

TARTU SEMIOTICS LIBRARY 15

Series editors:

Kalevi Kull

Silvi Salupere

Peeter Torop

Advisory board:

Tatiana Chernigovskaya (St.Petersburg State University, Russia)

Robert E. Innis (University of Massachusetts Lowell, USA)

Frederik Stjernfelt (Aarhus University, Denmark)

Jaan Valsiner (Aalborg University, Denmark)

Ekaterina Velmezova (Lausanne University, Switzerland)

Vilmos Voigt (Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary)

Tartu Semiootika Raamatukogu 15

Тартуская библиотека семиотики 15

**Tõlkest transduktsioonini:
intersemioosi klaasjas olemus**

**От перевода до трансдукции:
прозрачная сущность интерсемиозиса**

Dinda L. Gorfée

FROM TRANSLATION
TO TRANSDUCTION:
THE GLASSY ESSENCE
OF INTERSEMIOSIS

Book series *Tartu Semiotics Library*

Editors: Kalevi Kull, Silvi Salupere, Peeter Torop

Copy editors: Jonathan Griffin, Tyler Bennett, Silver Rattasepp

Address of the editorial office:

Department of Semiotics

University of Tartu

Jakobi St. 2

Tartu 51014, Estonia

<http://www.ut.ee/SOSE/tsl.html>

Copyright: University of Tartu, 2015

ISSN 1406-4278 (print)

ISSN 2228-2149 (online)

ISBN 978-9949-32-989-2 (print)

ISBN 978-9949-77-010-6 (online)

University of Tartu Press

www.tyk.ee

For Jeff Bernard † 2010
with tears of joy

... But man, proud man
Dressed in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
His glassy essence, like an angry ape
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As makes the angels weep, who, with our spleens,
Would all themselves laugh mortal.

(Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, Act II, Scene 2)

Contents

1. Facts and Figures of Translation	9
2. Translation and Semiotranslation	20
2.1. Translation	20
2.2. Semiotranslation	28
2.3. Circuitous Roads	32
2.4. Anatomy of the <i>Black Box</i>	47
3. Semiotic Tools of Translation	56
3.1. Peirce's Categories	56
3.2. Multitasking	66
3.3. Experiment, Experience, Expertise	72
3.4. Hypostatic Abstraction	83
4. From Intersemiosis to Transduction	91
4.1. Beyond Translation	91
4.2. Transposition, Transcoding, Transmutation	99
4.3. Linguiculture	105
4.4. Multimessages	111
4.5. From Duplicity to Triadicity	115
4.6. Transduction	123
5. Between Fact and Fiction	130
5.1. Amusement and Musement	130
5.2. Thoreau's Arcadia	139
5.3. Homeric Mimesis	152
5.4. Grieg's Vaudeville	171
5.5. Reli-kitsch	183
5.6. Dalí's Fantastic Trick	201
5.7. Lust and Luxury	221
6. Postscript on Transduction	231
References	236
Name index	253

1. Facts and Figures of Translation

The process of translation can suggest to the readers a wealth of further opportunities: the combination of literary, historical, and cultural studies into the whole region of the semiotic approach. The next chapter of this book has as a principal theme the narrow along with more full ideas, notions, and processes of the concept of translation from one language to another (Chapter 2). Rephrasing Charles Sanders Peirce's molding and modeling of semiotic reasoning, the techniques of "signs", "tools", and "models" (Bunn 1981) in the process of translation starts with a simple sign receiving the new form and structure taken from a different sign system. The semiotic phenomenon turns translation into a human-made tool of modeling arts into "translation" (Chapter 3). The movement of ordinary "translation" will then grow into an intermedial model for "intersemiosis" and "transduction" (Chapter 4). Tracing the synoptic view of primary translation as it may transform into the "category mistake" (Bunn 1981: 107) of the figurative "translation" will be further developed.

"Translation" in quotation marks indicates the changing of one thing into something else. The inverted commas make possible the melodramatic plasticity of form and material of "translation" growing further into "transduction". Transduction is the new term that relates to the parallel of "translation" not applied to language but within intermediality of speeches of non-linguistic texture between the doctrinal, the educational, and the emotional aspects of different arts. Beyond language, transduction is the history of resemblances and likenesses permitting a modernist (or postmodernist) setting or bracketing together source side by target side of two arts. The practical and theoretical questions seem split into two stories on postmodernist prefigurements of human art (Sebeok 1981: 210–259).

