An international conference
to celebrate the 60th birthday
of Prof. Peeter Torop

Culture in Mediation:

Total Translation, Complementary Perspectives

26-27 November
2010

University of Tartu
Estonian Semiotics Association

An international conference to celebrate
the 60th birthday of Prof. Peeter Torop

Culture in Mediation: Total Translation, Complementary Perspectives

26–27 November 2010

University of Tartu, Department of Semiotics
Estonian Semiotics Association

Supporters:
Estonian Science Foundation (Grant No 7594)
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tartu
Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics, University of Tartu

Organising committee:
Elin Sütiste
Katre Väli
Terje Loogus
Maarja Saldre
Timo Maran
Katre Pärn

Edited by Elin Sütiste, Terje Loogus, Maarja Saldre, Katre Väli
Cover design by Pärt Ojamaa
Language editor Mara Woods

ISBN 978–9949–19–542–8

Tartu University Press
www.tyk.ee

Photo Silvi Salupere

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

Peeter Torop, Professor of Semiotics of Culture at the University of Tartu, is one of the most notable representatives of modern translation studies and semiotics of culture in Estonia and his theory of total translation as well as publications on cultural semiotics have attracted attention and recognition also in the international academic community.

As a general development of recent decades in the theories of culture, static descriptions have more and more given way to dynamical and processual approaches. In this context, the present conference picks up the concept of mediation, understood as an overarching term to cover all kinds of information processing and exchange taking place in culture. Culture mediates and is being mediated, shaping the complex autocommunicative regulation and dynamics between different levels and languages of description.

Inasmuch as mediation in culture depends on languages or other sign systems, it can be productively analysed as translational processes. The title of the conference includes a reference to the concept of "total translation", which points to the ubiquity of translational processes in culture. Regarding the concept of translation as including various kinds of mediating processes in culture brings about the need for an interpretive methodology to account for their diversity both on the object- and meta-levels.

The keywords for the conference point to the areas of research that are in one way or another related to cultural mediation: semiotics and theory of culture, semiotics of translation and intersemiotic processes in culture, literature and history of literature, different types of auto-communication, history of science, including history of cultural semiotics and translation history.

We would like to thank all supporters and colleagues for their help with the preparations of the conference.

Organisers
Department of Semiotics at the University of Tartu
Estonian Semiotics Association

ABSTRACTS

MYTHOPOETICAL MODEL IN KECHWA/KICHWA WORLD: PROBLEMS IN CULTURAL TRANSLATION

Ileana Almeida
Universidad Central del Ecuador, Quito, Ecuador

Julieta Haidar
Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico City, Mexico
jurucuyu@gmail.com

The main goal of this presentation is to analyze some problems in cultural translation between the Kechwa and the Hispanic worlds in Ecuador. The cultural translation processes between the Kechwa semiosphere and the Hispanic one are complex and they produce various problems.

The first translation problem is related to the categories of "pacha" and "pachamama". The category "pacha" has a complex semantic field, as it condenses inside a single concept all time and space, without the separation that exists in Occidental languages/cultures such as in Spanish.

The second problem, which is connected to the first one, refers to the category of "pachamama" that is associated with Mother-Earth. This latter concept does not have the same sense in the Hispanic cultural semiosphere. These problems have led us to thorough research of the semantic fields in several semiospheres, to reviewing of the existing linguistic translations, to re-thinking and re-constructing these on the basis of appropriate cultural translations.

The third aspect relates to the mythopoetical world model that compels us to reflect on cultural translation. The mythopoetical world model emerges at certain historical periods such as the ancient civilizations of Sumer, Egypt, Harappa, Yin Dynasty in China, Creto-Mycenean Greece, Mesoamerica, and last but not least ancient Peru.

The mythopoetical model in the Kechwa world can and must be analyzed in a transdisciplinary way, from several convergent angles such as philosophy, art theory, psychology, sociology and some other disciplines that deal with man's most complex ideas about the world. In this presentation we appeal to cultural semiotics as it contributes a new comprehensive approach, with highly-valued heuristic categories for analyzing the Kechwa culture in connection with cultural translation.

Goethe's Glosses to Translation

Dinda L. Gorlée
Juridisch Vertaalbureau Gorlée, The Hague, Netherlands /
University of Bergen, Norway
gorlee@xs4all.nl

Traditionally, translation was regarded as a purely cognitive activity as a combination of Saussure's dual approach of twofold concepts of signifier and signifier, language and parole, denotations and connotation, matter and form, etc. The logical unity of this dual tradition of translation was uprooted and reconstructed by a triadic approach of translation, mediating the organic unity of Peirce's three-way dynamic process of semiotics. The concept of "semio-translation" clears a different semiotic path through the general history of translatology. Semiotranslation creates a dynamic network of Peircean interpretants, which are artificial but alive and progressively growing from undetermined ("bad") translations to higher determined ("good") translations.

Between Saussure and tending toward Peirce, Jakobson's three types of translations gave widening significances to the concept of translation. Joining with Lotman's semiotic theory of culture, the universe of translation involves both language and culture. This expansive system was developed in Torop's "total" translation, celebrated today, to reach the ultimate goal of Torop's theory of intersemiosic translation or interartistic transmutation.

Three-way forms of translation was no semiotic discovery, but even mentioned by Goethe. Goethe imitated the old Persian poetry of Hafiz (1320–1390) to compose his German version of West-Östlicher Divan (trans. West-Eastern Divan) (1814–1819). Goethe added to his translated/paraphrased verse in German poetry a collection of Noten und Abhandlungen (trans. Notes and Essays) and Paralipomena 1818–1819), furnishing explanatory notes to justify the liberties of his own translation. Through his critical glosses, Goethe directed and redirected the possibility of a three-step concept of translation, in which information, adaptation, and reproduction of the foreign culture and literature (old Persian written in Arabic script) were transplanted to the "equivalent" in German language. As critical patron of translation and cultural agent, Goethe's Divan notes are mediate types to build a likeness mixing Orient and Occident.

Key words: (1) Translation, (2) Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, (3) Peirce, Charles Sanders.

Understanding. System Approach

Jelena Grigorjeva
University of Tartu, Estonia
jelena.grigorjeva@ut.ee

For the last two years I have been working on building and studying a dynamic on-line model of text that organizes and explains itself according to the concept of Semiosphere coined by Juri Lotman. I called this model Semiocoine. "Semiocoine" is a derivation from "semeion" and "koine" – κοινὴ διάλεκτος (koine dialektos) meaning a common language for different groups of people, a lingua franca. I changed "k" for "c" to creatively engage the meaning of the English word "coin".

As a result of this experiment, I formulated and proved a theorem of the total language nature of the Universe:

If (and until) the Universe is a system it has language nature.

"System" and "language" are brought into equivalence with each other on the basis of such common distinctive features as:

- "system" can be defined as a regular interaction or communication between its parts (elements, vocabulary);
- "system" is formed in the process of communication (or agreement) between communicative partners only;
- "system" is a product of mental and cognitive effort, which means that "system" is a description of a certain state of affairs while a description is not equal to the reality as such (whatever it could mean);
- "system" is a concept by definition, and therefore lies in the sphere of a model phenomenon, not of an ontological phenomenon.

I see the theorem as a suggestion or, to be precise, generalization of the most powerful types of world pictures (mythological, religious and scientific ones) elaborated by the human in the course of cultural/ biological evolution. In my presentation I comment on the cognitive impact of my theory.

Autogenesis and Semiotics of Culture

Tomi Huttunen
University of Helsinki, Finland
tomi.huttunen@helsinki.fi

As the theory of semiosphere shows us, it is evident that in human culture nothing is born out of nothing, by itself, but everything exists in a historical continuum of tradition and intellectual communication. Thus in culture all new, even the most creative, spontaneous phenomena (innovative texts) are eventually considered in relationship to a tradition. Suggesting the existence of autogenetic, spontaneous formations, and self-creation in culture therefore seems absurd. Nevertheless, autogenesis as a declaration is very often emphasized in semiotics of culture, especially in the analyses of abruptness and unexpectedness. In my paper I intend to look at these questions against the background of semiospherical understanding of culture with examples taken mainly from Russian literature.

The Role of Habit in the Dynamics of Culture

Kaie Kotov
OÜ Mängiv Inimene / Homo Ludens, Inc., Estonia
kaie.kotov@gmail.com

Habit is by no means a new concept in semiotic theory. What I hope to offer is a fresh insight as to its role in the process of identity formation and social and cultural dynamics.

Juri Lotman proposed in the Introduction to his book "Culture and Explosion" that "The fundamental question concerning any semiotic system is its relationship to the external realm beyond the boundaries of the system and, secondly, the relationship of statics and dynamics. The latter may also be formulated: How can a system evolve and yet maintain its identity? These are the most fundamental and at the same time most complicated questions".

I propose that semiotic notion of habit is well situated at the cross-section of those two questions. On the one hand, it mediates the semiotic and non-semiotic realms. On the other hand, it provides a means to address the balance of social dynamics and social inertia (which is not necessarily a negative concept because it is also a measure of self-identity).

When applied, it enables a more profound understanding of the resilience of a specific culture. In the face of cultural and social explosions (in Lotman's sense) that have taken place in the global as well as Estonian society in recent years, bringing about the experience of a crisis. Semiotics can offer an insight as to the factors that either enable or inhibit the adjustment or as to the underlying patterns that guide the adjustment: Under what circumstances can an old dog learn new tricks?

The Cultural Mediational Dynamics of Literary Intertexts

Katalin Kroó
Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), Budapest, Hungary
krookatalin@freemail.hu

The paper raises the theoretical question of the cultural mediational quality of literary intertexts. It pays attention to a special type of intertextual complex functioning in the literary text as a semantic translational operator. This mediational-"translational" function of the intertextual system reveals itself in setting a well-outlined interpretational framework for some explicitly or implicitly cited literary works. This framework, on the one hand, is intratextually regulated, on the other hand, it accentuates the cultural semantics of the intertexts, i.e. it connects the single text to a broader range of cultural communication, at a metapoetic level assigning the place of the given literary work in the history of literature. The examination to be given in the paper is focused on the following aspects of the intertextual complex, the translational nature of which is to be defined from different points of view – 1) the integrating and segmenting function of the intertext; 2) its function of establishing semantic synthesis and hierarchy; 3) the literary historical context of the intertextual construct. With all these aspects text and culture are treated as relational concepts. Mediation between a) the various levels of textual composition, b) text and its interpretations, and also between c) text and culture, is explicated in terms of semantics. Literary examples are to be taken from 19th century Russian literature.

On Biotranslation

Kalevi Kull
University of Tartu, Estonia
kalevi.kull@ut.ee

In our joint article "Biotranslation: Translation between umwelten" (Kull, Torop 2000; reprinted 2003) we gave a generalised definition of translation, which would allow the use of the concept in the cases of interspecies transmission of messages, i.e. for the cases in which the sign systems involved may even not include any language. The formulation, in its short form, defines translation as (a code related) transmission between umwelten. It should be added, that (as different from communication in general in which the codes in encoding and decoding can be shared) in case of translation, among the codes used in the encoding and decoding, at least some have to be different — if translation is defined as a communication between (at least slightly) different sign systems. Accordingly, "translation semiotics itself can be regarded as a discipline that deals with mediation processes between various sign systems, and, on the macro level, with culture as a translation mechanism" (Torop 2008: 256).

Translation in this general sense, then, was divided into two major types — biotranslation (or protranslation), and logotranslation (or eutranslation) (Kull, Torop 2000: 34). Eutranslation being a transmission between languages, leaves all those cases where at least one of the (bio)texts is not language under the concept of biotranslation. Evidently no other species except humans has a capacity for language.

Such a general concept of translation is necessary at least since semiotics is covering the area of meaningful communication of all living beings. This view was the core of the manifest of Anderson *et al*. (1984) and has been supported by Lotman's and Hoffmeyer's concepts of semiosphere.

