

FILM ADAPTATION OF LITERARY WORKS AS A SPECIFIC TYPE OF INTERSEMIOTIC TRANSLATION

Hanna Khutorna

Lecturer, Dnipro University of Technology;
Postgraduate Student, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Ukraine
e-mail: hannakat335@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0002-0391-8920

Summary

This paper deals with the problem of the phenomenon of intersemiotic translation in the field of film translation, which provides recoding of a work from one sign system to another. The process of intersemiotic translation has certain features and creates a special system of relations between the literary source and its film adaptation. Intersemiotic translation represents the field of new linguistic processes, as they tend to create different interpretations of signs. During the process of translating a literary work into the language of cinema, the skills and emotions of the actors play a significant role, as well as the ability of the director and screenwriter to identify the key elements of the literary piece that must be translated effectively into the language of film. Methods used in the study: a comparative method (contrast of lexical, grammatical and phonetic phenomena in English and Ukrainian), a descriptive method, and a method of observation.

Key words: intersemiotic translation, film adaptation, cinematic translation, cinematic language, verbal language, cinematic text.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5814>

1. Introduction

Today cinematography is probably the most widespread form of art, and thanks to modern technical achievements we have the opportunity to watch foreign films which were successfully translated into Ukrainian.

The term “cinematic translation” usually refers to the translation of the texts of artistic and animated films, as well as TV series. However, we are not always dealing only with the translation of the film text from one language to another. Over the last century, specific polycodal systems have emerged, which are based on a combination of texts of different semi-otic nature, and therefore, along with the phenomenon of film translation, the phenomenon of intersemiotic translation appears, i.e., the recoding of a piece of art from one sign system to another (*Jacobson, 1959: 233*). One of the results of the intersemiotic translation process is a film adaptation. R. Jakobson defines film adaptation as a type of intersemiotic interpretation (*Jacobson, 1959: 234*), while U. Eco in his works defines it as “transmutation” (*Eco, 2000: 50*). Since film adaptation, as an act of intersemiotic translation, provides broader possibilities for interpreting the original work, the relationship between the literary source and its film adaptation requires greater attention from researchers, especially considering the development of new trends in the film industry. Therefore, research in this field is currently relevant, particularly due to the insufficient number of theoretical and practical works by national researchers dedicated to this problem.

The aim of the research is to identify and analyze the peculiarities of intersemiotic translation based on an adapted literary work.

When Jakobson introduced the idea of intersemiotic translation, it opened up infinite possibilities for studying the relationships that different art forms enter into. However, it also required a change in perspectives regarding questions of fidelity to the original work and its status. By using the term “transmutation” to describe translation between different information sources, Eco highlighted five main characteristics of it:

1. Adaptation ensures the harmonious coexistence of the original and target texts in the cultural sphere, where they mutually support each other. For example, “the adaptation of a musical work for ballet involves the simultaneous presence of music (the source text) and choreographic action (the target text)” (Eco, 2000: 100).

2. Adaptation can manipulate the source. For instance, the adaptation of a musical work can radically recontextualize the source according to the author’s interpretation (Eco, 2000: 101).

3. Adaptation can sometimes show what was not directly expressed in the original text. For example, a film adaptation may add audiovisual details to better convey the design, clothing, or chromatic nuances of a character or story that were not envisioned in the literary source (Eco, 2000: 101–103).

4. Adaptation can emphasize a specific aspect of the original that the adapter wishes to highlight. For example, in the process of adaptation, a novel may be selected for its narrative level while disregarding the preservation of its stylistic aspects (Eco, 2000: 89).

5. Adaptation can be perceived as an entirely new work. For instance, viewers may not necessarily evaluate an adaptation by comparing it to the original text, but instead focus on how the adaptation translates the source using different semiotic languages (Eco, 2000: 90).

Intersemiotic translation operates on different “descriptive levels”, allowing for the selection of relevant aspects from the original work and reproducing them in the translation. Thus, the relevant properties of certain aspects are transformed into new materials and processes. For example, the linguistic aspects of a literary work (rhythmic, syntactic, or psychological) are transformed into the dynamics of movement, spatial organization, lighting design, costumes, scenography, and so on.