First, the modishly cult name of Susan Sontag's "camp" objects identifies the ego-psychology of the postmodernist or neo-avant-gardist treatment of kitsch art (Cornis-Pope 2008: 17, Bertens 1995: 14, 23, 29, 132). Jencks (1987) proposes the definition of "late-modern" as separate from "early modern" and "postmodern" movements, while Danesi has emphasized postmodernism as the counter-reformation of modern art stressing "eclecticism and eccentricity in design, putting, for example, a triangular roof structure on skyscrapers" (2009: 238). In Sontag's words:

Camp sees everything in quotation marks. It's not a lamp, but a "lamp"; not a woman, but a "woman." To perceive Camp in objects and persons is to understand Being-as-Playing a Role. It's the farthest extension, in sensibility, of the metaphor of life as theatre. (Sontag 1966: 281; see Bertens 1995: 100)

Camp is regarded as the melodramatic voice of the artist, expressing his or her special (or specialized) mood or ambivalence for a sublime, but slightly "degraded", fashion of "decadent" ornament (or ornate decoration). The "radical" approach of the new play of metatextuality and intertextuality meets the challenge to the traditional modes of modernist arts against classicism (Chapter 5). Jencks's "Protestant Inquisition" (1987:12f.) has shifted from a consistent mood of conservative standards to a kaleidoscopic sensibility of collage and stream-of-consciousness in arts, called a "Post-Modern carnival" (Jencks 1987: 55). The critical attitudes of Cubism, Dadaism, Surrealism, and Objectualism feel less evangelical about the cultural creativity of art objects. These trends stress the "formal, self-reflexive, parodic experiments, with a recognition of stronger political (contestatory) forms of postmodernist representation" (Cornis-Pope 2008: 17). The deconstructive criticism of postmodern camp "politicizes" or "depoliticizes" the double coding of what an artistic form could stand for: against the coded modernist reaction to the uncoded self-reference of the artist or artisan, having a complex relationship to narrating forms of irony, allegory, and parody (Chapter 4, 5).

Second, Susanne Langer's "deceptive analogies" (1957: 75–89) suggest the interrelations of all arts into the "transductive" craftsmanship of "translations" in quotation marks. The special effects of the arts show how the different materials and techniques appeal as artistic aftereffects to the audience. The quotation marks differentiate between language and metalanguage into the metanarrative of imagined "reality". In the assimilation of music into dance or sculpture into painting, there must be a "balletic" (German *tänzerisch*) entertainment characterizing the playful show. The *ballet* style of metalanguage and metanarrative push away from daily reality into all kinds of conjoined arts: poetry and music, painting, sculpture, dance, and so forth.

First, Langer meant translations in the materialistic sense, when she wrote that: "Even where the parallels of structure are recognizable, as in a painted design following the verbal design of a sonnet, the visual forms may be interesting, even pleasant, but they are not creative" (Langer 1957: 86). This conventional or "half-baked" (Langer 1957: 86) translation can be followed by another, also weak, kind of translation, suggesting that

architecture is frozen music; but music is not melted architecture. When this musical ice cream is returned to its liquid state, it runs away in an amorphous flow of sound [...] A painting expressive of a very lyrical composition, such as Chopin's G major *Nocturne*, has no lyrical character at all, but only indistinct washes of color. The reason for such failure is that the painter is not guided by discernment of musical values, but is concentrating his

attention on his own feelings under the influence of sounds, and producing *symptoms* of these feelings. What he registers is a sequence of essentially uncomposed, actual experiences; symptoms are not works. (Langer 1957: 86f.)

Instead of the token-like or “symptomatic” type of partial translation, referring to mere details or fragments (Gorlée 2007), the third type of “translation” becomes a real translation to give a complex, coherent composition to the work in its entirety, with its “semblance of concentration together with complete articulation” (Langer 1957: 87). In Langer’s words:

Schumann’s “Arabesque” does not copy any design of Arabic sculpture, but it achieves a feeling of elaborated thought where no thought really has beginning nor end, or of motion in a maze yet without dizziness [...] Interweaving of phrases is only an obvious bit of imitation in Schumann’s piece; the to and fro of ambiguous or mixed harmonies and the relations of melodic rhythmic accents are just as important, and correspond to nothing in a stone tracery. The sculptor works with light, texture, height, and many other material data of which Schumann was certainly not thinking. He probably was not even thinking of any particular arabesque, though of course we cannot know his thought. (Langer 1957: 87f.)