As a remark, it should be mentioned that the process of code-based protein synthesis on the basis of mRNAs that takes place in ribosomes and is called ‚translation' in molecular biology, is not biotranslation, and consequently not translation at all in the general sense as defined above. This is because building proteins on the basis of RNAs as 'translation' includes only coding, but coding (as well as decoding) by itself is only a necessary component of translation and not yet a translation itself.

Thus, in addition to intralanguage and interlanguage translation (both human), intermodal translation (the translation between sign systems of different modalities, often called oxymoronically 'intersemiotic', usually meant as human), there exists interspecies trans-

lation which does not assume the language capacity of one of the participants. This is a necessary addition in order to understand culture in its ecosystemic whole, so realizing the potential that the *semiospherical turn* (Torop 2005: 168; 2009: xxxv) can provide for the cultural theory and the semiotics of culture.

References

Anderson, Myrdene; Deely, John; Krampen, Martin; Ransdell, Joseph; Sebeok, Thomas A.; Uexküll, Thure von 1984. A semiotic perspective on the sciences: Steps toward a new paradigm. *Semiotica* 52(1/2): 7–47.

Kull, Kalevi; Torop, Peeter 2000. Biotranslation: Translation between umwelten. In: Petrilli, Susan (ed.), *Tra Segni*. (Athanor: Semiotica, Filosofia, Arte, Letteratura, anno XI, nuova serie 3.) Roma: Meltemi editore, 33–43.

Kull, Kalevi; Torop, Peeter 2003. Biotranslation: Translation between umwelten. In: Petrilli, Susan (ed.), *Translation Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 315–328.

Torop, Peeter 2005. Semiosphere and/as the research object of semiotics of culture. *Sign Systems Studies* 33(1): 159–173.

Torop, Peeter 2008. Translation and semiotics. *Sign Systems Studies* 36(2): 253–257.

Torop, Peeter 2009. Foreword: Lotmanian explosion. In: Lotman, Juri, *Culture and Explosion*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, xxvii–xxxix.

On the Feasibility of Total Translation: A Case of an Estonian Translator

Anne Lange
Tallinn University, Estonia
alange@tlu.ee

While considering the feasibility of total translation – a translation of a text not only into a text but also into a culture – a translator has to negotiate his possibilities in the specific temporal context. It is not what every translator does but those that recognise their responsibility as agents of the target culture evince a clear understanding of the performative potential of translation turning also translation into a way to define themselves and their agenda. The paper will focus on the translations of Enn Soosaar (1937–2010), establishing himself as a public intellectual in the 1970s, the period of hardened sovietization in Estonia, doing this primarily with the selection of texts he translated, and his translation criticism. Projecting the metatextual aspects of his translations on his textual translation, the paper aims at showing that Soosaar was one of the translators who never thought it possible to underestimate the totality of translation, a process shaping the target culture, even if the latter is a highly regulated regime of its segregating ideology. Soosaar's selective difference on metatextual but also on textual levels turned him into a highly visible translator in Estonia although he advocated the fluency of translations, wishing to present neither his source writer nor his target reader as the cultural Other.

Cross-Cultural Translation and Related Intraindividual Conflicts

Terje Loogus
University of Tartu, Estonia
terje.loogus@ut.ee

For a long time, translation is not just regarded as a simple transfer from one language into another, or from a source text into a target text. Instead, translation is understood as transfer between cultures. Therefore, it is only natural that before generating any linguistic expression, the cultural context needs to be considered. Translators as members of a certain culture, generally that of the source culture, base their translation-relevant decisions on their own culture, whereby the decisions are motivated by the (other) source culture. In the translation process, cultural differences may lead to various decision-making conflicts and the translator has to find a compromise between the author of the source text, the target recipient and finally, of course, the translator himself. In this paper, the discussion focuses on the decision-conflicts related to translating the culture-specific elements. Culture-related decision-conflicts, as considered herein, refer to the translator's inner indecision with reference to his/her goals, interests, values, beliefs, methodological approach, or any consequences thereof, attributable to the different cultural embedding of the source text and the target text. In general, decision-conflicts are perceived as subjective translation problems. The translator has to be able to constantly act between separate perspectives, continuously see things from different viewpoints. The conflicts arise when the translator attempts to bring together two incongruent cultures without prejudice to any of the parties involved in the process. Acting within the interface of two different cultures, bearing in mind the interests of several participants – that is what makes translation-relevant decisions a highly complex matter.

Equiprosodical Verse Translation

Maria-Kristiina Lotman
University of Tartu, Estonia
maria.lotman@mail.ee

One should distinguish between equimetrical translation of verse which conveys the metre of the source text and equiprosodical translation which conveys the versification system of the source text. Equiprosodical translation of verse can rely on the possibilities of natural language (for instance, Publius Baebius Italicus, a likely author of the *Ilias Latina*, made use of the quantitative structure in Latin), but it can also employ an artificial system (compare, for instance, the quantitative verse in Church-Slavonic or English). The Estonian language allows one to convey the syllabic (based on the number of syllables), accentual (based on the number and configuration of accents) and quantitative (based on the configuration of durations) versification system. In practice, the combined types are more frequent, for instance, the ones in which both the syllable count and the configuration of accents are relevant; in Estonian, versification systems with the participation of all three principles are possible as well. Although there is the contrast of quantity in Estonian, the transmission of the quantitative structure of ancient metrics still involves a number of difficulties which result from the different prosodical structure. The transmission of a purely syllabic versification system has also been problematic: it is hard to perceive such structure as versified forms in Estonian and therefore it has often been conveyed with different syllabic-accentual or accentual-syllabic verse metres. Although equiprosodical translation is not necessarily equimetrical, in actual translation practice it usually is so.

Translating the Versification System: Russian-Italian Poetry

Mihhail Lotman
Tallinn University / University of Tartu, Estonia
mihhail.lotman@ut.ee

Breaking the syllabic-accentual monotony was an important task in Russian poetology already in the second half of the 18th century – the beginning of the 19th century. Just like in the German tradition, sources were from both folklore tradition and ancient metrics and these were often united: purely syllabic verse vs syllabic-accentual verse. Paradoxically, the French syllabic verse was unequivocally associated with the syllabic-accentual principle. In the background was another syllabic tradition which to a certain extent had an impact on the poetic canon: it was the Italian syllabic verse which was mainly known for the opera arias. Nevertheless, the purely syllabic verse evolved in Russia not in relation to opera, but through the most famous Italian poets, first of all, Ariosto and Tasso, later also Dante and Petrarca. Some examples of Stepan Shevyrev's and Osip Mandelshtam's poetry will be analysed.

Semiotic Transduction in Knowledge Communication

Irene Machado
University of São Paulo, Brazil
irenemac@uol.com.br

Having in mind that the only "one possibility to understand a culture is to learn the languages of the culture, the sign systems operating within the culture", as Peeter Torop conceived, the main objective of this essay is to examine the mechanisms of culture translation in the work of code, when information turns into a text of culture, i.e. into knowledge. To do so, we start with the operations of synthesis and analysis processed by the code when one system is translated by another of different configuration. In this case, the work of the code in the cultural translation of knowledge manifests itself through the movement of transduction that occurs in the relational experiences of different experiences of the living world. Consequently, it is through transduction that one can observe the transformations of semiosis in systems of culture, for example, of art and science. As a result, modelling forces in action in the environment of culture can also be examined through the lens of transduction. We will discuss here two modelling examples in the systems of Brazilian culture. The first one analyses transduction in the mythological experience modelled by indigenous narratives; the second observes the transduction of artistic experience into scientific knowledge, seen in the context of the transformations of the Brazil-wood tree into the cultural system of instrumental music. It is expected thus to reach the notion of Umwelt in the movements of transduction in which the interaction with the surroundings configures the human knowledge of the world.

Key words: code, transduction, translation, semiosis, transference, work

The Image of Neighbours: Latvian and Lithuanian Literature in Estonia

Anneli Mihkelev
Under and Tuglas Literature Centre of the Estonian Academy of Sciences / Tallinn University, Estonia
milenna@hot.ee

The story of Latvian and Lithuanian literature in Estonia is the story of reception – the reception of another culture through literature that begins with the reading and translation process and ends with interpretations of the text in new contexts. The translated text has a specific value in the new culture: it can be the translation of the literary text and it can be the translation of culture. Reception begins with the selection of the author: it may be the reception of a literary or historical epoch or literary style as well as the reception of different ideologies. At the same time reception is also translation: it is the movement when two strange cultures mix, and that situation needs understanding of the other.

Although the languages are different, the historical background connects the cultures of the three countries, especially Estonian and Latvian culture. Lithuania has a different and great history, but the Soviet period gave a common destiny to all three countries. That connection is not absolute because the translation of culture is needed beside the translation of the literary text.

The paper examines different texts from Latvian and Lithuanian literature (mainly the old periods of Latvian and Lithuanian literature and the first half of the 20th century) which are translated into Estonian: what kind of texts are translated in different periods (the selection of the authors and the texts), what the purpose of the translation (aesthetic or ideological) is, and how these translations translate other cultures into Estonian or how Estonians understand and accept these translated texts.

(De)Constructing Culture: Lotman's "Translation" and Derrida's "differance"

Daniele Monticelli
Tallinn University, Estonia
daniele.monticelli@tlu.ee

If in the political and sociological jargon and public rhetoric of the last decades the concept of 'culture' has gradually replaced such discredited and unusable concepts as race, ethnos, even nation, it still seems to have inherited from them its position in the conservative agenda. In the politics of identity culture is imagined and described as a closed system with clear-cut boundaries whose internality must be defended from external contamination.

Drawing on the Saussurean conceptual universe, Derrida and Lotman both construct their theory of language and culture on the basis of a thorough (anti-structuralist) critique of that kind of internalizing self-enclosure which allowed Saussure to delimit and describe *langue* as the object of linguistics. The presentation will try to pinpoint and compare the fundamental instruments of this critique in Derrida's and Lotman's thought, touching upon the notions of textuality, mirror structure, heterogeneity and others. Particular attention will be paid to the notion of medium or mediality as it emerges in Lotman's theory of the semiosphere and Derrida's efforts in deconstructing the notion of presence. There emerges an understanding of mediation as not only the point of contact between the (at least) two, but also as the place for the indetermination of the two, which is not reducible to any kind of *Aufhebung* and frustrates the pretenses of identity constantly dislocating and differing any attempt at semiotic self-enclosure. I will compare Lotman's *translation of the untranslatable* and Derrida's *différance* as similar ways of describing this kind of mediation.

Derrida and Lotman offer us important instruments to deconstruct from a theoretical point of view and oppose from a practical point of view the kind of essentialist understanding of culture used today as a new (old) kind of ideological justification for social conflicts. The (de)constructive nature of culture, as described by Lotman and Derrida, challenges any attempt at theorizing structural cultural constraints as sources of irreducible identities/differences and conflicts.

The Interpretant as an Agent in Semiosis According to Peirce

Winfried Nöth
University of Kassel, Germany / São Paulo Catholic University, Brazil
noeth@uni-kassel.de

Already in Peirce's earliest definitions of the sign, we find the argument that the sign is a mediator between its object and its interpretant. In 1903, Peirce finally exclaimed: "All my notions are too narrow. Instead of sign ought I not to say medium?" This terminological reconsideration reflects Peirce's conviction that the study of a sign is more that the study of a representation of objects and ideas since a full description of the sign process requires reference the interpretant created by the sign.

In his studies of the process of semiosis, Peirce often uses the metaphor of the interpreter who translates, or a teacher who explains, the meanings of words or sentences to a learner of a foreign language. In 1898, he calls the interpretant of the sign "a mediating representation [...] because it fulfils the office of an interpreter". Since the interpretation of a sign is in itself a process that involves an interpreter, namely, the interpreter who understands and reacts to the sign, this means that a process of semiosis involves two interpreting agents, a metaphorical and a "real" one. The paper examines the relationship between these two interpreters with a special focus on Peirce's metaphor of the interpreter in the sense of a translator.

