

THE THIRD CODE IN NOORU SIMHASANANGAL: SELF TRANSLATION AS SEMIOTIC RESISTANCE

Amruthashree R.
Research Scholar
Institute of English
University of Kerala
ammruthashree@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article examines how the self-translation of the Malayalam novel Nooru Simhasanangal by B. Jeyamohan into English produces a resistant 'third code' through the negotiation of caste-marked multilingualism and linguistic asymmetry. Drawing on William Frawley's notion of the third code and Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, the study argues that translation produces a hybrid translational register that negotiates multilingualism without fully assimilating it to anglophone literary norms. Through close analysis of dialogue, code-switching, community markers and animal imagery, the paper demonstrates how translational decisions such as borrowing, transliteration, compensation, modulation, and selective explication function as semiotic operations. The translation foregrounds linguistic hierarchy embedded in Malayalam-Tamil-English interactions, rather than pursuing equivalence, preserving asymmetries that structure caste and institutional authority in the source text. The elite discourse marked by class hierarchy transfers with relative fluency, while subaltern speech resists seamless reproduction, thereby generating a 'third code' that marks cultural distance within the target literary system. By treating translation as an interpretive act shaped by ethical and systemic considerations, the study analyses the production of a third code, positioned as a site of resistance that challenges linguistic normalization and colonial continuity within translation practices.

Keywords: Translation as method, third code, foreignization, polysystem theory, code-mixing, marginalisation

Postmodern literature frequently incorporates multiple linguistic and cultural codes to structure narrative meaning. Within such texts, code-mixing is not merely a stylistic device but a constitutive element that shapes narrative perspective and social positioning. In this context, the present study examines Jeyamohan's *Nooru Simhasanangal* through self-translation, to understand how translation functions as a methodological practice for analysing intercultural interpretation and transaction. It adopts a practice-based translation

methodology combining close textual analysis with reflective examination of translational decision-making during the self-translation process. The act of translating the text becomes an analytical process through which linguistic hierarchy and cultural asymmetry are rendered visible. Translational decisions are examined as sites of interpretive negotiation shaped by power relations and cultural distance in the source text *Nooru Simhasanangal*. This practice-informed approach allows translation to function as a lens for understanding how meaning is reconfigured across cultures, particularly in postcolonial contexts marked by inequality. Translation, in this sense, is not merely a means of transfer but a mode of inquiry that sheds light on the ethics of representation within the literary polysystem. This methodological approach intersects with theoretical debates on multilingualism and translational asymmetry that inform the present study.

B. Jeyamohan's writings frequently engage with caste oppression, marginalisation, and social hierarchy. This study engages with one of his most popular novels titled *Nooru Simhasanangal* (A Hundred Thrones) through self-translation. The characters in *Nooru Simhasanangal* are inspired by the real personas from his life experience. *Nooru Simhasanangal* views the Indian societal framework and structure with a very critical outlook. Through the novel *Nooru Simhasanangal*, the author narrates the life of the protagonist Dharmapalan who is an IAS officer and who also belongs to the *Naayati* community. The word *Naayati* means one who hunts or in this case, one could propose that the word figuratively signifies a folk people being hunted by the society. Everything related to this marginalized cultural group is in contrast with the 'conventional' society, their occupation, mannerisms, language, food, and so forth. The novel delineates numerous instances of oppression and subjugation encountered by Dharmapalan and his mother who are the representatives of the grass-root section among the social hierarchy.

