopoi*. In brief, then, semiotic translation can be defined as an inclusive, all-encompassing project that does not anatomize, contain, idealize,

manipulate, schematize, nor biologize semiosis. This clearly contradicts Gorlée's semiotranslation:

[S]emiotranslation is a *unidirectional, future-oriented, cumulative, and irreversible process*, one which *advances*, in successive instances, *toward higher rationality, complexity, coherence, clarity, and determination*, while *progressively* harmonizing chaotic, unorganized, and problematic translations (and elements and/or aspects of translations), as well as neutralizing dubious, misleading, and false ones. (Gorlée 1994: 231; my emphasis).

I shall now try to indicate in outline the character of my semiotic translational framework

- (1) Semiotic translation attaches itself conceptually to an extended notion of semiosis involving the transformation of any sign system into other sign systems. Notwithstanding, it deviates greatly from Gorlée's semiotranslation, particularly in its rejection of a definition of translation and translating as interpretation, or of translation proper as an interlingual operation. In other words, translation does not take place "wherever semiotic processes occur" (Ponzio 2000[1999]: 5), sign transformation does!
- (2) Semiotic translation is not confined to the boundaries of anthroposemiosis. It acknowledges all sorts of sign transformation well beyond the human semiosphere. It is thus argued that human cognition (as the extension of a vast biological substratum) should strive for a description of the human experience through the observation of natural phenomena, which are, in principle, semiotic facts.
- (3) Semiotic translation is abductive, i.e., it derives its explanatory power from an emphasis on Firstness rather than from sign oppositions (Secondness) leading to interpretation (Thirdness). As we shall see, the three metaphors of translation presented in this paper represent a variation of the Peircean abductive reasoning. In particular, the emphasis is on the role played by elements of surprise, novelty, or creativity determining different metaphors of translation: (1) *indexical translation* dealing with the connection of both signs and pre-signs across sign systems; (2) *dynamic discontinuity* drawing on the surfacing of Objects in Secondness from the stream of signs in Firstness; and finally, (3) *metaleptic translation*, operating a "contaminating semiotic effect" by way of the emergence of signs in a different sign system.
- (4) In the context of semiotic translation, all the forms of translation suggested by Jakobson (1966[1959]) are considered as "translation proper". Consequently, the definition of forms of translation such as *intralingual*, *interlingual*, and *intersemiotic* is very different. For example, intralingual translation is not viewed as mere rewording. Rather, it can incorporate a number of "non-linguistic" signs in the

translated text, coexisting and significantly increasing the semiotic power and scope of translation. Interlingual translation (defined as translation proper by Jakobson and Gorlée) is viewed here as the creation of functional types of texts that may eventually include non-linguistic sign systems. Finally, intersemiotic translation is neither adaptation nor transposition, e.g., a book turned into a film (Jakobson 1966[1959]).

- (5) Semiotic translation is not a matter of Thirdness, of symbolicity or habit only. It constantly creates usage-driven signs and interpretations begotten in Firstness. In this sense, the emergence of the translated text is deemed to occur from its deep structure to its surface structure.
- (6) The *skopos* of a translation is an all-encompassing criterion determining the quality and functional value of a translation in a given culture.
- (7) As previously noted, semiotic translation shifts the accent onto the *writerly* role of the translator. On this reading, the translator plays three roles in his/her quest for the construction of a text. First of all, s/he becomes a Surfer (“*Navegante*”) in order to gain access to the pre-Firstness of Text 1 by virtue of his/her acquaintance with the intrinsic qualities that separate this sign system from other sign systems – playing the role of *representamens* to other signs. Only then is it possible to define these signs as *representamens* in their own right. On the next level, the translator acts as a *Facilitator* (“*Facilitador*”), whose main task consists in reconstructing the meaning of the object in order to prepare the emergence of Text 2. Such endeavour is far from being a mere reconstruction of objects present in both Text 1 and Text 2. Since the relationship between two structures or concepts in a sign-system pair is never symmetric, the revelation of the meaning of an original Object in Text 1 entails the inclusion of different types of analysis (logic, mathematical, linguistic, etc.), enabling the reconstruction of meaning. As a result, the translator becomes an *Interpreter* (“*Intérprete*”) that shapes the *representamen*.

From this nucleus one might develop new types of translation methods which would be at the same time exploratory and creative. Such formulations may well be regarded as summing up arguments that have been suggested from various perspectives, namely that semiotic translation is in some nontrivial sense a *writerly* rather than a *readerly* operation. This basically means that translating a text is an act analogous to writing an “original” text. In virtue of this, in translating, it is the translator who decides where and when to bring a text to an end instead of embracing passively a Hegelian let-it-go inertia. This clues us in to the absolute difference between semiotic translation and semiotranslation: whereas the latter propounds final signification as a means to attain self-contentment (through the overcoming of an alleged

“lack” of cultural sophistication and rationality), the former views the conjunction of translation and semiotics as a desire-driven process leading to self-overcoming in the Nietzschean sense. Another point of difference concerns the transformation of signs when a text is translated. This picture contrasts with traditional translational models whereby translation adds a sort of motion to the passing from the source text to the target text in terms of either a transfer (Reddy 1979), equivalence (Nida 1966[1959]), or target (Vermeer 1978, 1979, 1989, 1996; Holz-Mänttari 1984, 1986).

### 3.1. The role of Peircean semiotics in semiotic translation

The contribution of semiotics to the comprehension of the ties of thought with nature in human experience constitutes a rich field of endeavour that encompasses

the study of body language, art forms, rhetorical discourse, visual communication, media, myths, narratives, language, artifacts, gesture, eye contact, clothing, advertising, cuisine, rituals – in a phrase, anything that is used, invented, or adopted by human beings to produce meaning. (Danesi 2004: 4)

In particular, Peirce’s theory of signs (adapted from Kant’s categories) introduced an unprecedented triadic relation represented by the Sign-Object-Interpretant trichotomy configuring three stages of semiosis (sign action): Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness. The introduction of the Interpretant constitutes an innovation that stresses the dynamic dimension of signification contesting static structural theories anchored in Secondness, recurrently articulated in the form of a binary opposition pivoting on the Saussurean ‘either-or’ focus on system (*langue*) or function (*parole*).

The purpose of this section, to be clear, is not to piece together Peircean semiotics from a detailed historical background, but rather to attend to the incompleteness of Peirce’s work as itself bearing great conceptual significance. My main point is that the question what the collaborative potential of pragmatic semiotics amounts to is the interest of this rationale to challenge the pervasively dichotomous Western thinking.

