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Abstract: With the rapid development of science and technology and mass media, the dominant role of language has been gradually weakened, and visual communication has been on the rise. Multimodal discourse plays a more and more important role while the traditional language-based discourse analysis is on a decline. Multimodal discourse analysis began in the 1990s and was established on Halliday’s systemic functional grammar. Kress and van Leeuwen propose the theory of visual grammar which is about the conceptual meaning, interpersonal meaning, and textual meaning of systemic-functional grammar. Here we will analyze the culture-loaded word of “pot arrow” from a TV series named The Story of Minglan from the perspective of visual grammar. This study illustrates the effectiveness of applying visual grammar to activity discourse analysis and how we make it more understandable and memorable by viewers. Hope that can contribute to the spread of Chinese culture.
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1. Chapter 1 Introduction

In the 1970s and 1980s, with the advent of polysystem theory and norms of translation behavior, western translation theories shifted their focus from text to cultural, social, historical and political factors. In the 1990s, a cultural model of translation studies emerged, which Snell-Hornby (Snell-Hornby, 1990) called “cultural turn”(刘军平, 2019). In the early time, Xu (许国璋, 1980) put forward the concept of culture-loaded words in his article. In 1984, Wang (王佐良, 1984) mentioned
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in the *Comparison of Cultures in Translation* that no one can truly master a language without understanding the social culture of the language. This includes history, dynamics, customs, economic foundations, emotional lives, philosophical ideas, scientific and technological achievements, political and social organizations, and so on. The exchange of two different national languages is essentially the exchange of two different national cultures. In the process of language communication, whether people from two different countries or nationalities can communicate with each other depends not only on their understanding of the language itself, but also on their understanding of the cultural implication carried by the language (孙致礼, 1999). Therefore, the handling of culture-loaded words which can also be named Culture-specific items is crucial. In the field of culture-loaded words, many translation scholars have studied the translation of culture-loaded words from different perspectives. We also should be clear that culture-loaded words do not just exist as an ambiguous concept. They have been defined by scholars. Liao (廖七一, 2000) defined culture-loaded words, and he mentioned that culture-loaded terms refer to the words, phrases and idioms that mark unique things in a certain culture. These words reflect the unique ways of activities that a certain nation or country has accumulated over the long history that are different from other nations. Research (包惠南、包昂, 2004) also argued that culture-loaded words also mean a kind of lexical gaps, that is, the cultural information carried by the original words does not correspond to the characteristics in the target language, reflecting the distinctive target language and culture.

According to Professor Wang (王德春, 1990), the classification of culture-loaded words in China can be divided into two categories. One is to reflect the things and concepts unique to China. The other category is words with special national cultural meanings. Some of the contents overlap and can be subdivided into seven categories: 1. Words reflecting the unique things in China that have no corresponding words in foreign languages; 2. Words with special national culture; 3. Words with a special historical and cultural background; 4. National slang; 5. Habitual greetings; 6. Names with rhetorical significance; 7. Concurrently, it has the meanings of the two countries and customs.

Outside China, Nida (Nida, 1945) wrote, “words are fundamentally symbols for features of the culture. Accordingly, the cultural situation in both languages must be known for translating. Newmark (Newmark, 1988) argued that foreign cultural words make it complicated to translate, since “they are intrinsically and uniquely bound to the culture concerned and, therefore, are related to the context of a cultural tradition”. The culture-loaded words, which are called by Aixela as cul-
ture-specific words, are difficult to deal with because they “do not have equivalent items in the target reader’s culture system. Thus leading to a translation difficulty while transferring the function and the meaning of the source text to the target text” (Aixela, 1996). Mona Baker (Baker, 2000) also mentions in her book that some of the source language words are unfamiliar to the target language readers, such as religious belief, a social custom, or even a type of food. They are sometimes too abstract or too concrete.

So, the classification made by Nida (Nida, 1945) was thought to be the earlier work on culture classification. He had classified culture into 5 types, “Translation-problems, which are essentially problems of equivalence, may be conveniently treated under (1) ecology, (2) material culture, (3) social culture, (4) religious culture, and (5) linguistic culture”. Adapting Nida, Newmark (Newmark, 1988) categorized them into 5 types: ecology, material culture (artifacts), social culture - work and leisure, organizations, customs, activities, procedures, concepts and gestures and habits. Aixela “distinguished two basic categories from the point of view of translators: proper nouns and common expressions”. And the proper nouns be subdivided into conventional nouns and loaded nouns.

