

Natalia Mospan

University of Economy in Bydgoszcz

Linguistic and Semiotic Analysis of the Source and Target Texts

1. Semiotics

Semiotics is the theory of sign systems. It is related to the production and interpretation of their meaning. For decades it has been assumed that every sign system in nature, society and cognition belongs to the domain of semiotics. The scientific literature on the subject is voluminous.

The current theories of semiotics may be traced back to two main sources. The first is Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913), a Swiss linguist for whom 'semiology' was the study of the role of signs as part of social life. The second is Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914), an American philosopher whose field of study was the 'formal doctrine of signs'.

We agree with a researcher Mohammad Issa Mehawesh who suggests starting with Saussure who is considered the founding father of semiotics. Saussure's interest was in language[1]. He defined the linguistic sign as being dyadic. He invented the linguistic term 'sign' that unifies 'signifier' (sound-image or word) and 'signified' (concept). In his work, he focused on the linguistic aspects signs and semiosis.

Ferdinand de Saussure defines semiotics as (...) a science, which studies the role of signs as part of social life. It would form part of social psychology, and hence of general psychology. We shall call it semiology (from the Greek *sēmeion*, 'sign'). It would investigate the nature of signs and the laws governing them. Since it does not yet exist, one cannot say for certain that it will exist. But it has a right to exist, a place ready for it in advance. Linguistics is only one branch of this general science. The laws which semiology will discover will be laws applicable in linguistics, and linguistics will thus be assigned to a clearly defined place in the field of human knowledge [2: 15-16].

Saussure considered language as a system of signs, which have meaning by virtue

of their relationships to each other. Similarly to Peirce, he says that every sign consists of a 'signifier' and the 'signified'. The relationship between them, for him, is called 'signification' [2: 66].

On his part, Peirce defines signs as follows: 'Signs in general [are] a class which includes pictures, symptoms, words, sentences, books, libraries, signals, orders of command, microscopes, legislative representatives, musical concertos, performances of these... [Cited in 3: 50]. Peirce extended the scope of semiotics beyond the linguistics signs used in communication between humans. According to Peirce semiotics involved the systematic study of signs, sign systems or structures and sign functions. Peirce proposed a triadic model which consists of the following.

1. The representamen: the form which the sign takes.
2. An interpretant: the sense made of the sign.
3. An object: to which the sign refers.

More precisely, Peirce says that: (...) a sign or 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. It stands for that object, not in all respects, but in reference to a sort of idea, which I have sometimes called the ground of the representamen [4: 5].

Thus, semiotics focuses mainly on units of meaning and the generalizable conditions for encoding across symbolic systems (linguistic, visual, auditory), and, in general, uses language as the modeling system for other 'second order' systems that function according to systematic rules (e.g., visual art, music, literature, popular media, advertising, or any meaning system).

Every time we apply the semiotic methodology in question to the objectively existing facts of the language we have to be aware of the continuous interaction of language and speech, language and thinking, language and literature, language and culture. Semiotic studies are increasingly attractive to whoever is interested in signs at large. At present, however, the attempts to address every instance of semiotics to the general theory of sign systems have widened the scope and confines of semiotics. We can see from this that semiotics and structuralism, rather than being dead, are still in the process of developing their tools and vocabulary, formulating answers to their most basic questions, and changing rather than remaining static.

Before we pass on to the material at hand and demonstrate the linguosemiotic methodology we are aiming at, we would like firstly to present the categorical characteristics of the science. In our research, we referred to ideas and concepts of Roland Barthes, who has been perhaps the most influential synthesizer and popularizer of all that had gone before in semiotics and structuralism. We find it necessary to highlight those which we applied in the present article.