In such parallels of ordinary “translation”, the point is not merely superficial techniques or materials, but rather a spiritual (or even humorous) attachment to two arts, giving the created art forms or decorated objects a new mastery, called “transduction”.

In the transformation into transposition, transcoding, and transmutation, the method of primary translation will be inevitable and even desirable in the larger “second-hand” activities of different kinds of “translation” (Chapter 4). This book, *From Translation to Transduction: The Glassy Essence of Intersemiosis*, welcomes us into the free, charming, and even luxurious ideas of what “translation” could eventually express in the essence of “transduction”: composing and depicting the varieties of different and differentiated art objects springing from the artistic imagination of Roman Jakobson, the innovator of the new tradition in translation. After real and reverse forms of intersemiosis, the change will develop further into the novelty (or even the kitschiness) involved in the interartistic forms and shapes of “transduction”, as argued here in the metanarratives of the practical examples (Chapter 5).

Pursuing in this book the fruitful roots of biotranslation (Kull, Torop 2003), the creeping movement of forms of “translation” offers parallel – or perhaps better: parasitic – transformations of the “serial strings, as in speech, or writing, or gesturing” (Sebeok 1984: 8) of symbiosis referring to Peirce’s semiosis.¹ “Parasite”

¹ For an introduction into Peirce’s semiotics and his semiotic terminology, see Savan (1987–1988); for a shorter explanation, see Gorlée (1994: 31–66).

derives from ancient Greek for “fellow diner” or “table companion”. This neutral term for “one who sits near the food” starts acquiring the pejorative sense it still has today (Heller, Humez, Dror 1983: 143f.). The parasite is condemned as an organism that has a dependent relationship with another organism. Generally, parasites are regarded as target outsiders, with no vital function except finding refuge from predators in the host source for nourishment, but causing disease or deformation in the source specimen (source text). The parasitical plant or animal (target text) survives as alien (alienated, alienizing)² target organism living at the expense of, and harmful to, the original species (source text). Instead of the “hard” sense of parasitism with target intruders invading a prey, the “soft” reproductive system is perhaps a more useful association of spreading out from the source into the target materials (Gorlée 2011a: 177f.).³

The outgrowth of the intruding target plant may perhaps not be harmful to the source, but when glancing at its roots – by means of an underground, but wild and nomadic, rhizome (Gorlée 2004b: 173–177) – the organism still manages to fulfill its mission: to ensure survival in the struggle for life. Parasitism could give something in return: the main branch can ramify into several branches into target branches. The prolific shapes of the target branches are “copies” responsible for the soft plasticity of the fertile soil in the obvious branches and leaves. The multiple copies (replicas) can harden into a final cause for the future, making it such that the original source tends to belong to the hidden memory as a thing of the untraceable past. The parasitical elasticity of both sides of translation will refer back to the recoding of encoded messages in language, to decode this cryptogram of which the set of codes (transformation rules) tends to hide the exchange from the source text to the differentiation inside not one, but a multiplicity of target texts (Sebeok 1984: 8) (Chapter 4).

Peirce’s image of the forked road (CP: 1.371) (Chapter 2) branches off to the positive harmony of symbiosis or semiosis – bound in an alliance of mutual benefit, but the extension holds out the branch of liberation taken from the original stasis of source and target texts. The metaphor of parasitism can mean the mutual benefit of sheltering each other in well-being, or rather developing a risk of resistance to infectious diseases from outside. The freedom between two symbols may be a romance, since it

² “Alienation” is here expressed in biology. However, in a metaphorical sense, it carries “specific but disputed meanings in a range of disciplines from social and economic theory to philosophy and psychology” (Williams 1976: 33). The notion of alienation is a “term of inflated currency” meaning the “expression of the human condition” (Bunn 1981: 1981: 172). Alienation is “not intrinsically an evil” (Bunn 1981: 172) and may be regarded as the “glassy essence” argued throughout this book.

