Cognitive and Semiotic Model of Translation

Ruslana PRESNER¹,
Nataliia TSOLYK²,
Oleksandra VANIVSKA³,
Ivan BAKHOV⁴,
Roksolana POVOROZNYUK⁵,
Svitlana SUKHARIEVA⁶

¹ Ukrainian National Forestry University,
Lviv, Ukraine, presner@nltu.edu.ua,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7393-6745>

² Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University,
Lutsk, Ukraine, nata_cl@ukr.net,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3300-5150>

³ Ukrainian National Forestry University,
Lviv, Ukraine,
vanivskaoleksandra@gmail.com,
<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0750-3949>

⁴ Interregional Academy of Personnel
Management, Kyiv, Ukraine,
bakhov@ukr.net,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8379-199X>

⁵ Taras Shevchenko National University of
Kyiv, Institute of Philology, Kyiv, Ukraine,
salina.sunset@gmail.com,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3418-6651>

⁶ Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University,
Lutsk, Ukraine,
svitlanasuhareva@gmail.com,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5039-582X>

Abstract: The paper aims to give a comprehensive cognitive and semiotic analysis of translation strategies implied in the translation of the film “Darkest Hour”. Regarding a film as a communicative process mediated by certain semiotic features makes it possible to analyze the semiotic character of film discourse in translation. Thus, it was decided that translation is not just a speech-oriented process but a communicative act taking place within a definite semiotic space in a cross-cultural perspective.

The semiotic model of cinematic discourse has a complicated structure and is analyzed based on semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic criteria. The choice of the semiotic system primarily depends on the communicative situation and its recipients. As the semiotic system of the film “Darkest Hour” is both socioculturally and situationally conditioned, the translator reconstructed the sense of the source language text by implying the translation transformations that assured the accuracy and adequacy of its translation into the target language text.

Keywords: *Translation strategy; translation; semiotic space; communicative act; cinematic discourse; semiotic system; adequacy of translation.*

How to cite: Presner, R., Tsolyk, N., Vanivska, O., Bakhov, I., Povoroznyuk, R., & Sukharieva, S. (2021). Cognitive and Semiotic Model of Translation. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(3Sup1), 125-142.
<https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.3Sup1/355>

1. Introduction

In the era of globalization, the immense technological breakthrough, and ever-growing cross-cultural interactions, the problem of efficient intercultural communication is becoming a major area of interest within the field of linguistics and translation studies. As the concepts of language and culture are inseparable (Kostopoulou, 2015, p. 56), the changes under the influence of social modifications, both technological advances and globalization processes, are reflected somehow in the language. The latter has had a privileged place in human culture and human thought (Zlatev, 2009, p. 187) as it helps us articulate and communicate experiences, being a living repository of cultural conceptualizations. Among its key functions, modelling the world and representing the structure of reality (Asoulin, 2016; Beni, 2019; Chandler, 2017; Gerasymova et al., 2019; Onishchuk et al., 2020) are regarded to be fundamental.

To facilitate communication and formulate theories of semiotics, one must explore “the mechanics of human perception and the effect of language as referent, accurate or inaccurate, upon the perception process” (Trifonas, 2015, p. 1140). Communication strategies are believed to be of universal character in the sense that they potentially cover any kind of speech behavior as well as all forms of linguistic material (Rebrii & Tashchenko, 2020, pp. 150-151). Considering recent research on cross-cultural and interlingual differences, languages typically show discrepancies in respect of adaptation to the environment within the process of linguistic change. Communicational environments are believed to be always complex and multimodal. Any aspects of the communicational situation can, potentially, act as prompts (Wang, 2019, p. 4). As soon as we are apt to compare two or more languages, it is evident that their concepts will not align perfectly. Thus, the signs used for the world mapping in one language are hardly replicated within the other language.

Viewed as a systemic activity and artistically creative process (Rebrii & Rebrii, 2018, p. 182), translation across languages is gaining fresh prominence. One major theoretical issue that has dominated the field for many years concerns the debate about the unit of translation. Until recently, translation has been regarded as the linguistic substitution of the words and expressions in the source language through their equivalents in the target language. Consequently, personal, psychological, social, and cultural aspects have been intentionally left out. To our mind, adequate translation has to be much closer to deciphering and focused on the mental mechanisms involved in linguistic replacement and the transfer of meaning.

Recent trends in semiotics have led to a proliferation of studies that focused on translation as a specific case of translation across sign systems (Petrilli, 2015, p. 99). However, current linguistic and translation studies seem to operate mainly on the assumption that language is the most complex and developed code. In this regard, the cognitive and semiotic approach to translation has several attractive features. Firstly, as opposed to the theories of equivalence, it is mainly centered on the process of translation. Secondly, it contributes to a better understanding of algorithms and mechanisms involved in obtaining the final product of translation. Finally, the cognitive and semiotic approach makes it possible to decode the peculiar system of senses, the imprint of the source language message fixed in a definite sign sequence capable of encoding its content.

