**Conceptualization**  
Since the emergence of complexity thinking, scholars from the natural and social sciences as well as the humanities are renewing efforts to construct a unifying framework for all scholarly activity.

The work of Terrence Deacon (2013), situated at the interface of physics, chemistry, biology, neurology, cognitive science, semiotics, anthropology and philosophy at least, is a great, though not the only, example of this kind of work. Deacon’s contribution lies not only in his original findings in any of the fields in which he works but also in the ways in which he relates bodies of knowledge to one another.

An example of this is the way he links a theory of work in physics to a theory of information in cybernetics by means of a theory of semiotics. This line of thinking place semiotics, particularly biosemiotics, at the center of the abovementioned debate (see also Hoffmeyer, 2008; Kauffman, 2012). Petrilli’s (2003) thought-provoking collection on semiotics encompasses a variety of chapters on translation, which she conceptualizes as semiotic process. Her work has made it possible to link biosemiotics particularly and semiotics more generally via a notion of “translation” that we explore further in this book. Cronin’s work in translation feeds into this through his notion of “ecology.” His work challenges text-oriented and linear approaches and engages in eco-translational thinking in order to comprehend interconnectedness and vulnerability in our anthropocene age. He calls all of the global translation systems a “tradosphere” to encapsulate all the ways in which information circulates between living and non-living organisms and is translated into a language or a code that can be processed or understood by the receiving entity (Cronin, 2017, p. 71). Cronin’s work on ecology is complemented by Latour’s (2005) development of a sociology of translation that reconnects the social and natural worlds and accounts for the multiple connections that make up what he calls the “social.”

In an effort further to work out the implications of this new way of thinking, Marais conceptualized translation in terms of “negentropic semiotic work performed by the application of constraints on the semiotic process” (2019, p. 120; see also Kress, 2013). Building on Peirce’s view that the meaning of a sign is its translation into another sign, Marais defines translation is a process entailing semiotic constraints. This allows for the study of all forms of meaning-making, i.e., translation, within a single conceptual framework and a unified ecological view for both the sciences and the humanities. As Cronin puts it: “The long standing distinction between the human and social sciences and the natural and physical sciences is no longer tenable in a world where we cannot remain indifferent to the more than human” (2017, p. 3).

These kind of approaches create many possibilities for dialogue between translation studies and semiotics, including biosemiotics, exploring translation not only in linguistic and anthropocentric terms, but also as a semiotic process the human and non-human, the organic and inorganic, and the material and immaterial alike. Thus, translation processes are present not only the translation of Hamlet into French or speech into subtitles, but also in communication between dolphins, between dogs and their owners, in the relocation of a statue, or in the rewatching of a film. However, many implications of this line of thinking still need exploring and, if what Deacon, Petrilli and Cronin hold is valid, this should be done in an interdisciplinary way that tests, transgresses and transforms scholarly boundaries.

Based on the conference that took place in August 2021, we call for papers contributing to an edited volume drawing together the work of biosemioticians, other semioticians, and translation studies scholars to discuss their interdisciplinarity and its implications for the study of social and cultural reality as emerging from both matter and mind. We invite colleagues who presented at the conference as well as those who did not to submit theoretical, data-driven, or mixed proposals that reflect on the complexity of social-cultural emergence as a translation process. Questions to be addressed are not to confined to but could include:  
(a) Is translation, as semiotic work and process, able to link the biological and non- biological worlds into one ecology and, if so, how?  
(b) Which concepts in each of the three fields identified are relevant for the others and in what ways?  
(c) Could those working in these fields learn methodological and epistemological lessons from one another? If so, what would doing so entail?  
(d) Could collaborative scholarship enhance an understanding of social-cultural emergence and, if so, what would this scholarship entail?  
(e) How, if at all, does entropy and negentropy play out differently in social-cultural and biological-physical systems?  
(f) How does social-cultural emergence differ from biological and even physical emergence?  
(g) Systems thinking tends to ignore distinctions in the intentionality of biological and non-biological agents so, if we consider intention to have possible effect, how do we factor intention into thinking about complex adaptive systems?
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