Barthes published *S/Z*, the best-known of his works, generally taken to be representative of structuralist methods, even a model reading. *S/Z* highlights Barthes' response to reading a text: the multiplicity of readings and responses is seen as the goal of the method. Elements of Semiology provided a much-needed theoretical base for the fledgling French structuralists and provides a sort of blueprint for Barthes' later studies. Barthes' main sources in Elements of Semiology are Saussure, Hjelmslev, Peirce, Lévi-Strauss, Durkheim, Jakobson, Troubetzkoy, and Lacan. Barthes managed to combine the ideas and terminology of all of these theoreticians, using one to support another and the second to back up a third. His book is influential because of the variety of examples that he offers, and the degree to which he is ready to extend semiotic and linguistic analysis.

A language is a system of signs. Barthes ends Elements of Semiology with a few recommendations to 'semiological' researchers: to keep to a principle of relevance as in linguistics in which a single viewpoint is maintained throughout the investigation and only information relevant to the viewpoint is presented, and to select a corpus which is 'wide enough to give reasonable hope that its elements will saturate a complete system of resemblances and differences' and which is as homogeneous 'as possible'. He also speaks most strongly for synchronic analysis rather than diachronic analysis [5: 95-98].

Although much has been written and said about Barthes' *S/Z*, it should be briefly mentioned because it has been considered to be the best and most typical structuralist analysis of fiction. In *S/Z* Barthes' analysis has the appearance of rigorous method: Balzac's story is divided into 561 numbered 'lexias' or units of reading which range in length from a few words to a few sentences. But as Barthes notes, this division and subdivision 'will imply no methodological responsibility, since it will bear on the signifier, whereas the proposed analysis bears solely on the signified. That is, the division of the text into the many lexias is not very important except for the analysis of the reader's responses to the text, using the text as a point of departure [6: 36].

Barthes' goal in *S/Z* is to illustrate the ways in which the reader is the producer of a text; as a critic, Barthes' task is to seek out the 'play of codes' in the work. For this extended demonstration Barthes uses a short story, 'Sarrasine' by Balzac. Barthes divides this story into 561 numbered lexias (units of reading); the lexias are interleaved with ninety-three numbered 'divagations', or brief essays on topics. Each of the lexias are identified with one or more of five codes: the semic, symbolic, referential, proalretic, or hermeneutic.

The semic code contains those semantic features which relate to character development. The symbolic code allows for the 'expansion' from surface reading to the level of the thematic and symbolic. The referential code contains reference to the text's cultural background (intertextual, extra-textual). These three codes are called 'integrative': they must be integrated at a 'supertextual' level.

The proairetic code allows for the reader's construction or reconstruction of the plot. The hermeneutic code is the question-and-answer code which calls for the reader to put the clues together, to solve an enigma. This last code usually involves feints on the part of the text to throw the reader off the track, according to Barthes (a promised response, a 'lure', ambiguous actions or phrases, a 'suspended response', etc.). The proairetic and hermeneutic codes are distributive (that is, they are sequential and repeated).

The Barthes' understanding of the code we will employ in our research.

'Codes' refer to a system of rules and responses for encoding and decoding shared by the author of a text and the audience of that text, even though neither the author nor the audience would be able to explain all of the codes at work in a given text. The semioticians believe that we live in a world of codes. A critic may analyze various types of codes or develop hierarchies of the codes in a particular fictional work. For example, Roland Barthes examines four codes at work in a story by Poe, the cultural code, the code of the Enigma, the communication code, and the code of action.

It is hardly possible to reach any consensus on the number or variety of codes which may be found in literary works, although in recent years most of the code critics have been including the 'extratextual code' or the 'cultural code' as components in their analyses. According to U.Eco, a code is a rule that rewrites an element on an expressive plane so that it is correlated with an element on a content plane. This union of elements is a sign- function. In Eco's depiction of the communicational model [7: 141], a sender, following the rules of codes and subcodes, encodes messages which are sent through a channel; the messages, as expressions, are received within a certain context or circumstances. The addressee (receiver of the messages) decodes the messages following the rules of his codes and subcodes, to interpret the text as content. Eco's theory of codes emphasizes the complexity of the messages (considering the message as a text or a network of different messages dependent upon different codes and correlated to other messages) and the possibilities of ambiguity or different decoding (and therefore different content received) by the addressee.

