

SAL 35/2019

Frame Semantics  
and Translation of  
Intertextuality

Received 02/2019

Accepted 10/2019

# Frame Semantics and Translation of Intertextuality

## Freimų semantika ir intertekstualumo vertimas

TRANSLATION / VERTIMAS

**Uliana Tatsakovych**

Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ukraine


<http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.35.0.24016>

### Abstract

The article investigates intertextuality and its translation in the context of frame semantics and R. Schank's dynamic memory theory. The study provides an overview of linguistic and psychological theories examining the role of frames and visualisation in conceptualising reality and discusses their application to the understanding and translation of intertextuality. The theory of dynamic memory is used to explain the nature of textual and intertextual frames and build visual models of their mappings. Based on the analysis of 70 examples of the translation of intertextuality (quotations and allusions) from M. Atwood's novel *The Handmaid's Tale* and its Ukrainian translation, six translation techniques are identified. They are outlined on the basis of the transference of linguistic elements and the conceptual information activated by them (frame mappings, mental images). The examples are compared in terms of cognitive equivalence, which is also defined within the presented approach. The study generally adopts a broader view of intertextuality as a cognitive category and translation as a cognitive process to contribute to the development of cognitive poetics and cognitive translatology.

**KEYWORDS:** intertextuality, translation, textual frame, intertextual frame, analogous mapping, cognitive equivalence.

### Introduction

Cognitive translatology – an interdisciplinary of the 21<sup>st</sup> century overlapping cognitive linguistics, cognitive psychology and translation studies – is increasingly gaining ground since it looks into mental structures and processes underlying translation, places emphasis on the conceptual rather than the formal level of translation, takes into account social, cultural, pragmatic, psychological and other factors important for translation; stresses the role of cognitive individual differences in conceptualising reality; views the translator as a mediator between two conceptual systems, whose dissimilarities lead to many translation problems.

J. Kristeva's theory of intertextuality (1980), developed under the influence of M. Bakhtin's works on dialogism, polyphony and heteroglossia (1981, 1984), has been extensively discussed by philosophers, linguists, literary theorists and critics. Since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it has been studied in works on cognitive linguistics and cognitive translatology both in Ukraine and abroad (e.g., see van Herdeem, 2008; Dzera, 2018). The novelty of these types of research lies in their attempt to analyse the cognitive basis of intertextuality and its translation as well as to offer a different approach to defining and studying the term, thus shifting away from its well-established semiotic, structuralist, post-structuralist, feminist theory, etc. definitions.



The translation of intertextuality poses many problems for translators since they are responsible for an adequate representation of intertextual information in another language in order not to impoverish the target reader's experience of a foreign text. Cognitive science can add some depth to traditional translation techniques, e.g., equivalent translation, substitution, descriptive translation, compensation, etc. that cover the transference of linguistic units with no regard to the activation of conceptual structures in which they are grounded. More specifically, frame semantics corroborated by psychological evidence offers a valid theoretical background for studying the preservation of mental imagery evoked by ST<sup>1</sup> intertextual units in the target text. This aspect of analysis is deemed effective for translation scholars as an additional component of their research and for translators as an incentive to focus on their visualisation not only when it comes to metaphoric language but for all types of translation, specifically for translating intertextuality where they need to mentally restore the already known information. The theoretical underpinnings and models presented in the paper can be applied to language pairs other than English-Ukrainian and thus may be interesting both for Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian readers.

The aim of the article is to use frame semantics and R. Schank's dynamic memory theory to define intertextuality and analyse its translation from English into Ukrainian. The scope of the study is an equivalent transference of the SL frame information and mental imagery into the TL. The research material consists of 70 intertextual units (quotations and allusions) presented in the novel *The Handmaid's Tale* by Margaret Atwood and their translation counterparts in Ukrainian (*Opovid Sluzhnytsi [The Handmaid's Tale]*, 2017). The choice of the research material is motivated, first and foremost, by the author's extensive use of a variety of intertextual references as well as by the novel's recent rise in popularity caused by the release of the television series of the same name that prompted many people to read the book.

The main objectives of the research are:

- 1 to review the academic literature on the use of frame semantics in translation studies and discuss the psycholinguistic findings behind the concept of mental simulations activated by frames and their importance for the translator;
- 2 to use R. Schank's theory of dynamic memory to describe the nature and structure of frames;
- 3 to propose the definition of intertextuality in the context of frame semantics;
- 4 to analyse the translation of intertextuality from English into Ukrainian and identify techniques for translating intertextuality on the basis of the discussed findings.

Concerning the limitations of the study, the translation analysis focuses on the preservation of ST basic frame components and mental images, so that the presented models and examples can be then used as a part of more in-depth research. For this reason, the discussed examples are not thematically related since it gives variety to the study of mental images. It also has to be noted that the list of the translation techniques might not be exhaustive due to the use of one language pair and one work of fiction for analysis.

Introduced into linguistics by Ch. Fillmore, the term 'frame' evolved from denoting a combination of semantic roles (deep cases) required by a specific verb (Fillmore, 1968) to 'a system of linguistic choices' (Fillmore, 1977) and, finally, to organised cognitive structures shaping our knowledge of the world and allowing to reason about our life experiences – earlier referred by him to as 'scene' (Fillmore and Baker, 2009). The notion of a frame with its different meanings was deemed an effective tool for explicating the translation process by many scholars. Van-

---

## Frame Semantics and Translation: Literature Review

<sup>1</sup>The abbreviations ST and TT stand for 'source text' and 'target text' respectively; similarly, SL and TL mean 'source language' and 'target language'.

nerem and Snell-Hornby (1986, pp. 184–202) described it as the process of building up individual scenes ('visual imagery') based on SL frames (linguistic expressions) and finding suitable TL frames for their actual representation. This view was elaborated by Vermeer and Witte (1990) who additionally emphasised the specific nature of scenes and frames in terms of context, individual knowledge and experience; and later by Kußmaul (2005, p. 382) who viewed translation as the visualisation of the scene based on the source frame and its actualisation in the target frame with the frame acting as the focus on the background highlighting a certain part of the scene. Neubert and Shreve (1992, p. 61) adopted the definition of a frame as a cognitive structure instead that of a scene and explained the translator's task as the 'reestablishment' of textually realised 'knowledge repertoire' organised by frames from L1 into L2. The view was later shared by Rojo (2002, p. 315) who described translation as the projection of SL frames onto TL linguistic components, provided that the conceptual information corresponds to that evoked by SL components in semantic, pragmatic, and stylistic terms. The principles of frame semantics were also applied to translation studies by Talmy (2000), Slobin (2005), Khayrullin (2010), Bertoldi and Chishman (2012), Čulo (2013), Boas (2013) and others. Despite different approaches within the frame semantics and translatology paradigm, all of them tend to place emphasis on translation as creative activity and the translator as a creative mediator between two conceptual systems who by processing the SL frame information through their own cognition transfers it into the TL using TL linguistic means. They take into account the translator's knowledge, experience, ethnic and cultural backgrounds, individual psychological features influencing their decisions during the process of translation.