Prior studies (Gupta, 2015; Huber & Lideikytė, 2021; Kostopoulou, 2015; Krysanova & Shevchenko, 2019; Vitucci, 2017; Zabalbeascoa, 2008) have noted the importance of audiovisual texts to be the objects of cognitive and semiotic analysis. The audiovisual text is endowed with its own 'cognitive and semiotic space' and presents a communication act involving sounds and images (Zabalbeascoa, 2008, p. 21). Furthermore, this type of discourse has a suggestive power as it can alter the recipient audience, imposing particular views, beliefs, and behavioural models.

This study *aims* to shine new light on these debates by analyzing translation strategies applied in the translation of the film "Darkest Hour" from a semiotic angle (Wright, 2017a; Wright, 2017b).

The film is an epic biographical drama depicting English sociocultural realia in the times of World War II. It was directed by Joe Wright and written by Anthony McCarten. The translator is unknown. The plot focuses on Winston Churchill's early days as prime minister during the Second World War and the May 1940 War Cabinet Crisis, while Nazi Germany's Wehrmacht swept across Western Europe and threatened to defeat the United Kingdom.

"Darkest Hour" strikes considerable interest as the object of scientific research. First, the film has not appeared in linguistic research so far. Second, it reconstructs the actual historical events during four crucial weeks of World War II, portrays the British social and political divide, and performs 'cultural references' representing important dimensions of English culture at those times. The shape of culture determined by history and shared experiences plays a significant role in the British community's reality. Consequently, sociocultural realia depicted in the film are linked to the semiotic codes particular to the English language and culture. Third, "Darkest Hour" presents a system of senses reflecting the English nation's

specific means of world perception and a cultural phenomenon determining and altering the recipients' outlook. The analysis of the film in question enables the recipient audience to open new senses, enhancing the critical perception of reality and find solutions to global problems. Along with decoding mosaic codes (linguistic, cultural, and semiological), it is possible to describe English core values through characters' planned activity and active social position actualized in the film under review.

'Cultural turn' has a clear impact on the research conducted in the field of translation. From a postmodern perspective, the main emphasis is put on the unique role of the interpretation procedures and the significance of deciphering cognitive and communicative signs regarding any reality organization and world mapping as a sign. "Darkest Hour" will undoubtedly stipulate considerable research interest when addressed from a perspective centered on how the language in the target text is affected by context and sociocultural constructs. Moreover, cinematic language plays a fundamental role in the transmission of stereotypes from one culture to another. Winston Churchill, the main character of "Darkest Hour", is an iconic figure for many political speakers, both native English and non-English, highly skilled in the art of communication. His speeches imply philosophy, cultural manifestation, and ideology to attain persuasive ends. Thus, their analysis from a cross-cultural perspective helps reveal political rhetoric and cultural factors which enrich the discourse of politics making the meaning negotiable.

Furthermore, the in-depth analysis results will substantiate the function of language in cross-cultural mediation and sign transfer by activating references that allow the new recipient audiences to experience English communication practices from their native language perspectives. The audiovisual text can be transformed in the semiotic context due to the constant intersection of cross-cultural 'borders' and native semiosphere. Cultural identity oozes from all the film's semiotic systems and pragmatics, which go well beyond purely all linguistic dimensions. The 'translation' of signs functioning in British culture based on semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic criteria makes it possible to outline the semiotic model of the film "Darkest Hour" and reveal semiotic aspects of its functioning.

Since we are opting to analyze meanings from the perspective of linguistic and cultural semiotics, the *methods* will have to be suitable for this purpose. Therefore, the observation, descriptive and comparative methods seem promising and offer several advantages for the proposed research.

2. Theoretical Framework

Much of the current literature on translation pays particular attention to the conceptualization of translation in semiotics. Kourdis and Zafiri (2010, p. 119) approach it from language teaching angles when they discuss intersemiotic translation. According to Marais (2019, p. 84), the most profound way of conceptualizing translation is to think of 'translation of meaning', in all of its myriads of forms, shapes, shapelessness, materialities, instances. The scholar highlights the relevance of the translation theory to be embedded in a comprehensive theory of meaning, referred to as semiotics. In the same vein, Petrilli (2015, p. 98) notes that the sense, meaning, and significance of an utterance are understood and enhanced through ongoing translational processes. In this view, the semiotic model of translation is regarded as the process of conveying meaning in two languages by translating signs into signs.