³ Michel Serres adorned the rhetoric style of French philosophy with poetic speech and multilingual puns. The mixed pseudo-literary narration makes Serres’ logic of parasitism (1982) apply to the labyrinth of verbal themes, but becomes out of step with the insights of Peirce’s semiosis (Freadman 2004: 263f., Nöth 2012: 124f., 128f.).

may be simple juxtaposition (literal metaphor), a rhetorical statement of likeness or similarity (descriptive metaphor), an analogy of proportion among four terms (formal metaphor), an identity of an individual with its class (concrete universal or archetypal metaphor), or statement of hypothetical identity (anagogic metaphor). (Frye [1957]1973: 366)

The parasitical culture can be a horror of “operatic” art, larger than life, but can also be converted into a pleasurable amusement of the *dernier cri* in fashion, as denoted and connoted in the practical examples (Chapter 5).

The “hardness” of regency can still be weakened into making all kinds of the degenerate copies of itself in the image, motif, and archetype of all types of “translations”. Regency of translations can be provided with a loss of meaning between source and target texts and can thus become “infected”. In those “parasitical” forms, as noted, the dramatic or theatrical versions can play a parodic or eccentric role of the secondary adjunct or interval of the primary source text (Chambers 2010). The source text tends to disappear from the natural scene to highlight the interpreted, or translated, scenario of the artificial target text. The exotic or “alienating” loss of equivalence between source and target texts can be supposed to deconstruct the “political” information into types of misinformation between the act of translation. The misconstruction makes the effort after meaning a mostly impossible task (Brown 2002 cited in Serres 1974, 1982). Here, in this book, the loss of equivalence has been disentangled from the French political connection and liberated from the desire or effort of the two-way equivalent translation (Lotman 1990: 47). The loss of equivalence is approached as an ordinary phenomenon with the relevance of the cultural equivalences in the phenomenon of the new term, transduction.

The lack of equivalence attempts the unfashionable and negative task of developing some ritual bondage of the familiarity of what we know (source) with the yet unknown unfamiliarity (target). The freedom offers a conceptual framework of translation repeated and not-repeated in the alienated parasitism of all kinds of “translations”. The non-equivalence would seem a negative answer to the fashions of the cultural trend. Yet the positive sense will show the lack of equivalence as the richness and depth of a broader process, widening Jakobson’s experiment of the three types of translation (1959: 233). The availability of alternative conceptual models, such as the artistic case of “transduction”, is not an idly speculative movement, but regarded as a potent factor in encouraging translation and “translation” to appeal to Peirce’s sentiment, experience, and reflection. As shall be noted, the artistic “translators” reflect with much delicacy and skill upon Peirce’s categories of Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness, reflecting on the results which the cultural variations might produce: identity, fashion, and decorum (Peirce’s names of these cultural types are tone, token, and type) (Chapter 4).

As shall be noted in the dividing line between the theoretical direction and the practical examples in the present work, transduction is no longer dominated

by the applied linguistics governing the procedure of translation; but helped by auxiliary sciences (such as biology, folklore, archaeology, theatre studies, and religion) transduction is associated with the primary cultural material of fine arts. Transduction applies the method of “linguiculture” (Gorlée in Anderson, Gorlée 2011), a hybrid method of language-and-culture moving into the cultural behavior belonging to the languages of arts (Chapter 4). Both language and culture have “hard” and “soft” aspects and their intercombination (or transcombination and cross-combination) will explore the interartistic interface between signs with codes and their shapes of uncodedness. The one-way growth from translation into intersemiosis or transduction will not be restrained by the cotextual relativity of the code-governed thoughts of language, but the growth of conventional translation from “translation” to “transduction” will give both fixity and mobility to both sides, source and target objects.

Persisting in the “hard” sciences of biotranslation (Kull, Torop 2003), the varieties of intersemiosis and transduction will put up with a multifunctional and open-ended flow of parasitical ideas in contextual (*Umwelt*-like) forms and shapes. However, the purpose is the commentary (or metacommentary) within “soft” humanities about man’s (and woman’s) tendency to grow into adopting human routines (adopted as Peirce’s habits, see Gorlée forthcoming). Habit-breaking can transform into habit-taking (Chapter 3, 4). Habits break the clichés of “ordinary” habits (Secondness and Firstness) to grow steadily into logical Thirdness (CP: 1.409, 6.32). The flow of evolution removes the boundaries and limits of fluid readaptations, reshaping the flux of “translation” into parenthesis.