In a collection of Barthes' miscellaneous essays [8] Barthes comments on photography, music, singing, film. Barthes finds the creative ground of any narrative between the linguistic code and the translinguistic code. Traditionally linguistics has dealt only with the sentence, and the sentence was considered a perfect exemplar for linguistics, meaning a unit which exhibited every type of discourse grammatically possible. Beyond one sentence was only another sentence. Barthes advocates a 'second linguistics' which would take extended discourse into account as a unit and study the extralinguistic codes more fully than is possible for traditional linguistics. He explains the story / discourse distinction, functions, indices, catalysts, the cultural code, mimesis, and other terms which he has coined or borrowed for use in structural analyses. For showing this, Barthes uses as examples fiction by Ian Fleming, Agatha Christie, and Poe.

In general, Barthes formulates five codes, each of which has roots in a different aspect of literary analysis. The first of these codes is the hermeneutic code, which governs the proposing, sustaining and resolution of enigmas. Small enigmas might be solved quickly, while major enigmas, those which are integral to maintaining suspense in the text's plot, are prolonged through various means. The semic code is the code of character. Through it, the writer unfolds the personalities of the characters of the story. The symbolic code refers to the symbolic antitheses which are so prevalent in classical literature: for example, references to life and death, hot and cold, youth and age, etc. The proairetic code is the most basic of the codes: it is the sequence of events and actions that make up the plot of the story as it unfolds [9]. We also can say that Barthes is not really interested in performing a structural analysis himself; this he defines as showing how the text is constructed. Instead, he is interested in performing a 'textual analysis', that is, in showing how the text, through its various codes, can be taken apart or 'unmade'.

In this article we will retain the described approach and see which of the Barthes' codes will be feasible for the purposes of our analysis of *The Jungle Book*, written by R. Kipling.

To support our method of reading and at the same time investigating the text we refer to other researchers who shared similar views on the text analysis cited below.

R. Ingarden finds that there are four codes or 'layers' present in all literary 'artworks'. The text's rhythm, beat, and melody forms the 'layer of the sound texture'. Whatever the author chooses to do to insure that his written images and the possible attitude-forming structure of his words represents his intentions is found in the 'layer of schematized images', i.e., the meanings of words, sentences, paragraphs, chapters, or the entire text form the 'layer of the units of meaning'. These three layers make the literary work form a world which is incompletely defined and without fixed boundaries, but with a fixed mode of existence [10].

Lotman is one of the leaders of the Tartu, Estonia, USSR, semioticians. His interest is in combining semiotic analysis with information theory to analyze the author-text-reader relationship in terms of the communicated information. Basic to his approach is the understanding that language itself is a code, that the text is the message, and that the author encodes and the reader decodes the message carried by the text. The 'artistic text' is of the greatest interest to him because it represents the most complexly coded text.

The Structure of the Artistic Text is made up of essays written over a period of years, and reviewers have pointed out that this has resulted in both repetition and contradiction as Lotman modified his earlier views and ideas. The essays all deal with the ways in which the artistic text is structured, transmitted, and understood, and the way in which it functions in a communication process (he speaks of 'textual energy'). In his practical criticism Yu. Lotman explains his notion of the cultural text and the extra-text and framing and the use of space (what separates the text

from the non-text, the fiction from the truth, chapter three from chapter four, etc.). He also considers the types of plot (plot may be perceived as a continuation of the culture, thus forming a critique of the society's ideological base, it may be seen in terms of oppositions [i.e., revolutionary/static], it may be defined in terms of its difference from reality, in its being artistically structured). Lotman applies his terms and categories to works by Tolstoy, Turgenev, Pushkin, Choderlos de Laclos, and many others [11].