Types of Translation Process in Culture

Bruno Osimo
Fondazione Milano, Milan, Italy
bruno.osimo@scmmi.it

Translation as a science is undoubtedly a discipline in its infancy, with much still needing to be tested and debated and new theories and developments having yet to make their debut on the scientific scene. However, there is no denying that over the past fifty years translation science, interestingly, has witnessed a surge of contributions, with varying degrees of pointedness and awareness. Unfortunately such contributions have not become homogeneously widespread. From this perspective, the globe appears as if it were divided by two heavy curtains, each of which concealing and protecting a separate and autonomous world that thrives and evolves regardless of what happens in the other one. "Total'nyj perevod", i.e. "total translation" is the revolutionary core of Torop's view, the starting and ending point for the construction of a universal model. Conceptualized by Firth and later resumed by Catford, such expression acquires a completely different quality in Torop's work. The existence of a residue is the hallmark of any communication process. That is one of the fundamental aspects examined through the total-translation approach. Translating all means devising a way to transfer onto the receiving culture what the main metatext is unsuited to contain. After identifying the dominants of the metatext through careful translation-focused analysis, the 'total translator' shall concentrate on the loss that will make up the metatextual system in the form of notes, remarks, introductions, forewords and afterwords. According to Torop, these 'artificial' extensions of the translated text, which are designed to convey the loss into the culture of 'the other', are of vital importance in intercultural exchange. "Translation is a complicated matter". Let us not fear to utter such a statement. The translator has a tough task to perform, a task that involves dealing with rationalizations, analyses, elaborations, syntheses, processes, residues, systems. The outcome of all these rational workings must always feel natural and spontaneous.

In What Sense Can Reality Be a Translation?

Aare Pilv
Under and Tuglas Literature Centre
of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, Estonia
aare.pilv@mail.ee

In my paper I will try to discuss relations, blending and mutual transferences between poetic/fictional and factual discourses – how texts are translated between these discourses. By factual discourses we can understand both descriptions of the world and declarations, performative speech acts which do not describe but make reality. Characteristic to the poetic and fictional discourses is the fact that the area of validity of the speech acts that are performed in those discourses is limited to a certain context and they do not have immediate relation to the real world at first sight. But there exist cases where there are made transfers or "translations" from one discourse to other; for example, the use of poetic or fictional means in an autobiography or in political or historiographic discourses (all these are ways of describing/establishing identity – autobiography for personal identity and the others for collective one). There is possible to transfer/ "translate" different aspects: content (themes, problems), structural peculiarities, modalities, specific silent "blind spots" of the chosen speech mode etc. Sometimes there can occur surprising effects during such transfers and I will try to describe some of these. On the theoretic level I see a productive possibility to draw parallels between three approaches that deal with the relations between those discourses: the distinction between primary and secondary modelling systems, used by the Tartu semiotic school; the view of literature as an archive of standards for language games (and also as a laboratory for the elaboration and modification of the standards) by John Gibson whose theory is based on the theory of language games by Ludwig Wittgenstein; pragmapoetic "theory of two contexts" by Arne Merilai (which describes the principles of distinguishing fictional and factual speech acts and which is in my mind possible to develop to a further theory that would allow us make distinctions also between e.g. ideological and non-ideological discourses etc.). Those parallels could maybe have additional heuristic resources, and e.g. the theory of Gibson makes it possible to propose the hypothesis that in a sense the primary modelling systems follow the secondary ones, not vice versa.

Intersemiotic Translation as a Mechanism of Cultural Memory

Maarja Saldre
University of Tartu, Estonia
maarjasa@ut.ee

Everything we know about the past has been mediated, and cultural memory is mostly embedded in narratives. Therefore, transformations in the narratives about the past (e.g. deletion or addition of certain textual elements) bring along changes in the ways that the members of a culture remember their past. Those transformations are tied to an important autocommunicative mechanism – the repetition of canonical, meaningful texts. The identity of a culture is influenced both by those manifested (self-)descriptions of the past, and by the communicative processes, and languages currently in use. Today the canonical narratives of the (Western) cultural memory exist mostly in the written form, while the essence of literacy and that of text itself are growing inclined to other, mostly visual and intermedial forms. It means that to communicate the old, classical narratives to new generations, new ways, new languages of mediation have to be found.

Therefore, the function of intersemiotic translation is of growing importance. It could be the main tool for keeping certain narratives (or parts of the narratives) active in cultural memory. The empirical material of my presentation originates from some Estonian literary texts, which several decades after their creation are translated into new sign sytstems, as well as into new cultural contexts. These texts become processual entities, existing simultaneously in written, cinematic and staged versions. All of these versions have their own dominant, bringing chosen meanings of the prototext to the core, and leaving others in latent form to the periphery. By intermingling in the cultural memory, the variants form a new mental whole, where the well-structured and more static invariant part is in constant dialogue with the surrounding variable areas, filled with the infinite potentiality of creating new meanings.

From a Cultural into a Power Turn? Power and Globalisation in Contemporary Translation Studies

Ene-Reet Soovik
University of Tartu, Estonia
ene-reet.soovik@ut.ee

It has been widely accepted that since the late 20th century translation studies have undergone a "cultural turn", which, in the formulation of Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (1990), would indicate that it is "culture" as a whole rather than any smaller units that should be considered as units of translation. The presentation discusses the manifestations of the idea in the writings of translation scholars both predating and following this suggestion, observing the significance attributed to cultural centres and peripheries as well as the related issues of power relations and ideological undercurrents in translation that occur within the cultural contexts involved in translational processes. Special attention is paid to the parallel emergence of similar ideas within the framework of postcolonial studies, as exemplified by, e.g., the work of Robert J. C. Young, and its intersection with translation studies.

The talk also addresses the situation of translational relationships in a (postcolonial) world that is increasingly more often described as a globalising network of power relations and power imbalances. Within the academic sphere with its long-established international and intercultural character, it still is the centres of power that determine the validity and relevance of academic paradigms and research questions; thus the intercultural travelling of ideas and theories also emerges as a subfield that can be proposed as a fruitful area of research and metalevel self-examination both in scholarly endeavours in general as well as translation studies in particular.

Mediating Difference: The Semiotic Practices of Marginalization in Medieval Society

Marek Tamm
Tallinn University, Estonia
marek.tamm@tlu.ee

From the early thirteenth century onwards, the ecclesiastical and secular authorities in Western Europe invented and imposed a rich apparatus of external distinguishing signs in order to maintain and mediate social difference. These included both positive (e.g. pilgrims or crusader's cross) and, more frequently, negative signs. The initial impetus was given by the decision of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) which decreed that in order to avoid confusion between Christians on the one hand, and Jews and Saracens on the other, the latter should wear distinguishing clothing. In the wake of Lateran IV, numerous local synods and royal decrees imposed all over Christendom various specific signs of distinction for different social groups (lepers, heretics, prostitutes, etc.)

The unprecedented use of distinguishing signs can be regarded as part of two larger processes, which also started in the thirteenth century. On the one hand, the interest towards semiotic theories and practices grew significantly: dress symbolism was used in an increasingly sophisticated manner and semiotic theories were elaborated in the growing number of universities and monasteries. Thus, we could even speak about the "semiotic turn" of the thirteenth century. On the other hand, the period witnessed a growing intolerance that is perceptible both in the popular disturbances and officially sanctioned persecution. Using the expression coined by Robert I. Moore, we could argue for the "formation of a persecuting society" in the thirteenth-century Europe. These developments resulted in the novel form of "semiotic persecution", expressed in the vast array of the distinguishing signs that since the early thirteenth century were applied to all the significant minority groups.

The development of this variegated semiotic apparatus should be considered as one of the most important inventions of the thirteenth-century Europe that still waits for a thorough and interdisciplinary study. Therefore, my paper will offer only a preliminary exploration of just a few aspects of the complex system of semiotic marginalization in the medieval society.

Culture Mediated by Mind: Principles of 'Moi' and 'Soi' in Semiotics

Eero Tarasti
University of Helsinki, Finland
eero.tarasti@helsinki.fi

In my recent theoretical elaborations on existential semiotics I have come to distinguish among four cases of the categories of 'Moi' and 'Soi' representing correspondingly the body and the society. I see two semiotic 'forces' functioning within our minds as subject and semiotic selves, and within the society to which we belong. The body develops from pure corporeality and sensibility (Mo1=M1) into a permanent stable body as person (M2), whereas the society shifts from its values and norms as abstract categories (Soi1=S1) into more concrete social institutions, roles and practices (S2). These two movements meet each other when social institutions recruit persons (M2:s) as their agents. So we see how society gets ,so to say, 'corporealied' and the body, on the other hand 'socialized'. This dynamic model of cultural mediation enables us to develop also a theory of semiotic action in all fields and particularly in communication following the Bakhtinian principle of dialogicity.

Semiotics of Mediation

Peeter Torop
University of Tartu, Estonia
peeter.torop@ut.ee

Understanding of semiotics of mediation in cultural communication processes has mostly proceeded from the similarity of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication processes and has to a large extent relied on L. Vygotsky's views on semiotic mediation. Another way how semiotic mediation has been represented is R. Jakobson's view of translation as combining interlingual, intralingual and intersemiotic kinds of translation. With regard to translation, both translation studies and philosophy have employed the notion of indeterminacy. From the viewpoint of semiotics of culture, the impact of intracultural mediation on the diversity of culture on the one hand and on the self-description of culture, i.e. cultural metamechanisms on the other hand is important. In addition to diversity, intersemiotic processes in culture raise also indefinability. Already in the 1970s J. Lotman called for a discussion of the semiotic modelling of indefinability. On the one hand this adds relevance to the typological analysis of different cultures or parts of cultures, and on the other hand this forces us to look differently at the problem of translatability and untranslatability. Semiotics of mediation as a complex understanding of intracultural and intercultural processes of communication begins with a semiotic interpretation of translatability and untranslatability.

Urban Landscapes in Finnish Poetry of the 1960s: Mediations between the Past and the Present, the East and the West, the Centre and the Periphery

Harri Veivo
Visiting Professor of Finnish Studies
CIEH & CIEFi (Centre interuniversitaire des études hongroises et finnoises), University of Paris III – La nouvelle Sorbonne, France
harri.veivo@helsinki.fi

The 1960s in Finland were marked by the rapid process of urbanization that emptied the countryside and provoked the construction of the new suburbia, the ever increasing presence of pop and youth cultures (jazz, rock, hippies), the rising underground scenes in Helsinki and Turku, the expansion of a consumer society with TV as its main media, and the growing social consciousness and politicization of everyday life. While political sympathy for the Soviet Union and the Eastern Block was strong among the artists and writers, the West with its production of popular culture (considered as an alternative to traditional "high culture") aroused more and more interest. Everyday life was changing rapidly and Finland's place in international relations was constantly in question. For many writers, experimentation with poetic discourses was the means to reflect on these changes and tensions. The poets of the 60s were actively looking for ways to mediate such formerly separated categories as "high" and "low", "art" and "everyday", "poetry" and "science", "serious" and "entertaining", or even "culture" and "consumption". In my presentation, I will focus on how the city – as a landscape, a topos, or a symbol – was used in this process of cultural reconfiguration and redefinition. I am interested in knowing how the city functioned both as a palimpsest carrying traces of earlier periods, as a stage for present-day transformations and tensions, and as a sign pointing towards future mutations, and, more precisely, how the city of Helsinki was used to mediate and interpret the categories of center and periphery and the East and the West.