Fittingly, Peirce’s categories of Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness are the main components on the semiotic side of my analytical framework to translation. Notwithstanding, in order to be true to the critical spirit of this text, I also feel an obligation to point out that pragmatic semiotics needs to go a lot further in coming to terms with its subject matter in order to meet specific disciplinary needs. Accordingly, I would like to suggest that the analysis of seemingly unrelated (though dynamically-interacting) sign systems is facilitated by the analysis of the three phases of semiotic translation:



- (1) *Identity* (what the Object is before becoming a sign, including both latent and active antinomies thereof; abduction).
- (2) *Transformation* (what the sign becomes when interacting with other signs, i.e., the sum of its possible hybridizations; deduction).
- (3) *Interpretation* (what an Interpreter can possibly associate with the sign, as a point of departure in his/her quest for meaning; induction).

This taxonomy stands in stark relief against the notions of uncertainty and uncontrollability as some immanent principles working within the essence of semiosis, instead of the conventional idea of a *measurable substance* resulting from the process of interpretation. Admittedly, the idealization of scientific thinking has been part of the advancement of the human relation with knowledge, for example in cognitive sciences.

The cognitive science revolution was based on a fundamental idealization, the myth of ‘the human mind’. Research on human vision, audition, memory, categorization, or the like presumes a single mental capacity, idealized away from all the ‘noise’ of individual variation or systematic cultural diversity. (Levinson 2012: 397)

This “‘noise’ of individual variation” has also been taken out from the semiotic equation by some Peircean interpreters:

Loosely, we call ‘signs’ those *sense-perceptible vessels that cause us to think of something else*, particularly in those cultural cases where the sense-perceptible material structures were erected for the purpose of guiding our attention. (Deely 2004: 217; my emphasis)

The ordering of trichotomies that give rise to the classifications is extremely important in this context, to the point that some of the classes of signs that are formed by a certain order of determination *might not even exist if we adopt a different order*. (Farias, Queiroz 2004: 44; my emphasis).

Summing up, the fundamental sign is: [...] – A symbol, which (*sic*) qualities separates (*sic*) discourse communities from each other [...]. (Thellefsen 2005: 62)

In particular, Thellefsen’s formulations should be read as an extreme case of semiotic dogmatism revealing the author’s subjective-turned-objective dispositions towards science: “good science” is based on “stringent terminology” (Thellefsen 2005: 51). (Sadly, he is not alone among semioticians in his approach to the subject).

Ironically, the situation just described is due not least to the prescriptivism and vague modularity of Peirce's characterization of semiosis as a process of sign refinement<sup>4</sup>:

A sign, or a *representamen*, is something which stands to somebody for something in some respect or capacity. It addresses somebody, that is, creates in the mind of that person an equivalent sign, or perhaps a more developed sign. That sign which it creates I call the *interpretant* of the first sign. The sign stands for something, its *object*, not in all respects, but in reference to a sort of idea, which I have sometimes called the ground of the representamen. (CP 2.228)

Although it would be unfair to generalize, it is evident that narrow interpretations do limit the ambitious extrapolations of Peirce and many of his interpreters who eulogically mobilize a fits-all-size, trichotomized semiotics, i.e., a “project of ‘cutting’ minute portions of the process [semiosis] and actualizing them as signs for observation, formal study, analysis, and synthesis” (Queiroz, Merrell 2006: 39). My argument here is that a more fluid version of semiosis should be adopted. Hence, Firstness is characterized herein as a would-be, latent semiosis underlying any sign action (iconicity) and serving as the substrate to all semiosis; Secondness represents the simultaneous passing from iconicity to indexicality, i.e., the sign's transformation prior to interpretation in terms of “turn-into” rather than opposition; finally, Thirdness entails the potential representation (unfinished and ultimately elusive) made by an interpreter, not conditioned *a priori* by the flow of signs. Uniquely, the emphasis is on the interaction of sign systems permeating other sign systems *ad infinitum*, a metaphor that replaces the determinism of the conventional three-corner metaphor whereby fixed points define stages of sign identity.<sup>5</sup> It follows that semiotic

---

<sup>4</sup> This mindset is reinforced by a hierarchical access to semiosis: “The triadic relation between *S*, *O* and *I* is regarded by Peirce as *irreducible*, in the sense that it is not decomposable into any simpler relation” (Queiroz, Merrell 2006: 41). Since this interpretation represents a “historically specific semiotic ideology that determines what will account for the interpreter and actor as objects and in contrast to what subjects” (Keane 2003: 423), the consequences of any semiotic enquiry should be analysed *a priori* against the backdrop of social relations.

<sup>5</sup> The focus of the present analysis is on the Object-Sign relation (icon, index, and symbol), producing three instances of morphological variation. In this sense, further classifications of signs developed by Peirce to analyse sign relations during semiosis (S-O-I) are avoided. The reason is that such an inventory of sign instances consists in fixed abstractions dwelling in a formalistic view of semiosis as a series of interconnected points providing an interface between the mind of an ideal interpreter and a set of qualia. This is revealed by many examples used by Peirce, for example, the deterministic selection of signs by other signs deemed to share similar properties: “many words, though strictly symbols, are so far iconic that they are apt to determine iconic interpretants, or as we say, call up lively images” (NEM 4: 243). This

translation defines triadic relationships as a *dynamic flow of signs* (semiosis), always moving upwards in the semiotic continuum. Moreover, this blurring of the line between sign and semiosis facilitates the analysis of most of the constraints observed during language processing that does not stop with the interpretant, who is, too, immersed in Firstness.

## 4. The three metaphors of semiotic translation

As noted earlier, semiotic translation focuses on discovering the best way to retrieve meaning from the stream of signs permeating all sign systems. This might be said to hold equally true of the semiotic transformations that display characteristics of biological systems (defined in terms of *Identity*), or the substrate to all sign systems (i.e., their Firstness); *Transformation*, the unfolding of sign systems onto one another (Secondness); and *Interpretation*, i.e., the emergence of meaning through the action of a social Interpreter (Thirdness). It further suggests that semiotic types of translation share a dynamics analogous to “[n]atural networks, especially biological ones [which] are never static” (So et al. 2014: 16). These dynamics are projected onto actual classroom performance, since “[i]ntellectual capabilities of people such as teaching and learning, are deeply supported by brain functionality” (Yano 2013: 28). Such a rationale leads to three semiotic metaphors of translation: (1) *metaleptic translation*, (2) *indexical translation*, and (3) *translation as dynamic discontinuity*. Admittedly, such a project demands, too, an understanding of teaching as a high-level phenomenon (Yano 2013: 28) which of necessity entails the development of forms of translation drawing on culturally-driven forms of semiosis. Each of these metaphors will now be discussed in turn.