Frame semantics is coherent with some aspects of the connectionism theory and R. Schank's theory of dynamic memory. Both of them explain meaning creation as a local dynamic process underlying our ability to perceive, understand, interpret, produce and predict information. Although their structures of knowledge representation are different (information-processing models in the connectionism theory [McClelland et al., 1986] and scripts, scenes, and stories in the dynamic memory theory [Schank, 1999]), they are viewed as interconnected units organised in a dynamic system. Meaning arises from a parallel activation of connections between processing units (connectionism) or between indexes of scripts or stories (the dynamic memory theory). The dynamic nature of meaning construction proposed by these two approaches can be used to explain creativity in translation as is the concept of mental visual representations of real, hypothetical and imaginary situations – frames (Minsky, 1974); scenes, scripts, stories (Schank, 1990, 1999); simulators, simulations and frames (Barsalou, 1999); mental models (Johnson-Laird, 2010). Mental images are very important for the translator, especially if they are viewed as dynamic and easily modifiable since visualisation facilitates the interlingual transference of information. As stated by Holz-Mänttari (1990, p. 67), the translator mentally constructs the 'worlds' of the author and the target audience. A mental construal of the SL scene helps to arrive at the best possible representation of it in the TL.

The idea of mental imagery was elaborated in the theory of perceptual symbols system (Barsalou, 1999) and the simulation semantics theory (Zwaan, 2009; Bergen, 2015). The gist of their arguments is that people process information by means of complex mental simulations based on their physical and introspective experience. Again, mental simulations are not rigid and discrete but dynamic multimodal representations of entities and events (Bergen, 2015, p. 154; Barsalou, 1999, pp. 584–585). Therefore, conceptual processes consist in generating simulations activated by some external input, e.g., text. Despite some disagreements about the nature (modal or amodal [Barsalou, 1999, pp. 578–582]) and structure of simulations, cognitive psychologists and cognitive linguists generally agree upon the existence of internal mental representations of physical and introspective phenomena and their importance for

conceptualisation (see Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Langacker, 1987; Schank, 1982; Fauconnier, 1994; Gibbs, 1994; Talmy, 2000). The importance of simulation semantics and frame semantics for understanding the functioning of language and cognition is stated by Feldman (2008, p. 147): 'language primarily operates at the level of frame parameters and understanding involves imaginative simulations invoked by these frames'. Since frames have open structure and represent static and dynamic phenomena through mental simulation, they work efficiently for describing and explaining the workings of the translator's mind.

Lastly, the problem which cannot be avoided in any research on translation is equivalence. As regards cognitive linguistics, where emphasis is placed on cognitive processes and mental models that define the way people speak, behave and generally interact with the world, the meaning of equivalence is supposed to be understood differently. Sickinger (2017, p. 233) proposes to measure cognitive equivalence by determining the degree of similarity between mental simulations generated by L1 and L2. Similarly to Rojo (2002, p. 315), I propose to add that the more the TL mental simulation corresponds to the SL one in semantic, pragmatic and stylistic terms, the more 'equivalent' the translation is to the original.

Considering the above-mentioned findings by cognitive psychologists and cognitive linguists, translators, from the perspective of frame semantics, are generally viewed as creators who, by operating with frames, aim to achieve cognitive equivalence, i.e., make sure TL linguistic expressions activate frames having the highest degree of similarity possible to the ones evoked by SL linguistic expressions.

Frame semantics can be used to analyse intertextual references within a text as well as the translation of intertextuality. The problem has been researched by Western European (e.g., Sourvinou-Inwood, 1996; Rothbart, 2009; Karpenko-Seccombe, 2016) and Eastern European scholars (e.g., Gasparov, 2010; Litvinenko, 2013). In Ukraine, it has only recently been investigated in more depth (Dzera, 2018). In Tatsakovych (2018), I use the principles of frame semantics and the dynamic memory theory (Schank, 1982, 1999) to study intertextual relations, more specifically, to build rough visual models representing the structure of and the interaction between frames activated by texts and their intertexts.

The idea of employing Schank's dynamic memory theory to study intertextuality comes from T. Karpenko-Seccombe's article 'Intertextuality as Cognitive Modelling' (2016) where she uses his findings to provide the definition of intertextuality as analogous mappings between ST scenes and scripts and their TT analogue models. This view fits well into the cognitive theory of intertextuality where it could be understood as a category of cognition manifesting itself in analogous mappings between conceptual structures and verbalised in the form of intertextual expressions.

The following statements of Schank's theory (1982, 1990, 1999) are applicable to this research (Tatsakovych, 2018):

- 1 The systemic nature of memory: at the most basic level, knowledge is stored in scripts (habitual recurrent information) and stories (one-off episodes) which are organised by scenes (physical, social, personal backgrounds of situations) and then by memory organization packets – MOPs (by structural similarities and a common goal) and thematic organization points – TOPs (by a generalised common theme) (Schank, 1999, pp. 107–155). Recurrent situations are stored in long-term memory whereas one-off events are stored in episodic memory. It provides a more structured and detailed view of human memory applicable to explaining the understanding of intertextuality.
- 2 The dynamic nature of memory. Information about each script or story (actors, actions,

---

## Methods

goal, location, etc.) is stored by indexes. They can be added on or modified with new incoming information; some unexpected events in the usual course of action in a script are indexed as mistakes (Schank, 1982, pp. 158–183). This explains the processes of remembering and interpretation.

- 3 The interconnectedness of memory structures. Episodes having the same or similar indexes, shared goals or themes are connected in memory by MOPs or TOPs, thus causing the reminding to occur on the basis of analogy. It provides an explanation for the reader's identification and retrieval of intertextual information (Schank, 1999, pp. 75–89).
- 4 The focus on an individual understanding and interpretation of information. According to Schank (1990, pp. 89–91), each person's knowledge is unique because of a different scope and content of individual stories, thus contributing to different ways of conceptualising information. Understanding is processing new stories in the context of the 'old' stories that already exist in memory. Therefore, each reading and interpretation is different as are the processes of decision-making and problem-solving in translation.

