

International Semiotics Institute (ISI), Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

ICoN2016: PROCESSES, MAPS, NARRATIVES

SemTra2016: 12th International Symposium on Semiotics and Translation

Directors: Professor Pirjo Kukkonen & Dr. Ritva Hartama-Heinonen

University of Helsinki, pirjo.kukkonen@helsinki.fi, ritva.hartama-heinonen@helsinki.fi

**Semiotics, Multisemiotics, Translation-semiotics, and Translating:
Maps, Gaps, and Bridges**

Throughout our history, we have interpreted all types of signs – natural signs and human-made signs – to give them an identity, a content, a purpose, and a meaning. Signs become meaningful only in processes and systems.

In the history of semiotics, the process of semiosis was mapped very early, for instance, by the physician Galen of Pergamum (129–c.215) for whom diagnosis was a process of *semeiosis*. By the 18th century, the terms *semiotica*, *semeiotica*, *semiotique*, or *Semiotik* were employed as official medical terms denoting the doctrine of symptoms and later on, the term *semiology* found use in medical semiotics. Within philosophy, semiotics was introduced in the thought of Locke (1690), Lambert (1764), or Bolzano (1837), as well as of Peirce, Morris, and many others (the 19th and 20th centuries). As to linguistics and structuralism, the key figures were de Saussure (1916) who represented *sémiologie*, and Bühler (1934), who discussed the interface between language and functions in his *sematology*. In the 1950s and 1960s, Jakobson developed an approach to the diverse functions of language, that is, his well-known communication model (which was later on adapted in the functionalist translation research). In the 1960s, Greimas started his text semiotic project. In the 1970s and onwards, Lotman and Bakhtin were the forerunners for *cultural semiotics*. In 1969, *semiotics* was adopted as the general term. This short historical overview of the four main branches of semiotics – empirical, philosophical, linguistic, and cultural – illustrates the idea of a sign process, that is, how signs, when they are used for some function or purpose, become meaningful. This list can aptly be complemented by Halliday's *social semiotics* (from the 1970s), which has informed research on *multimodality* (Kress and many others) and *multisemiotics* (O'Halloran, Ventola).

In the historical mapping of *translation studies*, semiotics is used in many ways as theories, methodologies, and perspectives, dialogically and polyphonically (collaborative strategies) as both maps and bridges, but also as a scene of Bakhtinian heteroglossia (conflicting strategies), that is, as a scene of gaps, theoretically and methodologically speaking as *la struttura assente* (Eco). Translation studies is a relatively young interdisciplinary (1950s–) which borrows its methods from other disciplines, as does the interdisciplinary field of the *semiotics of translation*.

For both semiotics and translation studies, the processes of signification and meaning-making is crucial. In our SemTra2016 symposium, the purpose is to discuss intra-, inter- and multidisciplinary within semiotics, multisemiotics, and multimodal studies, translation semiotics, and translation studies. Drawing on the theoretical and empirical approaches to the questions of semiotics and translation, the aim is to chart the maps, gaps, and bridges in narrating traditional and new theories, methodologies, and models in translation activity. Translation activity covers Jakobson's (1959) intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic forms of interpretation and translation, and concerns diverse text worlds which provide us with an opportunity to interpret, translate, transfer, and mediate for instance, textually (genre-specifically and stylistically) varying signs across sign systems.

E-mail: pirjo.kukkonen@helsinki.fi, ritva.hartama-heinonen@helsinki.fi