



Kseniya **Leontyeva**, ksenja_leontieva@mail.ru

Tambov State University named after G. R. Derzhavin, Russian Federation

Enactivism, cognitive semiotics and translation studies: to the benefits of cooperation

The purport of this paper is to show that enactivism, one of the state-of-the-art paradigms within the field of Cognitive Sciences, has a significant potential for mutual coordination of three major approaches, i.e. cognitive, sociological, and cultural (Chesterman 2009), defining the current state of Translation Studies. Its central concepts, i.e. autopoiesis, autonomy, sense-making, value, embodiment, embeddedness, emergence, experience, adaptivity, agency, and interaction (Di Paolo, Rohde, De Jaegher 2014; Cuffari, Di Paolo, De Jaegher 2015), could provide a truly *integrated* and *empirically* grounded *semiotic* framework that enables *multifocal*, yet ontologically *unified* study of translation as an autopoietic (and, thus, autonomous) social (syb)system (Tulenev 2010). This system reproduces its self-identity (mediation) by means of translation process, taken in the *unity* of its three dimensions, i.e. translation act, translation event, and translation practice (Toury 2012, Chesterman 2015).

The process itself is performed by the translator's «living-lived body» (Froese 2011), that constitutes an autonomous *operationally* closed cognitive system (Di Paolo, Rohde, De Jaegher 2014). Due to such closure, in actuality it is the translator's and not the author's individual experience and self-identity (and intention) that is at stake in translation act, the text functioning merely as an instruction manual («trigger-causality»; Tulenev 2010) for the translator's sense-making (evaluation) of the world enacted in his interpretive engagement with the text. At this point my argument will be based on the concepts of narrative experientiality (Caracciolo 2011, 2012), participatory sense-making and emergence (Di Paolo, Rohde, De Jaegher 2010). At the same time, since autonomous system are *interactionally* open (Di Paolo, Rohde, De Jaegher 2010), the translator's cognitive activity (translation act) extends into higher-order social and cultural value landscapes, wherein his body is embedded and wherein translation events take place and translation practices emerge and evolve. I will discuss the ongoing tension between individual and social value patterns and norms, shaping translation process as a means of social interaction and a kind of «linguaging» and semiosis.

Finally, I will examine the enactivist view on cognition as constant adaptation to precarious conditions, by means of active coordination of the interaction flow, this interaction being transformational, not merely informational (Di Paolo, Rohde, De Jaegher 2010), and discuss from this perspective the issue of the translator's visibility, manipulation, and intervention. In this respect, enactivist perspective contributes to the gradual transformation of Translation Studies into anthropocentric «Translator's Studies» (Chesterman 2009).

References

- Caracciolo, M. (2011). The Reader's Virtual Body: Narrative Space and Its Reconstruction. *StoryWorlds: A Journal of Narrative Studies*, 3, 117–138.
- Caracciolo, M. (2012a). Narrative, Meaning, Interpretation: An Enactivist Approach. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 11 (3), 367–384.
- Chesterman, A. (2009). The Name and Nature of Translator Studies. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, 13–22.
- Chesterman, A. (2015). Models of what processes? In M. Ehrensberger-Dow, B. Englund Dimitrova, S. Hubscher-Davidson (Eds.), *Describing Cognitive Processes in Translation: Acts and events*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 7–20.
- Cuffari, E., Di Paolo, E., De Jaegher, H. (2015). From participatory sense-making to language: There and back again. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 14 (4), 1089-1125.



Di Paolo, E., Rohde, M., De Jaegher, H. (2010). Horizons for the Enactive Mind: Values, Social Interaction, and Play. In J. Stewart, O. Gapenne, E.A. Di Paolo (Eds.), *Enaction: Towards a New Paradigm for Cognitive Science*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 33-87.

Froese, T. (2011). Breathing new life into cognitive science. *Avant: Trends in Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2 (1), 113–129.

Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. Revised ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tulenev, S. (2010). Is Translation an Autopoietic System? *MonTI*, 2, 345-371.

Acknowledgements. The research is supported by the Russian Science Foundation, project 15-18-10006 «Cognitive Study of Anthropocentric Nature of Language».