The ideas proposed by Schank and Karpenko-Seccombe contribute to developing a detailed and well-thought-out cognitive theory of intertextuality. The only difficulty lies in the mixed terminology (scripts, scenes, frames, indexes, etc.). Since frame semantics has the established term 'frame' for the structure representing a certain situation, I propose in Tatsakovykh (2018) to use it as the uniform term in order to avoid confusion; elements of a frame might be as well called 'slots' instead of 'indexes'. It also seems necessary to differentiate between frames that store the information from the texts the reader/translator has already read and newly formed frames activated by intertextual expressions. I suggest referring to the former ones as *textual frames* and to the latter ones as *intertextual frames*. Intertextual understanding occurs when a newly created intertextual frame connects with the already existing textual one. Each mapping is established on the basis of analogical connections between slots of frames organised under the same MOP or TOP causing the reminding to happen. The translation of intertextuality, within this approach, consists in the transference of the SL frame information (mappings between intertextual and textual frames, mental imagery) into the TL with regard to semantic, pragmatic, cultural and stylistic factors.

In the next section of the paper, I attempt to analyse the Ukrainian translation by looking at the correspondence between the SL and TL mappings of the frames activated by the SL and the TL texts and by specifically focusing on the degree of their similarity in terms of frame mental imagery.

The analysis of 70 examples of intertextuality (quotations and allusions) led to identify the following techniques for translating intertextual expressions from English into Ukrainian:

- 1 complete activation of source structure + identical linguistic expression (FMSW: full mapping, same wording);
- 2 partial activation of source structure + modified linguistic expression (PMDW: partial mapping, different wording);
- 3 complete activation of source structure + modified linguistic expression (FMDW: full mapping, different wording);
- 4 failure to activate the source structure + modified linguistic expression (FLMDW: failed mapping, different wording);
- 5 activation of a different frame + different intertextual expression (DFDW: different frame, different wording);
- 6 activation of a different frame + identical linguistic expression (DFSW: different frame, same wording).

## Results and Discussion

### Complete Activation of Source Structure + Identical Linguistic Expression (FMSW: Full Mapping, Same Wording)

*The Handmaid's Tale* is a dystopian novel depicting the Republic of Gilead – a Christian theocratic regime established after a military coup in the United States. The society is class-divided; men (the Commanders) form the ruling class whereas women are deprived of the major rights and are recognised as legitimate (the chaste Commanders' Wives, the fertile Handmaids, the housekeeping Marthas) and illegitimate (lesbians, feminists, prostitutes). The plot follows the story of the Handmaid Offred who is assigned to produce children for her master as his enslaved concubine. Offred's narrative alternates between her past life before the coup and her present experiences leading to the subsequent disclosure of the future of the Republic and her own life.

Chapter 15 of the novel describes a monthly ritual of the Commander trying to impregnate the Handmaid. The rest of the household – the wife and the Marthas – are present to watch the procedure. It begins with the Commander reading out the verse from the Bible (Genesis 1:28) in which Adam and Eve are encouraged by God to bear children: *It's the usual story [...] God to Adam [...] Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth* (p. 73). It helps to justify the act of moral and physical abuse of the Handmaid since she is one of the few fertile women left in Gilead. Making her a rape victim is an offering, the fulfilment of God's command. The intertextual expression *be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth* activates the intertextual frame containing the following slots (see Table 1).

Intertextual Frame
[actor]: God
[goal]: exerting influence
[goal object]: Adam and Eve
[action 1]: the command to be fruitful and multiply
[action 2]: the command to replenish the earth
[location]: Heaven

**Table 1**  
Intertextual frame  
'God's command to  
Adam and Eve'

The slots of the newly created intertextual frame conceptualising God's command to Adam and Eve help to activate the already existing (if the reader is familiar with the biblical story of Genesis) textual frame containing the same information. Since all of the slots in both of the frames are identical, the mapping between them will be complete. Due to the common structure, goal and theme, the activated frames share the same MOP and TOP forming the cognitive link, which is textually realised in a quotation (Karpenko-Seccombe, 2016). The activation of the existing textual frame representing the corresponding biblical story helps to interpret the episode from the novel: the preparation for the ritual of impregnating is therefore being processed in the context of the information already known by the reader. The analogous mapping between the two frames thus explains the reminding process.

The Ukrainian translation of the ST intertextual expression preserves its exact linguistic form: *Звичайна історія [...] Бог до Адама [...] Плодіться й розмножуйтеся, і наповнійте землю* (p. 83) (*The usual story [...] God to Adam [...] Breed and reproduce, and fill the earth*<sup>2</sup>). It is taken directly from the Ukrainian Bible without alterations. The intertextual expression in the Ukrainian text activates the already existing textual frame if the Ukrainian reader knows the story (see Table 2).

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all translations that follow are made by the author of the article

Table 2

Analogous mapping  
'God's command to  
Adam and Eve'

Textual Frame		Intertextual Frame
[actor]: God	↔	[actor]: God
[goal]: exerting influence	↔	[goal]: exerting influence
[goal object]: Adam and Eve	↔	[goal object]: Adam and Eve
[action 1]: the command to breed and reproduce	↔	[action 1]: the command to breed and reproduce
[action 2]: the fill the earth	↔	[action 2]: the fill the earth
[location]: Heaven	↔	[location]: Heaven

The analogous mapping between the frames evoked by the TT intertextual expression is complete and identical to the mapping between the ST frames. The mental images evoked by the frames are likewise identical. Therefore, the Ukrainian translation fully activates the ST mapping and its mental image without modifying the linguistic form of its intertextual expression. In terms of cognitive equivalence, the Ukrainian translation is cognitively equivalent to the original.

### Partial Activation of Source Structure + Modified Linguistic Expression (PMDW: Partial Mapping, Different Wording)

Chapter 10 of the novel starts with an episode where Offred says that sometimes she sings to herself some sad songs she remembers from the past. She only sings them in her head because all the songs with the word 'free' and the like are forbidden. The one she is remembering goes like this: *Amazing grace, how sweet the sound/ Could save a wretch like me,/ Who once was lost, but now am found,/ Was bound, but now am free* (p. 47). It is the first verse of the Christian hymn 'Amazing Grace' written by John Newton in 1779. This intertextual expression activates two interrelated intertextual frames (see Table 3).

Table 3

Intertextual frames  
'God's salvation of the  
person'

Intertextual Frame 1	
[actor]: God's grace →	[actor's feature 2]: sweet-sounding
[actor's feature 1]: amazing	
[action]: saving	
[action object]: the person	
[action object's feature]: a wretch	
[action status]: accomplished	
Intertextual Frame 2	
[actor]: unknown	
[action 1]: finding	
[action 2]: freeing	
[action object]: the person	
[action object's feature 1]: once lost	
[action object's feature 2]: once bound	
[action status]: accomplished	

These intertextual frames will be identical to the corresponding textual frames (if they exist in the reader's conceptual system), and the mappings between them will be complete. Like in the previous example, the newly created and already existing frames are linked by the same MOP and TOP indicating that the intertextual unit under analysis is a quotation.