Most of the researches and studies on translating strategies of culture-loaded words focused on text level, there has been little work that specifically targets the nature of the intersemiotic semantic complementarity between the visual and verbal modes, while, however, this thesis focuses on multimodal intersemiotic complementarity.

2. Chapter 2 Previous Studies on Multimodal Discourse Analysis

In the 1950s, discourse analysis emerged and has been studied with wide attention. However, the information technology develops so fast that the new media must be utilized to meet the requirement of analysis. Information tends to be carried in multimodal materials such as image, sound, color and action and the discourse theory happens to be applied to multimodality. In this part, previous studies on multimodal discourse analysis will be reviewed.

(1) Definitions of Modality and Multimodality

First, we need to have a clear understanding of modality before realizing multimodality. Kress (G. Kress, 2010), from the social semiotic perspective, defined “modality” as “the meaning-making semiotic resources shaped in the social culture”. Modalities like image, gesture and music all can complete meaning construction as verbal language does, in aspects of expression plane, the lexical-grammar

In China, Zhu Yongsheng(朱永生, 2007) defined modality as communication channels and media, including semiotic systems like language, technology, image, color and music. He, according to human beings’ five sensory channels: visual channel, auditive channel, tactual channel, olfactory channel and gustatory channel, classified five types of modalities. They are visual modality, auditory modality, tactual modality, olfactory modality and gustatory modality correspondingly.

Then what’s for multimodality? With the rapid development of science and technology, especially, multimedia and digital technology, recent years have witnessed a shift of researches shifting from the static discourse, for example, newspapers and books to dynamic multimodal discourse, such as film, TV shows, etc. It has made discourse analysis far from comprehensive and exhaustive(朱永生, 2007). Thus, multimodality comes into beings. The clear definition of multimodality is the foundation for studying the intersemiotic complementarity. And, started in the 90s of the last century in the west, multimodal discourse analysis can solve these challenges to a great extent. Lots of scholars have specified the term “multimodality” from different perspectives. Among them, O’Halloran (K. L. O’Halloran, 2004)points out that “terms such as ‘multimodal studies’, ‘multimodal semiotics’ and ‘multimodality’ have been taken to refer to the study of any form of communication other than the supposed dominant form, (written and spoken) language”. Van Leeuwen(Leeuwen, T.v., 1999)also specified “multimodality” as “the combination of different modes in a communicative artifact or event”. Baldry and Thibault (Thibault, 2006) defined “multimodality” the “diverse ways in which several distinct semiotic resource systems are both co-deployed and co-contextualized in the making of a text-specific meaning”.

(2) Previous Studies on Multimodal Discourse Analysis Home and Abroad

Van Leeuwen and Jewitt’s book (Leeuwen, T.v.&Jewitt, 2001) analyzed first “Multimodal Discourse Analysis”(MDA) as a part of their book. It branches out from discourse analysis. Subsequently, there held an International Multimodal Discourse Conference in 2002, in Salzburg, Austria. Then Perspectives on Multimodality got published after the fruit of the conference. Since then, the conference is held every three years. Later, a body of scholars, through the analysis of various materials, have explored the analytical framework, research methods, and application of the theory of multimodal discourse analysis. Social Semiotics, Semiotica, Visual Communication, Discourse and Society and Discourse Studies are the main academic journals in this field (覃冰玲, 2016). It developed well and the three major schools of multimodal discourse are: Social Semiotics, Cognitive Linguistics

The earliest school is social semiotic. It is also the most mainstream linguistics school. In 1996, Kress and van Leeuwen (Gunther Kress & Leeuwen, 2006) proposed a theoretical framework for image research, which is visual grammar, and analyzed the communicative meaning of the visual image and proposed the representational, interactive and compositional functions of image. Their works are based on Halliday’s metafunction theory (M. A. K. Halliday, 1978). It is the research from the perspective of systemic functional linguistics.


The second school is cognitive linguistics. The multimodal metaphor theory is derived from cognitive linguistics. It has become a significant development of MDA in recent years. The perspective of cognitive linguistics pays more attention to the characteristics of metaphor, metonymy and its dynamic construction mechanism. Its goal is to enrich and perfect the conceptual metaphor theory developed based on language research into multimodal metaphor theory. The pictorial metaphor theory is first introduced to MDA by El Refaie (El Refaie, 2003) from the field of media arts. In China, the cognitive linguistic school also follows the direction of foreign researches. And they also take advertisements and films as examples to analyze it from the perspective of metaphor.