It is necessary here to clarify what is meant by a sign. The latter is pragmatically defined as "a medium for the communication to the interpretant of a form embodied in the object, so as to constrain, in general, the interpreter's behavior" (Aguiar, Atã, & Queiroz, 2015, p. 12). Indeed, in the literature, the term tends to be used to the elementary unit and the so-called 'building block' of complex semiotic mechanisms. Although differences of opinion still exist, there appears to be some agreement that "sign" refers to an inscribed image or symbol used to convey a sense or message.

Certain interconnected theoretical assumptions underpin the semiotic theory. Saussure (1966) and Peirce (1991) are believed to be its founders, presenting their conceptions of semiotic analysis in linguistics. The former offered a 'dyadic' model of the sign, stating that it is a system of signs in which the only essential thing is the union of meanings and sound-images, and in which both parts of the sign are psychological (1966, p. 15). According to Saussure (1966), a sign is composed of the signifier and the signified. The relationship between them is referred to as "signification". Nowadays, this basic model shows that a linguistic sign is not a link between a thing and a name, but between a concept and a sound pattern, and is commonly adopted in linguistic research.

The issues addressed in Saussurean studies were reconsidered by Peirce (1991), who proposed his triadic model of linguistic signs (Fig. 1).

Fig. 1. *Peirce's triadic model of the sign*

As shown in Fig. 1, representamen is a form taken by a sign, which is not always materialized. The interpretant corresponds to a sense derived from a sign, whereas the object is the thing the sign refers to. In Peirce's view, the sign is anything that is so determined by something else, called its Object, and so determines an effect upon a person, which effect is called its interpretant. The latter is thereby mediately determined by the former. The scholar was interested in the signifying element of a sign, believing that the elements of a sign do not carry the same weight in its interpretation. Although admittedly, the sign itself does not signify an object, it is possible due to the elements most crucial to its functioning as a signifier. Peirce defined the relationship between the representamen, the interpretant and the object by the term “semiosis”.

In the process of semiosis, the sign appears to be in relation to both semiotic elements – the designated object and the interpretant. In this regard, Morris (1938) put forward the semiotic theory as an offshoot of pragmatic philosophical tradition (Bogdanović, 2020, p. 108), which is fully justified. Consistent with the proposed theory, the sign functions in three semiotic dimensions: semantic (concerned with the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable), pragmatical (describing the relation of signs to interpretants), and syntactical (demonstrating how all signs are potentially if not actually related to other signs). The dimensions of semiosis in question gave rise to three different sub-disciplines within semiotics.

Danesi (2007, p. 133) has observed that signs give shape to formless ideas, not in an arbitrary fashion, but rather in response to inferential processes tied to our experience of reality. In our view, semiotics clarifies that the nature of signs and peculiarities of their functioning lie within the nomination, representation, and communication processes. The cognitive and semiotic approach to the study of translation is directed towards disclosing the relations between cognitive structures, signs, and material

world objects (Pieshkova, 2019, p. 58). From this perspective, translation is intricately linked to nomination. In contrast, it encompasses pretty different phases (Fig. 2) when the translators would basically “strip off language from messages to grasp their deverbilized sense and then clothe it later in the words of a different language” (Martin, 2016, p. 7).

Fig. 2. *Cognitive and semiotic model of translation*

From the figure, it can be clearly seen that the core senses constituting the plain of content in the source language are singled out in the first phase. Suppose the metaphorization process has occurred not so long ago. In that case, the forms nominating the sign will refer to the objects of the ambient world. Otherwise, the translation output will depend on the translator's ability to decode the core senses corresponding to the designated objects. The consequent phase presupposes selecting the alternative sign in the target language capable of expressing the same concept standing for the same thing. The selection of signs, stored in the brain, is performed based on their relations in the mental lexicon (Mel’čuk & Milićević, 2020, p. 38).

Cognition coordinates the process of semiotic translation even though it does not serve to construct an accurate representation of the world. A longitudinal study of integrating signs, minds, meaning, and cognition by Paolucci (2021, p. 6) reports that in order to act in the world in an effective way, it is necessary to build versions of the world that are capable of bringing forth a world, not to represent it. As far as the latter is concerned, we should bear in mind that although the objects and phenomena of the ambient world are similar for different peoples, their attitudes can vary from one cultural community to the other. Consequently, the corresponding pragmatic meanings of linguistic signs may not coincide.

In his groundbreaking book of 2007, Danesi claims that our knowledge systems can only give us partial glimpses of reality. The scholar draws attention to the fact that knowledge systems vary throughout the world, but this variation is superficial on closer scrutiny. Danesi (2007, p.

133) pertains to the idea that beneath the surface of these systems are sign creation processes that reflect universals regarding how reality is perceived. Thus, we cannot get the whole image representing the world at once. Suppose the target culture is devoid of certain concepts. In that case, cultural bumps can hinder cross-cultural communication and “may become actual culture pitfalls, and actually hamper the receivers’ comprehension of the target text” (Gupta, 2015, p. 84).