2. Cinematic and verbal languages

Film adaptation as a special type of intersemiotic translation involves transforming a verbal text into an audiovisual one. The Encyclopedia of Contemporary Ukraine (*Ekranizatsiia. Entsyklopediia Suchasnoi Ukrainy*) provides the following definition of film adaptation: the interpretation of literary, dramatic, and poetic works through the medium of cinema. From a semiotic perspective, such transformation necessitates the intersemiotic incorporation of codes from other sign systems, specifically the use of film language. The visual and expressive elements of film, such as framing, the spiritual content of the frame, acting, editing, musical accompaniment, etc., significantly differ from the artistic devices of verbal art.

The issue of the cinematic language was relevant even during the silent film era. In the 1910s–1920s, the notion of film language appeared as a universal phenomenon, free from any conventions and therefore superior to verbal language. In the 1960s–1970s, a new stage in the exploration of film language began, influenced by structural linguistics and semiotics. A notable contribution to the study of these problems was made by Christian Metz (1931–1994), a French expert in film theory and semiotics. Metz identifies two main differences between cinematic language and verbal language: the signs of verbal language are considered conventional signs

according to contemporary linguistics (as symbols according to Charles Peirce), while cinema operates with iconic signs (*Metz, 1974: 50*). This led to the notion that cinematic language is an autonomous system that does not yield to verbal language in terms of universality.

However, this theory was criticized. Later, a new idea of the similarity of structures between verbal language and all other sign systems, including cinematic language, emerged. The theory of triple articulation of cinematic language arose, contrasting with the double articulation of natural language. According to Umberto Eco, cinematic language appears so rich and unusual compared to verbal language that encountering it is like a two-dimensional creature encountering the third dimension. Eco suggests abandoning the illusion of interpreting film reality as primary and instead attempting to identify the conventions and rules on which film language is based. In his view, iconic signs are weak and unstable codes limited by the frames of individual perception. An iconic sign corresponds not to a single word but to an utterance in verbal language. For example, an image of a person does not simply mean “a person” but rather “an elderly European man wearing a hat”, and so on (*Eco, 2000: 45*). Any image undergoes a series of consecutive transcriptions, a complex and repeatedly mediated process that can hardly be considered an unconditional substitute for the object it represents.

Olha Lyntvar suggests the following main points regarding the comparison of the cinematic language with the natural verbal language:

- 1) the notion of the conventional nature of visual representation implies a return to the idea of structural similarity between film language and verbal language but at a new level;
- 2) the idea of multilevel encoding of iconic signs suggests that the cinematic language is not simpler or more universal than the verbal language; rather, it is characterized by a higher degree of conventionality;
- 3) not every communicative act is based on a language similar to verbal language, such as images.

Cinematic language fundamentally differs from the language of literature. From a semi-otic perspective, signs of natural language are conventional signs, while signs of film language are iconic signs. Even every natural object within a frame carries a specific meaning that is inseparably linked to the main idea the director seeks to convey to the audience through various filmic techniques.

3. Typology of film adaptations

The reinterpretation of a literary work for film adaptation inevitably gives birth to a new work of art that begins its own life in the cultural environment for which it is intended. The accessibility of broader possibilities for interpreting the original work during the creation of a film adaptation is, on the one hand, due to the necessity of adding a visual component to the story composed of the thoughts and experiences of the characters. However, filmmakers use the novel as a basis for their own work, sometimes manipulating the chronology of events presented in the novel, adding new events, and paying special attention to the musical accompaniment in order to tell a slightly different story. This approach can be influenced by the specifics of communication and the means of conveying meaning in literature and cinema, as well as differences in the target audience of the author and the filmmakers.

If a certain degree of linguistic equivalence is a necessary prerequisite for quality translation, adaptation is more focused on socio-cultural context and creativity. “The process of adaptation is now seen as a creative practice that depends on the socio-political context that influences adaptation, and the film industry, which is the driving force behind it” (*Perdikaki, 2016: 171*).

Thus, translation ceases to be seen as a one-sided process dominated by the original. A film based on a book is a unique work of art that involves “multilevel dialogues” (Naremore, 2000: 67).

However, of course, such a complex process is regulated by certain laws and principles that govern the adaptation of a literary work.