Dharmapalan faces a lot of challenges from his childhood onwards to reach a topmost position in the administration. Being a member of the lower caste *Naayati* community, the 'civilized' society finds it hard to accept him as their superior. For this reason, he confronts hurdles in both his personal as well as professional life. Dharmapalan never succeeds in satiating his mother's hunger or grief; in the novel, we could find him saying, "...for her heart to satiate its hunger and merge with this earth I would need a hundred thrones more" (71). Dharmapalan's mother begs him to join her by disposing of his shirt and master's chair, but Dharmapalan is unable to do so. On the other hand, he tries to change her into a new woman but she clung to her identity arduously and asks him to do so as well. She picks up rags and nibbles at rotten food as always. She cares little about attire and etiquette. Her ways are structured as a result of years and years of systematic oppression faced by their community. Everything is lost for them except the tag of '*Naayati*' which in itself is the primary element for meting out injustice towards them. Jeyamohan deftly blends his own

experiences and emotional turmoil with the life experiences of an IAS officer in this novel. Readers observe the unravelling of the story through the perspective of the protagonist, Dharmapalan. Each character's dispositions, and societal stature are evident from their dialogues which accentuates the underlying power politics and class hierarchy in society. The comparison of *Naayati* people with that of trash and similar images explicitly state them as the undesirable or the 'wretched of this earth'.

Code-mixing is another characteristic employed in the novel that expresses the fluidity of language and highlights the privileged status of the users. The notion of coding or code occupies different positions in various disciplines though it is commonly used as a relative principle in Linguistics, Semiotics, Communication theory, Translation Studies among other disciplines. Primarily the code represented the formal aspects of a linguistic system wherein it became synonymous with the word 'system' itself that constituted the structural rules in a language. At the same time 'code' denoted the 'concealment' or rather cultural conventions in the case of cultural studies where it became the structure of meaning altogether. When semioticians used to describe the sign processes by 'code', within a semiotic perspective translation scholars referred to the complexity of the translation process by the term. It stood for the transition of cultural structures within a system. Against this backdrop, the paper argues that translation reveals the marginality indexes in the narrative arc of the source text that resists direct interpretation and translation, which further produces a 'third code' that emerges from the interaction of source and target languages. Rather than viewing this third code as a deviation, the study foregrounds it as a productive space through which otherness, resistance, and cultural specificity can be preserved within the target literary system.

The analysis of the source text reveals that the conversations in the novel are the complex areas where the thoughts are essentially structured and the readers are expected to interpret the connotation rather than the denotation. This is where the emotions, intonation, modulation, and gestures come about that could be examined through semiotic translation. As Dharmapalan is an administrative officer, his societal position is superimposed onto his identity as a *Naayati*. His thoughts are linguistically unproblematic to interpret during the reading as well as the translation process as he aligns with the standardized lingua franca for expression. Most of the exchanges within the novel are between him and the other characters where, according to the shift in context, fluctuations can be noticed when emotions, culture, and language influence gets elicited. Thus, it is relevant to map such variations within the third code. These variations become particularly visible in the novel's multilingual structure, where language functions as a marker of caste, class, and institutional authority.

Language in the novel functions not merely as a medium of communication but as a marker of caste, class, and lived experience. The source text primarily employs three

languages, Malayalam, Tamil, and English to structure its narrative world. The multilingual texture of *Nooru Simhasanangal* encodes social stratification through language use. The conflict between linguistic variations invariably suggests a difference in perspective as well as experience. They signal differences in social hierarchy and cultural belonging. The mixed Tamil marks the Naayati community as culturally and socially marginalised, Malayalam enables partial mobility, and English frequently signifies institutional authority within the novel. The characters who converse in English are associated with the urban, educated elite who occupy positions of institutional power and remain largely insulated from subaltern realities. This could be examined through how the author switches between the source code and foreign code while narrating the novel. The English words and expressions used in the source code include, but not limited to (i) technical terms such as, tribunal, inner organs, treatment, quota, postmortem, management ethics, accused, crime; (ii) speech phrases like 'I am sorry', 'my goodness', 'listen', 'actually', 'say', 'Mister', 'my god', 'nonsense'; (iii) whole sentences like 'please understand', 'leave him alone', 'don't be ridiculous', 'really I can't understand her', 'now I am leaving', 'all that fuss she made' etc. Even though there are source language equivalents for many of these foreign words which are also in daily use, the author employs code-mixing to highlight the strata-based semiosis within the society. It also helps readers to recognize the use and function of languages that compartmentalizes different sections in a culture.