2. Semiotics and Translation

Translation theory has moved away from a purely linguistic perspective towards the methodology of translation towards incorporating non-linguistic disciplines such as semiotics to supplement existing theory. Many authors realized that semiotics can do lots of good to translation research: Janice Deledalle-Rhodes, Umberto Eco, Dinda Gorleé, Susan Petrilli, and Peeter Torop are the leading voices.

As it is shown below semiotics has an important role to play in translation. Translation studies are known for bringing together a wide variety of fields.

In his famous article 'On linguistic aspects of translation' R. Jakobson [12: 232] distinguishes three ways of interpreting a verbal sign:

- intralingual translation (a verbal sign may be translated into other signs of the same language which can involve rewording or paraphrase);
- interlingual translation (the translation of sign into another language);
- intersemiotic translation (translation between sign systems).

According to R. Jakobson, translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes [12: 233]. Thus, the translator has to recode the source text and then s/he has to transmit this message into an equivalent message for the target culture.

One of the scholars who has been inspired by the ideas of R. Jakobson (1959) is A. Popovic. He points out that the literary text is not just a combination of verbal signs, but it is a culturally-loaded linguistic system, and it needs a thorough examination before the process of translation is carried out. Furthermore, he argues that: (...) the semiotic aspect in translation is concerned with the differences met within the process of translation, which are a consequence of a different temporal and spatial realization of the translated text [13: 16].

Nöth [14: 476] stresses the importance of semiotics to translator by saying that: (...) semiotics provides the theoretical tools for the analysis of signs and communication process (...) semiotics expands the analytic horizon from the verbal message in the narrower sense to the multiplicity of codes used in persuasive communication.

According to Ubaldo Stecconi semiotics is good for Translation Studies for (at least) five reasons:

-
- it is a theory of signs in general, not of verbal language;
 - it provides a viable model for the core of translation events;
 - it redefines the traditional image of translating as transfer;
 - it casts new light on equivalence and loss; and
 - it affords an investigation of the logico-semiotic conditions to translation in general.

The last point is crucial. Three existential characters can be identified for translation semiosis: difference, similarity, and mediation [15].

This article is an attempt to show what the demands of translating cultural elements in the author fairy-tale are, and how to approach and deal with these elements from a semiotic point of view in order to create an effect or response in the translated text that is similar to that of the source text.

There is usually no full equivalence between code-units in the case of interlingual translation, but the message may serve as adequate interpretations of alien code-units or messages. What happens is that during the translation process the message in the source language is substituted for an entire message in the target language, and not only code-units. The translator acts as the go-between between the two languages and has to create an equivalent effect in the target language.

The translator has to identify the codes at work in the source language to translate the text and context of the source text into the target text, in order to create an equivalent effect. A combination of interlingual and intersemiotic translation will enable the translator to create equivalence between the source and target languages.

3. Supporting Sources

In the previous pages much theory regarding semiotic analysis as well as translation was discussed in order to arrive at a possible solution to the transfer of semiotic codes in the author fairy-tale. Let us move on to show how these theoretical insights can be applied in practice. Rudyard Kipling's *The Jungle Book* and its translation carried out Evgenia Chistyakova-Ware will be examined and discussed in terms of semiotics, language and cultural transfer.

4. Rudyard Kipling's *The Jungle Book*

Published in 1894, Rudyard Kipling's *The Jungle Book* [22] proved to be loved by the young and old alike. *The Jungle Book*'s stories of a human boy named Mowgli raised by animals in the wild made for riveting reading. In these tales, the animals proved to be both Mowgli's allies and adversaries. Baloo the bear, Bagheera the panther and Shere

Khan the tiger have all become famous characters in children's literature. Kipling never even visited the jungle mentioned in *The Jungle Book*. Despite spending years in India, he chose to set his stories in the Seonee jungle (now known as Seoni), an area he'd never visited.