History of Soviet Humanities (Semiotics, Linguistics, Philosophy) As Reflected in the Novels of Konstantin Vaginov

Ekaterina Velmezova
Lausanne University, Switzerland
Ekaterina.Velmezova@unil.ch

In the 1920s, Russian poet and novelist Konstantin Vaginov (1899–1934) had contacts not only with most of the major literary circles in Petrograd/Leningrad, but also with members of the so-called "Bakhtin circle" (Mikhail Bakhtin, Pavel Medvedev, Valentin Vološinov, Lev Pumpjanskij, Ivan Sollertinskij, Matvej Kagan, Boris Zubakin, Marija Judina, Aleksandr Mejer, among others). Various intellectual discussions of this group were reproduced in Vaginov's novels Kozlinaja Pesn' (literally "Goat Song") (1927), Trudy i dni Svostonova ("Works and days of Svistonov") (1929), Bambočada ("Bambocciada") (1931) and Garpagoniana ("Harpagoniana") (1933). Our analysis of Vaginov's novels in the light of the history of Soviet humanities will not only allow an understanding of how a number of linguistic and philosophical trends were interpreted in the 1920s–1930s by particular groups of Soviet intellectuals (in literary circles for instance), but also propose a new reading of Vaginov's novels, showing how important these works were for Vaginov's professional evolution in general. We shall also compare the history of the humanities as reflected in the novels of Vaginov with some other works of Soviet writers published in the late 1920s – early 1930s dealing with the problem of "intelligentsia and Revolution", such as Veniamin Kaverin's novel Skandalist, ili Večera na Vasil'evskom ostrove ("The Troublemaker, or Evenings on the Vasil'evskij Island") (1928). In the 1920s–1930s, literary works of Vaginov and Kaverin had often been reviewed together and today they are of particular interest in the light of the intellectual biographies of scientists who have inspired writers and served as prototypes for characters in their literary works.

European Culture Mediation from 1614

Vilmos Voigt
Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), Budapest, Hungary
voigt@ludens.elte.hu

Culture mediation today follows different ways of communication. There is a long tradition of comparing European cultures, but that material was not often studied in semiotics. In my paper I will discuss one of the earliest and most interesting books on that topic.

The famous political essayist and writer John Barclay (1582–1621), born to a Scottish teacher of law and a French mother, was an English nobleman, who spent most of his life on the Continent, writing exclusively in elegant Latin on European state affairs and social life. His first important book was the Satyricon (1603), a picaresque novel in three parts, mirroring everyday life. The next book Icon Animorum (London 1614) was understood by the contemporary European public as the fourth book of the Satyricon, presenting its theoretical summary. After a dedication to the French king, there are two chapters of introduction (on the four ages of man, on genius seculorum et regionum) and seven descriptive chapters according to states and peoples (Gallia, the English, Scots and Irishmen, Germans and Belgians, Italians, the Spanish, Hungarians, Poles and Muscovites, the Turks and Jews). Then seven synthetic chapters follow, about mental capacities, characterology, types of power and rulers, men in the service of courts, magistrates and patrons, divine experience and religious leaders. No explanatory notes, maps or illustrations are included. In the later (German) editions of the book exhaustive commentaries have been added.

Barclay's book is an excellent source for the historical culture mediation. Especially the third topic in the book – description of a dozen European peoples – offers good material for comparative semiotics.

It will be analysed in the framework of later characteristics of the European peoples/cultures.

From Word to Image – Culture in Transition

Nayden Yotov
New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria
childharold@gmail.com

It is quite understandable that sight and hearing are inseparable and indivisible, there could be no real evolution without their conjunction. The image is a part of reality. But it is impossible to represent fully the truth whatsoever. It contains only external, visible behavior. It is not possible to represent the spiritual evidence, the need for justice, the intimate territory in human beings, i.e., the image is not determining the truth. In all these cases the image is related to the form. It could reflect the ritual which is a necessary thing in the world of visuals, where one needs a statistics. Then we have to anticipate the religion through its rituals. Otherwise it could not be understandable enough. The word is necessarily paradoxical, it predisposes to a long journey for distinction, for a choice, for experimenting. What comes from the word is never obvious. The actual could be obvious, the truth – never.

The continuous tendency of using images for depicting reality deprives the domain of the word from being accepted as veracious representation of the truth as such – hidden reality that is independent from the process of interpretation. The mixing of actuality and truth is the greatest seduction of our civilization (connected to the technical hegemony). Praxis became a measure for the reality. Propaganda has long disdained the comic lies of past and outmoded forms of propaganda. It operates instead with many different kinds of truth – half truth, limited truth, truth out of context.

The purpose of this paper, as a part of ongoing research, is to make clear distinction between word and image, between reality and truth, to recall the difference between them and their place.

In my methodology I intend to use hermeneutics which could be found in the works of Gadamer, Jacques Ellul and Paul Ricoeur.

ARTISTIC PROGRAMME

TRANSLATING TARTU & SPEAKING THROUGH THE VOICE OF ANOTHER III

By **Heather Connelly**

> *"You take delight not in a city's seven or seventy wonders, but in the answer it gives to a question of yours....or the question it asks you, forcing you to answer."* (Italo Calvino, "Invisible Cities", Vintage, London 1997, p. 44)

This project uses translation as creative tool and makes use of R. Jakobson's tripartite definition of the phenomenon: interlingual, intralingual and intersemiotic. Heather has used the conference as an opportunity to create two new works that explore and respond to 'Culture in Mediation' and the site of the exhibition: a series of texts and a sound work that have been installed in the museum. Both works introduce subjective narratives into the institution (museum), offering personal perspectives on Tartu and the Estonian language, thus mediating Estonian culture.

1. ***Translating Tartu:*** Heather invited Tartu residents to respond to a series of questions to enable her to build up a 'mediated' mental image of the city, she collated and edited these texts and has placed them around the museum. These texts serve as an alternate guide and their placement open up the potential for new interpretations and associations with the exhibits, drawing our attention to the fluidity of meaning.

2. ***Speaking through the voice of another III:*** Heather initiated a translator-mediated dialogue, whereby she was forced to converse with an Estonian speaker through a translator. The resulting sound work reveals the difficulties, the frustrations and humorous consequences of what took place. It reveals the agency of the translator who becomes central to the communicative act translating not only the content of the discussion but also finding ways to articulate cultural anomalies and particular idiosyncratic concepts.

Heather hopes that the experiential nature of her work and disseminating her research by practice encourages the audience and

participants to reflect upon mediation, what happens 'in' translation by exposing issues and processes that we usually take for granted.

Biography

Heather Connelly is a PhD by practice student in Fine Art at Loughborough University, UK, practicing artist and lecturer. Her research uses translation as both the subject and process to make a series of art works that provoke new ways of thinking about the transformations that happen 'in' inter-lingual translation. She is interested in the complex, polyvocal and dialogic nature of translation and uses the term to include oral interpretation. Using sound as her main medium she creates works that celebrate the tone and timbre of the voice and the musicality and diversity of spoken language. Heather creates interventions, situations and events that subvert, challenge, explore and examine conventions, philosophical debates, theoretical positions and practical issues associated the phenomenon, in order to draw people's attention to what happens during this process and to explore its creative potential. She aims to make explicit this hidden phenomenon which usually remains silent and invisible, seeking undermine it's seemingly 'neutral' position, by revealing its subjectivity: giving translation a voice. Heather has become increasingly interested in minority languages and considering focusing upon the Finno-Ugric languages of Estonia and Finland.

email: h.connelly2@lboro.ac.uk
Blog: http://voiceofanother.wordpress.com/
Website: http://www-staff.lboro.ac.uk/~achc/pages/homepage.html

Translation is Dialogue

By **Arlene Tucker**

Translation is dialogue and it allows transcendence of oneself to another. Regardless of the situation happening organically or consciously it is bound to the subjective state of the translator, yet it is through such discourse where truth or realization is found. This project, Translation is Dialogue, made by the author, Arlene Tucker, is mainly to build a platform to do and not think so much.

Tucker picked a song and gave it to Alejandra Pineda, a dancer and semiotician. Pineda then choreographed a dance performance on the basis of this song. Space, dancers, materials and anything that is needed to make this performance as she wishes is available because it was constructed in her imagination. Recordings of Pineda describing her envisioned dance were sent to artists from Estonia, Columbia and the USA, to name a few. The artists' participation in the next stage of translation is to create something on the basis of Alejandra's description. Now, not only is there the translation of the musician's intent to sound, sound to recording, recording to ears, Pineda's ears to thoughts, thoughts to voice, voice to MP3, these selected artists have created an extension of melody, meaning, and purpose from their interpretation.

This project takes the notion of translating, communicating through language and transferring ideas intentionally and unintentionally. Juri Lotman's thoughts on the artistic text and Roman Jakobson's intersemiotic translation, or transmutation, define how motivated artistic expression can be made. Jakobson defines intersemiotic translation as "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of the signs of a non-verbal system" (Jakobson 1984: 68–9). The installation will follow the form of these translations produced in a range of mediums such as video, colored pencils and sculpture. From thought to matter the continuity of mind is forever transforming as the viewers reinterpret their surroundings.

Applying Jakobson's and Lotman's theories on translation and art builds a platform for better problem solving for creative issues. The artists are translators who create their own boundaries of artistic expression, language, culture, and society. "An idea in art is always a model, for it reconstructs an image of reality" (Lotman 1977: 12). With that said, art is in a constant state of evolution traveling from one semiosphere of reality to another, perhaps in unreality.

References:
Jakobson, Roman 1984. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: Roman Jakobson, *Essays on General Linguistics*. Barcelona: Ariel.
Lotman, Jurij 1977. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan.

Participating Artists:

Jesper Alvaer is an artist and currently interested in issues connected to producing art, e.g. strategy, distribution and instrumentalization as processes within artistic practices. He works preferably in collaborative situations. He is living in Oslo.

Mike Ballard works primarily as a translator and teacher, and he carries across the concept of symbolic meaning from his daily professional life into his artwork. Symbolism has its own inherent energy, and how it is interpreted by each of us depends on our understanding of its value: whatever you interpret from his work is always going to be right.

Arngrímur Borgþórsson graduated from the Iceland Academy of Arts in 2006. He lives and works in Reykjavík, Iceland.

Olivier Clerc designs packaging to corporate identities with passion. He has accumulated more than 10 years of creation thanks to his higher education in industrial, interactions and graphic design. Gushing with arts & creativity, his blood streams out of the box ideas to reach further ends.

Madis Katz's artwork is concerned with virtualization of the day-to-day existence and sometimes takes a form of artistic anthropology via documentary conceptualism.

Kaisa Krusenberg enjoys manipulating natural fibres, up-cycling industrial waste, reusing materials and fabrics including linen, ramie, sisal, and wool. She studied fashion design in Teko, design and business academy in Denmark. Currently she is working towards a Bachelor of Fine Arts in fashion and textile at Tartu Art College.

David Wright Lagrone's artwork, at its most core, regards human connection and disconnection. Primarily concerned with interpersonal and societal disconnection, my work most often serves as a reflection

of the elements in the modern world, which prevent healthy social connection.

Nathan Lay was born in 1977 in Columbia, MO. He grew up in St. Louis, and attended art school at the Savannah College of Art and Design. There, he earned a BFA in 3D Computer Animation, and a BFA in Video/Film Production. After a brief stint as a private investigator, he is now a production designer and artist in Los Angeles.

Leyna Marika Papach is a composer, video artist and violinist from Japan and the United States. She has made numerous soundtracks for video/film, theater and dance productions, and her video work as well as her musical theater pieces has been performed in both western and eastern Europe as well as the United States and Japan.

Carlos Alejandro Marulanda is a filmmaker and cinematographer based out of San Francisco, California. His work focuses primarily on the surreal and highly visual elements of storytelling. In 2004 he expanded into gallery-based video and sound installations that explore the manner in which the moving image is experienced by the viewer.

Anna-Stephanie Müller was born 1986 in Karl-Marx-Stadt/GDR. She sees her creative working as a way to express herself. At the moment she is involved with the performing theater in Chemnitz.

Jaanika Peerna is an artist living and working in New York. She works at the crossroads of digital and traditional media, often dealing with the themes of water, simplicity and silence in drawing, video, and installations.

Alejandra Pineda Silva has been developing her interest about bodily experience and learning through her artistic formation in contemporary dance and complementary performative art techniques. Her studies in Linguistics and as a master student in Semiotics have connected her exploration between arts and language.

Kristino Rav is interested in using her own body as a creative tool. She explores the borderlines and interactions between personal and public spheres, which are challenged by endurance-demanding performances. Kristino has a bachelor of Fine Arts from the Estonian Art Academy and is currently studying Semiotics at the University of Tartu.