Colloquial Tamil, particularly the old Tamil variety spoken by the Naayati community, marks exclusion, marginality, and cultural distance. Their language and culture become a barrier either to allow or to align themselves into the foreign lingua-cultural system. As could be seen in the use and translation of lexical reduplications that change meaning grammatically or semantically in the source text. The reduplication refers to the repetition of words, verbs, or sentences that leads to modification in meaning. There were reduplicants in the source text such as slang usages and sentences that were not semantically refined or could only be understood within the context. Reduplicants such as (i) *thinna! thinna!* (eat! eat!) (ii) *unari idude...oori ittudude* (just threw it away...couldn't you remove it) (iii) *ezhide...ezhide makka* (get up, get up son) (iv) *Podu podu* (put more and more), are some of them.

Malayalam occupies an intermediate position, enabling mobility between centre and periphery wherein texts and codes acquire central or peripheral positions depending on their cultural influence. For instance, the use of loan words that are commonly used and plays an important part in enriching the vocabulary of the English tongue. There are several loan words used in the source code that are frequently used in the target code which highlights the less hurdled transference into the target code that the readers have little difficulty in placing the word in context. Some of them are, (i) Teapoy- a three-legged table, (ii) Bungalow- a

large house with more than one storey, (iii) Guru- a Hindu spiritual mentor, (iv) Swami- a Hindu sage, (v) Ashram- an abode of the monk, (vi) Samadhi- union with the divine, (vii) Dharma- righteousness often interpreted as ethics.

This kind of linguistic stratification in the target code parallels the literary hierarchy in Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, wherein the translated text acquires a central or peripheral position according to the level of influence it holds over the target language and culture. The translation process suggests that elite discourse performed within the source text transfers relatively smoothly into English, whereas the emotive and cultural density of colloquial Tamil resists direct transference. Instances involving Kaapan's mother are particularly resistant, as her speech embodies cultural memory and experience of systemic oppression. Selective retention of source-language expressions in such cases function as strategies to preserve cultural distance and resist normalisation within the target system. Foreignization enables the translator to negotiate centreperiphery dynamics within the literary polysystem. The pursuit of fluency often renders the translator invisible while suppressing the individuality of the source culture as it denies the source culture its right to appear as different. A resistant translation strategy therefore allows marked forms, mixed registers, and culturally specific signs to interrupt the illusion of transparency. In the study, foreignization is not employed to exoticise the source culture but to foreground cultural specificity. Translation thus becomes an act of ethical negotiation rather than assimilation, enabling the marginalised voices within the source text to retain their distinctiveness.

The translational strategies adopted in this self-translation resist what Lawrence Venuti terms domestication, the reduction of linguistic and cultural difference to target-language fluency (20). Such a reduction will ultimately result in the equalization or rather normalization of the source language literary and cultural tropes and idiosyncrasies. Rather than assimilating caste-marked address forms, kinship terms, and onomatopoeic utterances into idiomatic English, the translation retains lexical opacity through oblique translation techniques. These choices interrupt smooth readability and foreground the asymmetrical relation between colloquial Tamil, Malayalam and English as structured in the source text. This is when foreignization becomes an act of resistance against homocentric modes of transference. It interprets the iconic, indexical, and symbolic signs in the source text that needs to be reproduced identically and otherwise, without losing the charm of the source text. The techniques like borrowing, calque, adaptation, modulation, explication among others not only aid the translation process, underscoring the cultural values of the source text, but also substantiate this foreignization process.

For instance, the retention of honorific particles and caste-indexed vocatives prevents the erasure of embedded hierarchies that would otherwise dissolve under naturalizing equivalence. Similarly, the expansion of embodied and emotive utterances into descriptive

clauses does not neutralize their force but re-mediate them within a third code that preserves affective intensity while acknowledging structural untranslatability. In both cases, the translation refuses to naturalize subaltern speech into standardized narrative decorum. This practice aligns with foreignization not as a stylistic choice but as an ethical positioning. By sustaining lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic friction in translation, the transference exposes the limits of equivalence and renders visible the linguistic hierarchies that condition both source and target systems. The tensions produced by these linguistic hierarchies become especially pronounced in moments of emotional and performative speech. The resulting third code is therefore not translationese, but a deliberate inscription of difference within the target text.