“Translation” shows the metatheoretical developments of translation in theory and practice. Within “translation”, intersemiosis is still based on speech as source or target text, but becomes through the translator’s work a novel but still imaginable (un)coding of metalanguage. Transduction exceeds the “old” ways of translation, based on equivalence from source to target, meant to create non-verbal metanarratives and metapoems (Popovič 1975: 12f.), moving at a specular distance from the inquiry of simple reasoning coded in the transferal of one speech to the next. Transduction will reach the endless fascination of aestheticizing the “ordinary” practice and experience to inspire the commercial feeling and naturalistic potentialities of imagining unprecedented paranarratives to organize them progressively in the uncoded multimessages of fine arts.

Semiotic transduction is actively connected (and disconnected) with other media to mix their sharp differences of the media into creating a theatrical or musical performance. Transduction refers to the sculptural or dancing spectacle. The artistic ideas, experiences, and thoughts of Henry David Thoreau, Edvard Grieg, and Salvador Dalí (Chapter 5) will offer practical instances of metalanguage in metaliterature, now appearing as metanarrative elements in technical details of source and target texts in language, music, or sculpture. Together with their analyses, the bio-energetic exemplification does not claim to have solved the meaning of the syncretism of the metamedium and the metadata into the

artistic desires of the target, the metapoem. Transduction will remain the hidden sign of the magical *black box*, although a part of it (a mere fragment, as argued) becomes transfigured into the metacreation of public amusement. Such amusement is the effect of Peirce's unstable "musement" (further defined in Chapter 5). Musement exists to meander towards a stable form to be cherished and enjoyed as the collective amusement in arts.

The mystery will stay, since the subjective illusion is made of the individualistic and playful differences echoing in the author and artist's minds and hearts. The artist gives a particular voice to the artistic impersonation that secretly ferments the active imagination of the reader and listener. In the following pages, the meaning of the unanalyzed examples will be explained through Peirce's categorical thought, flowering into the inferential formulation of the human mind in what we see and listen to the real and fictional worlds. In the critical applications of the transducer's effort, I will pursue Peirce's theoretical principle of "hypostatic abstraction" (Chapter 3) that takes the interdependence of the wide-ranging implications of his categories, from Firstness and Thirdness, to nourish the real Secondness. This order is the methodological tool for the ambiguity and eccentricities of the spiritual mind of the multilingual artwork, explaining the practical theory and exemplification of transduction.

Beginning this monograph from "ordinary" translation as the transferral from one language into another, I have found myself in a sense entangled in intersemiosis. Long ago, I read MacCannell, MacCannell's semiotic commentary about the future views on "the verge of a new era of freedom in intersemiotic studies [regarding] the opening of direct analytical relationships between semiotic systems [...] beyond the one-way relationship of language to other systems of meaning" (MacCannell, MacCannell 1982: 153). This counterrevolutionary tendency surfaced at the early moment of contemporary semiotics, when the semiotic doctrine was still at low ebb in many parts of the world. The invitation to the oceanic cultures and transoceanic subcultures has turned into a theoretical and practical tool to get semiotic methodology through the back door. My reaction was excited about the horizons of intersemiotic processes, but with some caution, suggesting that

The decentering of language and linguistics within semiotics should be interpreted positively, meaning that verbal signs are accompanied by, and built upon, nonverbal ones, so that a constant interaction takes place between them. This aspectual differentiation has important consequences for the varieties of translation between them. Jakobson's still relatively narrow concept of intersemiotic processes has been stretched to include not only the transmutation of verbal signs into nonverbal sign systems, but also the reverse operations. (Gorlée 1994: 227)

From around the 1980s, interdisciplinary studies criss-crossing the boundaries between the changing fields of research, have become a "fashionable" trend. All types of "interdisciplinary excursions into foreign territory" (Gunn 1992: 239)

have turned the humanistic practice upside down and made them intellectually interesting, taken from the perspective of Barthes' "traversal" (1986: 58) or "transversals" (1979: 75) (trans. from Barthes' French word "*traversée*"). The contemporary tendency to mark the difference between source and target texts has acknowledged, instead of the "old" symmetry, the view of an unbalanced lack of traditional equivalence. The negative counterpart of the *difference* seems "ripe for [the] infiltration, subversion, or outright assault" of the positive and creative "reconfiguration [which] seeks to reproduce or recover meanings that their formerly configured relations tended to blur, camouflage, or efface" (Gunn 1992: 243).