The Ukrainian translation of the ST intertextual expression – *О дивна милість, ти спасла/Негідного мене!/ Був втрачений, та ти знайшла,/ З полону вільний вже.* (p. 54) (*Oh, marvellous grace, you saved/Miserable me!/I was lost, but you have found me,/I'm already released from captivity*) – only partially activates the source mapping (see Table 4).

ST Intertextual Frame 1		TT Intertextual Frame 1		
[act. f. 2]: sweet-sounding	↔	[actor]: God's grace	↔	[actor]: God's grace
	↘	[actor's feature 1]: amazing	↔	[actor's feature]: marvellous
		[action]: saving	↔	[action]: saving
		[action object]: the person	↔	[action object]: the person
		[action object's feature]: a wretch	↔	[action object's feature]: miserable
		[action status]: accomplished	↔	[action status]: accomplished
ST Intertextual Frame 2		TT Intertextual Frame 2		
		[actor]: unknown		[actor]: God's grace
		[action 1]: finding	↔	[action]: finding
		[action 2]: freeing		[action object]: the person
		[action object]: the person	↔	[action object's feature ]: once lost
		[action object's feature 1]: once lost		[action status]: accomplished
		[action object's feature 2]: once bound		
		[action status]: accomplished		
		TT Intertextual Frame 3		
				[actor]: unknown
				[action]: releasing
				[action object]: the person
				[action object's feature]: once in captivity
				[action status]: accomplished

**Table 4**  
Analogous mapping 'God's salvation of the person'

The TT intertextual expression activates three interrelated intertextual frames. TT Intertextual Frame 1 almost completely reproduces the corresponding ST intertextual frame representing the person's gratitude to God for their salvation. It does not, however, evoke the ST slot about the sweet-sounding God's name. TT Intertextual Frame 2 differs from its ST counterpart in the sense that it shifts the focus from the object of the action (the once-lost person having been found) to the agent (God's kindness that has found the sinner). The state of the person being freed from the bounds of sin conceptualised by ST Intertextual Frame 2 is represented in TT Intertextual Frame 3 in which the focus shifts back to the object of the action (the person who has been released from captivity). Furthermore, the difference between the ST and TT intertextual frames lies in different scene conceptualisations: when TT Inter-

textual Frame 3 is being evoked, the Ukrainian reader will conceptualise a scene unlike the ST one depending on what ‘captivity’ means to each person. The states of ‘being bound’ and ‘being in captivity’ can be conceptualised quite differently by different people, e.g., as being tied with a rope, kept in a cage or a prison cell, etc. Therefore, the frames with their mental imagery evoked by the Ukrainian text (the linguistic form of which is not identical to the ST one) are only partially equivalent to the ST ones since the translation only partially activates the frame structure of the original resulting in modified conceptualisations of the target text by Ukrainian readers. Therefore, the Ukrainian translation cannot be regarded as cognitively equivalent to its original counterpart.

### Complete Activation of Source Structure + Modified Linguistic Expression (FMDW: Full Mapping, Different Wording)

There are cases when conceptualisations of the scene remain the same both in the source and the target texts, although the translator modifies the linguistic form of the ST intertextual expression. For instance, during one of her usual night-time routines, Offred gets out of bed and goes to the window in her nightgown to watch the moon: *I fold back the sheet, get carefully up, on silent bare feet, in my nightgown, go to the window, like a child, I want to see. The moon on the breast of the new-fallen snow* (p. 80). The intertextual expression *the moon on the breast of the new-fallen snow* is a line from C. C. Moore’s poem ‘A Visit from St. Nicholas’. In the poem, a father gets out of bed at night and goes to the window to see what causes the noise outside. He first describes the weather and the moon and then sees St. Nicholas in a sleigh with eight reindeers. Offred, standing by the window, is reminiscing about her carefree childhood; the similarity of the scene (the night, bare feet, a nightgown, winter, moonlight) reminds her of those winter nights when she would be waiting for Santa to come. The intertextual expression activates either a new intertextual frame (representing the scene unfamiliar to the reader) or an instant analogous mapping with the existing textual frame (if the reader knows the poem quite well to recognise the reference). The mapping can be represented by the following model (see Table 5).

Table 5

Intertextual frame ‘The moon on the breast of the new-fallen snow’

Textual Frame		Intertextual Frame
[actor]: Father		[actor]: Offred
[goal]: finding the source of the noise		[goal]: watching the moon
[action 1]: standing	↔	[action 1]: standing
[location]: by the window	↔	[location]: by the window
[action 2]: seeing	↔	[action 2]: seeing
[action 2 object]: the moon	↔	[action 2 object]: the moon
[action 2 object’s location]: on the breast of the snow	↔	[action 2 object’s location]: on the breast of the snow
[action object’s location feature new-fallen	↔	[action 2 object’s location feature]: new-fallen
[action 3]: seeing		[action 3]: thinking
[action 3 object]: Santa	↔	[action 3 object]: Santa

The mapping is not complete, because the slots ‘actor’ and ‘goal’ do not match. The frames do not share the same structure, goal and mental imagery but are linked to the same TOP by

the common themes: a wintery, snowy night; moonlight; Santa. The mapping based on the shared TOP is textually realised by an allusion (Karpenko-Seccombe, 2016) because the similarity of the frames is partial (not identical like in quotations), and the intertextual reference is understood primarily by means of a common generalised theme.

The Ukrainian translation of the original intertextual expression is slightly modified in terms of its linguistic form: *Я хочу подивитися. Місяць на грудях свіжого снігу* (p. 91) (*I want to see. The moon on the breast of the fresh snow*). The Ukrainian translator uses the adjective 'fresh' to describe the snow because it would sound more natural in Ukrainian. Nevertheless, it does not interfere with the conceptualisation of the scene; both English- and Ukrainian-speaking readers will conceptualise the same image of Offred's looking at the freshly fallen snow. The mapping, though, will not occur because the problem arises on a cultural level: it is unlikely that Ukrainian readers will recognise the reference to the poem because, first of all, it is not widely known and, secondly, because its Ukrainian translation omits this line altogether. For this reason, the Ukrainian translator added the footnote revealing the hidden intertextual expression. If the reader is inquisitive enough, they will find the poem and explain the author's intention by means of analogous mappings between the frame activated by the poem and the one activated by the text and thus interpret the intertextual connection. In this case, the mapping (incomplete) will match the original one in terms of the structure and mental imagery. Therefore, despite a slight modification to the original linguistic form of the intertextual expression, the ST and TT conceptualisations will be the same making the original text and its translation cognitively equivalent.