A recent study by Kourdis and Petrilli (2020, p. 4) reports that the broad notion of the text has mainly come about thanks to semiotics. While applying the semiotic model to translation, the elementary sense representing some fragment of the world is treated as the unit of translation. In this respect, translators are faced with new challenges and forms of translation activity, all of which may question traditional notions of the discipline and shift its boundaries (Rędzioch-Korkuz, 2020, p. 215). Based on the source language text, the translator needs to reproduce the fragment of reality in the neatest details in the target language. In a nutshell, the translator’s primary objective is to represent the subtlety of lexical and grammatical meanings correlating with extralingual reality in the source language through the target language.

Films appear to be the central object of analysis in many research fields. Their topicality in translation studies is beyond doubt as the number of translated films into Ukrainian is incessantly increasing. Constant exposure of a person to various cultures displayed in mass media subsequently changes our views on the world. It brings together people with somewhat different value systems, being the most powerful tool of socialization.

Cinematic discourse is a type of audiovisual text, a mode of communication distinct from the written and the oral modes. However, it may not be easy to draw a clear borderline between the audiovisual and other modes (Zabalbeascoa, 2008, p. 28). Cinematic discourse operates on the intersection of several semiotic systems whose interplay develops its polycodal character as a heterogeneous phenomenon. In his longitudinal study on semiotic cohesion of audiovisual texts, Vitucci (2017, p. 84) claims that the excitement and feelings aroused by the multimodal text must preserve their crucial role for translation. Consistent with Zabalbeascoa’s views (2008, p. 33), audiovisual communication requires careful thought into the nature of text modes and media and how texts are stored and distributed.

The interdisciplinary semiotic and synergistic approach makes it possible to treat cinematic discourse as a unity of verbal and non-verbal

components and disclose the factors contributing to its production and perception. Together these ensure organic conceptual, structural and functional unity. The viewer's perception is believed to be crucial in evaluating the final product (Huber & Lideikytė, 2021, p. 146). The film is not purely semiological creation that is just restricted to signs. On the contrary, it is filled with signs created by the author and addressed to the audience. Looking more closely at it, it is evident that the film is not merely a system of randomly organized signs but represents a system of related senses. Consequently, each sign stands for decoded thought, representing sociocultural reality.

The translation is often treated with suspicion due to the possibility of source text domestication in translation. The latter can assign specific linguistic and cultural values that are clearly understood by the target audience. Domestication reaches its highest point and intensity whilst choosing the appropriate translation strategy. Rewriting the source text, the translator can use different discursive strategies, giving preference to certain values over others. The process is then even more complicated as the translational output makes cultural and political impact on the audience, depending on different social roles and contexts.

3. Film Translation from the Semiotic Perspective: A Case Study of "Darkest Hour"

Nowadays, film-making is one of the most popular artistic crafts. Films are polysemiotic phenomena, "multimodal products that have increasing entertainment value" (Huber & Lideikytė, 2021, p. 137). Consequently, they are generating considerable interest in linguistics and translation studies. The specificity of cinematic translation is primarily concerned with the fact that such translation combines the features of both written and oral translation. Furthermore, cinematic discourse represents several semiotic systems, which are inseparably interconnected and contribute to its polycodal character.

The present study was designed to conduct a comparative analysis of the translation strategies involved in translating the film "Darkest Hour" from the semiotic angle. Thus, the source and target texts under consideration were compared to be identical semantically, syntactically and pragmatically. The corpus for analysis is comprised of English and Ukrainian audio scripts, subsequently transcribed and subjected to comparative analysis.

In his seminal article, Torop (2020, p. 268) claims that to understand the nature of a text and its meaning-making, the capacity to distinguish

between basic structural levels is necessary. Therefore, the process of analyzing the film scripts presents a descriptive model involving the comparative analysis with its focus predominantly on the target language text, its linguistic code, and the system-recipient. The integration of these contributes to deciphering a mismatch between verbal signs in the source and target languages and if they help the translator reach communicative effect imposed on the recipient. Furthermore, the appropriately selected speech “ingredients” in translation ensure the synergy of the target text (Rebrii, & Rebrii, 2018, p. 183).

The film’s headline is of great importance in genre comprehension as it establishes the connection with its content and attracts the attention of the potential audience. Having analyzed the headline of the film in question and its Ukrainian equivalent, we can conclude that the translator employs the strategy of semantic equivalence. To match the meaning of the English phrase “*the darkest hour*” (a critical moment or period in history), the translator has implied a semantic variation, or semantic paraphrase of the source language headline (“*темні часи*”), preserving the structure of the phrase and its authentic sense. One more striking feature that has been revealed in the process of comparison is the substitution of the noun number category (the singular in English “*hour*” by the plural in Ukrainian “*часи*”). The use of this grammatical transformation can be explained by the fact that the sense expressed lexically in English can only be rendered grammatically in Ukrainian.