The Jungle Book is obviously set in the jungle. But which jungle? The Kipling Society places *The Jungle Book* in the Central Provinces of India, near Seoni (hence the 'Seonee' Wolf Pack is mentioned throughout the Mowgli chapters). The jungle in Mowgli's chapters is separate from the village nearby, and both the animals and the people like to keep it that way.

It is a story that conveys some sort of moral or lesson, using animals as the main characters. This goes hand in hand with the narration style of *The Jungle Book*. Our narrator is an unnamed man-who-talks-to-animals, who is now relaying the stories to us as though they're true. We're supposed to believe these wild jungle tales actually happened, like they're legends, and we learn from them. And speaking of learning from these tales, this educational vein is part of what makes this book children's literature. What kid wouldn't want to read about a child raised by wolves and a childhood spent exploring the jungle? It's the perfect cover to molding young minds. That said, we find ourselves with a few questions: What do we learn from these stories? Many of the tales are about the Law of the Jungle or the Law of the Beach. Should we apply these laws to our own lives? The Law of the City or the Law of the Suburbs? What can men learn from animals? And, in this day and age, as the book still enjoys a wide popularity, what remains relevant? What are the lessons learned?

5. Translation of *The Jungle Book*

Some words are to be said about the translator of *The Jungle Book* we have chosen. Evgenia Mickalovna Chistyakova-Ware (nee Shakeeva) (years of life have not been established) is a Russian writer and translator (mainly for children) of the beginning of the twentieth century. The circumstances of her life have not been identified. Collaborated in the magazines: 'Igrushechka', 'Magazine for Children' in the 1880s as E. Ware. Under the pen-name of Ware-Chistyakova her books were published, namely 'Stories for Children', St. Petersburg, 1886; 'Forgot and Other Stories for Children', Moscow, 1902, 1909; 'Truthful Peter: Stories', Moscow, 1905, 1912; 'The kingdom of Joy' and other fairy tales and stories for children', Moscow, 1909; 'Ezhulka. The story', Moscow, 1913, and others. She translated from French, Italian and English. For the purposes of our research a translation 'Книга Джунглей (Маугли)' made in 1916 was selected for analysis [23].

6. Analysis of the source and target texts through semiotic codes

R. Kipling selects details of setting and action which encode several messages beyond simply a factual accounting of the setting and action. These details place the characters in a certain position, inform the reader of how the characters think, indicate what the readers should think about the characters and their actions, and describe the culture which makes up the textual environment.

Let us analyze the author fairy-tale through the perspective of linguosemiotic perspective focusing on semiotic codes and their equivalents in the target text to see whether the translator could decipher and communicate them for the Russian-language readers.

Applying the R. Barthes' understanding of minimum meaningful unit of text, *lexia*, we analyzed several semiotic codes which we believe make up the skeleton of the tale. It was identified which of the codes are operative in that text segment, that is, by means of which codes the reader processes the story to derive meaning from it.

The first one is the initial code. 'It was seven o'clock of a very warm evening in the Seeonee hills when Father Wolf woke up from his day's rest, scratched himself, yawned, and spread out his paws one after the other to get rid of the sleepy feeling in their tips'. The beginning of the story represents the initial code which is the introduction, the starting point. It sets the general tone of *The Jungle Book*, to get a good idea of which one should not look no further than the first line. It's all very casual, a wolf waking up and stretching, and the voice sounds like grandpa telling you a story around a campfire. Let us see how this *lexia* was interpreted by the translator: 'В Сионийских горах наступил очень жаркий вечер. Отец Волк проснулся после дневного отдыха, зевнул, почесался и одну за другой вытянул свои передние лапы, чтобы прогнать из них остаток тяжести'. We see that some details were omitted like pointing out the time which also makes an additional input to the general 'feeling' of the atmosphere of the story and sets a certain tone: 'It was seven o'clock'. At the same time the translator made a lucky find: 'to get rid of the sleepy feeling in their tips' was decoded like 'чтобы прогнать из них [paws – author's note] остаток тяжести'.