#### **Failure to Activate the Source Structure + Modified Linguistic Expression (FLMDW: Failed Mapping, Different Wording)**

In the novel, one of the classes of women in the Republic of Gilead is the Marthas whose job is to cook and do housework. Every cook or maid is referred to as 'Martha' after Martha of Bethany – a biblical figure who was busy getting everything ready when Jesus visited her house while her sister Mary did 'the better part' by listening to his teachings (Luke 10: 38–42). Since the source text contains many references to the Bible, the inquisitive reader will soon discover why domestic servants in Gilead are called like this by drawing either on the already existing knowledge about this biblical story (the analogous mapping between a new intertextual frame and the existing textual one) or on the newly acquired information after doing some research into it (the analogous mapping between a new intertextual frame and a new textual one). Let us consider the following example: *A Martha arrives, with a tray: a jug of fruit juice, the kind you make from powder, grape it looks like, and a stack of paper cups* (p. 99). When Offred arrives at Commander Warren's house to witness his Handmaid Ofwarren's labour, which is a usual thing for Handmaids to do, she starts chanting with the others to help the mother breathe and sees a Martha coming in with a jug of juice. The intertextual expression activates a partial analogous mapping (see Table 6).

Textual Frame		Intertextual Frame
[actor]: Martha of Bethany	↔	[actor]: a Martha
[goal]: welcoming	↔	[goal]: welcoming
[goal object]: Jesus and disciples		[goal object]: Handmaids
[action]: preparing everything to entertain the guests		[action]: offering something to drink
[location]: Martha and Mary's house		[location]: Commander Warren's house

**Table 6**  
Analogous mapping  
'Martha's welcoming'

The frames are not identical in terms of structure (only the 'actor' and 'goal' slots match) and mental imagery, but they are thematically related and belong to the same TOP (welcoming and entertaining guests). Thematic similarity in this case is indicative of an allusion.

It is unlikely that the Ukrainian translation of the intertextual expression will always activate the textual frame representing the biblical story about Jesus's visit to Mary and Martha: *З'являється Марфа з тацею: кухоль фруктового соку (такі роблять з порошку), схожого на виноградний, і стос паперових стаканців* (p. 112) (*Here comes a Martha with a tray: a mug of fruit juice (the kind made from powder), looking like the grape one, and a stack of paper cups*). The translator chooses to transliterate the *th* letter combination in *Martha* with the letter *f* (Ukr. *ф* – *Марфа*), mostly in the Russian manner, not with the letter *t* (Ukr. *т* – *Марта*) as found in all of the full editions of the Bible translated into Ukrainian from the original: *Марто, Марто, турбуєшся і журишся ти про багато чого, а потрібне одне* (1988); *Марто, Марто, журишся та побиваєшся про многе, одного ж треба* (2003); *Марто, Марто, ти побиваєшся і клопочешся про багато, одного ж потрібно* (2007); *Марто, Марто, турбуєшся й журишся ти про багато чого, а потрібне одне* (2011); *Марто, Марто, ти піклуєшся і клопочешся чималим, проте лиш на одне потреба* (2013) (*Martha, Martha, you are anxious and upset about many things, but few things are needed – or indeed only one [Luke 10:41–42]*). Only the 2004 edition of the Bible translated from Russian has *Марфа* instead of *Martha*: *Марфо! Марфо! Ти турбуєшся і клопочешся про багато що. А потрібне тільки ж одне*. This translation does not technically qualify as a mistake because the 1992 edition and the recently published 2019 Ukrainian Orthography Guide allow two possible variants of transliterating old proper names containing the *th* letter combination, although the latter now prescribes the use of *m* instead of *ф*. Nevertheless, the allusion will not be immediately recognised by all Ukrainian readers who are familiar with this biblical story, especially with regard to those younger readers who are used to hear about *Марта* and *Марія* (*Martha and Mary*) at school and church, at least as far as Western Ukraine is concerned. The translator does not provide any footnotes throughout the text to facilitate the activation of the already existing frame. Therefore, since the translation might possibly create some difficulty in interpreting the intertextual reference, it cannot be regarded as cognitively equivalent.

#### **Activation of a Different Frame + Different Intertextual Expression (DFDW: Different Frame, Different Wording)**

There are instances when the translator decides to use a different intertextual expression that, consequently, activates a different mapping and completely alters the conceptualisation of the scene. Sometimes such a choice is motivated by the translator's intention to bring the text 'closer' to the reader in cultural terms; sometimes the translator's subjective reasoning comes into play, although the choice of a translation strategy in this case is not always motivated. The latter can be illustrated by the example from Chapter 14 of the novel and its Ukrainian translation. The chapter describes the preparation for the already mentioned ritual of impregnating; Offred comes into the Commander's room, takes her usual kneeling position by the footstool of the Commander's Wife and waits for the others to come: *I wait for the household to assemble. Household: that is what we are. The Commander is the head of the household. The house is what he holds. To have and to hold, till death do us part* (p. 67). The intertextual expression *to have and to hold, till death do us part* is a line of the marriage vow taken from the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. It activates the mapping conceptualising the scene of a soon-to-be-married couple saying their marriage vows in church; the scene conceptualisation will vary depending on each person's knowledge and experience of church wedding ceremonies. The number of frame slots can differ depending on how many lines from the vow readers actually remember. There might be only two, reminded by the

intertextual expression, or there might be more if the reader has a good memory of what two people who are getting married in church say to each other. The activated “marriage vows” textual frame helps to interpret the meaning of the intertextual expression in the context of the novel. Since by saying these words people promise to stay together and “hold” each other till death, they are recalled by Offred when she thinks of the Commander as the *householder*, the one and only owner of the house and ‘the husband’ to all the women who live in it. The analogical mapping between the intertextual frame activated by the passage from the text and the ‘marriage vow’ textual frame can be schematically represented like this (see Table 7).

Textual Frame	Intertextual Frame
[actors]: a couple	[actor]: the Commander
[goal]: getting married	[goal]: being the head of the household
[action]: saying	[action 1]: having
[action object]: a marriage vow	[action 2]: holding
[action object's feature 1]: to have and to hold	[action object]: the household
[action object's feature 2]: till death do us part	[action object's feature]: till death do them part
[location]: a church	[location]: the house

**Table 7**  
Analogous mapping ‘A marriage vow’

The mapping between the frames in terms of the actions and the action object’s features is partial. The common slots make possible the process of reminding the existing ‘marriage vow’ textual frame and the subsequent interpretation of the ST intertextual expression. The commonality of the theme (staying together till death) links the frames under one TOP indicating that the intertextual expression is an allusion.