The first cues uttered by the actors demonstrate the adequate choice of translation strategies. The word meaning in the source text cannot be understood and translated in the target one without due regard to specific context in which it is actualized. In the original message reproduction process in cinematic translation, the translator is often confronted with problems of contextual meanings. There occur lots of words that are less sensitive to the contextual influence than others. They are mainly found among proper and geographical names (*Winston Churchill, Clement Attlee, Layton, Hitler, Mussolini, Oliver Wilson, Belgium, Brussels*), names of specific places, organizations, and political bodies (*Downing Street, Buckingham Palace, Windsor, Westminster, the Opposition, the House, the Nazi*), and terms typical of political endeavor (*prime minister, leader, ambassador, raid, peace talks, capitulation*). They have permanent equivalents in the target text and posit no severe problems of the appropriate translation variant.

However, the occurrence of polysemantic lexical units with definite meanings retained in specific contexts is relatively frequent and requires steady attention on the translator’s part. For instance, compare the use of

the polysemantic adjective *clear* in the source text (*It seems that I have not been clear enough*) with its contextual substitute in the target text (*Схоже я висловився не досить прозоро*). The translator finds new nominations of the same denotative meaning in the target language to address the language of translation on formal sign level.

The same point is exemplified in the following pair of sentences: *His record is a litany of catastrophe. Їїого діяльність – це якийсь набір халеп*. The word *record* used to mean ‘the facts about how successful, good, bad someone or something has been in the past’ is rendered in Ukrainian by the noun *діяльність*, transferring the signs of the source text to the target text in such a way to reproduce their semantic aspects. Such words play a significant role in the translation process as they can refer the text to different contexts, depending on the translator’s choice.

Picking up a more specific word in translation gives a more accurate and precise description of the idea than does the lexical unit in the source language. Such cases are pretty common in the English-Ukrainian translating process of “Darkest Hour”. For example, confer the following sentences: *Do you think they’ll take me to Downing Street if he gets the job? А мене візьмуть на Даунінг Стріт, якщо наш пройде?* The very source and target language texts name locations meaning officials, preserving metonymy in both languages. The translator assumed that the name mentioned above is well known to the recipient and avoided explanation of this realia by synecdoche shift (*Уряд Великобританії*).

The other example of contextual adaptation is the use of the noun *job* (*I’m getting the job only because the ship is sinking*) and its Ukrainian substitute *штурвал* (*Я отримую штурвал через те, що корабель тоне*). Finally, there are samples containing the words of wide semantic volume that have been made more concrete in translation due to the translator’s choice: *Ensuring his fingerprints are not on the murder weapon. Він не хоче лишати відбитків на знарядді вбивства. They have already invaded Belgium? То Бельгія вже під німцями?* The translator cautiously applied concretization to bind the idea to a given context to be understood by a target language recipient.

As cinematic translation is close to free translation, the translator can accurately transmit the meaning of specific translation units by near-equivalents. The case can be exemplified in the following sentences: *He is the man, like any other. Він – чоловік, що з них візьмеш. You don’t know for sure. Це вилами по воді писано. My darling, you are on the brink of having tremendous power ... Дорогенький, ти за крок до того, щоб стати людиною великої влади ...* On this level of semantic equivalence, the source and target sentences have the

same communicative aim, describe the same situation, convey almost identical lexical meanings, but differ in their grammatical structures.

Furthermore, there appear to be instances when the source and target language cues can describe the situation from different angles with different words and structures: *Where should we be at the end of all that? Чого Ви прагнете у ці темні часи?*(the situation at war). There are no parallel lexical or structural units in this set of examples, and the word senses and paradigmatic relations between the sentence components do not coincide. Nevertheless, the utterances in question correspond to each other in the same situation and communicative function.

Among the most widely used syntactical transformations in the translation of “Dark Hour” is a transposition, i.e., word-order change or the succession of linguistic signs. The vivid example of this changes is the diverted word-order in the English sentence *Hardly seems like there’s a war at all* and its counterpart in Ukrainian (*Тут і не видно, що у свімі йде війна*). The employment of this translation strategy is caused by the necessity of preserving the functional sentence perspective, which takes different places in two languages in this case. The translator also exploits concretization which is accompanied by addition: *there’s a war – у свімі йде війна*.

In the sentences *I want others to love and respect you, as I do* and *Хай усі тебе шанують і люблять, так як я* the translator changes the order of homogeneous objects to achieve the higher communicative intent. Besides, the surface structure of the sentences presents the meaning of the same message differently in the source and target languages. In Ukrainian imperative mood substitutes the Objective-Infinitive Construction used in English sentence. The same construction with the Infinitive is used in the source language text (*I can’t bear myself think*), but the part of the sentence performing the function of a complex object (*myself think*) is not preserved in the target text and was replaced by a plural noun (*думок*). The translator renders the same information by some other means of the target language, which serve equivalently to render the meaning of the source language unit.