Emotional intensity presents a significant challenge in translation, particularly when linguistic displacement occurs across multiple codes. Intra- and inter-systemic translation involving Tamil, Malayalam, and English often results in attenuation of affect. While elite discourse transfers with relative ease, subaltern speech resists full emotive reproduction due to cultural and experiential distance. The translator confronted difficulty while translating cultural items from the source to the target text. The cultural items denote those terms that are oriented culturally or are specific to distinct regions, tongue, community, and stature. The social stature also conditions the language varieties used by people within the society. Culturally specific coinages are abundant in meaning, allusions and have a referential quality due to which it is difficult to carry over the meaning in its original sense. While several translation techniques such as addition, reduction, borrowing, adaptation, modulation, explication, calque, transliteration, synonymous words, compensation, and literal translation are used to overcome the issue of untranslatability, it throws light upon the relation between the translation technique and the situation or features in the source text that brings about the conundrum in transference.

The translator also enquires into sites within the source text where emotion, language, and culture stimulate or discourage the translation process. The situations where Kaapan's mother converses with him and Sudha invariably deter the target code. As the translator had to carry out intrasystemic as well as inter systemic translation, the target language is doubly displaced from the source language. That is to say, Kaapan's mother converses in colloquial Tamil tongue and the translator had to first decode this variable and position it synchronically within the Malayalam discourse to re-encode the resultant variable into the TL, English. The emotional content is also very much marked in the first variable that, regardless of the techniques used, the translator finds it difficult to conjure the emotive quality of the original into the TL. At the same time, the translator is able to transcreate the exact emotions and concerns submitted by the icons of civil society such as Sudha, Doctors, IAS officials, Prajanandan, Sundara Ramaswamy where the TL is stimulated and encouraged. Secondly, the

situations where linguistic elements prompt the translation are when Dharmapalan converses with the civil society; we could find instances of code-mixing as well. The places of inter-systemic coding also stimulated the translation process unlike the instances of intralingual translation where the translator had to switch among three languages to reach the target readers. Thirdly, settings where culture excites and hinders translation include the instances of the Naayati community wherein situational usage of regional cultural terms, kinship words, hypoicons among others deter the target language. On the other hand, the instances of doctors-hospital, swami- ashram, administrators- office and Dharmapalan's bungalow- the target language gets stimulated. Though from the perspective of the third code, code-mixing and equivalency stimulate translation, it also strives to arrest the position of center in the literary polysystem through absolute submission to the target language that in turn makes the translation a secondary system that aligns with the center. In the case of translation between Indian languages and English, the latter has an upper hand over the former. This is a latent form of colonization continuum whereby foreignness is perceived with an element of awe and fear. And there is this constant attempt to satisfy the dominant code through domestication.

Dialogue exchanges that are analysed from the emotional and cultural dimensions produced several untranslated expressions that emphasize the differences in language use within the source text. The mother's colloquial Tamil resists direct assimilation into English thus, through the production of a third code she becomes an icon of a culture that does not understand or submit to the foreign as exemplified through various instances in the novel. She doesn't wish to perceive foreign culture as she warns gravely about the callousness of the 'other' to his son. At the same time, the literal translation overlooking source language nuances could manipulate her position and subdue her sentiments which would eventually declare her position in the system of the target culture however trivial, normalizes the impact and effect of the source culture within the target language. The translator could only produce several exchanges into English effectively without deterring the source language intent that indicates an imbalance in culture, language, emotion, and thought within the text that can't be negotiated. These difficulties foreground the limits of equivalence and reinforce the view of translation as a continuous semiotic process rather than a replicative act. Emotional transfer becomes a site of negotiation where loss, transformation, and resistance coexist.