The third school which we just give a brief description is interactional sociolinguistics. They see language as social behavior and also, the interactive process as a co-participating process. Norris is the Experts with more research results and Gu Yueguo is the famous one in China.
Let’s see it in an overall view. Based on the papers on multimodal discourse analysis published in foreign languages CSSCI journals in China, Cheng Ruilan and Zhanf Delu (程瑞兰 & 张德禄, 2017) discussed the research status of multimodal discourse in China from the aspects of the number and distribution of research results, development trend, research methods, research content, theoretical basis and so on. From their point of view, the theory of multimodal discourse analysis has gone unnoticed in China during 1996-2002 and has been studied sporadically during 2003-2008. It enjoyed a rapid development during 2009-2013, and suffered a short-term decline during 2014-2015. See Figure below (Cheng Ruilan and Zhanf Delu):

![Figure3: The distribution of research types of journal achievements](image)

Shi Xingsong and Xu Wenjuan (史兴松 & 徐文娟, 2020) reviewed online multimodal studies which included 158 papers in Social Sciences Citation Index from 2004 to 2018. The literature review was conducted from three dimensions: the overall research trend, the research theme and the methodological issues. We can see the number of them as below in Figure (Shi Xingsong and Xu Wenjuan):
The number of published articles rose from below 8 before 2012 to more than 25 after 2016.

We also can see the main authors in this field as below (cited).

Figure: The main author of online multimodal discourse research in SSCI journals in the past 15 years
3. Chapter 3 Theoretical Framework

(1) Systemic Functional Linguistic

The theoretical foundation of this thesis is derived from the Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL). It views of language as “social semiotic” (M. A. K. Halliday, 1978).

Halliday makes four central claims about language: functional, semantic, contextual and semiotic. Different from Malinowski, Bühler, Leech or Jakobson, Halliday identifies “three kinds of meaning that are embodied in human language as a whole, forming the basis of the semantic organization of all-natural languages” (M.A.K. Halliday, 1978). These are metafunctions that operate simultaneously in the semantics of every language, and are defined as: the ideational metafunction: “the representation of experience: our experience of the world that lies about us, and also inside us, the world of our imagination. It is meaning in the sense of ‘content’”. The interpersonal metafunction: “meaning as a form of action: the speaker or writer doing something to the listener or reader employing language”. The textual metafunction: “relevance to the context: both the preceding (and following) text, and context of situation” (M.A.K.Halliday & Hason, 1989).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metafunction</th>
<th>Visual Meanings</th>
<th>Intersemiotic Complementarity</th>
<th>Verbal Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideational</td>
<td>Variations occur according to the coding orientation. In the Naturalistic coding we can look at: Identification: who or what Activity: what action. Circumstances: where, who with, by what means Attributes: the qualities and characteristics</td>
<td>Various lexicosemantic ways of relating the experiential and logical content or subject matter represented or projected in both visual and verbal modes through the intersemiotic sense relations of: Repetition: identical experiential meaning. Synonymy: the same or similar experiential meaning. Antonymy: opposite experiential meaning. Meronymy: the relation between the part and the whole</td>
<td>Lexical elements which relate to the visual meanings. These lexical items arise according to Identification (participants): who or what is involved in any activity”? Activity (processes): what action is taking place, events, states, types of behavior? Circumstances:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Interpersonal | Variations occur according to the Coding Orientation. In the naturalistic Coding—it is a continua of the use of:  
*Address*
*Involvement&Power*
*Social Distance*
*Modality Markers* | Various ways of intersemiotically relating the reader/viewer and the text through MOOD (Address via offers, commands, statements, questions) and MODALITY (Attitude something as real or unreal, true or false, possible or impossible, necessary or unnecessary, and other attitudinal positions) through the intersemiotic relations of Reinforcement of address: an identical form of address.  
Attitudinal congruence: a similar kind of attitude.  
Attitudinal dissonance: an opposite orironic altitude. | Elements of the clause as an exchange that relates to visual meanings. These arise according to:  
*The MOOD elements in the clause realizing speech function.*  
*The MODALITY features* of the clause which express attitudes.  
Modalization views on the possibility, probability, and certainty of the proposition, as well the use Comment Adjuncts. Also the use of altitudinal Epithets in the form of subjective adjectives. |
Halliday argued there are many sense relations: Synonymy which means they are the same thing, Antonymy which means the opposite of the item, and Hyponymy that holds between a general class and its sub-classes. Meronymy which refers to a part-whole relation is also like a sense relation. There is another lexical patterning that contributes to texture named Repetition which repeats experiential meaning. There is also the general category Collocation. “Any two lexical items having similar patterns of collocation -that is, tending to appear in similar contexts - will generate a cohesive force if they occur in adjacent sentences (M.A.K.Halliday & Hason, 1976)“. “Whenever two lexical expressions stand in any of these relations, a cohesive tie is established”(M.A.K.Halliday & Hason, 1989).