Owing to discrepancies in the grammatical systems of the source and target languages, the transformations of omission and addition are the most frequently used. In some cases, the target text seems more condensed due to omissions. However, this grammatical transformation makes it possible to realize the rhythmical patterns of the original sentences: *I’ve never queued for bread. I believe I can boil an egg. – Я ніколи не стояв у черзі за хлібом. Але зумів заварити яйце*. Such examples are pretty numerous: *He stands for one thing, and only one thing, himself. – Він узагалі підтримує одну річ, себе*. However, addition in translation can also be found: *We are at war Mr. Speaker ... at war. Ми у сьмани*

війни, Містер Снікер, як не прікфо. In the light of today's events, the time is ripe ... for many preparations to be made. З огляду на сьогоднішні події, вважаю, що час наснів ... отже багато обов'язкових приготувань ...

The next pair of sentences (*Owing to his years of inactivity and incompetence, we find him personally responsible ... personally responsible for leaving this nation ruinously unprepared to face the present Nazi peril. Він багато років утверджував бездіяльність і непрофесійність, і тепер має особисто відповідати ... особисто відповідати за те, що нація кричущо неготова протистояти загрозі від нацистів.*) strikes considerable interest. Even preserving the repetition of the original phrase in the target language, the translator introduces the replacement of subordination by coordination. This strategy is well approved as English clauses are subordinated more frequently than those in Ukrainian. As for the latter, coordination is more typical and predominates in translating complex sentences.

Pragmatics is a component of considerable importance in cinematic translation. The film language is called upon not simply to reflect the events and phenomena in the ambient world but also to convey the subtlety of mental models represented in signs that individuals and cultures bear on the communication process. Therefore, the script of "Darkest Hour" is characterized by a high pragmatic value. The translator's task is daunting as he/she should comprehend and process the source language text for further conceptualizing and reformulating the target one. The translator is to display a great awareness of pragmatically relevant features of the two languages to achieve an adequate translation fully fulfilling its communicative aim in the target language.

The film begins with the repetition of elliptical stable expressions, the sense of which cannot be deduced from their contents: *Order! – Тууа! Order! – Тууа!* Their implication represents indirect communicative acts, their propositional and illocutionary sense does not coincide. The translator should be aware of such pragmatic idioms for their precise identification, avoiding their perception of the direct meaning and retaining the same communicative function as in the source language. The following examples of pragmatic idioms occur in the source and target texts performing a phatic function: *Give way! – Звільнити лаву! Shame on you! – Сором! Good luck! – Щасту! Let's go! – Ходімо!* The translator by far perfectly detected the intercultural interaction structures and speech act strategies used in such situational contexts and managed to fully preserve the pragmatic intent of the source language idioms (to force action, facilitate the further activity, and persuade to engage in an activity).

Sometimes the communicative intent may not be vividly expressed in the verbal form but must be complemented by non-verbal elements. In one of the episodes, Churchill's assistant receives a telegram and utters the following words: *I'm not ... Але я не ...* The sentence is abrupt and, perhaps, would not have been clearly understood without the girl's body movements and gestures that promoted the naturalness of expression in both source and target language. The translator uncovered the hidden paralinguistic features between languages, established convergence between cultures and made a rational choice of the equivalent.

The human factor is of great importance in analyzing pragmatic features of an utterance, as it is possible to trace and study all the circumstances under which the speaker uses linguistic signs for some definite purposes. For example, if to analyze the speech of Winston Churchill, certain peculiarities of translation transformations can be outlined. The character uses too many questions in his speech that trigger our interest in terms of stylistics. For instance, in the questions *How many "manies" did you write, you nincompoop? Скільки "багато" Ви написали, розтелепо?* the main character uses the pejorative word *nincompoop* possessing the semantics of a *stupid person*. In contrast, the translator's choice is on the word *розтелепо* in Ukrainian having the meaning of an inattentive person (*неспритна, неуважна людина: роззява*). Thus, these words are partial equivalents as the original image is subtly changed in translation to be adjusted to the context and match the neutral stylistic register.

The main character's speech is characterized by wide usage of rhetorical questions rendered into Ukrainian by the corresponding rhetorical questions: *Be what? Which self should I be today? Будь яким? Яким собою мені побути сьогодні?* To our mind, their implication was aimed at reaching the communicative aim, making an impact on the recipient by puzzling him/her about what happens next.