### 4.1. Translation as metalepsis

*Metaleptic translation* operates a *contaminating passage* between two distinct socio-cultural realities (sign systems). The term ‘metalepsis’ is borrowed from Genette’s

---

approach is partly flawed, since the whole point of semiosis is the *non-linear, non-deterministic transformation of signs* across sign systems, rather than the fixation of sign categories such as those consigned in the Peircean protocols, namely the *phaneroscopic protocol* and the *protocol of degeneracy*. Thus, whereas some may interpret the Peircean program as an “attempt to rescue perception” (Radford 2008: 4) from the Kantian “manifold of senses” (Radford 2008: 4), Peirce’s phenomenological enterprise suffers from an inevitable objectivism that turns perception into an idealized encounter between “[an] Object [that] gives itself to the Subject’s consciousness as it is, in its immaculate suchness” (Radford 2008: 5).

narratology (1980[1972]) and is defined as “any intrusion by the extradiegetic narrator or narratee into the diegetic universe (or by diegetic characters into a metadiegetic universe, etc.), or the inverse (as in Cortazar)” (Genette 1980[1972]: 234–235).

To understand this novel approach to translation, we only need to visualize the process as a series of interconnected links permeating all semiotic universes. This allows the visualization of an underlying sign system in Text 1 that emerges unexpectedly in, and acts as a contaminator of Text 2 (the Target Text) in which it surfaces. Thus, both Text 1 and Text 2 represent two different sign systems arranged *on a stack*, independent from each other and permeated by signs in a *metaleptic surfacing* of hidden Text 1 constructions in Text 2. This realizes a *rhetorical metalepsis* (Genette 1980[1972]), i.e., a hybridization process not affecting the integrity of signs in their corresponding system, but causing a movement from Sign System 2 to Sign System 1 thereby revealing any features relevant for the translational event that otherwise would be missing from the pragmatolinguistic analysis. The resulting hybridization illustrates translation’s potential for creating two-way intersemiotic meaning-generating instances shaping mental representations of non-linear forms of reality.

Metalepsis can therefore be defined as a manifestation of Firstness, of the Qualisign. In this vein, only when the icon surfaces in a different sign system, the sign’s true nature is revealed in the form of an index that, ultimately, becomes a symbol, a Legisign.

#### 4.2. Indexical translation

I define *indexical translation* as the use of signs to indicate the presence of any type of signs in Text 1 that are generally omitted from Text 2. The purpose of indexical translation is thus to create a *tracking shot effect* taking the experiencer through both texts by means of a sort of hypertext link, i.e., “a mixed sign ‘combining iconic, indexical and symbolic modes of representation’” (Wirth 2002: 166). The stability of this sign is determined by both the functional selection of language pairs and the creation of symbols to be used in language-related domains such as language education, forms of audiovisual translation, and discourse analysis, to name a few. As a matter of fact, the “target sign” can either be an equivalent linguistic sign or, as in our case, an identity-endowed legisign (a sign, which is a law), created by the co-referential association of an utterance with an index (signifying by causal connection), which in reality is another form of the same utterance and hence a symbol (formed by convention).

The presence of indices does not establish, however, a hierarchical, one-way semiotic relation, because the analysed Text 1 form-function pairing becomes, in turn, an index to an absent construction in Text 2 marked by the non-linguistic symbol; these symbols point, so to speak, to an interconnected pragmatically-driven semiotic system defined in terms of co-reference.

### 4.3. Translation as dynamic discontinuity

In the case of intralingual translation, some constructions reveal the true nature of the communicative act (genre or register). Similarly, underlying socio-cultural dynamics, not necessarily predictable from the distinctive usage of speakers (idiolect) in a macro-level language system, are unveiled. As expected, all constructions have two intrinsic qualities: (1) a continuous quality (internal, i.e., a function existing in the realm of Firstness); (2) a discontinuous quality (external, i.e., a form instantiated in the realm of Secondness) revealing a flow of meaning captured by the Interpreter in the realm of Thirdness. This alludes to the role of languages' external discontinuities such as semantics, pragmatics, and parsing as an important part of language learning:

Discontinuity is a condition for cognition, and moreover, cognition depends in an intrinsic way on some external phenomenologically relevant variables, the variation of which is seen as the cause of the discontinuity of the process (Østergård 1998: 309).

An interesting example is the way discourse markers such as 'you know' (cf. Section 5), behave in a pedagogically-oriented type of translation. Thus, instead of being void recipients of pragmalinguistic information from a traditional subtitling viewpoint (cf. Gottlieb 2001[1998]), and hence redundant in the translation, these items convey a "flow of meaning" in a specific communicative situation (conversation) defined by the speaker's need to deploy linguistic strategies to cope with real-time discourse processing. These draw on specific discontinuities pointing to increments of online processing, an external, cognitively relevant variable (discontinuous) whose internal linguistic nature (its Firstness) remains, however, hidden. Further, speech functions such as discourse markers can also recreate the context of a conversational situation in written texts (like novels, tales or poems), in which case external communicative parameters become part of the linguistic item itself in terms of a triadic form-function-context characterization describing internal dynamics. This adds a new layer to our analysis, since as soon as a discourse marker is embedded in a written text its primary function (the reduction of cognitive overload) is neutralized:

Dot and I sent him to college thinking he might go into medicine or law. He was bright enough. He majored in agriculture and he's doing what he loves. I don't think Enrique could sit behind a desk any more than I could. **You know**, Howie, if more people worked at what they loved we'd have far fewer problems.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (<http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>).

This passage makes it all too clear how the written text echoes the pragmatics of shared context, real-time processing, or affective content to recreate a conversational effect. However, in the above passage, the discourse marker is devoid of any real online processing properties. As a consequence, the use of specific linguistic strategies in conversational registers define the pragmlinguistic consistency of discourse within the boundaries of a language (internal flow of meaning) determined by speakers' externally-driven selection of utterances (discontinuous realization of meaning). So looking further afield, *indices* serve an additional function: they guide learners' comprehension of both internal and external variables of the communicative situation.

## 5. A semiotic analysis of hedging strings

As noted at the outset, hedging strings are formulaic sequences that appear in a range of communicative situations, revealing pragmlinguistic patterns ranging from non-assertiveness to vagueness realizing specific attachment patterns, which I analyse in Table 1 (all examples are taken from the Corpus of Global Web-Based English, Davis 2013<sup>7</sup>).

As shown in Table 1, the pragmlinguistic nature of HSs is enhanced by their formulaic nature (cf. Torres-Martínez 2014), leading to distinct online language processing increments in both native and nonnative communicational contexts (cf. Conklin, Schmitt 2008; Jiang, Nekrasova 2007; Cappelle et al. 2010). Moreover, the association of specific formulaic language with prosodics results in a host of learning advantages (Lin 2012). This has the potential to be a truly instructional medium, whereby drawing on native hedging strategies may contribute to create a “feel of register” (Torres-Martínez 2013) among EFL language learners.