So, to analyze the cohesion in multimodal material, sense relation and the ideational metafunction will be utilized. They are represented by a capital word: Repetition (R); Synonymy (S); Antonymy (A); Hyponymy (H); and Meronymy (M); Collocation (C).

(2) Visual Grammar

Visual Grammar is floated to concentrate on ‘grammar’ and syntax, and on how elements are combined into meaningful wholes. Like grammars of language, “visual ‘grammar’ is used to describe how depicted elements - people, places and things - combine in visual ‘statements’ of greater or lesser complexity and extension”(Gunther Kress & Leeuwen, 2006). It draw part of inspiration from the work of Michael Halliday who “saw grammatical forms as resources for encoding interpretations of experience and forms of social (inter)action”(Gunther Kress & Leeuwen, 2006).

Visual structures of representation can be divided into conceptual patterns whose represent participants are done in terms of their class, structure or meaning, and narrative patterns that serve to present unfolding actions and events, processes
of change, transitory spatial arrangements. The former is more or less stable and timeless essence (Gunther Kress & Leeuwen, 2006).

a. Narrative processes

Narrative processes is that participants are connected by vectors. They are represented as doing something to each other. Different kinds of narrative processes can be distinguished based on the kinds of vector and the number and kind of participants involved. It is divided into three kinds of processes: non-transactional process, transactional process.

Action processes can be divided into the non-transactional process and the transactional process. There is only one participant, the actor. It emanates vector or itself forms the vector. The action with an actor in a non-transactional process has no ‘Goal’, so we call it a non-transactional action process. Sometimes, there is only a vector and a Goal. Representations of actions that include only the goal we will call Events. When a narrative visual proposition has two participants, one is the Actor, the other the Goal. Some transactional structures are bidirectional.

In Reactional processes, the vector is formed by an eye line, thus the process is reactional. We call the actors reactor and the goals phenomena. The reactor must be a creature with visible eyes and facial expression. The phenomenon is formed by other participants or a transactional structure. Reactions can also be transactional or non-transactional. The latter case has no Phenomenon, and the previous can be manipulated into the latter one by cropping.

In Speech process and mental process, a special kind of vector in comic strips: the thought balloons and dialogue balloons that show their speech or thought.

In Conversion processes, the chain of transactional processes. This chaining results in the third kind of participant which is the goal of one participant and the actor concerning another. Geometrical symbolism is a “communication model” with only a vector. It does not include any participants.

Circumstances refer to secondary participants that are related to the main participants, but not through vectors. Locative circumstance is a setting that requires contrast between foreground and background. The tools used in action processes are often represented as Circumstances of Means and it needn’t be objects. When there is no vector to relate the two participants, we call it as a Circumstance of Accompaniment. It’s a text giving descriptive information than a story about what participants do.
Below is a figure cited from Gunther Kress & Leeuwen, which shows us the relation among them clearly.

b. Conceptual representations: designing social constructs

Conceptual representations represent participants in terms of class, or structure or meaning. It is more generalized and more or less stable and has a characteristic of timeless essence.

Classificatinal processes relate participants to each other in terms of taxonomy: covert taxonomy and overt taxonomy and do not simply reflect ‘real’ and ‘natural’ classifications. It has subordinates and superordinates. Flowcharts also belong to classificatinal processes.

Analytical processes deal with a part-whole structure. They involve two kinds of participants that one is Carrier representing the whole and the other is any number of Possessive Attributes representing the parts. Abstract art may also be analytical. Analytical processes can be subdivided into unstructured analytical processes which only shows the parts, temporal analytical processes which is the category of the timeline, exhaustive and inclusive analytical processes that the structured analytical processes can be exhaustive sometimes and inclusive sometimes, topographical and topological processes, dimensional and quantitative topography, spatio-temporal analytical structures. The figure below which is cited as above shows the relationship:
However, with the development of science and technology and communication approaches, discourse analysis cannot be limited to text analysis. Various symbols, such as pictures, music, sounds and gestures, can be used to convey information.