The certain difficulty for translation has been caused by the main character's speech defects caused by stammering: *It-it's not a gift, it's a revenge. Ніякий це не дарунок, а помста*. The last examples demonstrate that the devices used to build a sentence like cohesion and coherence are not selected at random but are instead chosen to best suit the aim of the communicative act. The use of contradicting ideas undeniably enhances emotive and expressive effect and strongly impacts the recipient audience.

The conducted comprehensive analysis of translation strategies implied in the "Darkest Hour" translation helped reveal common and distinctive features of signs transmission from English to Ukrainian.

Moreover, it enabled us to treat cinematic discourse as a specific language variety and a socially embedded practice.

4. Conclusions

One of the more significant findings to emerge from this study is that the choice of translation strategy contributes much to a better comprehension of the original film in the target language. However, there does not exist the universal mode of cinematic translation. Cross-cultural differences between the source and target languages have a significant impact on the process of translation. Therefore, the translator engaged in cinematic translation should apply all the possible translation strategies to achieve the adequacy of translation. The study has shown that the translator is bound to pay attention to the genre of the translated film, its structural and lexical peculiarities, stylistic register, the film situation, and the context it is realized in.

The semiotic relations between signs, communicants, and the objects denoted by them underlie the translation transformations applied in the translation of the film “Darkest Hour” into Ukrainian. Consequently, the semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic categories have been chosen as the basic criteria for justifying the adequacy and equivalence of translation. The most frequently used translation transformations are concretization, transposition, parts of speech and sentence replacements, the replacement of subordination by coordination, and semantic paraphrase. Summing up the results, it can be concluded that the translation of the film “Darkest Hour” in Ukrainian proves to be centered on the translator’s rational choices of translation transformations regarding the peculiarities of both source and target languages and the semiotic code encoded in the original text.

Further research might explore the interaction of verbal and non-verbal elements and identify semiotic cohesion means that contribute to adequate cinematic translation.

Acknowledgement

The authors have equally contributed to the article under their speculation. Authors A and B collected and analyzed theoretical material related to the focus of the research. They outlined the fundamental principles of semiotic theory and studied relevant trends in the conceptualization of translation in semiotics. Author C justified the choice of the film “Darkest Hour” as the object of cross-linguistic research, highlighted its importance for the in-depth analysis, and developed the

scheme for analyzing translation strategies applied in the translation of the film in question. Authors D and E were responsible for language data collection and their analysis based on semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic criteria. Author F generalized, verified and edited the final text version of the paper.

The authors would like to acknowledge the valuable comments and suggestions of the reviewers, which have improved the quality of this paper.

References

- Aguiar, D., Atã, P., & Queiroz, J. (2015). Intersemiotic translation and transformational creativity. *Punctum: International Journal of Semiotics*, 1,(2), 11-21. <http://doi.org/10.18680/hss.2015.0013>
- Asoulin, E. (2016). Language as an instrument of thought. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, vol. 1 (1), no 46, pp. 1-23. <http://doi.org/10.5334/gigl.34>
- Beni, M. D. (2019). *Cognitive Structural Realism: A Radical Solution to the Problem of Scientific Representation*. Springer.
- Bogdanović, M. (2020). Philosophical implications of Morris' semiotic theory. *Filozofija i društvo*, 31(1), 108-125. <http://doi.org/10.2298/FID2001108B>
- Chandler, D. (2017). *Semiotics: The Basics* (3rd ed.). Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Danesi, M. (2007). *The Quest for Meaning: A Guide to Semiotic Theory and Practice*. University of Toronto Press.
- Gerasymova, I., Maksymchuk, B., Bilozero,va, M., Chernetska, Yu., Matviichuk, T., Solovyov, V., & Maksymchuk, I. (2019). Forming professional mobility in future agricultural specialists: the sociohistorical context. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 11(4), 345-361. <http://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/195>
- Gupta, T. (2015). Subtitling Nonverbal Cultural References: Satyajit Ray's Apu Trilogy. In J. Díaz Cintas & J. Neves (Eds.). *Audiovisual Translation: Taking Stock* (pp. 69-86). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Huber, L. U., & Lideikyte, V. (2021). Audiovisual Communication and Subtitling from the Perspective of Semiotic Cohesion: A Case Study of "Garden of Eden". *Respectus Philologicus*, 39(44), 136-147. <http://doi.org/10.15388/RESPECTUS.2020.39.44.83>
- Kostopoulou, L. (2015). Translating culture-specific items in films: the case of interlingual and intersemiotic translation. *Punctum: International Journal of Semiotics*, 1(2), 53-67. <http://doi.org/10.18680/hss.2015.0016>