Questions about the principles of adaptation have been asked since ancient times. At the beginning of the century, the tasks of “cinematic illustration” and “cinematic staging” were divided. For the former, it is important to depict the literary work on the screen without transforming it into another form, without changing the composition, system, and characteristics of the characters, or the content of individual parts. Cinematic staging is the transformation of literary material into a new form of organic film dramaturgy, closely related to its literary original, which is reproduced using cinematic expressive means. Recently, the term “adaptation-interpretation” has been used to denote the essence of the concept of “cinematic staging”.

Estonian researcher P. Torop (Torop, 2013) identified the following types of adaptations based on their relationship with the literary source:

1. Macro-stylistic adaptation, which has dominance in the text or its formal features. The authors of such films do not strive for literal conformity to the literary text, while preserving the framework of the text, its main characters, the relationship between plot and storyline, and the narrator (even in cases when it changes). Significant importance is given to the stylization of the chronotope.

2. Literal adaptation, based on information and content. In such films, an attempt is made to present the content in as much detail as possible and even provide commentary if necessary. For this purpose, the technique of a voice-over narrator is often used; filmmakers strive for accuracy in costumes, furniture, tableware, etc.

3. Micro-stylistic adaptation primarily focuses on a specific character. It involves a psychological deepening of the character and allows for deviations from the plot and chronotope. An example of this is Akira Kurosawa’s film “Throne of Blood” (1957), based on William Shakespeare’s “Macbeth”. The events of this film adaptation of the play are transposed to 16th-century Japan.

4. Quotation adaptation, where the dominant element is the motif. Such films are close to the first type, but their connection to the original is weaker. At the level of motifs, adaptation can encompass not only a specific text but several works by one author, united by a leitmotif of creativity.

5. Thematic adaptation primarily preserves the theme of the literary work, which can be either archaic or modernized. An example is the film “Stolen Happiness” (directed by A. Donchyk, 2004) – a modern version of Ivan Franko’s famous play. The action is moved to the beginning of the 21st century, the classical foundation is filled with contemporary realities, and the tragedy is transformed into a melodrama. The soundtrack for the film was created by the leader of the legendary Ukrainian band “Okean Elzy”, S. Vakarchuk.

6. Descriptive adaptation starts with a conflict and seeks to enhance and generalize this conflict through all available means as a descriptive film. This is achieved through the use of an “associative chronotope”.

7. Expressive adaptation, where the dominant element is the genre. Depending on the genre, the text can be freely adapted, modernized, or an attempt is made to create a film that transcends time. Therefore, the degree of proximity to the text varies. For example, George Bernard Shaw’s “Pygmalion” was successfully adapted as the musical film “My Fair Lady” (1964).

8. Free adaptation reflects a distinctly individual version of the text. In such films, the style of the translator takes precedence over the style of the original author.

The study of the typology of adaptations provides grounds to argue that for the analysis of a literary text through the prism of cinematography, it is advisable to turn primarily to macro-stylistic and accurate adaptations.

However, “optimal” adaptation is mostly considered when the aim of filmmakers is to create an artistic analogy of the adapted work, translating it into the language of cinema while preserving the main features of the content and style of the source material. In this process, it is natural to abandon literal translation, shorten accompanying plotlines, focus more on the action or spiritual sense of the depiction. A prime example of such a non-literal approximation to the artistic depths of the adapted work can be found in the globally renowned film “Shadows of Our Ancestors” by S. Paradjanov.

4. Main peculiarities of a film adaptation

On one hand, as a form of visual art, film is more explicit, but on the other hand, directors encourage their viewers to actively participate in the process of interpretation. Films combine language, visual imagery, and music. However, it is primarily the actors and their performances that determine whether the film resonates with the emotions of the audience. While books create a conducive environment for describing a character’s emotions and beliefs, on screen, the talent of the actor is crucial. An excellent example of this can be seen in the adaptation of Ian McEwan’s novel “Atonement” (*Atonement*, 2007), directed by Joe Wright. It is a war romantic drama co-produced by the United Kingdom and France, starring Keira Knightley and James McAvoy. Since the novel is a kind of symphony that combines love and war, guilt and forgiveness, rich style, and provocation, the director faced quite challenging tasks. However, the film was highly successful, receiving 17 awards and 63 nominations, partly due to the successful adaptation of the literary text to the requirements of cinematography and the film as a whole, as well as the professional cast. But can it be claimed that such success is limited solely to a successful process of intersemiotic translation, resulting in the transmutation of the codes of the literary work into cinematic codes without altering the structural and meaningful elements of the original work?