Michelle Rosenberg is an architect and an artist living in New York, NY. She creates work in different mediums that encourage collaboration

among strangers. Michelle graduated from The Rhode Island School of Design with a Bachelor of Fine Art and a Bachelor of Architecture. Currently, she is pursuing an MFA degree in Combined Media at Hunter College in New York.

Scott Ruff of RuffWorks Studio is an Associate Professor of Architecture at the Tulane School of Architecture.

Andrew Steinmetz works primarily in video, web pages, and drawing in Brooklyn, NY. He is interested in the history of film, communication technology, music, language and their borders. He also produces music recordings and performs in the Wrong Music Ensemble/Guns Germs & Steel with Ian Dreiblatt. He has exhibited at Horton Gallery, Monkey Town, The Troutfarm, K&M Bar, and Mandrake, Los Angeles, among other venues.

Raul Taremaa has a lot of interests as he has studied Biology at the University of Tartu and Music at the Georg Ots Music School. Currently he is a student at Tartu Art College. He is mainly focused on how to use his knowledge and background for artistic purposes, likewise dealing with analyzing its impact on the audience.

Daniel Teichmann is interested in nature and people. He loves watching life trough the photographic lens because in the picture one can feel the power of nature and people. Teichmann's profession is confectioner and he is in his third year of studying Estonian Sign Language interpreting at Tartu University.

Andi Thea is the creator and chief scribbler of Scribble mats! Her original Scribble mat was developed in the early 1980s as a white vinyl place mat/play mat packaged with crayons for kids to color. She is an artist as well as toy inventor. In both fields, her vision is to create art in a way that evokes happy emotions and helps people learn while having fun.

Arlene Tucker received her Bachelor of Fine Arts from the Savannah College of Art & Design, USA. Tucker's adventures stimulate her senses to try and making meaning from an orchestra of foreign sounds. Her dream is to travel, discover and build for people by contextualizing new signs. Currently, Tucker is working towards a Master's degree in Semiotics at the University of Tartu, Estonia.

Rafael Duarte Uriza is a designer, jeweller and body researcher born in Bogotá, Colombia. His creative interests include scenic work,

improvisation and art installations. Since 2003 his explorations and body research are bound to yoga, in this way his search has been directed to a new body language, which has structured his training in dance, acrobatics, physical theatre and aerial circus techniques.

Nathan Williams is a New York City-based architectural designer. He received his professional training as an architect at Cornell University's School of Architecture, Art, and Planning, College of Architecture, in Ithaca, New York. Williams travels throughout the Americas researching African Trans-Atlantic Diasporic creative theory, process, and practice with views toward developing artistic and architectural language.

Nayden Yotov is a pianist and actor from Bulgaria. His music is influenced by Russian Romance, Impressionism, and Romantic movements, which he enhances with passionate expression and freedom in form and design. Fantasy, imagination and a quest for adventure play an important role in Nayden's performance.

Irina Avramets, Juri Lotman, Peeter Torop, Mihhail Lotman, and Igor Černov discussing the formation of the Department of Semiotics in the home of Juri Lotman and Zara Mints, in 1992.

Photo Sergei Černov

A Few Notes on Peeter Torop

By **Mihhail Lotman**

For the first time I saw Peeter Torop more than 40 years ago, on September 1st or 2nd 1969 when we both started our studies of Russian philology at the University of Tartu. In the course of this time a lot has changed. A millennium has ended, a thousand-year-old empire (this is how philosopher Aleksei Losev is said to have called the Soviet Union) has collapsed, the Estonian Republic has risen as a phoenix from the ashes, not to speak of a multitude of smaller changes. On this background it is striking how Peeter Torop has defied the passage of time and remained the same not only in terms of his character but also in his outward appearance – and it is noteworthy that in his case, appearance and character are in especially strong correlation. Just like in September 1969, also today Peeter is always wearing an elegant suit and a tie, with the top button of the shirt fastened. Only during open air activities the jacket may be from a different set than the trousers and the top button of the shirt may be left undone. But these are already very strong signs of informality. Behind this appearance there is a steadfast character, a person who can always be counted on. Similarly elegant and businesslike was Peeter during the university years at the then compulsory classes of physical education: to this day I remember his stylish long jump – before, I had seen something like that only on TV. Another thing which set Peeter apart right away was his grown-up demeanour, and the first thing he did when he had started university was to get married to a woman with whom he lives happily also today. It goes without saying that the same seriousness marked also Peeter Torop's attitude towards his studies as well as his scholarly activity that started already in his university years.

Peeter Torop's first area was translation theory and its application to the Estonian translations of Russian literature. I remember the enthusiastic comments of his supervisor of the time, Igor Chernov. But already during his studies he took up also another topic that was related to Fyodor Dostoyevski's works and especially their ideology; Zara Mints was Peeter Torop's supervisor and she too thought very highly of her student's diligence and the maturity of his work's results. In those times there were two principal possibilities to deal with Dostoyevski (let us remind ourselves that it was just the time when Dostoyevski acquired the status of "permitted author" in the Soviet Union – in connection with his 150th anniversary his collected works began to be published). The first possibility was related to Soviet literary studies represented by Georgi Friedländer, the other one to Mikhail Bakhtin's ideas on Dostoyevski as an author of polyphonic

novels. Peeter Torop was searching for his own way and while proceeding from Bakhtin, he showed that "polyphonic novel" is a too narrow definition and that unlike how Bakhtin saw it, Dostoyevskian voices are not equal. It was in those times that a semiotic understanding of Dostoyevski's work began to develop in the Tartu-Moscow school, the most important representative being Vladimir Toporov. Peeter Torop's studies fit into this context very well and enriched it. While Bakhtin's Dostoyevski speaks with many mouths at the same time, Torop tries to demonstrate the possibility of different interpretations of one and the same scene.

But dealing with the history of Russian literature could not suppress Peeter Torop's interest in translation theory. These two topics resonated: Torop applied translation theory to the publications of Dostoyevski's translations into Estonian, while the material on Dostoyevski provided food for thought in translation research. Within a short time span Torop published two monographs[1] which attracted much international attention and acknowledgement right away. "Total Translation" has been translated into Italian; an English-language translation is underway. The author approaches translation from the viewpoint of semiotics of culture; his point of departure is Roman Jakobson's translation theory and the latter's typology of different possibilities of translation. Differently from Jakobson, for whom translation remains an intertextual relation, Torop shows that in cultural context also specific extratextual translations can occur. The solid methodological basis is complemented with deep cultural erudition (e.g. Torop feels as much at home in the world of cinema as in literary history).

From the second half of the 1990s onwards Peeter Torop pays increasing attention to problems of semiotics of culture, to what he himself calls institutional semiotics of culture, and in 1998 becomes institutionalized himself: he becomes the professor of semiotics and head of the department of semiotics. The preceding years had been a difficult time for Tartu semiotics. After Estonia had regained its independence in 1991 and after Juri Lotman's death in 1993 many old contacts were lost, the publication of the famous *Sign Systems Studies* series ceased with the last number issued in 1992. Thanks to Peeter Torop's commitment the publication of the series was revived, now already in the form of an English-language international peer-reviewed journal. Besides that, just like in the golden times of Tartu semiotics, other publications were launched, such as Tartu Semiotics Library,

---

[1] Пеэтер Тороп. *Тотальный перевод.* Tartu: Tartu University Press, 1995 (Itaalia keeles: P.Torop. *La traduzione totale.* Ed. by B. Osimo. Modena, Guaraldi Logos, 2000); Пеэтер Тороп. *Достоевский: история и идеология.* Tartu: Tartu University Press, 1997.

Hortus Semioticus and *Acta Semiotica Estica*. The latter two are the first semiotic publications in the Estonian language; an important role in propagating semiotic ideas belongs to Estonian Semiotics Association.

But the huge load of administrative responsibilities has not stopped Peeter Torop's scholarly development: new challenges are offered by various areas of semiotics of culture. The results of those years are presented in the article collection "Kultuurimärgid" [*Signs of Culture*][2]. In addition to the expected sections "Culture as translation" and "Russica" we find also a section "Intersemiosis". Although the collection brings together previously published articles from the years 1987–1999, they reflect the already achieved results as well as point to the future perspectives of research. What characterises Torop's scholarly style from the beginning up to this day is his emphatic attention to the problems of metalanguage which seems especially worthwhile in the case of studying areas and phenomena that are only just being discovered. Metalanguage offers a point of support for approaching these problems.

60 years is a young age for a humanities scholar. As always we are looking forward to fresh ideas and new books from the ever elegant, focused and unwavering scientist.

[2] Peeter Torop. Kultuurimärgid. Tartu: Ilmamaa, 1999 (2000).

Biography of Peeter Torop

Peeter Torop was born on November 28, 1950 in Tallinn. However, at an early age his family moved to Tartu where he graduated from the Secondary School No. 5 (now Tamme Grammar School). Despite of having dreamed of becoming an architect, Torop completed the first level of academic education in 1974 as a Russian philologist at the Department of Russian Literature of the University of Tartu. He continued to work at the department as a senior assistant until 1976, and after that as a senior lecturer until 1992. His main field of research was Russian literature from the late 19th and early 20th centuries (the works of Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy and Chekhov). In 1997, a collection of his essays was published under the title "Dostoyevsky: History and Ideology" (*Достоевский: история и идеология*). After the formation of the Department of Semiotics in 1992, Torop has been one of its central figures, working as the head of the department in the years 1997–2006. His doctoral dissertation "Total Translation" (*Тотальный перевод*), written under the supervision of professor Pekka Pesonen, was defended at the University of Helsinki in 1995. The work has so far been translated into Italian; the English-language version is to be published in the near future. In 1998 Peeter Torop was elected Professor of Semiotics and in 2003 he was elected Professor of Semiotics of Culture in the University of Tartu, a position he holds also today. In 1999, his previously written essays covering themes of Russian literature, Juri Lotman and Tartu semiotics, translation theory and intersemiosis were collected and published under the title "Signs of Culture" (*Kultuurimärgid*). Currently, he is the principal investigator of the Estonian Science Foundation´s research project "The typology of cultural autocommunication" and an active member of the semiotics research group in the Centre of Excellence in Cultural Theory, which is developing transdisciplinary methods and models for the chronotopic studying of culture.

As a lecturer for students from first year undergraduates to doctoral candidates, Torop has covered a wide range of subjects, recently concentrating on the methodologies of translation studies and those of the semiotics of culture in general. Besides his home university, he has also lectured at several other universities, both in Estonia and abroad. Nine doctoral and over 15 master's dissertations have so far been defended under his supervision. Torop is also the co-editor of the oldest international semiotics periodical *Sign System Studies*, and belongs to the editorial board of several other publications. He is the president of Estonian Semiotics Association, a member of the Executive Committee of the International Association for Semiotic Studies, and of many other

national and international commissions and associations. His scientific merits have been acknowledged with the Estonian Renaissance Award in 1995 (with Ann Malts and Ljubov Kisseljova) and with the Estonian Scientific Award in 2001 among others. By today, Peeter Torop has become the main continuer and developer of the culture semiotic tradition of the Tartu-Moscow school.

Bibliography of Peeter Torop

Torop, P. 2010. Szimultaneitás és dialogicitás Dosztojevskij poétikájában. In: Kroó, K.; Tamás, B. (eds.), *Utópiák és ellenutópiák*. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 295–317.

Torop, P. 2010. The Soviet Empire of Signs: A History of the Tartu School of Semiotics. By Maxim Waldstein. *Slavic Review* 69(2), 517–518.

Torop, P. 2010. Culture and Translation. *Applied Semiotics / Sémiotique appliquée*, 9(24), 11–17.

Torop, P. 2010. Translation as Communication and Auto-Communication. *Applied Semiotics / Sémiotique appliquée*, 9(24), 3–10.

Torop, P. 2010. Multimeediumlik "Kirsiaed". *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 8–9, 40–52.

Salupere, S.; Torop, P. (eds.) 2009. Лотман, Ю. *Чему учатся люди: статьи и заметки*. Москва: Центр Книги ВГБИЛ им. М. И. Рудомино.