The Ukrainian translation of this passage activates different intertextual and textual frames: *Чекаю, поки збереться вся господа. Господа, ось що ми таке. Командор на чолі госпуди. Він господарює в цьому будинку. Господь дарує і забирає.* (p.76) (*I'm waiting for all the household to come. The household, that is what we are. The Commander is at the head of the household. He is the master of the house. God gives and takes away.*). The TT intertextual expression *God gives and takes away* refers to the Bible’s Book of Job in which Job, an innocent and god-fearing man, blessed with wealth, land and many children, is put to the test by Satan who wants to prove to God that Job is pious only because he lives in abundance. As a result, Job is left with nothing but, nevertheless, does not blame God: *The Lord gave me what I had, and the Lord has taken it away. Praise the name of the Lord!* (Job 1:21). If the reader knows the story about Job, the intertextual expression will activate the following textual frame (see Table 8).

Textual Frame
[actor]: Lord
[action 1]: giving
[action's DObj. 1]: family and possessions
[action's IObj. 1]: Job
[action 2]: taking away
[action's DObj. 2]: family and possessions
[action's IObj. 2]: Job

**Table 8**  
Textual frame ‘Job’s loss of his possessions’

The intertextual frames activated by the text can be different: 1) Offred thinks about her once happy days when she was free and happy, and how God took all of that away leaving her with nothing but the duty to obey her master's wishes; 2) the Commander may be viewed by Offred as 'God' in their household who decides the fate of everyone who lives in the house and who has the right to 'give' and 'take away', which adds sarcasm to the narrative. The latter puts more emphasis on the overall dominance of men in the Gilead society and the inferior position of women who serve their masters in comparison with the ST conceptualisation of the scene where the Commander and his household are viewed as a married couple bound to be inseparable till death. With this conceptualisation, the intertextual frame will schematically look like this (see Table 9).

**Table 9**

Intertextual frame "The Commander's right to give and take away"

Intertextual Frame
[actor]: the Commander
[actor's feature]: God
[action 1]: giving
[action's DObj. 1]: family and possessions
[action's IObj. 1]: the Commander's household
[action 2]: taking away
[action's DObj. 2]: family and possessions
[action's IObj. 2]: the Commander's the household

In this case, the analogous mapping between the textual frame (representing the biblical story of Job) and the above intertextual frame will be partial since only the 'action' and 'action's DObj.' slots<sup>3</sup> will be the same. Similarly to the original, they will be linked by the same TOP forming the basis for an allusion.

The textual and intertextual frames evoked by the Ukrainian translation of the passage are different from the ST ones. The mental images differ as well (the ST one conceptualises the Commander and his household as a marriage union whereas in the TT one, the emphasis is placed more on the Commander who is viewed as God holding the ultimate power). Therefore, since the Ukrainian translator decides to introduce a different intertextual expression, it activates a biblical textual frame rather than a 'marriage vow' one, thus completely changing the conceptualisation of the scene for the Ukrainian reader. The reason for the change of the original intertextual expression is not culturally motivated because the Greek Catholic (*I promise you love, honesty and marital fidelity, and that I will not leave you till death*) and the Roman Catholic marriage vows (*I promise you love, fidelity and marital respect, and that I will not leave you till death*) in Ukraine are very similar to the Anglican one. If the translator had alluded to a marriage vow, the ST and TT frames and their mental images would have been more closely related. They would not have been identical, but as far as cultural and pragmatic aspects are concerned, the original and its translation would have been cognitively equivalent.

#### **Activation of a Different Frame + Identical Linguistic Expression (DFSW: Different Frame, Same Wording)**

Due to cultural differences, there is a possibility that an identical translation of an intertextual expression can activate a different textual frame. For instance, Chapter 30 reveals to the reader Offred's loneliness, her everyday suffering, her own version of the Lord's Prayer, her nostalgia for the past. She is sitting by the window praying to God and telling him that she feels very lonely:

<sup>3</sup> The abbreviations DObj. and IObj. stand for 'direct object' and 'indirect object', respectively.

*I feel so alone. All alone by the telephone. Except I can't use the telephone. And if I could, who could I call?* (p. 152). The intertextual expression *all alone by the telephone* is a line from the song 'All alone' written by Irving Berlin in 1924. In the song, the person tells how lonely they feel without their other half: *All alone/By the telephone/Waiting for a ring/A ting-a-ling*. The textual frame will be activated only in those readers who have heard the song and can recognize the hidden intertextual expression since the author does not include any footnotes or additional explanations. The hint is dropped nonetheless: Offred saying *All alone by the telephone* sounds a little out of place in the context of the novel because telephones are not allowed in Gilead, which she mentions straight afterwards: *Except I can't use the telephone*. The inquisitive reader will feel that this line must be taken from somewhere else, and if the reference is discovered, the intertextual expression will activate the following mapping (see Table 10).

Textual Frame	Intertextual Frame
[actor]: a person	[actor]: Offred
[actor's feature]: all alone	[action 1]: sitting
[action]: waiting	[location 1]: by the window
[action object]: a ring	[action 2]: telling
[action object's feature 2]: a ting-a-ling	[IObj. 1]: God
[location]: by the telephone	[IObj.2]: a feeling of loneliness
	[action 3]: recollecting
	[DObj.]: a line from the song
	[DObj. feature]: all alone by the telephone

**Table 10**  
Textual frame  
'All alone by the  
telephone'

In terms of structural similarity, only the 'location' slot in the textual frame and the 'DObj. feature' slot in the intertextual frame are similar; apart from this, their mental images are completely different. They are connected under the same TOP on the basis of a common theme of loneliness.

The Ukrainian translator preserves the linguistic form of the intertextual expression: *Почуваюся самотньою. Як у пісні: сама-самісінька біля телефону. От тільки користуватися телефоном мені не можна. А якби й можна було, кому мені дзвонити?* (p. 174) (*I feel lonely. As the song goes: all by myself near the telephone. Except that I am not allowed to use a telephone. And if I were, who would I call?*). The translator adds *as the song goes*, thus revealing the allusion. Ukrainian readers cannot be expected to know Irving Berlin's song; therefore, they will try to think of songs that have similar lines to this one. There can be quite a few of them both in Ukrainian and Russian (especially with the line having 'a window' instead of 'a telephone', e.g., *I'm standing alone by the window*). A variety of possible songs will generate many different textual frames and, consequently, different conceptualisations of the scene which will not match the original one. As far as mental imagery is concerned, the translation is not equivalent to the original. However, in cultural terms, the reader's interpretation is not impoverished in any way, and the original emotional charge is preserved. As a result, although the ST and TT frame mapping and mental images are not identical, the texts can be considered cognitively equivalent.