The onomatopoeic words like the 'rr-ing' sound of A/C, clicking sound of the phone; expressives like 'Oh', 'Thoo', 'Le' or 'Ele' that has meaning only when read contextually due to its embodied nature, are instances where the translator either reproduced it directly or modified it as per the context of the text. Here the expressive 'Oh' is situational, which could be an utterance of disappointment, joy, or depression thus, the translator modified it according to the sense of the situation. Similarly, the expressive 'thoo' is used colloquially to

express one's scorn; such usage is absent in the target code. However, when such oral gestures embedded in the text that affectively engages with the body are replaced with the adopted descriptive clauses like "she spat out contemptuously" converts a performative utterance into narrative mediation. The bodily immediacy of the sound is replaced by explanatory syntax, shifting affect from embodied utterance to narrated evaluation. Thus, it converts an indexical sign to iconic sign or a represented image. This shift demonstrates how subaltern speech as represented in the source text resists direct transfer and must be discursively reconstructed in the target text to produce a third code. The resulting linguistic disruption opens a productive space of intercultural negotiation through the formation of a third code. This semiotic instability is further reflected in the construction of character identity within the novel.

The protagonist is the pivotal centre through whose perspective the narrative unfolds. The protagonist is known by three different names in the story- Kaapan, Dharmapalan, and Balu. The protagonist's multiple names, Kaapan, Dharmapalan, and Balu, function as iconic signs marking shifts in identity, social position, and psychological state. Kaapan signifies survival and marginality; Dharmapalan represents institutional authority tempered by anxiety; Balu indexes intimacy and unresolved belonging. These layered identities resist stabilisation within the target culture, reinforcing the need for a third code to preserve semiotic complexity. The name Kaapan is an iconic sign indicative of him being the only surviving child of his mother. Kaapan is black, short, and 'rat' like in physicality. He is moreover a survivor who is very emotional and dilemmatic. The name Dharmapalan represents an administrator who is responsible, keen to serve others, a good father, but who is also paranoid of others' thoughts and lacks power. In the past Dharmapalan was also an obedient student, eager for gaining knowledge and who respects Guru's words. Finally, the third name Balu is the sign for the lover in him, a gentle husband who is determined to make peace; this iconic representamen has another interpretant as well, that he is the husband of an upper-class white girl who fails to identify himself with the high-class society.

The climax of the novel indicates that the protagonist fails miserably as a son, as an administrator, and as a husband, from his perspective. In the last chapter, the readers find him ready to join his mother renouncing his positions but before he could assure her, his mother dies. And as a husband he never agrees to Sudha, his wife's wish, as he is reluctant to abandon his mother. Also, he realizes that what his mother said was true all along that he shouldn't be sitting in the master's chair as he is a powerless administrator. An instance would be when his order backfires as the senior doctor gets suspended. He acknowledges that to come in terms with the real world, he would 'need a hundred thrones more'. In the end, the protagonist Dharmapalan becomes *Naayati Kaapan* when he realizes that no matter whatever he does to improve the status quo, nothing really changes and he is left only to be haunted by

the thoughts of his past, present, and future. The instability of identity in the novel is reinforced not only through naming but also through recurring visual imagery.