Torop, P. 2009. Предисловие. In: Salupere, S.; Torop, P. (eds.). Лотман, Ю. *Чему учатся люди: статьи и заметки*. Москва: Центр Книги ВГБИЛ им. М. И. Рудомино, 5–10.

Torop, P. 2009. Teatrifestival kui kultuuriline autokommunikatsioon. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 11, 34–40.

Torop, P. 2009. Methodology of Cultural Semiotics in Context of Cultural Research. *Culture of Communication, Communication of Culture. Abstracts Book: 10th World Congress of Semiotics; A Coruña, Spain; 22nd–26th September 2009.* A Coruña: Asociacon Espanola de Semiotica, 176–177.

Torop, P. 2009. Lotmanian Explosion. In: Lotman, J., *Culture and Explosion*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co, XXVII–XXXIX.

Torop, P. 2009. *La traduzione totale. Tipi di processo traduttivo nella cultura*. Milano: Hoepli.

Kroó, K.; Torop, P. 2009. Dialogue of Estonian and Hungarian Literary Semiotic Approaches. The Legacy of Russian Classics and the Lotmanian Critical Heritage as "Our Text". In: Tarasti, E.; Forsell, P.; Littlefield, R. (eds.), *Communication: Understanding/Misunderstanding*. Imatra, Helsinki: International Semiotics Institute, 791–807.

Torop, P. 2009. Social Aspects of Translation History or Forced Translation. In: Hartama-Heinonen, R.; Sorvali, I.; Tarasti, Eero; Tarasti, Eila (eds.), *Kielen ja kulttuurin saloja*. Imatra, Helsinki: International Semiotics Institute, 239–248.

Torop, P. 2009. Kultuuri analüüsitavusest. In: Sütiste, E.; Salupere, S.; Pärn, K. (eds.), *Acta Semiotica Estica* VI. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 11–41.

Torop, P. 2009. Semiotics of Translation in Context of Cultural Theory. *Abstracts. International Summer School for Semiotic Studies. Pan European Culture Heritage in the Global World*. Imatra, 78–79.
Torop, P. 2009. Semiotics of Translation from Pedagogical Point of View. *Abstracts. International Summer School for Semiotic Studies. Pan European Culture Heritage in the Global World*. Imatra, 78.
Torop, P. 2009. Methodology of Cultural Semiotics in Context of Cultural Research. *Culture of Communication, Communication of Culture. 10th World Congress of Semiotics, 2009. Abstracts Book*. A Coruña: IASS-AIS, AES, 176–177.
Torop, P. 2009. Gogol kui revident. In: Gogol, N., *Revident*. (Loomingu Raamatukogu 11–12). Tallinn: SA Kultuurleht, 95–108.
Torop, P. 2009. Bilingual Communication and Translation: Semiotic Aspects. *10th Nordic Conference on Bilingualism: 26–29 October 2009 Tartu, Estonia: Conference Abstracts*. Tartu, 12.
Torop, P. 2008. Перевод как коммуникация и автокоммуникация. *Studia Slavica Savariensia*, 1–2, 381–397.
Torop, P. 2008. La traduzione come comunicazione e autocomunicazione. In: Arduini, S.; Carmignani, I. (eds.), *Libri e riviste d'Italia*. Roma: iacobelli, 73–91.
Torop, P. 2008. "Keisri hull" ja eesti lood. In: Kross, J., *Keisri hull*. Tallinn: Eesti Päevaleht, Akadeemia, 319–331.
Torop, P. 2008. Karusmari, karuZmari. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 27(10), 90–107.
Torop, P. 2008. Translation and Semiotics. *Sign Systems Studies*, 36.2(2), 253–257.
Ricoeur, P.; Torop, P. 2008. *O tłumaczeniu*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
Torop, P. 2008. Identity of Cultural Text and Creolization of Cultural Languages. *Acta Semiotica Fennica*, XXX, 223–236.
Torop, P. 2008. Достоевский, Бахтин и семиотика скандала. In: Букс, Н. (ed.), *Семиотика скандала*. Париж, Москва: Европа, 185–208.
Torop, P. 2008. Multimeedialisus. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 8/9, 721–734.
Torop, P. 2008. Lotman, Iurii Mikhailovich. In: Hundert, G. D. (ed.), *The YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe.* Vol. I. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1088.
Torop, P. 2008. Eesti sambad. *Vikerkaar*, 4–5, 81–92.
Torop, P. 2008. Kodumälu. *Eesti Ekspress*, 27.03.
Torop, P. 2008. Античность в гетерофонии Достоевского. In: Kroó, K.; Torop, P. (eds.), *Russian Text (19th Century) and Antiquity / Русский текст (19 век) и античность*. Budapest, Tartu: L'Harmattan, 322–342.
Kroó, K.; Torop, P. 2008. Russian Text (19th Century) and Antiquity. Editorial Foreword. In: Kroó, K.; Torop, P. (eds.), *Russian Text*

(19th Century) and Antiquity / Русский текст (19 век) и античность. Budapest, Tartu: L'Harmattan, 7–14.
Kroó, K.; Torop, P. (eds.) 2008. *Russian Text (19th Century) and Antiquity / Русский текст (19 век) и античность.* Budapest: L'Harmattan.
Torop, P. 2008. Translation as Communication and Auto-Communication. *Sign Systems Studies*, 36.2(2), 375–397.
Sahk, K.; Torop., P; Sepp, K. 2007. Nature and Artifact Markets of Real Estate Value: What do the Market Accept? *14th Annual European Real Estate Society Conference in London, UK, 27.–30.07.2007*, 158.
Torop, P. 2007. Культурное многоязычие и проблемы переводимости Достоевского. In: Kroó, K.; Geza S. Horvath (eds.), *13th Symposium of the International Dostoevsky Society: F. M. Dostoevsky in the Context of Cultural Dialogues. Budapest, 3.–8.07.2007.* Budapest: University ELTE, 171–172.
Torop, P. 2007. Tõde tules. *Eesti Ekspress. Areen*, 01.11.
Torop, P. 2007. Ajalooteraapia. *Eesti Ekspress. Areen*, 09.08.
Torop, P. 2007. Dostojevski lavastatavusest. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 5, 3.
Torop, P. 2007. Kajakavool. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 11, 25–37.
Torop, P. 2007. Semiosfera como objeto de pesquisa na semiotica da cultura. In: Machado, I. (ed.), *Semiotica da Cultura e Semiosfera*. Sao Paulo: ANNABLUME editora, 45–56.
Torop, P.; Kroó, K. 2007. A Dialogue of Estonian and Hungarian Literary Semiotic Approaches. The Legacy of Russian Classics and the Lotmanian Critical Heritage as "Our Text". *Communication: Understanding/Misunderstanding. Abstracts of the 9th World Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies*. International Semiotics Institute.
Torop, P. 2007. Montage and Semiotics of Culture. *Communication: Understanding/Misunderstanding. Abstracts of the 9th World Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies*. Helsinki/Imatra: International Semiotics Institute, 440.
Sütiste, E.; Torop, P. 2007. Tõlketeadus, semiootika ja tõlkeprotsessi piirid. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 7, 554–570.
Torop, P. 2007. La scuola di Tartu come scuola. In: Sanches, M. C. (ed.), *Semiotica – Cultura – Conoscenza. Lotman*. Torino: Ananke, 97–116.
Torop, P. 2007. Distsiplinaarsed piirid, uurimisobjekti piirid ja teadlase identiteet. In: Vihalemm, R. (ed.). *Teaduse uuringud: eesmärgid ja meetodid.* Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 77–92.
Torop, P. 2007. The Widening of the Boundaries: Translation Studies and Semiotics of Translation. In: Hellman, B.; Huttunen, T.;

Obatnin, G. (eds.), *Varietas et concordia*. Helsinki: Helsinki University, 197–209.
Torop, P. 2007. Methodological Remarks on the Study of Translation and Translating. *Semiotica*, 163(1/4), 347–364.
Sütiste, E.; Torop, P. 2007. Processual Boundaries of Translation: Semiotics and Translation Studies. *Semiotica*, 163–1/4, 187–207.
Torop, P. 2006. A hösök átalakulása F.Dosztojevszkij "Bün és bünhödés" címü regényében. In: Kroó, K. (ed.). *Bevezetés a XIX szazadi orosz irodalom történebe*. Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium, 508–520.
Torop, P. 2006. Forced Translation. *Baltic Horizons*, 6(105), 49–57.
Torop, P. 2006. Hariduse hoidja: Silvi Salupere 50. *Universitas Tartuensis*, 12.05.
Torop, P. 2006. Enda mäletamisest. *Eesti Päevaleht*, 16.09.
Torop, P. 2006. Semiotics, Anthropology and Analysability of Culture. *Sign Systems Studies*, 34(2), 285–315.
Torop, P. 2006. Kultuurivärav. *Eesti Ekspress*, 16.11.
Torop, P. 2006. Juri Lotmani "Vestlusi vene kultuurist" on mäluvaru looja. *Postimees*, 17.03.
Kull, K.; Torop, P. 2006. Semiosfäär Brasiilias. In: Sütiste, E.; Salupere, S. (eds.), *Acta Semiotica Estica* III. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 238–241.
Torop, P. 2006. Tekst ja/kui struktuur. In: Lotman, J., *Kunstilise teksti struktuur*. Tallinn: Tänapäev, 505–535.
Torop, P. 2006. La semiosfera y/como el objeto de investigación de la semiótica de la cultura, *Entretextos*, 7, 1.
Torop, P. 2005. La traduzione totale. In: Buffoni, F. (ed.), *Traduttologia. La teoria della traduzione letteraria*. Roma: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato S.p.A., 643–675.
Torop, P. 2005. Tekst intersemiootilises ruumis. In: Sütiste, E.; Salupere, S. (eds.), *Acta Semiotica Estica* II. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 11–20.
Torop, P.; Salupere, S.; Kull, K. 2005. Semiotics Has No Beginning. In: Deely, J., *Basics of Semiotics*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 4–25.
Torop, P. 2005. The Tartu-Moscow School of Semiotics and Possibilities of Cultural Analysis. In: Rocha, D. (ed.), *Boletim informativo do I Encontro Internacional para o Estudo da Semiosfera*. São Paulo, 2–3.
Torop, P. 2005. Semiospherical Understanding: Textuality, Chronotopicality, Multimediality. In: *EFSS'2004 Culture and Text*. София: Издателство на Нов български университет, 83–99.
Torop, P. 2005. Culture as Translation: Intersemiosis and Intersemiotic Translation. In: *EFSS'2004 Culture and Text*. София: Издателство на Нов български университет, 100–113.