No doubt that the initial code entails the stylistic code (or *vice versa*) which sets the atmosphere, a specific environment of the story and introduces the 'starred' actors of it. By employing this code the author adds color to his written speech and makes certain emphasis which is important for the purposes of unfolding the plot.

Let us move on and analyze another code which is closely and inextricably bound up with the previous two. Halliday and Hasan [16: 46] point out that the context of situation, however, is only the immediate environment. There is also a broader background against which the text has to be interpreted: its context of culture. Any actual context of situation, the particular configuration of field, tenor, and mode that

has brought a text into being, is not just a random jumble of features but a totality – a package, so to speak, of things that typically go together in the culture and attach these meanings and values to them; this is what a culture is. Like context of situation, context of culture is an important element through which one can comprehend texts. From the linguo-semiotic perspective of the text analysis we identify the cultural code but a specific one. Through it the author gives information not only on what is happening but also about the whole so-called cultural environment – the environment of the Jungle which has its own laws behind the participants and behind the spread practices in which they take part, determining in this way their meaning inside that culture. ‘The Law of the Jungle, which never orders anything without a reason, forbids every beast to eat Man except when he is killing to show his children how to kill, and then he must hunt outside the hunting grounds of his pack or tribe’. R. Kipling explains casual connection between the reasons and uses the term to describe an actual set of legal codes used by wolves and other animals in the jungle. ‘The real reason for this is that man-killing means, sooner or later, the arrival of white men on elephants, with guns, and hundreds of brown men with gongs and rockets and torches. Then everybody in the jungle suffers’.

According to the reliable on-line idiom dictionary [17] *The Law of the Jungle* is the idiomatic expression which means ‘the way in which only the strongest and cleverest people in a society stay alive or succeed’. An experienced translator is expected to consider that fact when decoding the segmented text: ‘Закон Джунглей, никогда не приказывающий чего-либо беспричинно, позволяет зверям есть человека, только когда зверь убивает его, желая показать своим детям, как это надо делать, но тогда он должен охотиться вне мест охоты своей стаи или племени’. In fact the cause-and-effect connection embedded into the cultural code was transferred under a connotation different from the source text: ‘Настоящая причина этого состоит в том, что вслед за убийством человека, рано или поздно, являются белые на слонах и с ружьями и сотни коричневых людей с гонгами, ракетами и факелами. И все в джунглях страдают’. In the following sentence we see that the author does not explicitly convey the message of the generalization when the translator does: ‘The reason the beasts give among themselves is that Man is the weakest and most defenseless of all living things, and it is unsportsmanlike to touch him’.

Let us check the translated lexia: ‘Однако между собой звери говорят, что Закон запрещает убивать человека, потому что он самое слабое и незащищенное из всех живых созданий, и, следовательно, трогать его недостойно охотника’. In this last sentence the interpreter introduces a new semantic element – the hunter which is unavailable in the original. Also, a pair *unsportsmanlike-недостойно* requires our attention because it is not a direct equivalent. According to the online dictionary [18], ‘unsportsmanlike’ means ‘недостойный спортсмена; неспортивный; не соответствующий правилам спорта; нечестный; непорядочный’. In compliance with the Oxford dictionary *unsportsmanlike* = *unsporting* [19]. As we see the Ev.

Chistyakova-Ware's choice was governed rather by her own feeling of the author's message than the suggested academic translations and it fits the context well enough. Here, we have to emphasize that the context of culture is very important because it is more than the immediate sights but also the whole culture behind the text determining the significance for it. The translator can transfer the author's code preserving his initial meaning of it provided the former is aware of that. Knowing where, when the text is set will help to understand the text more – both for the ultimate reader and the interpreter as the primary preceptor of the text.