Needless to say that these context-driven combinations provide a platform for outlining semiotic interactions between constructions and non-linguistic signs in online discourse production. For example, the hedging string ‘kind of’ encompasses six distinct values, three simple and three complex: *Pure Firstness* (1–1), *pure Secondness* (2–2), and *pure Thirdness* (3–3); *Firstness of Secondness* (1–2); it may also entail a *Firstness of Thirdness* relationship (1–3); or it can be the result of *Secondness of Thirdness* (2–3), in which case we are dealing with a representation or a transference in the context of a reported action. In this particular context, the pragmlinguistic function is overridden. Semantically, we are then confronted with at least six realities determining the development of both Text 1 (Source Text) and Text 2 (Target Text).

<sup>7</sup> Davies, Mark 2013. *Corpus of Global Web-Based English: 1.9 billion words from speakers in 20 countries* (<http://corpus2.byu.edu/glowbe/>).

Table 1. Slotting patterns of Hedging Strings.

SLOTTING PATTERNS OF HEDGING STRINGS ( <i>kind of/ sort of</i> )		
Example	Structure	Source
I feel like I'm the same person, but I know I'm a... <i>kind of a big load</i> to deal with.	HS+Noun phrase	Robert Patterson and his wife Karen   StoryCorps
A brief chat with the engine builder today did occur... and we <i>kind of agreed</i> that lightened, forged pistons and a properly balanced unit, with stronger bolts etc. should see another 5-7 bhp – not sure that is worth it TBH.	HS+ Verb	Jaw on the floor – Syvecs/RG FFF/ACT content – PistonHeads
An organisation with this <i>kind of disconnect</i> really should be broken up.	HS+Noun	Bishop Hill blog – The new head of BBC news
Everyone's <i>kind of gone through</i> what I've gone through.	Auxiliary verb (BE) +HS+ Past participle	Sabotage Times » Benny Banks: A True Voice Of The Council Estate
Well, it's <i>kind of hard</i> to do that, since, well, they really don't have much for us to take away, or do battle against. It's quite sad, really.	HS+ Opinion Adjective	The Overlord's Dispatches from the Throne Volume 5, flammecast
This <i>kind of us</i> platinum cope incorporates a recurrent Search facts quite.	HS+Object pronoun	Most of the people discovered how tiny most of the people – Charice
I think I just <i>sort of for whatever reason</i> fell in to be playing the mean girl.	HS+Fluency Device	Lynn Hirschberg talks to Megan Fox about swimming, the X-Men, and their cats.
Singing, a <i>sort of ad-lib</i> beat-boxing strays luring visitors through the doorway.	HS+ Deverbal adjective	The Matter of Presence: DOCUMENTA (13) at Kassel, Aesthetica Blog

### 5.1. Pure Firstness

Pure Firstness refers to the independent existence of signs conceived of as a state of being or happening beyond any Experiencer. Put this way, the very existence of semiosis as a dynamic transformation of sign's identity reveals the independence of signs from any potential interpretation. As shown in the following examples, some of the concepts related with online discourse production function as entry points to the realm of Firstness where they no longer function as concepts, but as laws. More precisely, the emergence of non-assertiveness enables us to gain insight into the non-linear (chaotic) dynamics of the mammalian brain (cf. Crook, Goh 2008).

- (1) I'm *kind of* in the middle of something.

In this sentence, the hedging string 'kind of' is used to convey three self-referential meanings:

- 1.a. Vagueness. No specification about the nature of the event is provided.

“Self-esteem is a *kind of* dead-end street, yeah, you can get there, but it doesn't get you any further than that.” Interesting, huh!

- 1.b. False non-assertiveness. The utterer wants to express annoyance. The illocutionary force of the item is best accomplished through body language and contextual cues.

There's an excellent article delivering a rebuttal of the majority of the *kind of* anti-Apple accusations I'm used to reading in comments to any iPhone piece here.

- 1.c. The combination of HSs with a relative clause focuses the attention on the utterer's state of mind as a product of a concurrent action.

But, you know, just this one little act here – which is so new that nobody really knows *kind of* what its impact truly is going to be – could be quite a big deal.

### 5.2. Pure Secondness

Pure Secondness presupposes the presence of a transforming sign (instead of a “tagged” sign). As noted earlier, there are a few drawbacks to using the conventional metaphor of translation. For one, it requires that a very precise and stable



one-to-one relationship with an object be in place. Thus, the object ‘hedging’ represented in English by the representamens ‘kind of’ or ‘sort of’, cannot always be rendered as equivalent structures in a given target language. Of course, if the purpose is to teach how these structures behave in the source language, their omission would be counterproductive. This is why a set of signs (symbols) must be developed to represent different hedging strategies. In other words, the reconstruction of the semiotic path linking Text 1 and Text 2 presupposes that a sign set must be developed to refer to each hedging strategy separately. Suffice it to say for now that in some cases the process consists in defining a sign set capable of recreating the pragmalinguistic situation in Text 1 without introducing structural changes in Text 2 (the passing from Thirdness to Firstness is preserved). With these background points in mind, both the semantic and the syntactic properties of signs are taken into account (*disjointness*, i.e., clear referential power, as well as *finite differentiation* of symbols in a sign system). Furthermore, graphical suggestiveness, mnemonic efficacy, readability, and set magnitude should be considered as relevant assets.

Going back to the notion of transformation, the movement from monadic identity to dyadicy is illustrated by the user’s perception of the prosodic force of an utterance transformed by means of intonational resources at the service of lexical constructions:

- (2) Ms-HART: What’s *that*? I missed *that*. RIVERA: Mike’s just giving a *kind of* a gynecological... Ms-HART: I -- I missed *that*.

### 5.3. Pure Thirdness

From the transformation of signs derives a sophisticated dynamics defined in terms of a multipronged system; here, not only are the sign and its object considered, but also the Interpretant. In such a context, the translation process departs from the assumption that the source sign (in our case a hedging string) is the product of a multi-referential operation:

- (3) I never saw movies that way, which is *kind of* a terrible thing to say.

In this example, the representamen ‘kind of’ spins out a past representation (evaluation) of a past representation. In other words, it refers to an object seen in backflash and existing outside the mind of the Interpretant by virtue of an actualized access to the concept of ‘cinema’ as a whole. The utterer’s current reference to this previous, underdeveloped stage of representation is thus invoked by a non-assertive formulaic sequence. Interestingly, the (self)-representation issued from the conjunction of the

primary and the secondary representation constitutes yet another representation in the Interpreter's mind.