Torop, P. 2005. Lugeja olemine kultuuris. *Lector in fabula.* Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 3–8.
Torop, P. 2005. Peeter Toropi järelsõna eestikeelsele väljaandele. In: Danesi, M.; Perron, P., *Kultuuride analüüs.* Tallinn: Valgus, 311–315.
Torop, P. 2005. Kultuurisemiootika keel. *Postimees*, 08.12.
Torop, P. 2005. Tõusu lootus mõõna märkides. *Postimees*, 16.12.
Torop, P. 2005. Kakskeelne Eesti. *Päevaleht*, 08.01.
Torop, P. 2005. Uus ühiskond – uus identiteet. *Diplomaatia*, 18/19, märts/aprill.
Torop, P. 2005. Madis Kõivu tagasipeegeldus. *Sirp*, 13.05.
Torop, P. 2004. Locations in Intersemiotic Space. In: Sarapik, V.; Näripea, E.; Tüür, K. (eds.), *Place and Location. Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics.* Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Arts, 59–68.
Torop, P. 2004. Semiospherical Understanding: Textuality. *Sign Systems Studies*, 31(2), 323–339.
Torop, P. 2004. El fenomeno Lotman. *Entretextos*, 3, 1.
Torop, P. 2004. La Escuela de Tartu como Escuela. *Entretextos. Revista Electrónica Semestral de Estudios Semióticos de la Cultura*, 4.
Torop, P.; Lotman, M.; Kull, K. 2004. Dialogue and Identity. *Globalization, Europe and Regional Identity: 9th Baltic Conference on Intellectual Cooperation; Vilnius; 6.–7.06.2003.* Vilnius: Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, 143–155.
Torop, P. 2004. Тартуската школа като школа. *LiterNet*, 1.
Torop, P. 2004. Umberto Eco ja koodiõpetus. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 11, 85–89.
Torop, P. 2004. Eco epifaania udus. *Eesti Ekspress. Areen*, 22.04.
Torop, P. 2004. Lihula semiootika. *Eesti Päevaleht. Möte*, 12.10.
Torop, P. 2004. Kultuurimälu keeled. *Õpetajate leht*, 26.11.
Torop, P. 2004. Au piiridest. *Hai*, 14, 5.
Torop, P. 2004. Elulookunst Lotmani moodi. *Eesti Päevaleht. Arkaadia*, 23.02.
Torop, P. 2004. Ray Chow. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 1, 48.
Torop, P. 2004. D. N. Rodowick ja kummaline meedia. *Teater. Muusika. Kino,* 7, 91–92.
Torop, P. 2004. Ümberpaiknemised intersemiootilises ruumis: märkmeid mõtlemise raamidest. *Sirp*, 01.10.
Torop, P. 2003. Semiosphere and/as the Research Object of Semiotics of Culture. *Sign Systems Studies*, 31(1), 159–173.
Torop, P. 2003. Intersemiosis and Intersemiotic Translation. In: Petrilli, S. (ed.), *Translation Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 271–282.
Kull, K.; Torop, P. 2003. Biotranslation: Translation Between Umwelten. In: Petrilli, S. (ed.), *Translation Translation.* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 313–328.

Torop, P. 2003. Bahtin sotsioloogilise ja ajaloolise poeetika vahel. *Vikerkaar*, 7/8, 104–111.
Torop, P. 2003. Tunnetus ja/kui muusika. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 2, 32–35.
Torop, P. 2003. Juri Tõnjanov: filmikunst ja filmiteadus. *Teater. Muusika. Kino,* 6, 28–32.
Torop, P. 2003. Semiospherical Understanding. *Annales universitatis scientiarium Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae. Sectio Linguistica*, 24, 305–311.
Torop, P. 2003. La Escuela de Tartu como Escuela. *Entretextos. Revista Electrónica Semestral de Estudios Semióticos de la Cultura*, 1.
Torop, P. 2003. Semiotica de la traduccion, traduccion de la semiotica. *Entretextos. Revista Electrónica Semestral de Estudios Semióticos de la Cultura*, 1.
Torop, P. 2003. Simultaneidad y dialogismo en la poetica de Dostoievski. *Entretextos. Revista Electrónica Semestral de Estudios Semióticos de la Cultura*, 2.
Torop, P. 2003. Escola de Tartu como Escola. In: Machado, I., Escola de semiótica: A experiência de Tartú-Moscou para o estudo da cultura. São Paulo: Atelie Editorial, 69–95.
Torop, P. 2003. Pictorial Language and Languages of Culture. *Estonian Art*, 1, 15–17.
Torop, P. 2003. Ameerika(ga) täitmine. *Päevaleht*, 22.10.
Torop, P. 2003. Vene pealinn Soome soos. *Eesti Ekspress. Reporter*, 29.05.
Torop, P. 2003. Isiksuse kultuur. *Eesti Ekspress. Areen*, 05.06.
Torop, P. 2003. Õpeta(ta)vast inimesest. *Postimees*, 28.06.
Torop, P. 2003. Aleksander Pushkin väärib Juri Lotmanit. *Postimees*, 12.12.
Torop, P. 2002. Translation as a Working Principle of Culture. *Reality and Subject*, 6(1), 15–18.
Torop, P. 2002. Translation as Translating as Culture. *Sign Systems Studies*, 30(2), 593–605.
Torop, P. 2002. Intersemiosis y traducción intersemiótica. *Cuicuilco. Revista de la Escuela Nacional de Antropologia e Historia.* Mexico: Escuela Nacional de Antropolog´ia e Historia, 13–42.
Torop, P. 2002. Tõlkesund. In: Sarapik, V.; Kalda, M.; Veidemann, R. (eds.), *Kohandumise märgid*. Tallinn: Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus, 195–206.
Torop, P. 2002. Semiopherical Understanding. *Annales universitatis scientiarium Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae. Sectio Linguistica*, 24, 305–311.
Torop, P. 2002. Introduction: Rereading of Cultural Semiotics. *Sign Systems Studies*, 30(2), 395–404.

Torop, P. 2002. Juri Lotmani kultuurianalüüsi programm. *Akadeemia*, 12, 2660–2662.
Torop, P. 2002. Tõlkesemiootika poole. *Akadeemia*, 2, 332–350.
Torop, P. 2002. "Viimne reliikvia": intersemiootilise tõlke ideoloogiline juhtum I. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 4, 80–88.
Torop, P. 2002. "Viimne reliikvia": intersemiootilise tõlke ideoloogiline juhtum II. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 5, 72–83.
Torop, P.; Lotman, M.; Kull, K. 2002. In Memoriam Thomas Albert Sebeok. *Trames*, 6(1), 110–112.
Torop, P. 2002. Tõlge kui kultuurimehhanism. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 12, 848–854.
Torop, P. 2002. Polüloogilisus ja multikultuurilisus. *Kunst.ee*, 1, 36–37.
Torop, P. 2002. Visuaalse ja verbaalse kreoliseerumine Arvo Iho filmis "Karu süda". *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 2, 61–67.
Torop, P. 2002. Lihtsustatud Eesti. *Päevaleht*, 15.11.
Torop, P. 2002. Prantsuse Ameerika. *Postimees. Arter,* 09.02.
Torop, P. 2002. Tartu väärikusest. *Postimees*, 27.02.
Torop, P. 2002. Eesti instituudid. *Sirp*, 06.12.
Torop, P. 2002. Juri Lotmani jätkumine. *Universitas Tartuensis*, 22.02.
Torop, P. 2001. Intertekstuaalne film. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 12, 82–86.
Torop, P. 2001. Humanitaarsemiootika. *Eesti Vabariigi teaduspreemiad 2001*. Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia, 81–83.
Torop, P. 2001. Vene terrorismi lätetel. *Vikerkaar*, 1, 68–76.
Torop, P. 2001. Новая парадигма культуры и / как новая парадигма описания культуры: русский аспект. In: *Русская культура на пороге нового века*. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, 33–43.
Torop, P. 2001. Lotman. In: Cobley, P. (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*. London, New York: Routledge, 326.
Torop, P. 2001. Vene kirjandus ja eesti teater. F. Dostojevski "Kuritöö ja karistus" ja L. Tolstoi "Sõda ja rahu" eesti laval. *Teatrielu*, 47–64.
Torop, P. 2001. Müüt kui seletus. (Neomütologismist). *Uurimusi müüdist ja maagiast*. Tallinn: Tallinna Pedagoogiline Ülikool, 27–36.
Torop, P. 2001. Per una semiotica della traduzione. *Incontri di culture: La semiotica tra frontiere e traduzioni*. Torino: UTET libreria, 13–21.
Torop, P. 2001. The Possible Fate of the Semiotics of Translation. *Interlitteraria*, 5, 46–62.
Torop, P. 2001. Interneti lugemine. *Kloostrist Internetini: Eesti Raamatu Aasta lõppkonverents; Pärnu, 5.–6. aprill, 2001.* Tartu: Ilmamaa, 210–277.
Torop, P. 2001. Coexistence of Semiotics and Translation Studies. *Mission, Vision, Strategies*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press, 211–220.

Torop, P. 2001. Pietari ja kaksoisolennot. *Abstraktit. Semiotiikan suomenkielinen kesäkoulu: kirjallisuuden ja kulttuurin semiotiikka, tarinoiden tutkimuksesta*. Imatra, 16–17.
Torop, P. 2001. Bulgakovimäng. *Postimees. Arter.* 06.01.
Torop, P. 2001. Ülemõtlemise raamat. *Eesti Päevaleht. Arkaadia*. 27.04.
Torop, P.2001. Filmatisointi. *Abstraktit. Semiotiikan suomenkielinen kesäkoulu: kirjallisuuden ja kulttuurin semiotiikka, tarinoiden tutkimuksesta*. Imatra, 16.
Torop, P. 2001. The Ideological Aspect of Intersemiotical Translation. In: Tarasti, E. (ed.), *Abstracts: International Summer Institute for Semiotic and Structural Studies (June 10–15, 2001 in Imatra, Finland)*. Imatra: The International Semiotics Institute, 112–113.
Torop, P. 2000. *La traduzione totale*. Modena: Guaraldi-Logos.
Torop, P. 2000. Kultuuri tekstuaalsus. In: Pärli, Ü. (ed.), *Kultuuritekst ja traditsioonitekst: 26.–27. novembril 1999 Tartus toimunud seminari materjalid*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 37–51.
Torop, P. 2000. Semiootika ja interdistsiplinaarsus. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 6, 440–444.
Torop, P. 2000. Identiteedi aegruumist. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 1, 62–66.
Torop, P. 2000. New Tartu Semiotics. *European Journal for Semiotic Studies*, 12(1), 5–22.
Torop, P. 2000. Intersemiosis and Intersemiotic Translation. *European Journal for Semiotic Studies*, 12(1), 71–100.
Torop, P. 2000. Интерсемиотическое пространство: Адрианополь в Петербурге "Преступления и наказания" Ф. М. Достоевского. *Sign Systems Studies*, 28, 116–133.
Torop, P. 2000. Перелом в переломах: из истории тартуской школы. *Studia Russica Helsingiensia et Tartuensia VII: Переломные периоды в русской литературе и культуре*. Helsinki, 9–24.
Kull, K.; Torop, P. 2000. Biotranslation: Translation Between Umwelten. In: Petrilli, S. (ed.), *Athanor – Tra Segni*. Roma: Meltemi editore, 33–43.
Torop, P. 2000. Towards the Semiotics of Translation. *Semiotica*, 128(3–4), 597–609.
Torop, P. 2000. Постмодернизм, постструктурализм и перевод. *VI World Congress for Central and East European Studies. Divergencies, Convergencies, Uncertainties. Abstracts. 29.07.–3.08.2000*, Tampere, Finland, 436.
Torop, P. 2000. Liblikas tormis. *Eesti Päevaleht. Arkaadia*, 05.02.
Torop, P. 2000. Sallivus ja autentsus. *Eesti Ekspress. Areen*, 27.07.
Torop, P. 2000. Уроки Лотмана. *День за Днем*, 25.02.
Torop, P. 1999. Lotmani lähenemine. *Postimees. Arter*, 21.08.