In next Chapter, we shall be discussing the CLW in *The Story of Minglan* -pot arrow- in perspectives of multimodality to explore the intersemiotic semantic relationships between the visual and verbal modes and to see how multimodal text visually–verbally coherent. Here we just take the ideational one into consideration.

4. Chapter 4 The Analysis of Ideational Intersemiotic Complementarity

In this chapter, we utilize the descriptive framework for the analysis of multimodal texts extracted from *The Story of Minglan* to see how both of the verbal and visual modes of communication complement each other in project meaning. Intersemiotic complementarity arises and is realized through various linguistic and visual means peculiar to the respective modes.

In the TV series, images or subtitles of “pot arrow” appeared 15 times in total. The first and second time it occurred in dialogues of two characters without companying with the image. In the third and fourth time, it occurs in longer plots with close-up scenes of the “pot arrow”. The fifth and sixth time is in the conversation. In the seventh time, the subtitle is about the rules of counting which is a part of the activity, but the CLW did not appear. At the eighth time, it again appears in the dialogue of others, and the ninth time it appears in the subtitles synchronously with the image or shot. The tenth time, the camera focuses on the pot-throwing process. The eleventh time, it appears in the dialogue of the characters again. The 12th time there shows the action of the “pot arrow”, and in the subtitles, one of the conse-
quences of the activity comes out. In the 13th time, the image and subtitle appeared successively. The scene is the “hit in both ears”, which was just one of the results of pot shooting. The 14th time, there came the image of “pole”, one of the results of the activity, and then followed by its subtitles and the score. And then on the 15th, the image of hitting in the marker occurs. In these modes, it isn’t symmetry between images and subtitles, there are delays or a subtitle matches a longer clip which is the characteristic of TV series. And there is little dialogue between characters, here, so we select the clips of the first appearance of subtitle and the first appearance of image of “pot arrow” to analyze how the meaning in different modes complement each other.

The first step of examining the ideational intersemiotic features of the shot of “pot arrow” involves deriving the Visual Message Elements(VME or VMEs) in The Story of Minglan.

When the subtitle that contained “pot arrow” first comes out, there isn’t a scene of “pot arrow”. Later, with the lens going on, there comes the scene of “pot arrow”. As the video is dynamic by rules of continuity, this thesis picks two scenes that most represent the whole process of “pot arrow “I am about to analyze.

In pictures, now we derive the VMEs out. Several represented participants in the scene are two boys and two pots. And we also can see it’s a narrative structure. “The hallmark of a narrative visual ‘proposition’ is the presence of a vector: narrative structures always have one”(Gunther Kress & Leeuwen, 2006). In pictures, the vector is the outstretched arm of the boy in blue. The boy in blue, who is surrounded by the crowd is standing there with an arrow in his hand, very calm, is a”reacter” in the reactional process of “shooting” aiming at it in the direction of the pot. The boy in white just stands in a row. Seconds later, the lens turns into a conceptual structure. There is no vector and two pots are placed side by side on the
ground with an arrow standing in one on the right. The process VME is that the boy is pushing the arrow out and the arrow flies into the pot of the right. The circumstantial VME is the crowd, most of whom is worried, watching the match. Around pots are betrothal gifts of geese and red boxes with double-happinesses sticking on them and Chinese bowknot attaching to them. The arrows are also the circumstance element.

Besides the images, there also are the sounds, Auditory Message Elements. Before the shooting, there is the voice of doubt in the crowd. After he shoots right in the pot, there come the cheers of the crowd ahead of the pots.

The derived VMEs are the starting point. Then this thesis is about to analyze the verbal aspect of the “pot arrow” for semantically related lexical items to produce a series of lexical inventories. These are presented in Tables 2.2 (i)

**TABLE 2.2 (i)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexicosemantic Intersemiotic Complementarity—”pot arrow”scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third brother, guests(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little bastard(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third brother(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The boy(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young master Ye(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lose of child(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changfeng(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second master Bai(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third master Sheng(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng’er(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixth Miss(M) Threw(S)  
Little girl(M) Compete with (S)  
Little doll(M) Beat(M)  
Win or lose(S)  
Ming’er(M) Throw(S)  
Hit in the ear(H) 4 points(C)  
Shoot in both ears(H) 6 points(C)  
Both ears marked(H) 10 points(C)  
the pole(H)

In the table, it keeps most of these typical expressions in subtitles with a few omitted during semantic repeated dialogues of the master and his guest who sends the gift and that doesn’t make any differences. The auditory is the same as the verbal thing here excepting for some sighs and applauses made by the crowd.