#### 5.4. Firstness of Secondness

As said above, the main feature of Secondness is the transformation of two entities preserving their own identity. It is precisely this transformation that makes semiosis possible:

- (4) She's *kind of* a party girl.
- (5) Because Mrs. Lincoln, she was – she would *kind of* lose it...

In Example 4, a shared identity between two entities is established. Firstness provides the substrate to a quality, whereas Secondness is the result of a contingent event. Interestingly, the inclusion of the hedging string enhances the characteristics associated with the complement ('a party girl'). Example 5 describes a change of state defined in two stages (Secondness): one prior to the inception of the event, the other occurring after the event has taken place. Again, the slotting pattern of the hedging string to the verb plays a crucial role here: it creates a dynamic causality, a cognitive momentum in the mind of the receiver. The circumstances of the reported event are not disclosed (leading to vagueness, a characteristic of a partially disclosed Firstness).

#### 5.5. Secondness of Thirdness

The non-assertiveness/vagueness characterization is construed as an evaluation of a factual element or event. This evaluation does not simply depict an action on the object but also a fusion with it. These participants are "real" and "virtual" simultaneously. In the following example, the real utterer reports what the virtual utterer has said:

- (6) I telephoned a friend on my cell phone and said, "You know, something's *kind of* funny here."

It can be argued as well that the cognitive element here (a condition for Thirdness) is represented by the explicit mutual agreement between speakers (the real utterer and the receiver of the message) about the asynchronous nature of the action reported, the description of which occurs in an interactive environment.

### 5.6. Firstness of Thirdness

Finally, Firstness of Thirdness features two implicit participants (characteristic of Secondness), and three explicit actants: the representamen (sign), the object for which the representamen stands, and the Interpretant. If we analyse ‘kind of’ in terms of its relationship with both the emitter (evaluator) and the interpreter (i.e., the receiver of the message) the values of vagueness (reference reduction) and/or non-assertiveness (shared context) encompass a dynamics of shared pragmalinguistic strategies between speakers, prototypically defined as “we”.

- (7) We just overheard that little conversation. It’s *kind of* creepy. Like, I don’t think you should trust that guy at all.

## 6. Semiotic Subtitling in the context of AVTS

Audiovisual Translation is defined as “the transfer from one language to another of the verbal components contained in audiovisual works and projects” (Chiaro 2013: 1). In the context of Audiovisual Translation Studies (AVTS), subtitling (a form of AVT) has been the subject of a triple discrimination: first, there is an assumption which remains alive and well in some corners of Translation Studies that subtitling (particularly intralingual) is not a type of translation proper (Gottlieb 2004; Diaz-Cintas, Remael 2007), but mere transcription (Bartoll 2004: 57); second, subtitles are viewed as an intrusive rendering of the human voice affecting the aesthetic quality of audiovisual documents, an opinion probably due to the treatment of the “*audiovisual text*” as a type of literary translation (Bassnett 1991[1980]; Snell-Hornby 1991); third, the referential power of subtitles with regard to the actual content they are supposed to convey is highly questioned, especially when compared with other forms of AVT such as dubbing. On the other hand, although subtitling is a highly specialized activity its practice has until recently tended to inhabit a disciplinary twilight zone. According to Gambier (2006), it was not until 1995 that subtitling became an established research topic. However, it is important to note that subtitling is still an underresearched area. Worst of all, no theory of language transfer, nor a consistent conceptualization or universal rules about its aesthetics and modus operandi exist (Luyken et al. 1991: 65). Furthermore, the instrumental and oftentimes patronizing approach to forms of subtitling such as respeaking (subtitles created through Speech Recognition Software) and SDH (subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing), has resulted in anti-translational practices aimed at fobbing off the target audiences with fractional written versions of the spoken language. Particularly in Columbia, audiovisual subtitling is virtually absent from the translational research

field. Whereas the preference for dubbed and subtitled films and other audiovisual content among filmgoers is split<sup>8</sup>, there seems to be a growing need for subtitled content which reportedly constitutes the lion's share of Columbian AVT companies (ca. 66.7% of the workload; cf. Orrego Carmona et al. 2010).

Against this background, I would like to suggest that a type of subtitling worth its salt must be capable of encompassing all semiotic channels. Importantly, semiotic translation and its subset, *semiotic subtitling*, should be considered as functional forms of translation drawing on the skopos model<sup>9</sup> (cf. Vermeer 1978, 1979, 1996; Holz-Mänttari 1981). According to Nord (1997: 46) the skopos model “parts from the view that translation is a form of human interaction and, as such, determined by its purpose or skopos. One of the main factors in the skopos of a communicative activity is the (intended) receiver or addressee with their specific communicative needs”. Moreover, while commercial forms of subtitling are said to be more effective when subtitles go unnoticed by the viewers (Georgakoupoulou 2009), semiotic subtitling exploits a host of semiotic techniques designed to integrate the competing influence of other semiotic channels present in the audiovisual document. By associating constructions with other signs in the audiovisual document, cognitive processes of categorization and noticing are enhanced:

The possible effect of intra- and interlingual captions and subtitles on FL learners is explained by the combination of aural, visual, and written elements in multimedia and the opportunity this combination offers for noticing speech acts which can then be internalized through task-based and other specifically designed activities. (Incalcaterra McLoughlin 2009: 175)

This, in turn, coincides with Hochel's (1986: 152) interpretation: “The text is to be understood from the standpoint of semiotics, that is to say, as the message in the relevant language (system of signs, code) with its own alphabet (vocabulary) and its own grammar (syntax, rules for linking signs)”.

<sup>8</sup> As noted by Chiaro (2013: 2), the traditional division between dubbing and subtitling blocks “is no longer clear-cut”. One of the reasons is the advent of media mobility: “Although audiences continue to watch films in theatres, even attending opening night screenings in order to experience being part of an even larger crowd, media mobility promotes a more fragmented, individualized notion of spectatorship” (Tryon 2012: 288–289).

<sup>9</sup> Although skopos theory (based on Nida's concept of *equivalence* 1966[1959]) focuses on the target text as outcome or *Translatum* (Vermeer 2004[1989]: 229), my interpretation of this theoretical framework confers relevance on the source text as well, since the pedagogic treatment of the source language requires an extensive semiotic analysis prior to its introduction in classroom settings.

Such an understanding of the relationship between subtitling and pedagogy sheds light on the question of the intrinsic qualities of alternative subtitling forms as facilitators of learning processes. Keeping in mind the premises laid out previously, the main strategies used by semiotic subtitling are described below.