Torop, P. 1999. Professor Juri Lotman jättis maha mõõdupuu. *Eesti Päevaleht*, 04.12.
Torop, P. 1999. Kultuur kui tõlge. *Eesti Päevaleht, Arkaadia*, 11.12.
Torop, P. 1999. Mis on "Sõda ja rahu". *Postimees, Arter*, 27.11.
Torop, P. 1999. Sign Systems Studies as Complex Systems Studies: From Semiosis to Intersemiosis. *Sign Processes in Complex Systems. 7th International Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies (IASS/AIS). Abstracts*. Dresden: Universitätsverlag, 377–378.
Torop, P. 1999. Semiotics of the Moscow-Tartu School. Past, Present and Future. *Sign Processes in Complex Systems. 7th International Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies (IASS/AIS). Abstracts*. Dresden: Universitätsverlag, 26–27.
Torop, P. 1999. О феномене языка научной школы. In: Levchenko, J.; Salupere, S. (eds.), *Материалы к словарю терминов тартуско-московской семиотической школы.* (Tartu Semiootika Raamatukogu, 2). Tartu: Tartu Ülikool, 7–11.
Torop, P. 1999. La traducibilita. *Testo a fronte. Rivista semestrale di teoria e pratica della traduzione letteraria*, 20, 5–47.
Torop, P. 1999. Cultural Semiotics and Culture. *Sign Systems Studies*, 27, 9–23.
Torop, P. 1999. *Kultuurimärgid*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
Torop, P. 1999. Semiootika piiril. In: Lotman, J. *Semiosfäärist*. Tallinn: Vagabund, 387–404.
Torop, P. 1999. Harimise kunst. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 5, 65–73.
Torop, P. 1998. Tõlge ja/kui retseptsioon. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 8, 513–520.
Torop, P. 1998. Границы перевода (социосемиотический аспект семиотики перевода). *Sign Systems Studies*, 26, 136–150.
Torop, P. 1998. Semiotics in Tartu. *Sign Systems Studies*, 26, 9–19.
Torop, P. 1998. Kollektivistlikust anarhismist. *Vikerkaar*, 1–2, 75–80.
Torop, P. 1998. Umberto Eco reaalsusest Eestis. *Vikerkaar*, 7/8, 169–175.
Torop, P. 1998. Dostojevski: juudiküsimuse loogika. *Looming*, 10, 1569–1592.
Torop, P. 1997. *Достоевский: история и идеология*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
Torop, P. 1997. The Position of Translation in Translation Studies. In: Mauranen, A.; Puurtinen, T. (eds.), *Translation-Acquistion-Use*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylan yliopisto, 23–39.
Torop, P. 1997. Inimesed ja sead. In: Dostojevski, F., *Kurjad vaimud*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 634–645.
Torop, P. 1996. Постмодернизация перевода. *Studia Russica Helsingiensia et Tartuensia* V. Helsinki, 73–92.

Torop, P. 1996. Вадим Гарднер. Стихотворения. *Новое литературное обозрение,* 18, 210–217.
Torop, P. 1996. Статус Тынянова. *Седьмые Тыняновские чтения.* Рига, Москва, 1995–1996, 49–58.
Torop, P. 1995. Vene kangelaslaul. *Maailmakirjandus*, 1. osa. Tallinn: Koolibri, 46–48.
Torop, P. 1995. О поэзии Вадима Гарднера. In: Гарднер, В., *Избранные стихотворения.* Санкт-Петербург: Акрополь, 89–93.
Torop, P. 1995. Semiótica de la traducción, traducción de la semiótica. *Signa. Revista de la asociación espanola de semiótica*, 4, 37–44.
Torop, P. 1995. Тартуская школа как школа. *Лотмановский сборник. I.* Moskva, ИЦ Гарант, 223–239.
Torop, P. 1994. Статус Тынянова. *Седьмые Тыняновские чтения. Матриалы для обсуждения.* Москва: Импринт, 19–22.
Torop, P. 1994. Tartu koolkond kui koolkond. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 10, 579–591.
Torop, P. 1994. Semiotics of Translation, Translation of Semiotics. *Russian Literature*, 36(4), 427–434.
Torop, P. 1993. La Escuela de Tartu como Escuela. *Discurso*, 8, 31–45.
Torop, P. 1993. Teaduse mälu. *Vikerkaar*, 8, 64–68.
Torop, P. 1993. Mees, keda ei olnud... *Eesti Ekspress*, 12.11.
Torop, P. 1993. Peeter Torop conversa con Iuri Lotman. *Discurso*, VIII, 123–137.
Torop, P. 1992. Тартуская школа как школа. *В честь 70-летия профессора Ю. М. Лотмана.* Tartu: Eidos, 5–19.
Torop, P. 1992. Достоевский: логика еврейского вопроса. *Сборник статей к 70-летию проф. Ю. М. Лотмана*. Tartu, 280–310.
Torop, P. 1992. Достоевский между Гомером и Христом. *Studia Russica Helsingiensia et Tartuensia,* III. Helsinki, 75–82.
Torop, P. 1992. Leo Tolstoi: etiikka ja eetos. *Todistajan katse. Kirjoituksia taiteen ja kirjallisuuden etiikasta.* Porvoo-Helsinki-Juva: Werner Söderström Oy, 71–89.
Torop, P. 1992. Достоевский: история и идеология. *Труды по знаковым системам*, XXV, 92–102.
Torop, P. 1991. Ajaloo aegruumis. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 1, 20–32.
Torop, P. 1991. Oma Lotman. *Sirp*, 27.09.
Torop, P. 1991. Historian aika-avaruudessa. *Synteesi*, 4, 38–50.
Torop, P. 1991. The Problem of Intext + Intertextuality of the Poetic Text. *Pamiętnik Literacki*, 82(2), 236–246.
Torop, P. 1990. Stockmann näidendis ja filmis. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 1, 51–54.
Torop, P. 1990. Проблемы переводимости литературного направления. *Studia metrica et poetica*. Tartu, 22–34.

Torop, P. 1990. Rahvuskirjanduse ontoloogilisest paradigmast. In: Undusk, J.; Viires, P. (eds.), *Kõnelusi rahvuskirjandusest. Konverentsi "Rahvuskirjanduse mõiste ja kriteeriumid" materjale.* Tallinn, 69–74.
Torop, P. 1990. Arvustus: Temira Pachmuss. Russian Literature in the Baltic between the World Wars. Columbus, Slavica Publichers, Inc., 1988. *Akadeemia*, 7, 1501–1509.
Torop, P. 1989. "Vaatleja" ante et post factum. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 10, 53–65.
Torop, P. 1989. Литература и фильм. *Киноведческие записки*, 5, 9–24.
Torop, P. 1989. Проблема переводимости поэзии русских символистов. *Studia Russica Helsingiensia et Tartuensia. Проблемы истории русской литературы начала XX века*. Helsinki, 195–210.
Torop, P. 1989. Vabadus ja orjus ajaloos: Berdjajev. *Akadeemia*, 8, 1778–1787.
Torop, P. 1989. Mängufilmiaasta 1988. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 9, 16–28.
Torop, P. 1989. Kirjandus filmis. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 5, 15–25.
Torop, P. 1989. Tõlkeloo koostamise printsiibid. *Akadeemia*, 2, 349–384.
Torop, P. 1989. Vastab Juri Lotman. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 5, 5–14.
Torop, P. 1989. Французская революция и Ф.М.Достоевский. *Тезисы докладов научной конференции "Великая Французская революция и пути русского освободительного движения"*. Тарту, 66–73.
Torop, P. 1988. Перевоплощение персонажей в романе Ф. Достоевского "Преступление и наказание". *Труды по знаковым системам*, XXII, 85–96.
Torop, P. 1987. Kirjandus ja film. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 1, 16–25.
Torop, P. 1987. Armastus ja halastus. In: Dostojevski, F., *Kuritöö ja karistus.* Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 523–534.
Torop, P. 1987. Bahtinoloogiast. In: Bahtin, M., *Valitud töid.* Tallinn, 285–291.
Torop, P. 1987. El fenómeno Lotman. *Criterios*, 1983–84, 5:12, 90–98.
Torop, P. 1987. Õpilane, õpetlane, õpetaja. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 8, 498–499.
Torop, P; Malts, A. 1987. Перевод и рецепция (Пушкин в Эстонии). *Пушкинские чтения в Тарту*. Таллинн, 80–82.
Torop, P. 1986. Tuglase tõlkeloomingu eripärast. *Edasi*, 01.03.
Torop, P. 1986. Tõlkelooline Betti Alver. *Edasi*, 29.11.
Torop, P. 1986. B. Alveri tõlkemeetodist. *Eesti NSV rahvakirjaniku Betti Alveri sünnipäevale pühendatud ettekandekoosolek*. Tartu, 11–13.
Torop, P. 1986. Friedebert Tuglase tõlkemeetodist. *Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia korrespondentliikme Eesti NSV rahvakirjaniku Friedebert*

Tuglase 100. sünniaastapäevale pühendatud ettekandekoosolek. Tartu, 9–11.
Torop, P. 1985. Film ja kultuur: otsingud. *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 7, 17–18.
Torop, P. 1985. Lev Tolstoi ja "Lev Tolstoi". *Teater. Muusika. Kino*, 8, 27–38.
Torop, P. 1985. Tõlkeluule: tõlkija ja luuletaja. *Studia metrica et poetica*. (TRÜ Toimetised 709). Tartu, 31–42.
Torop, P. 1984. Симультанность и диалогизм в поэтике Достоевского. *Труды по знаковым системам,* XVII, 138–158.
Torop, P. 1984. Tõlkekultuur ja tõlkeaasta. *Looming*, 5, 677–683.
Torop, P. 1984. August Sanga tõlkijakreedost. *Edasi*, 08.09.
Torop, P. 1984. August Sanga materjalid kirjandusmuuseumis. *Kreutzwaldi päevad 28: konverentsi ettekannete teesid*. Tartu: ENSV TA Fr. R. Kreutzwaldi nim. Kirjandusmuuseum, 20–23.
Torop, P. 1984. TRÜ vene filoloogide diplomitöid 1984. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 9, 575–576.
Torop, P. 1984. Põrandaaluse füsioloogia. *Edasi,* 13.10.
Torop, P. 1984. Auhinnatud Dostojevski. *Edasi*, 17.03.
Торор, Р., Баршт, К. 1983. Рукописи Достоевского: рисунок и каллиграфия. *Труды по знаковым системам*, XVI, 96–114.
Торор, Р. 1982. К основам критики перевода. *Труды по русской и славянской филологии.* (Уч. зап. ТГУ. 604). Тарту, 127–142.
Torop, P. 1982. Antoloogilisest tõlkest. *Edasi*, 08.05.
Торор, Р. 1982. Текст как процесс. *Finitis duodecim lustris: сборник статей к 60-летию профессора Ю. М. Лотмана*. Таллинн, 167–171.
Torop, P. 1982. Lotmani fenomen. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 1, 6–11.
Торор, Р. 1982. Процесс перевода и некоторые методологические проблемы переводоведения. *Труды по знаковым системам*, XV, 10–23.
Торор, Р. 1981. Проблема интекста. *Труды по знаковым системам*, XIV, 33–44.
Torop, P. 1981. Metatekstide teooriast mõnede tekstikommunikatsiooni probleemidega seoses. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 6, 321–328; 7, 392–396.
Торор, Р., Olesk, P. 1981. Текстология и перевод. *Linguistica,* XIV. Тарту, 90–96.
Torop, P. 1981. Sõna kehastumine. *Sirp ja Vasar*, 20.11; 27.11.
Torop, P. 1981. Dostojevski, F., *Inimene on saladus*. Tallinn: Perioodika. (Translation, foreword, commentary.)
Torop, P. 1981. Dostojevski psühhomüüdist. In: Dostojevski F., *Inimene on saladus*. Tallinn: Perioodika, 5–11.
Torop, P.; Sepp, R. 1981. Tõlkimise teooriast ja praktikast. *Sirp ja Vasar*, 16.01.

Torop, P. 1980. Rahvusliku tõlkeloo teadvustamisest. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 1, 63–64.
Torop, P. 1980. Poola literaadid Tartus. *Sirp ja Vasar*, 05.12.
Torop, P. 1980. Võõra sõna võõrutaja. *Sirp ja Vasar*, 08.02.
Torop, P. 1979. Перевод и культура. *Вторичные моделирующие системы*. Тарту, 48–50.
Torop, P. 1979. Принципы построения истории перевода. *Труды по русской и славянской филологии*. (Ученые записки Тартуского государственного университета; вып. 491). Тарту, 107–132.
Torop, P. 1975. К проблеме восприятия символизма в Эстонии. *Тезисы I Всесоюзной (III) конференции "Творчество А. А. Блока и русская культура XX века"*. Тарту, 170–173.
Torop, P. 1975. Tõlkekudrused II–III. *Tartu Riiklik Ülikool*, 10.01.; 24.01.
Torop, P. 1974. Tõlkekudrused I. *Tartu Riiklik Ülikool*, 29.11.
Torop, P. 1974. Suure sümbolisti mälestuseks. *Tartu Riiklik Ülikool*, 11.10.
Torop, P. 1970. Lydiardi süsteemist. *Tartu Riiklik Ülikool*, 18.12.

Photo Bruno Osimo

Notes

Notes