Barthes' statement that the text is a fabric – no fixed product, but a process – became really *en vogue*. The text (or texts) cut across the work in transpositions as travesty of the facts, in which certain ideas are transmitted in different cultures and from generation to generation to give a new meaning. The inspiration came from Barthes' image that

the reader of the Text might be compared to an idle subject (who has relaxed his image-repertoire): this fairly empty subject strolls (this has happened to the author of these lines, and it is for this reason that he has come to an intense awareness of the Text) along a hillside at the bottom of which flows a *wadi* (I use the word to attest to a certain alienation): what he perceives is multiple, irreducible, issuing from heterogeneous, detached substances and levels: lights, colors, vegetation, heat, air, tenuous explosions of sound, tiny cries of the birds, children's voices from the other side of the valley, paths, gestures, garments of inhabitants close by or very far away; all these incidents are half identifiable: they issue from known codes, but their combinative operation is unique, it grounds the stroll in a difference which cannot be repeated except as *difference*. (Barthes 1986: 60)

The cultural differentiation moves away from the traditional coded "grammar" into Peirce's "musement" introducing all types of uncoded transpositions (Chapter 4). The exercise of uncharted freedom will affect the innovative and controversial models of the works of Thoreau, Grieg, and Dalí, to understand and "control" (or reject any control of) their avant-garde narrative structure in its day. The exemplification opens the present to the past and to future generations into all types of rebellious ideas and bizarre thoughts within literature, music, and sculpture (Chapter 5). However, the manipulation of digital art or computer graphics in images or sounds has engaged art history into the translation (and "translation") of pioneering art projects. This fresh "branch" between the automatic, the mechanical, and the cybernetic processing deserves a specialized author.

The classification, organization, and hierarchization of possible intersemioses in this book follows the work of the Brazilian artist Julio Plaza's inter-code of text and image of trans-creative ideograms, based on Peirce's semiotics. After his dissertation *Sobre tradução inter-semiótica* (1985) at the Pontifical University of São Paulo, he published the commercial edition *Tradução inter-semiótica* (1987).

While his publications are mainly in Portuguese, he published in English the article “Reflection of and on theories of translation” (1981). After Plaza’s death in 2003, the semiotic scholarship of intersemiosis seems to rest with Peeter Torop and myself. Torop leads the area of cultural semiotics at the University of Tartu, and his scholarship is based on the bilingual and asymmetrical dialogue within Juri Lotman’s intercultural “semiosphere” (Lotman 1990: 143).⁴ Discussing translation as devices of intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and intermediality, translation is defended as culture and culture as translation (Torop 1999, 2003, 2007). Torop’s book *Total’nyj perevod* (1995, in Russian) classified “total translation” as follows:

1) whole texts are translated into other whole texts (*textual translation*), 2) whole texts are translated into culture as various metatexts (annotations, reviews, studies, commentaries, parodies, etc.) supplementing text translation or relating a certain text into culture (*metatextual translation*), 3) text or text groups are translated into text units (*intertextual and intertextual translation*), 4) texts made of one substance (for example, verbal) are translated into texts made of other substance (for example, audiovisual) (*extra-textual translation*). (Torop 2003: 271–272).

After my occasional remarks in the pages of previous books about the semiotic approach to translation (Gorlée 1994, 2004a, 2005a, 2005c, 2012) and articles, such as “Jakobson and Peirce: Translational intersemiosis and symbiosis in opera” (Gorlée 2008a) and “Metacreation” (Gorlée 2010b), I have proceeded further along Peirce’s and Jakobson’s semiotic lines to write about the duality of foreignizing or domesticating translations. Re-reading Silverstein’s article “Translation, transduction, transformation: Skating ‘glossando’ on thin semiotic ice” (2003)⁵ and reading Keane’s recently published article “On spirit writing:

⁴ For Lotman’s semiosphere, see *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture* (1990: 123–214).