Subtext presents a challenge in translation because semiotic meaning exceeds surface linguistic structure. The interconnection between surface code and subcode is analogous to the signifier and signified. Through a linear surface code, a multidimensional third code can be realized. Along with the different literary devices, the visuality of a text also contributes to the construction of subcodes within a target code. Through metaphor, imagery, and hypoicons, the text generates multiple layers of signification that complicate direct transfer into the target language. The translator explores instances in the source code where these visual representations and detailing stimulate or discourages the third code. The readers could analyse the author's ample use of animal similes for comparison. Human characteristics is compared to the nature of pigs, rats, rodents, bandicoot, stray dog, kitten, fish, bird, owl, horse, goat, donkey, leopard, wild animal, beast, and the like. Mostly the minorities like *Naayatis* are treated as castaways; thus, they are often equated to trash, garbage, filth, and carcass within the text. The personification of ordinary objects in the target culture, like the chair, as a 'cruel beast which craves blood', kindles contemplation among the readers upon different perspectives. It is also interesting to note that the different physical traits drawn by the author as an indexical sign that pronounces discrimination. *Naayati* people are described as short black humans with flat nose, long white teeth, big eyes, and curly hair. They are perceived as black demons by others in society. On the other hand, the representatives of the upper-class society like Sen Gupta and Sudha possess features distinct from these people, that are projected as refined and superior. In the text, the author describes Sen Gupta as a stout man with a heavy neck and plump cheeks. Similarly, Sudha is 'extra white' in the eyes of the protagonist and the mother. These are all features of the sophisticated, rich upper-class community who are vaguely aware of the struggle of the 'crude' just for existence. The translation of such culturally and visually marked signs requires specific translational strategies capable of preserving semiotic difference.

A range of translation strategies contribute to the formation of the third code within both source and target texts. Direct translation techniques such as borrowing, calque, and literal translation are employed for the transference of target code where conceptual and structural elements are in synchronization with the source language Malayalam. During the translation process, the translator came across several culture-specific words such as *kalvilakku*, *chenkal peedam*, *thampra*, *varahi*, *mayandi*, *thirumeni*, *mundu*, *pallikoodam*, *thali*; names representing caste, like *Nayadi*, *Narikuravan*, where the literal translation is impossible. The inefficiency caused due to the cultural variations has been met by borrowing and transliteration. Borrowing happens mostly when there is a significant disparity between the semantic and syntactic structures of the ST and TT, where the translator could only

compensate the difference by adding extra notes like footnote or endnote for that specific cultural element. A fine example would be the word '*mundu*' from the source code, which is a referent to the regional cloth type worn by men from South India. The type of *mundu* as well as the method of use makes it all the way different from that of the traditional *dhoti* of North Indian society. Thus, the word cannot be adapted to any other variants from the target culture. Another example from the third code for borrowing is the word *dharma* which cannot be replaced by any other words like ethics, morality, or right behaviour. For *dharma* is a combination of all these ideas, it is the reality central to the social order as exemplified in many philosophies. There exists a lot of such culture-specific words that the translator was compelled to borrow as such from the source code to emphasize the presence of a deviant third code. The translator italicized these words within the third code and provides an extra note explaining the concept or idea. Literal translation is not always feasible as the sentence structure of the Malayalam language is quite different from that of the TL English. The more the source and target codes consist of the same sentence structure, the less difficult it would be for a translator to achieve the normal interpretation or the belief of a potential translation. Examples from the translation include: (i) *Sudha bodham kettu veenu* (Sudha fainted) (ii) *Ente kaikal virachu* (My hands shook). Peter Fawcett quotes Vazquez Ayora thus on literal translation, "If, given two utterances, one in English and the other in Spanish, there exists between them a precise correspondence of 'structure' and of 'signification', and the equivalence is achieved moneme by moneme, literal translation results and can be applied without risk" (36). Compensation is another technique employed when there is an absence of equivalent linguistic elements in the target language. Since direct translation is not possible, the translator compensates the degree of formality in the source language by one variant in the target language. For instance, the words like *Ivar*, *Aval*, *Avare*, *Avale* in Malayalam could only be represented by the signifier 'her' in English. Similarly, regional forms of address such as *Ningal*, *Thankal*, *Nee*, *Edi*, *Thaan* can only be replaced by the target equivalent 'you'. Culturally oriented words, as well as community-based speech phrases, do not have an exact synonym or equivalent in English. Along with the transfer of single cultural semantic units like words, the semantic structure of the source text expressed as a whole is equally important. It can be observed that there are no exact synonyms even in the same language and its dialect; thus, language is not merely a medium through which experience is communicated but is something inseparable from the experience it communicates. Being a unique way of looking at undifferentiated reality, it invests its words with particular nuances, as J. C. Catford opines, "The language we speak forces us to select and group elements of our experience of the world in ways it dictates. It provides a kind of grid or series of grids, through which we see the world" (21). The cumulative effect of these translational

negotiations reveals how the third code functions not merely as a linguistic outcome but as a site of cultural and ethical resistance.