(1) *Expansion*. The term expansion does not refer here to any sort of paraphrase of the source text in the target text aiming to capture an equivalent meaning. One of the factors that condition learners' experience of pedagogically-adapted audiovisual works is spectatorial investment in the entertainment side of these documents. In this sense, the representational power of subtitles should be summoned to focus the attention on specific sound-language/video-language relations. This strategy leads onto the inclusion of full target constructions (which involves, especially in interlingual translation, the reordering of translation units), metalinguistic markers, or *ad hoc* symbols associated with a language (intralingual) or pair of languages (interlingual) adapted for pedagogical purposes (see Figure 1<sup>10</sup>).



Figure 1. Metaleptic subtitling (interlingual) displaying the particle “well” and the hedging string “kind of”. These structures are inserted in the Spanish text at exactly the same place they occupy in the English text.

<sup>10</sup> All subtitled samples are part of a large database I created with views to classroom exploitation.

(2) *Retention*. Semiotic subtitling presupposes a verbatim account of the linguistic signs in an audiovisual document (especially in interlingual subtitling). These signs are predefined *segmentation units*,<sup>11</sup> not necessarily sentences. This includes structures such as discourse markers often ignored in traditional subtitling.

As a consequence, semiotic subtitling avoids the reduction of the translated text for economy purposes. In dealing with the online processing constraints posed by lexical density, this type of translation utilizes different techniques including more than two lines per translated sequence, using special synchronization frames to facilitate the noticing of target structures, including more than two turn-takings sharing the same subtitle, distinctive text colour, etc. (See Figure 2). In case of sound-text synchronization, some time-frame delay between sound and text is favoured (which contrasts with the standard time frame rate of 180 words per minute used by the DVD industry). Among the benefits of these strategies in a pedagogical context, the reduction of the slowing language processing effect observed in bilingual speakers handling two languages simultaneously (Martin et al. 2012) can be mentioned.



Figure 2. Indexical translation (interlingual) featuring a pair of discourse markers (“you know”/ “nada”) in both English and Spanish.

<sup>11</sup> From a technical perspective, these segmentation units are part of subtitle templates. These templates consist of predefined sets of language structures stored as sub-sentential chunks organized, for example, in terms of their slotting patterns in Spanish and English. An important subset of templates has been tagged for discourse analysis (verb transitivity), and syntactic analysis (argument structure constructions; cf. Goldberg 2013).

At a fundamental level, the forms of subtitling described above represent a complex of potential uses, including forms of amateur subtitling exploiting free-access software and online subtitling tools (see Bogucky 2009). What is significant for understanding these subtitling techniques is an awareness of the particularities of language instruction that mark them as different from other translational experiences. Hence, one of the many ways in which a semiotic translation can inform language instruction is its potential to complement specific content to be analysed in the classroom. The subtitling of song lyrics for the teaching of process types such as ‘happening’, ‘being’, ‘sensing’, ‘doing’, and ‘saying’ is a suitable entry point for the analysis of poetic language in L2 instruction by means of *ad hoc* subtitled documents.

According to *Systemic Functional Linguistics* (SFL), a system of transitivity (Halliday, Matthiessen 2004) can be used to construe human experience (experiential metafunction) through the medium of six process types: material, mental, verbal, existential, relational, and behavioural. Of necessity, the type of translation required for the task is *indexical* in nature. This type of translation allows for the inclusion of metalinguistic markers (i.e. meaning-focused metalanguage used to guide learners’ discursive choices and functioning as indexes) pointing at specific discourse functions and structures. An illustrative example is shown in Figure 3.



Figure 3. Indexical translation (intralingual). A set of visual cues are used to call learners’ attention to specific process types associated with “DOING” verbs.

As we can see, the subtitles show two verbs ('clawed' and 'chained') associated with process types of DOING. The use of metalinguistic markers for DOING verbs, for example, is highlighted in the subtitles and associated with particular imagery, pointing to a type of indexical translation. These markers connect specific semiotic channels simultaneously: the linguistic (including the aural), the metalinguistic, and the visual (gestures, body language, etc.). Because of the rich semiotic interconnectedness this type of subtitles tap, semiotic subtitling becomes unremittingly allusive in a way that goes beyond simple transcription. Importantly, this type of subtitles are included as part of specific tasks such as focus on forms (Focus on Forms; Long 1991, 1996; Shintani 2015), providing learners with an explicit focus on language structure.

The above description offers a pattern of thinking that is telling for an all-encompassing account of translation. It seems clear to me that the metalinguistic dimension of the process outlined above entails "metalinguistic awareness [that] is distinct from the kind of knowledge that underlies everyday language use" (Ellis 2004: 231). Put simply, semiotic translation can become part of institutionalized forms of translation fostering metalinguistic knowledge for language learning.

## Conclusion

In this paper, I have presented a semiotic approach to translation called semiotic translation in the context of EFL instruction in Columbia. With regard to subtitling, it has been argued that the translation process goes beyond the confines of language to include all the semiotic channels present in audiovisual works. In order to illustrate my position, I have provided a multidisciplinary theoretical framework combining Peircean semiotics, translation studies, and applied linguistics. Accordingly, semiotic translation fills out the sense that the connection between language and its biological substrate encapsulates an expanded definition of sign systems as social (and also ecological) phenomena rather than as objects of analysis constrained by specific semiotic ideologies. It also gets at how both the Object's and the Sign's identities can escape the objectification of perception (Thirdness), assigning specific form and meaning to both inward and outward forms of semiosis. Not least, this premise avoids conventional sign categorizations drawing on normative, abstract definitions of semiosis that ignore shifting social and cultural concerns. Relatedly, the paradigmatic shift laid out here rules out the presence of any 'ideal observers',<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The notion 'ideal observer' is the cornerstone of Bayesian inferential models. These consider that, in order for an optimal understanding of the world to occur, the brain must be "tuned to the world": "The conception of 'tuning' that is tacitly adopted in many modern treatments is that the optimal Bayesian observer is correctly tuned when its priors match those objectively in force in the environment (the 'Lord's prior')" (Feldman 2013: 15). The risk of such a stance



since sign systems can combine multiple forms of interaction, not determined by idealized first-person observers. This conception has specific resonances in the translational act, since the notion of translation is expanded to include all possible semiotic channels. In the case of semiotic translation, signs (and the objects they refer to) are deemed to function as interacting information sources acting across sign systems. This view is reinforced by the introduction of three types of pedagogically-driven semiotic translation: (1) metaleptic translation, (2) indexical translation, and (3) translation as dynamic discontinuity. These have been connected to the classroom by means of specific semiotic models of subtitling (semiotic subtitling) aimed at equipping both instructors and learners with a rationale facilitating the analysis of specific constructions. In closing, I present these translational strategies as potentially generalizable to other subtitling techniques. Overall, semiotic subtitling bestows powerful leverage that confers great advantage of flexibility to alternative modes of translation using semiotic analyses to replace questions of “meaning” with those of “usage” in language instruction.