- Kourdis, E. & Zafiri, M. (2010). Semiotics and translation in support of mother tongue teaching. *Signs – International Journal of Semiotics*, 3, 108-133.
<https://tidsskrift.dk/signs/article/view/26856>
- Kourdis, E., & Petrilli, S. (2020). Introduction: Translation and Translatability in Intersemiotic Space. *Punctum: International Journal of Semiotics*, 6(1), 5-14.
<http://doi.org/10.18680/hss.2020.0001>
- Krysanova, T., & Shevchenko, I. (2019). The Intersemiosis of Negative Emotions in the Cinematic Discourse: a Psycholinguistic Perspective. *Psycholinguistics*, 25(2), 117-137. <http://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2019-25-2-117-137>
- Marais, K. (2019). *A (Bio)Semiotic Theory of Translation: The Emergence of Social-Cultural Reality*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
<http://doi.org/10.4324/9781315142319>
- Martin, R. M. (2016). Reembedding translation process research: Introduction. In R. M. Martin (Ed.), *Reembedding translation process research* (pp. 1-20). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://doi.org/10.1075/btl.128>
- Mel'čuk, I., & Milićević, J. (2020). *An Advanced Introduction to Semantics: A Meaning-Text Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
<http://doi.org/10.1017/9781108674553>
- Morris, C. (1938). *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Onishchuk, I., Ikonnikova, M., Antonenko, T., Kharchenko, I., Shestakova, S., Kuzmenko, N., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). Characteristics of Foreign Language Education in Foreign Countries and Ways of Applying Foreign Experience in Pedagogical Universities of Ukraine. *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 12(3), 44-65.
<https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.3/308>
- Paolucci, C. (2021). *Cognitive Semiotics: Integrating Signs, Minds, Meaning and Cognition*. Switzerland: Springer. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42986-7>
- Peirce, C. (1991). On the Nature of Signs. In J. Hoopes, (Ed.), *Peirce on Signs: Writings on Semiotic by Charles Sanders Peirce* (pp. 141-143). University of North Carolina Press.
- Petrilli, S. (2015). Translation of semiotics into translation theory, and vice versa. *Punctum: International Journal of Semiotics*, 1(2), 96-117.
<http://doi.org/10.18680/hss.2015.0019>
- Pieshkova, O. A. (2019). *Intermedialnist anbliiskomovnyh khudozhnikh tekstiv XX-XXI stolit: kobnityvno-semiotychnyi aspekt* [Intermediality of English-Language Literary Texts of the XX–XXI Centuries: Cognitive-Semiotic Aspect] [Thesis for a Candidate Degree (PhD) in Philology, Zaporizhzhia National University].
http://phd.znu.edu.ua/page//dis/02_2019/Peshkova_diss.pdf
- Rebrii, O., & Rebrii, I. (2018). Cistemnist' i tvorchist' u perekladi: psiholingvistichni pidhid [Systemic and Creative Aspects of Translation: Psycholinguistic

- Approach]. *Psycholinguistics*, 23(2), 180-191.
<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1199186>
- Rebrii, O., & Tashchenko, G. (2020). Translation Strategies for Phonographic Deviations: A Psycholinguistic Approach. *Psycholinguistics*, 28(2), 148-163.
<http://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2020-28-2-148-163>
- Rędzioch-Korkuz, A. (2020). Towards a semiotic model of interlingual translation. *Semiotica*, (236-237), 215-230. <http://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2019-0027>
- Saussure, F. de (1966). *Course in General Linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). McGraw-Hill Book Company. (Original work published 1916)
- Torop, P. (2020). The chronotopical aspect of translatability in intersemiotic space. *Punctum: International Journal of Semiotics*, 6(1), 265-284.
<http://doi.org/10.18680/hss.2020.0013>
- Trifonas, P. P. (2015). Text and Images. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *International Handbook of Semiotics* (pp. 1139-1154). Springer.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9404-6>
- Vitucci, F. (2017). The Semiotic Cohesion of Audiovisual Texts. Types of Intersemiotic Explications in the English Subtitles of Japanese Full-length Films. In A. Malgorzewicz & I. Bartoszewicz (Eds.), *Paradigmen in Der Translationsforschung Ein-und Aussichten* (pp. 83–105). Neisse Verlag.
<http://doi.org/10.23817/strans.8-6>
- Wang, M. (2019). *Multimodal Communication: A social semiotic approach to text and image in print and digital media*. Palgrave Macmillan. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15428-8>
- Wright, J. (Director). (2017a). *Darkest Hour* [Film]. Focus Features.
- Wright, J. (Director). (2017b). Темні часи [Darkest Hour] [Film]. Focus Features.
- Zabalbeascoa, P. (2008). The nature of the audiovisual text and its parameters. In D. Cintaz, J. (Ed.), *The Didactics of Audiovisual Translation* (pp. 21-37). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://doi.org/10.1075/btl.77.05zab>
- Zlatev, J. (2009). The Semiotic Hierarchy: Life, Consciousness, Signs and Language. *Cognitive Semiotics*, 4, 169-200. http://doi.org/10.3726/81608_169