The next code we identify is the *semic* code which is the code of character. Under this research, we will analyze a couple of wolves that played an important role in the fate of Mowgli. From the first pages of the story, the key story players are introduced: Father Wolf and Mother Wolf – these are the first characters we meet in Chapter One. We see Father Wolf, scratching himself like Al Bundy, and Mother Wolf taking care of the cubs. They adhere to the gender norms of the animal kingdom through which the code of conventional structures is manifested – father wolf goes out to hunt, mama wolf stays in the cave. The main role of Father Wolf boils down to following: at Raksha's request he brings the 'man's cub' to her and she decides to adopt him and name him Mowgli [20]. Let us see how the situation was described by R. Kipling.

He made his bound before he saw what it was he was jumping at, and then he tried to stop himself. The result was that he shot up straight into the air for four or five feet, landing almost where he left ground.

'Man!' he snapped. 'A man's cub. Look!'

We see a masterpiece depicting of the Father Wolf's *semic* code. This fiction character embodies the strength and power of his family defender and at the same time the description of his first meeting Mowgli has the color of kind humor which is so much appreciated by young children. When we analyze the 'starred' segment of the target text as Barthes called *lexia* we can see that the translator made almost word-for-word decoding:

Ещё не увидав, на что он кидается, зверь прыгнул и в ту же минуту постарался остановиться. Вследствие этого он поднялся на четыре или пять футов от земли и упал на лапы, почти на то самое место, с которого начал нападение.

– Человек, – коротко сказал он, – детёныш человека! Смотри.

In this context we also have to state that in terms of linguistic semiotics the underlying opposition lies between the following poles: 'man' vs 'animal' signaling that the speaker is intent on asking numerous questions like who wins in the fighting of the former and the latter? Do animals or men rule the world? By introducing the said opposition R. Kipling also manifests the *symbolic* code thus referring to the symbolic antitheses. Though the sequence of events and actions that make up the plot of the story as it unfolds the author develops the *proairetic* code conveying the message for the education and didactic purposes but not limited to them.

Getting back to the semic code which is under our review let us analyze another fiction character of the fairy-tale we have already mentioned: Mother Wolf or Raksha. Firstly, we have to make an important note for understanding of the author's encoded character type: 'Raksha' is the Hindi word for 'protection' [21]. Saying this we assume that R. Kipling conveyed the connotation code that is to be accurately perceived and transformed by the linguistic means of the target language. Following this code unfolding the author deciphers the semic code of Mother Wolf:

The tiger's roar filled the cave with thunder. Mother Wolf shook herself clear of the cubs and sprang forward, her eyes, like two green moons in the darkness, facing the blazing eyes of Shere Khan.

'And it is I, Raksha [The Demon], who answers. The man's cub is mine, Lungri – mine to me! He shall not be killed. He shall live to run with the Pack and to hunt with the Pack (...).

From the lexia stated above, we clearly see manifestation of the connotation code. It is impossible to underestimate the power of a mother to protect her children, and Raksha perceived Mowgli as her own kid. The translator transfers her decisiveness and willingness to defend the child:

Рёв тигра наполнил всю пещеру, как раскаты грома. Волчица Мать стряхнула с себя своих детёнышей и кинулась вперёд; её глаза, блестевшие в темноте как две зелёные луны, глянули прямо в пылающие глаза Шер Хана.

– Ты говоришь, а отвечаю я, Ракша. Человеческий детёныш мой, хромуля! Да, мой. Его не убьют! Он будет жить, бегать вместе со стаей, охотиться со стаей (...).

In this lexia the author uses the modal verb 'shall' which is formal or old-fashioned means to say that something certainly will or must happen, or that you are determined that something will happen. This sentence is as short as the R.Kipling's to make it more emphatic. To convey that message Ev. Chistyakova-Ware uses other linguistic means as compared with those applied in the source text like an exclamation sentence instead of an affirmative. In general, the interpreter's way of decoding the author's semic code of this particular fiction character matches the information embedded into it by R. Kipling.