## References<sup>13</sup>

- Bartoll, Eduard 2004. Parameters for the classification of subtitles. In: Orero, Pilar (ed.), *Topics in Audiovisual Translation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 53–60.
- Bassnett, Susan 1991[1980]. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bogucky, Łukasz 2009. Amateur subtitling on the Internet. In: Diaz Cintas, Jorge; Anderman, Gunilla (eds.), *Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 21–35.
- Cappelle, Bert; Shtyrov, Yuri; Pulvermüller, Friedeman 2010. *Heating up or cooling up the brain?* MEG evidence that phrasal verbs are lexical units. *Brain & Language* 115: 189–201.
- Chiaro, Delia 2013. Audiovisual translation. In: Chapelle, Carol A. (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1–5.
- Conklin, Kathy; Schmitt, Norbert 2008. Formulaic sequences; Are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers? *Applied Linguistics* 29(1): 72–89.
- CP = Peirce, Charles S. 1931–1958. *Collected Papers of Charles S. Peirce*. [Hartshorne, Charles; Weiss, Paul (eds.), 1931–1935; Burks, Arthur (ed.), 1958.] Cambridge: Harvard University Press [electronic edition Charlottesville: Intelex Corporaton.] In-text references are to CP, followed by volume and paragraph numbers.
- Crook, Nigel; Goh, Wee Jin 2008. Nonlinear transient computations as a potential “kernel trick” in cortical processing. *BioSystems* 94: 55–59.

---

is that “faith in the Lord’s prior – are not only epistemologically naive but, moreover, risk overtuning. Overtuning, in turn, leads to a fragility of performance in future encounters with the same class of environments, which is maladaptive. Priors must be suitably regularized to truly optimize the fit between mind and world” (Feldman 2012: 30–31).

<sup>13</sup> *Acknowledgements*: I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for his/her thoughtful and insightful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

- Danesi, Marcel 2004. *Messages, Signs, and Meanings: A Basic Textbook in Semiotics and Communication*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Deely, John 2004. "σημειον" to "sign" by way of "signum": On the interplay of translation and interpretation in the establishment of semiotics. *Semiotica* 148(1-4): 187-227.
- Diaz-Cintas, Jorge; Remael, Aline 2007. *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Ellis, Rod 2004. The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge. *Language Learning* 54(2): 227-275.
- Farias, Priscila; Queiroz, João 2004. 10cubes and 3n3: Using interactive diagrams to investigate Charles Peirce's classifications of signs. *Semiotica* 151(1-4): 41-63.
- Feldman, Jacob 2013. Tuning your priors to the world. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 5: 13-34.
- Gambier, Yves 2006. Orientations de la recherche en traduction audiovisuelle. *Target* 18(2): 261-263.
- Genette, Gérard 1980[1972]. *Narrative Discourse*. [Lewin, Jane E., trans.] Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Georgakoupoulou, Panayota 2009. Subtitling for the DVD Industry. In: Díaz Cintas, Jorge; Anderman, Gunilla (eds.), *Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 21-35.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2013. Argument structure constructions versus lexical rules or derivational verb templates. *Mind & Language* 28(4): 435-465.
- Gorlée, Dinda 1994. *Semiotics and the Problem of Translation: With Special Reference to the Semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- 2004. *On Translating Signs: Exploring Text and Semio-Translation*. (*Approaches to Translation Studies* 24.) Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
  - 2012. *Wittgenstein in Translation: Exploring Semiotic Signatures*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gottlieb, Henrik 2001[1998]. Subtitling. In: Baker, Mona (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London, New York: Routledge, 244-248.
- 2004. Subtitles and international anglicization. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 3(1): 219-230.
- Halliday, Michael. A. K 1989. *Spoken and Written Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, Michael A. K.; Matthiessen, Christian M. I. M. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Hartama-Heinonen, Ritva 2012. Interpretation is merely another word for translation: A Peircean approach to translation, interpretation and meaning. *Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences* 7: 113-129.
- Hochel, Bruno 1986. Communicative aspects of translation for TV. *Nouvelles de la FIT* 5: 151-157.
- Holz-Mänttari, Justa 1981. Übersetzen - Theoretischer Ansatz und Konsequenzen für die Ausbildung. *Kääntäjä/Översättaren* 24: 2-3.
- 1984. *Translatorisches Handeln. Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia.
  - 1986. Translatorisches Handeln - theoretisch fundierte Berufsprofile. In: Snell-Hornby, Mary (ed.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Eine Neuorientierung*. Tübingen: Francke, 348-374.
- Incalcaterra McLoughlin, Laura 2009. Subtitles in translator's training: A model for analysis. *Romance Studies* 27(3): 174-185.

- Jakobson, Roman 1966[1959]. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: Brower, Reuben A. (ed.), *On Translation*. Oxford University Press: New York, 232–239.
- Jiang, Nan; Nekrasova, Tatiana M. 2007. The processing of formulaic sequences by second language speakers. *The Modern Language Journal* 91(3): 433–445.
- Kachru, Braj. B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In: Quirk, Randolph; Widdowson, Henry G. (eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11–30.
- 1997. World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17: 66–87.
- Keane, Webb 2003. Semiotics and the social analysis of material things. *Language and Communication* 23: 409–425.
- Kline, Stephen J. 1995. *Conceptual Foundations for Multidisciplinary Thinking*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2012. The original sin of cognitive science. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 4: 396–406.
- Lin, Phoebe 2012. Sound evidence: The missing piece of the jigsaw in formulaic language research. *Applied Linguistics* 33(3): 342–347.
- Long, Michael H. 1991. Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In: De Bot, Kees; Ginsberg, Ralph B.; Kramsch, Claire (eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1996. The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In: Ritchie, William C.; Bhatia, Tej K. (eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press, 413–468.
- Luyken, George-Michael; Langham-Brown, Jo; Reid, Helen; Spinhof, Herman 1991. *Overcoming Language Barriers in Television, Dubbing and Subtitling for the European Audience*. Manchester: The European Institute for the Media.
- Martin, Clara D.; Costa, Albert; Dering, Benjamin; Hoshno, Noriko; Wu, Yan Jing; Thierry, Guillaume 2012. Effects of speed of word processing on semantic access: The case of bilingualism. *Brain & Language* 120: 61–65.
- Motha, Suhanthie; Lin, Angel 2014. “Non-coercive rearrangements”: Theorizing desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 48(2): 331–359.
- Murray, Neil 2012. English as a lingua franca and the development of pragmatic competence. *ELT Journal* 66(3): 318–326.
- NEM = Peirce, Charles S. 1976. *The New Elements of Mathematics*. [Eisele, Carolyn, ed.] The Hague: Mouton. In-text references are to NEM followed by volume and paragraph numbers.
- Nida, Eugene 1966[1959]. Principles of translation as exemplified by Bible translating. In: Brower, Reuben A. (ed.), *On Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 11–31.
- Nord, Christiane 1997. A functional typology of translations. In: Trosborg, Anna (ed.), *Text Typology and Translation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 43–66.
- Orrego Carmona, Jefferson; Alarcón Penagos, Natalia; Olaya Marulanda, Claudia; Pérez Rojas, Katherin 2010. Situación actual de la traducción audiovisual en Colombia. *IKALA* 15(26): 17–39.