Translation emerges in this study as a continuous semiotic process shaped by linguistic hierarchy, cultural distance, and ethical choice. The production of a third code enables the translator to negotiate untranslatability while preserving the otherness of the source text. In translating *Nooru Simhasanangal*, foreignization functions as an act of resistance against cultural homogenisation, allowing marginalised voices to retain their distinctiveness within the literary polysystem. By foregrounding translation as a semiotic practice, the study positions translational decision-making as a critical site for examining power, resistance, and intercultural negotiation in postcolonial literary systems. Though the primary language used in the novel is Malayalam, there are instances where the author employs old Tamil as well as English to denote cultural and communal differences in the story. As an intercultural literary translator, the translator confronted difficulties while translating the cultural and lingua-specific words of the *Naayati* community due to lack of adequate knowledge in the old Tamil tongue and also their lived experiences, which revealed the resistance of the caste-indexed discourse embedded within the source text. Yet it must be acknowledged that defamiliarization of source culture and language is also inviting an effective transposition of source code over the target code; thereby achieving a significant third code similar to the idea of the cannibalist metaphor recovered by de Campos brothers. In “Translation, Postcolonial Studies and the Americas” Edwin Gentzler suggests,

Translation is conceived of as a creative, transformative act, opening multiple lines of signification in the receiving culture. Cannibalist translation places a heavy emphasis on the phonetics of the original over the syntactic or semantic, and these sounds recreated in the target culture also tend to open new lines of association. (27)

Through the translation of *Nooru Simhasanangal*, the study demonstrates how a semiotic approach to translation can illuminate the hidden structures of linguistic hierarchy and provide scope for meaningful intercultural negotiation without erasing cultural difference.

References

- Jeyamohan, B. *Nooru Simhasanangal*. DC Books, 2019.
- Catford, J.C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Danesi, Marcel. *Messages, Signs, and Meanings: A Basic Textbook in Semiotics and Communication*. 3rd ed., Canadian Scholars' Press, 2004.

- Deely, John. *Basics of Semiotics*. Advances in Semiotics, Vol. 4, Tartu University Press, 2005, pp.09.
- Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.
- Fawcett, Peter. *Translation and Language: Translation Theories Explained*, Routledge, 2014.
- Frawley, William. "Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation". *Translation: literary, linguistic and philosophical perspectives*, edited by William Frawley, Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1984, pp.159–175.
- Gentzler, Edwin. Translation, Postcolonial Studies, and the Americas. PDF file, September 2020,
<https://www.brunel.ac.uk/creativewriting/research/entertext/documents/entertext022/Edwin-Gentzler-Translation-Postcolonial-Studies-and-the-Americas.pdf>
- Giuseppe Palumbo. *Key Terms in Translation Studies*. Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On linguistic aspects of translation". *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, London and New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. 113-18.
- Kourdis, Evangelos. "The Notion of Code in Semiotics and Semiotically Informed Translation Studies. A Preliminary Study". *Readings in Humanities*, edited by Oana Andreica and Alin Olteanu, Springer Cham, Vol.3, Jan. 2018, pp. 311-325. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-66914-4_21.
- Maran, Timo. *Ecosemiotics: The Study of Signs in Changing Ecologies (Elements in Environmental Humanities)*, Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, Rev. ed, Routledge, 2009.
- Nida. E.A. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.
- Petrilli, Susan. "Interpretative trajectories in translation semiotics". *Semiotica*, vol. 163, no. 1, 2007, pp. 311– 345.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, Routledge, 2003.