7. Conclusion

Semiotics helps explain how any member of a culture quickly produces or decodes meanings from a system of rules and symbolic correspondences that are internally structured and necessary for a culture in a parallel way to the rules of formation for any language. In this article, an attempt was made to demonstrate the effectiveness of the linguistic and semiotic approach to structure the source text and apply the outcome of this exercise to translated, ie target text. Use of this method contributes

to a better understanding of the author's style of Rudyard Kipling, help pick out the information and ideas derived from the original story as well as to the identification and justification of optimal translation solutions selected by the interpreter.

Unfortunately, the size of the article does not allow us going on with describing results of our research. The raised topic will be explored in depth in our further scientific publications.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_8_June_2014/10.pdf.
2. Saussure, F. *Course in General Linguistics*. (trans. Roy Harris). London: Duckworth, 1916 [1985].
3. Gorleé, D. *Semiotics and the Problem of Translation*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1994.
4. *Logic as Semiotic: The Theory of Signs*, In: R. E. Innis (ed.) *Semiotics: An Introductory Anthology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 4-23.
5. Barthes, R. *Elements of Semiology*, 1964 (trans. by Edicions du Seuil, Paris).
6. Julian Wolfreys *Literary Theories: A Reader and Guide*, 1999, 672 p.
7. Eco. *A Theory of Semiotics*, Indiana University Press, 1978, 368 p.
8. Barthes, R. *Image – Music – Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.
9. Barthes, R. *S/Z*, trans. Richard Miller, New York: Hill and Wang, 1974.
10. Ingarden, R. *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*. Trans. George Grabowicz. Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1973.
11. Lotman, Yu. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. (Lenhoff, Gail; Vroon, Ronald, trans.) (Michigan Slavic Contributions 7.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, 1977, 300 p.
12. *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*, in R. A. Brower (ed.). *On Translation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 232-239. Cited in http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_8_June_2014/10.pdf.
13. Popovic A., *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton, Alta: University of Alberta Press. Cited in http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_8_June_2014/10.pdf.
14. *Handbook of Semiotics*. Bloomington & Indiana Polis: Indiana University Press. Cited in http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_8_June_2014/10.pdf.
15. <https://benjamins.com/#catalog/books/btl.72.05ste/details>.
16. Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1985) *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*, Australia: Deakin University Press. Cited in http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_8_June_2014/10.pdf.
17. <http://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/the+law+of+the+jungle>.
18. <http://www.multitrans.ru/c/m.exe?l1=1&l2=2&s=unsportsmanlike>.
19. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/unsportsmanlike>.
20. http://www.bioreference.net/encyclopedia/wikipedia/f/fa/father_wolf.html.
21. <http://www.junglebook-collection.nl/pmwiki/pmwiki.php?n=Main.Raksha>.

SUPPORTING SOURCES

22. <http://manybooks.net/pages/kiplingretext95jnglb10/0.html>.

23. <http://coollib.com/b/68911>.

Linguistic and Semiotic Analysis of the Source and Target Texts

Abstract: The present article describes basics of a linguistic and semiotic approach in translation studies, i.e., to the translation of the text in accordance with which the latter is regarded as a sign system structured through various semiotic codes. The article highlights that an interpretation of the code is believed to be an approach for both translation studies and semiotics proving efficiency of applying semiotic instruments in translation of literary texts thereby. The paper suggests semiotic tools to be applied in translation in order to achieve the establishment of relations of maximum equivalence degree between the original and translated texts. Also, an attempt is made to place emphasis on interpretations of author's lexias carried out by a Russian translator. The analysis is made based on a famous fairy tale 'The Jungle' written by R. Kipling and its translation 'Книга Джунглей' made by Evgenia Miskalovna Chistyakova-Ware (nee Shakeeva), a Russian writer and translator (mainly for children) of the beginning of the twentieth century.

Keywords: linguistic and semiotic analysis, a text, a lexia, a code, a source text, a target text.