Frame semantics supported by psychological findings (R. Schank's dynamic memory theory, simulation semantics) contributes to developing a cognitive theory of intertextuality and analysing the translation of intertextual expressions. The implications of the use of these approaches are as follows: 1) intertextuality as a cognitive category is manifested in mappings

## Conclusion

between textual and intertextual frames and actualised by intertextual expressions; 2) the translation of intertextuality involves transferring the frame mapping and mental imagery of the source language into the target language; 3) the original and its translation are cognitively equivalent if the frame mental simulations they activate correspond in terms of semantic, pragmatic, cultural and stylistic factors.

The analysis of the Ukrainian translation of the intertextual expressions from the novel *The Handmaid's Tale* allowed to define the following techniques for translating intertextuality: 1) FMSW: full mapping, same wording; 2) PMDW: partial mapping, different wording; 3) FMDW: full mapping, different wording; 4) FLMDW: failed mapping, different wording; 5) DFDW: different frame, different wording; 6) DFSW: different frame, same wording. Achieving a 'full mapping' is very rare because of cultural dissimilarities. The translator's individual differences and subjective thought process influence their problem-solving techniques, thus causing some unmotivated decisions during translation. Translators should be encouraged to consider all possible options in order to arrive at such a TT conceptualization of the scene that would have the highest degree of similarity to the ST one, especially add additional explanations if the reader is unable to understand the intertextual reference because of a different cultural background.

The study aims to further a cognitive approach to translation and can be conducted on a bigger scale including more varied study material and different languages, developing a more detailed and structured practical guide to translating intertextuality and generally contributing to the field of cognitive translatology.

## References

- 1 Bakhtin, M., 1981. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays, (ed.) Holquist, M., (trans.) Emerson, C. and Holquist, M. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.
- 2 Bakhtin, M., 1984. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, (trans. and ed.) Emerson, C. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. <https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt22727z1>
- 3 Barsalou, L. W., 1999. Perceptual Symbols Systems. In: Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 22 (4), pp. 577-660. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X99002149>
- 4 Barthes, R., 1977. Textual Analysis of a Tale by Edgar Poe. In: Poe Studies, 10 (1), pp. 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-6095.1977.tb00029.x>
- 5 Bergen, B., 2015. Embodiment, Simulation and Meaning. In: The Routledge Handbook of Semantics, (ed.) Riemer, N. Routledge, pp. 142-157.
- 6 Bertoldi, A., Chishman, R., 2012. Frame Semantics and Legal Corpora Annotation. In: Linguistic Issues in Language Technology, 7(9).
- 7 Boas, H., 2013. Frame Semantics and Translation. In: Cognitive Linguistics and Translation: Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications, (eds.) Rojo, A. and Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. Walter de Gruyter, pp. 125-159.
- 8 Čulo, O., 2013. Constructions-and-Frames Analysis of Translations: The Interplay of Syntax and Semantics in Translations between English and German. In: Constructions and Frames, 5 (2), pp. 143-67. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cf.5.2.02cul>
- 9 Dzera, O., 2018. Sotsiokulturni ta linhvokohnityvni vymiry bibliynoho intertekstu v prostory suchasnoho perekladoznavstva [Socio-cultural and Linguo-cognitive Dimensions of the Biblical Intertext within the Space of Modern Translation Studies]: Thesis for the Scholarly Degree of Doctor of Philology. Kyiv National Linguistic University. (in Ukrainian).
- 10 Fauconnier, G., 1994. Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language. New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511624582>
- 11 Feldman, J., 2008. From Molecule to Metaphor: A Neural Theory of Language. MIT Press.
- 12 Fillmore, C. J., 1968. The Case for Case. In: Universals in Linguistic Theory, (eds.) Bach, E., and Harms, R. T. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 1-88.
- 13 Fillmore, C. J., 1977. The Case for Case Reopened. In: Syntax and Semantics, vol. 8, (eds.) Cole, P. and Sadock, J. New York: Academic Press, pp. 59-81.
- 14 Fillmore, C. J., Baker, C., 2009. A Frames Approach to Semantic Analysis. In: The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis, (eds.) Heine,