- Østergård, Sven 1998. The dynamics of verbs. *Semiotica* 118: 307–320.
- Peirce, Charles S., see CP, NEM.
- Ponzio, Augusto 2000[1999]. Presentation. *Athanos: Semiotica, Filosofia, Arte, Letteratura* X(2): 5–7.
- Queiroz, João; Merrell, Floyd 2006. Semiosis and pragmatism: Toward a dynamic concept of meaning. *Sign Systems Studies* 34(1): 37–65.
- Radford, Luis 2008. Diagrammatic thinking: Notes on Peirce's semiotics and epistemology. *PNA* 3(1): 1–18.
- Rajagopalan, Kanavillil 2012. "World English" or "World Englishes"? Does it make any difference? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 22(3): 374–391.
- Reddy, Michael 1979. The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In: Ortony, Anthony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reiß, Katharina; Vermeer, Hans J. 1991[1984]. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translations-theorie. (Linguistische Arbeiten 147.)* Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Sampson, Andrew 2012. Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal* 66(3): 293–303.
- Saraceni, Mario 2008. English as a lingua franca: Between form and function. *English Today* 24(2): 20–26.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2003. The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language* 79(2): 233–281.
- 2007. Evolutionary patterns of New Englishes and the special case of Malaysian English. *Asian Englishes* 6(1): 44–63.
- Seargeant, Phillip 2012. Disciplinarity and the study of world Englishes. *World Englishes* 31(1): 113–129.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary 1991. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shintani, Natsuko 2015[2014]. The incidental grammar acquisition in focus on form and focus on forms instruction for young beginner learners. *TESOL Quarterly* 49(1): 115–140.
- So, Paul; Tanushree B., Luke; Barreto, Ernest 2014. Networks of theta neurons with time-varying excitability: Macroscopic chaos, multistability and final-state uncertainty. *Physica D* 267: 16–26.
- Subtirelu, Nicholas 2013. What (do) learners want (?): A re-examination of the issue of learner preferences regarding the use of "native" speaker norms in English language teaching. *Language Awareness* 22(3): 270–291.
- Thellefsen, Torkild 2005. The revised fundamental sign. *Semiotica* 155(1–4): 51–63.
- Torres-Martínez, Sergio 2009. Las vicisitudes de la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras en Colombia. *Diálogos Latinoamericanos* 15: 56–75.
- 2013. A role for lexical bundles in the implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning programmes in Colombian universities. *English Today* 114(2): 40–45.
- 2014. Introducing conversational grammar in EFL: A case for *hedging strings*. *English Today* 118(2): 24–32.
- Tryon, Chuck 2012. "Make any room your TV room": Digital delivery and media mobility. *Screen* 53(3): 287–300.
- Valencia, Marlon 2013. Language policy and the manufacturing of consent for foreign intervention in Colombia. *Profile* 15(1): 27–43.

- Vélez-Rendón, Gloria 2003. English in Colombia: A sociolinguistic profile. *World Englishes* 22(2): 185–198.
- Vermeer, Hans J. 1978. Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie. *Lebende Sprachen* 23: 99–102.
- 1979. Vom “richtigen” Übersetzen. *Mitteilungsblatt für Dolmetscher und Übersetzer* 25(4): 2–8.
  - 1996. *A Skopos Theory of Translation. (Some Arguments For and Against)*. Heidelberg: TEXTconTEXT.
  - 2004[1989]. Skopos and commission in translational action. [Chesterman, Andrew, trans.] In: Venuti, Lawrence (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 227–238.
- Wirth, Uwe. 2002. As we may surf: The relevance of abductive inference for surfing through the internet. *Semiotica* 141: 159–168.
- Yano, Kazuo 2013. The science of human interaction and teaching. *Mind, Brain, and Education* 7(1): 19–29.

### **Семиозисный перевод: новое теоретическое обрамление для использования субтитров в сфере педагогики**

В данной статье рассматриваются новые типы перевода в контексте аудиовизуальных переводческих исследований. Для этого анализируются формулы, имеющие прагмалингвистическое значение (*hedging strings*). В статье утверждается, что мультидисциплинарный подход к характеристикам англоязычного общения дает представление о прагмалингвистической функции конкретных языковых последовательностей при создании онлайн-дискурса с целью их использования на уроках английского языка. В теории анализ опирается на семиозисный перевод и его подвид – семиозисное субтитрование. В статье утверждается, что такой подход проясняет связь вербальных знаков с другими знаковыми системами. Подход опирается на три типа семиозисного перевода: 1) металеptический перевод; 2) индексальный перевод; 3) перевод как динамическая прерывность.

### **Semioosiline tõlge: uus teoreetiline raam pedagoogilise suunitlusega subitreerimise rakendamiseks**

Käesolevas artiklis vaatlen uusi semiootikast lähtuvaid tõlketüüpe audiovisuaalsete tõlkeuringute kontekstis. Sel eesmärgil analüüsitakse valemjadasid, millel on pragmalingvistiline väärtus (põikleemisväljendid e. *hedging strings*). Väidetakse, et ingliskeelsele vestlusele omaste joonte tutvustamine multidistsiplinaarsest perspektiivist valgustab konkreetsete keeleliste jadade pragmalingvistilist funktsiooni *online*-diskursuse loomisel, pidades silmas nende pedagoogilist kasutamist inglise keele kui võõrkeele tundides. Teoreetiliselt toetub analüüs semiootikast lähtuvale raamile, mida nimetatakse semioosiliseks tõlkeks, ning selle alljao-tusele, semioosilisele subitreerimisele. Väidetakse, et see lähenemine annab selgituse sellele, mis seob keelemärke teiste märgisüsteemidega. See põhineb kolmel semioosilise tõlke tüübil: (1) metaleptiline tõlge, (2) indeksikaalne tõlge ja (2) tõlge kui dünaamiline katkendlikkus.