⁵ Silverstein’s article was published (with a valuable number of other essays) in the collection *Translating Cultures: Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology* (Rubel, Rosman 2003). On the cover, the bust of *Venus de Milo* with a lipsticked mouth and a blue ribbon in her hair, in the company of the mask of an art-deco smoking lady. On top of the head, a scorpion (*Bust of Venus, With Mask and Scorpion*, 1938; Madame Yevonde Portrait Archive, London). The cover confronts the reader with the glamorous exoticism of pioneering photos of old models transferred into a modernized version. The target version may perhaps acknowledge the source model: Caesar van Everdingen’s oil on canvas *Trompe l’œil With a Bust of Venus* (1665; Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague). The nude Venus is figured elegantly with a pink drapery in seemingly simple folds around her body. The floral display around the head and neck encircles the *finesse* of the charming appearance of the lady. Venus’ torso, accompanied by the smallish size of Cupid’s head, maintains the “cryptogram” of the mannered pose of mother and son (see the tabu tale, Leach, Fried 1984: 269, see 1155). The paradox of transduction offers the illusionist picture with many possible meanings to decode. The uncertainty of the artistic impulses adapt and refashion old material. As argued in Chapter 5, the *trompe l’œil* of Surrealism adapts the original of the marble cult-statue into the ambiguous shapes of the Venus in disguise.

The materiality of language and the religious work of transduction” (2013) forced this book on me, written in a paraphrase of their arguments. In the pages of this book, the updated semiotics of Peirce and Jakobson illustrate the relevant parts of the theory in which the examples of parasitical forms of transformation grew abruptly or suddenly from one medium into the next.

My general aim is to explore the rational and irrational structure of the artistic intermediality in three stages of translation, and, in the process, to throw some light on how the analysis of intersemiosis and transduction can fit in with, and become indeed an application of, Peirce’s and Jakobson’s semiotic approaches. Peirce’s semiotics includes both logical and pre- or post-logical sign systems of whatever genre. Specifically, the analysis of the “strange” transferral from source to target images forges new paths where other theoreticians have not tread; yet the following analysis is the starting place for describing what translation, intersemiosis, and transduction can (or may) signify. Facing the previous scholarship about intersemiosis, my analysis spins off the surprising pathways of the expression of trans-creativity in artistic artworks. I owe a debt of gratitude to the publications of Plaza, Torop, and other scholars on a subject so vast and in which so much territory is still to be charted. Finally, let us await the work of future semiotic scholars to survey the hills and valleys extending the critical scenery with their analysis of the subjective vagaries, composed by “translators” and “transducers”.

Chapters 2 and 3 appeared in some parts elsewhere: “The *black box* of translation: A glassy essence” that originally was published in *Semiotica* (Gorlée 2010a), “Metacreation” in *Applied Semiotics / Sémiotique appliquée* (Gorlée 2010b), and “Jakobson and Peirce: Translational intersemiosis and symbiosis in opera” (Gorlée 2008a) in *Sign Systems Studies*. I wish to thank Marcel Danesi, João Queiroz, and Kalevi Kull for their kind permission to republish, though with massive revisions, some sections of my articles here. Thanks to the Louvre Museum (Paris) and Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (Rotterdam) for the reprint of the copyright of the inside images.

The formal but impenetrable anatomy of the *black box* has served as my starting-point to define the metacreation of refashioned translations, readapted and reimagined to all kinds of artistic metanarratives, now called “transductions” meaning alien, alienating, and alienated translations. The *black box* model has made concrete William Shakespeare’s magical expression of man’s “glassy essence” (*Measure for Measure*, Act II, Scene 2 in 1987a: 2: 797), pursued in Peirce’s transfiguration of the man/sign semiotics (Chapter 2 and further). See Shakespeare’s citation in CP: 2.317, 6.238, 7.585, see CP: 5.519, 6.301. “Glassy essence” takes a new flavor in the subtitle and the epitaph mentioned at the beginning of this book (Gorlée 2004a: 209, 231f., see 85 fn. 12). The saga of the “glassy essence” of humankind is strongly continued in the pages of this book.

Living in a glass house, I shouldn’t throw stones at my helpers. I wish to thank the most dedicated reader of my manuscripts, Myrdene Anderson (Purdue University), for reading this script containing bits and pieces and giving me the

wisdom of her stylistic advice and recommendations. I also owe personal thanks to Kalevi Kull (Tartu University) for his kind invitation to publish this manuscript in the Series *Tartu Semiotics Library* by the University of Tartu Press. My special privilege, since the Department of Semiotics at the University of Tartu is one of the epicenters of semiotics in the world. Its mission is to explore the cutting edge of the semiotic fields to support no free choice nor a luxury for semiotic scholarship, but rather to create an extensive coverage of the solid, but shaky, grounds of the global view of world semiotics.