- B. and Heiko, N. New York: The Oxford University Press, pp. 313-339.
- 15 Gasparov, B., 2010. Speech, Memory and Meaning: Intertextuality in Everyday Language. Walter de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219111>
  - 16 Gibbs, R. W., 1994. *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding*. Cambridge University Press.
  - 17 Herdeen, van Ch., 2008. *Intertextuality Reinterpreted: A Cognitive Linguistics Approach with Specific Reference to Conceptual Blending*. University of South Africa.
  - 18 Holz-Mänttari, J., 1990. Das Transfer Prinzip. In: *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven*, (eds.) Arntz, R, Thome G. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, pp. 59-70.
  - 19 Johnson-Laird, P. N., 2010. Mental Models and Human Reasoning. In: *PNAS*, 107 (43), pp. 71-115. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1012933107>
  - 20 Karpenko-Seccombe, T., 2016. Intertextuality as Cognitive Modelling. In: *English Text Construction*, 9 (2), pp. 244-67. <https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.9.2.02kar>
  - 21 Khayrullin V. I., 2010. *Perevod i Freymy [Translation and Frames]*. Moscow: Libercom. (in Russian).
  - 22 Kristeva, J., 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semi-otic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
  - 23 Kußmaul, P., 2005. Translation through Visualisation. In: *Meta*, 50(2), pp. 378-391. <https://doi.org/10.7202/010943ar>
  - 24 Lakoff, G., Johnson, M., 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
  - 25 Langacker, R. W., 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites*, vol. I. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
  - 26 Litvinenko, T., 2013. Konets sveta kak intertekstualniy freim [Doomsday as an Intertextual Frame]. In: *The Journal of Irkutsk State Linguistic University*, pp. 8-12. (in Russian).
  - 27 McClelland, J. L., Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E., 1986. The Appeal of Parallel Distributed Processing, (eds.) Rumelhart, D. E., McClelland, J. L. and the PDP Research Group. MA, USA: MIT Press Cambridge, pp. 3-44.
  - 28 Minsky, M. A., 1974. Framework for Representing Knowledge. In: *AI Memo 306*. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
  - 29 Neubert, A, Shreve, G. M., 1992. Translation as Text. In: *Translation Studies*, No. 1. Kent State University Press.
  - 30 Rojo López, A. M., 2002. Applying Frame Semantics to Translation: A Practical Example. In: *Meta*, 47(3), pp. 312-350. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008018ar>
  - 31 Rothbart, S. L., 2009. The Translation of Humour in Roald Dahl's Parody: A Study of The Twits and George's Marvellous Medicine. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand.
  - 32 Schank, R., 1982. *Dynamic Memory: A Theory of Learning in Computers and People*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
  - 33 Schank, R., 1990. *Tell Me a Story: Narrative and Intelligence*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
  - 34 Schank, R., 1999. *Dynamic Memory Revisited*. New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527920>
  - 35 Sickinger, P., 2017. Aiming for Cognitive Equivalence - Mental Models as a Tertium Comparationis for Translation and Empirical Semantics. In: *Research in Language*, 15 (2). University of Lodz, pp. 213-235. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rela-2017-0013>
  - 36 Slobin, D., 2005. Relating Narratives in Translation. In: *Perspectives on Language and Language Development: Essays in Honor of Ruth A. Berman*, (eds.) Ravid, D. and Shyldkrot, H. B. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 115-129. [https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-7911-7\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-7911-7_10)
  - 37 Sourvinou-Inwood, C., 1996. "Reading" Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period. Clarendon Press.
  - 38 Talmy, L., 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics/ in 2 vol*. Cambridge, MA: MIT. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6848.001.0001>
  - 39 Tatsakovych, U., 2018. Intertekstualnist yak analogove mapuvannia mizh freimamy [Intertextuality as Analogous Mapping between Frames]. In: *The Journal of V. Vernadskiy Taurida National University, Philology and Social Communications*, 29 (68), No. 4. Kyiv, pp. 88-93. (in Ukrainian).
  - 40 Vannerem, M., Snell-Hornby, M., 1986. Die Szene hinter dem Text: 'Scenes-and-Frames' Semantics in der Übersetzung. In: *Übersetzungswissenschaft - Eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis*, (ed.) Snell-Hornby, M. Tübingen: Francke, pp. 184-205.
  - 41 Vermeer, H. J., Witte, H. 1990. Mogen Sie Zistrosen? Scenes & Frames & Channels. In: *Translatorischen Handeln, TextConText Beiheft 3*. Heidelberg: Groos.
  - 42 Zwaan, R., 2009. Mental Simulation in Language Comprehension and Social Cognition. In: *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39 (7), pp. 1142-1150. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.661>

## Sources

- 1 Atwood, M., 1985. *The Handmaid's Tale*. McClelland and Stewart Ltd.
- 2 Atwood, M., 2017. *Opovid Sluzhnytsi [The Handmaid's Tale]*, (trans.) Oksenysh, O. Kharkiv: Klub Simeynoho Dozvillya. (in Ukrainian).
- 3 Bibliia abo Knyhy Sviatoho Pysma Staroho i Novoho Zapovitu [The Bible: the Books of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments], 1988, (trans.) Ohiienko, I., 2nd ed. The publication of the Russian Orthodox Church. (in Ukrainian).
- 4 Bibliia. Knyhy Sviatoho Pysma Staroho i Novoho Zapovitu [The Bible. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments], 2004, (trans.) Patriarch Filaret. The publication of Ukrainian Orthodox Church. (in Ukrainian).
- 5 Bibliia [The Bible], 2011, (trans.) Turkoniak, R., 4th ed. Lviv: Ukrainian Biblical Society. (in Ukrainian).
- 6 Novitniy pereklad Biblii [A New Revised Translation of the Bible], 2013, (trans.) Hyzha, O. Kyiv: KT Zabelina-Filkovska Pulishing. (in Ukrainian).
- 7 Sviate Pysmo Staroho i Novoho Zapovitu [The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments], 2003, (trans.) Kulish, P., Puliui, I., Nechui-Levytskyi, I, 4th ed. Kyiv: Ukrainian Biblical Society. (in Ukrainian).
- 8 Sviate Pysmo Staroho ta Novoho Zapovitu [The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments], 2007, (trans.) Khomenko, I., 3rd ed. Zhovkva: Missioner. (in Ukrainian).
- 9 Ukrainskyi pravopys [A Guide to Ukrainian Orthography], 2019 [online]. Available at: <https://mon.gov.ua/storage/app/media/zagalna%20serednya/05062019-onovl-pravo.pdf> (in Ukrainian).

## Santrauka

### Uliana Tatsakovych. Freimų semantika ir intertekstualumo vertimas

Intertekstualumas kelia nemažai problemų vertėjams, nes jie tampa atsakingi už tinkamą intertekstinės informacijos pateikimą kita kalba, kad nebūtų pakenkta tikslinio skaitytojo užsienio kalba patirčiai. Freimų semantika (angl. Frame Semantics), paremta psichologinėmis išvadomis (R. Schanko dinaminės atminties teorija, simuliacinė semantika), padeda kurti pažintinę intertekstualumo teoriją ir analizuoti intertekstinių tekstų vertimą. Šio straipsnio tikslas – remiantis freimų semantika ir R. Schanko dinaminės atminties teorija, apibrėžti intertekstualumą ir išanalizuoti jo vertimą iš anglų kalbos į ukrainiečių kalbą.

Tyrime apžvelgiamos kalbinės ir psichologinės teorijos, tiriančios vizualizacijos vaidmenį konceptualizuojant tikrovę, ir aptariamas jų pritaikymas intertekstualumo supratimui ir vertimui. Dinaminės atminties teorija naudojama siekiant paaiškinti tekstinių ir intertekstinių freimų prigimtį ir sukurti jų vizualinius modelius. Tyrimo medžiagą sudaro 70 intertekstinių vienetų (citatų ir aliuzijų), pateikiamų Margaretos Atwood romane „The Handmaid's Tale“, ir jų vertimai ukrainiečių kalba. Išanalizavus šio romano intertekstinių raiškos vienetų vertimą į ukrainiečių kalbą, apibrėžti šeši intertekstualaus vertimo būdai. Individualūs vertėjo skirtumai ir subjektyvus mąstymo procesas daro įtaką jų problemų sprendimo būdams, todėl vertimo metu priimami nemotyvuoti sprendimai. Tyrimu siekiama išplėsti pažintinį požiūrį į vertimą. Jis gali būti atliekamas didesniu mastu, apimant įvairesnę mokslinę medžiagą ir skirtingas kalbas.

## About the Author

### Uliana Tatsakovych

English instructor, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

#### Research interests

Cognitive linguistics, translation studies

#### Address

57 Shevchenko St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76018, Ukraine

#### E-mail

ulianatatsakovych@gmail.com