Intersemiotic synonymy is significant here. The subject matter of this text, subtitle, is clearly “pot arrow”, the ancient activity, so accordingly, the topic and the lexical item or its various synonyms like “shoot in the kettle”, “play arrow game” and “hit the marker” of verbal phrase, or “pot arrow”, “arrow in the kettle game” etc. as a noun phrase are mentioned consistently. They are just the same thing depicted in the shot. The text-topic is therefore carried and reinforced across the modes by the use of intersemiotic synonymy. In terms of the engagement gifts, “engagement gifts of geese”, “betrothal goose” and “goose” are the objects that they kept talking about in the clip.

There is a high frequency of intersemiotic meronymy, which is concerned with part-whole relations. In this specific situation, it is used to point to one of the participants in the clip. The “pot arrow” needed to be done by partners while there is only one person who occurs in a subtitle, but actually, there are two in the shot. We also can see from the verbs such as “lose”, “compete” or “win or lose” that people just have one consequence at a time. So “win” or “lose” is just a part of the game’s consequence.
Intersemiotic collocation is also used here in counting the scores they have got during the game. When the boy in blue shot in both ears, he got “6 points” and when the little girl got a “pole”, she got “10 points”. These are lexical items which could be reasonably expected to co-occur in a text on a game topic.

There are many secondary participants related to the two boys but not employing vectors. They are yard, a crowd, betrothal gifts and the arrow. It works to supplement the visual setting represented in the shot of pot arrow and we call it circumstance. The yard is the circumstance of setting where the “pot arrow” action takes place. It is important in terms of the visual meanings where this activity happens and what they are doing. They realize ideational intersemiotic complementarity through the verbal aspect. A crowd that is watching the match and the betrothal gifts of geese and some other red boxes with double-happinesses sticking on them and Chinese bowknot attaching to them is the circumstance VMEs. The crowd in the shot forms an intersemiotic synonymy with the verbal language of everyone and betrothal gifts through intersemiotic synonymy and repetition. The arrow is the mean and the intersemiotic repetition is utilized to realize it.

Looking at the inventories of the pot arrow, we can see that it is quite clear there is intersemiotic complementarity among the three modes. The pot arrow inventories are particularly revealing: All the elements in the ideational is related. The subject matter of this clip is clearly what is pot arrow, the CLW, which occurs in the subtitle. And the talks of and around the two boys show the game or match is happening. It’s an activity that happened in a happy time. The culture-loaded word, pot arrow, is therefore carried and presented clearly to customers across the modes by the use of mainly intersemiotic repetition, synonymy, hyponymy and meronymy. It shows that both the visual and the verbal aspects of the pot arrow multimodality complement each other in maintaining and supporting the central topic by pertinent terminology. The fact is that this CLW is about a particular activity. The pot arrow is an ancient throwing game at a banquet needed to be done by two persons. They are requested to throw arrows into the pot and the person who hits the marker more times wins, otherwise, loses. The loser drinks or loses something. Usually, there are lots of people there looking at for fun. Through the intersemiotic complementarity, a multimodal text can more intuitively present the cultural meanings embodied in culture-loaded words to readers or viewers in the form of pictures, sounds and words.
5. Conclusion

We live in a society in which multimodal discourse prevails. The transfer of meaning is the integration of many symbolic systems, including language and vision, and they are transmitted through information in a specific context. The new digital world requires more media resources, verbal and non-verbal, so multimodal discourse analysis will flourish in the future. Using traditional written texts to spread Chinese culture is no longer the only way. We can carry out cross-cultural communication and spread Chinese culture in a way that is generally accepted and favored by young people today. Visual grammar makes all this possible. First of all, visual images can present conceptual items or dynamic traditional activities with an intuitive vision, which adds interest to target language readers. Second, visual grammar avoids the need for large paragraphs of annotations in traditional texts, whether in-text or as footnotes, which will destroy the reader’s thoughts and interrupt the coherence of reading. It is hoped that multi-modal analysis can provide a reference for Chinese culture’s spread.
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