Before delving into specific examples of the material under study, it is worth determining which type of adaptation (according to P. Torop’s classification) the film “Atonement” corresponds to. The original work is a metafictional novel that focuses on the process of unfolding the composition of an artistic work, periodically reminding readers that they are encountering a fictional or partially fictional story, which can be compared to a theater that does not let the audience forget that they are witnessing a performance. A prime example of a metafictional work is a novel about a novelist who writes a novel. This is one of the key elements in “Atonement”: the younger sister of the main protagonist, Briony, eventually writes the novel “Atonement”, in which she attempts to change the fate of her sister and her lover. Since the main formal characteristics and frameworks of the text are preserved in the adaptation, it is appropriate to classify the film adaptation of the novel “Atonement” as a macro-stylistic adaptation that has a dominant element in the text or its formal features, while the authors of such films do not strive for literal conformity to the literary text but maintain the boundaries of the text and pay attention to the chronotope.

When examining the immediate result of the transition of a work from one sign system (literature) to another (cinema), several main tendencies can be observed:

1. The language of cinema allows for unambiguous representation of certain emotions and feelings that may have been concealed or whose interpretation during the reading of the literary work can significantly depend on the interpreter's personality.

2. At the same time, regarding elements that are not related to emotions and feelings, the adaptation can create new semantic codes or even diminish the significance of certain elements that appear on screen, allowing the viewer to draw their own conclusions about the value and importance of those things.

3. Since the verbal capabilities of film language are narrower than the language of literature, there is inevitably significant text reduction, which can lead to the simplification of certain meanings that the author of the original work embedded in a particular everyday object. However, compensation is possible, allowing the portrayal of the significance of that object, albeit a bit later or in a different shot.

These tendencies can be illustrated with examples from a scene that is crucial in the entire work and, therefore, was preserved during the film adaptation without significant changes or distortions. The mentioned episode depicts the confrontation between the two main characters, Cecilia and Robbie, and their actions that will, in a certain way, lead to significant shifts in their relationship.

The first inevitable consequence of the film adaptation process is the absence of a description of the overall mood that exists between the two main characters, whereas in the literary version of this story, there are quite detailed descriptions of the characters' moods (with particular emphasis on the female character):

Awkwardly, for she still had her cigarette, she picked up the vase and balanced it on the rim of the basin. It would have made better sense to take the flowers out first, but she was too irritable. Her hands were hot and dry and she had to grip the porcelain all the tighter. Robbie was silent, but she could tell from his expression – a forced, stretched smile that did not part his lips – that he regretted what he had said. That was no comfort either. This was what happened when they talked these days; one or the other was always in the wrong, trying to call back the last remark. There was no ease, no stability in the course of their conversations, no chance to relax. Instead, it was spikes, traps, and awkward turns that caused her to dislike herself almost as much as she disliked him, though she did not doubt that he was mostly to blame. She hadn't changed, but there was no question that he had. He was putting distance between himself and the family that had been completely open to him and given him everything. For this reason alone – expectation of his refusal, and her own displeasure in advance – she had not invited him to dinner that night. If he wanted distance, then let him have it (McEwan, 2001: 22).

Незграбно, бо все ще з цигаркою в руці, вона підняла вазу й поставила, притримуючи, на край кам'яної чаші. Розумніше було б витягти спершу квіти, але вона була надто роздратована. Руки мала гарячі й сухі, тож повинна була ще міцніше тримати порцеляну. Робі мовчав, але з виразу його обличчя – силувана, нещира усмішка, стиснені губи – було ясно, що він уже жалкує, що таке сказав. Легше від цього все одно не стало. Саме так тепер найчастіше й бувало, коли вони розмовляли; хтось завжди почувався винуватим, прагнучи взяти назад останні слова. В їхніх розмовах не було легкості, стабільності, неможливо було розслабитися. Зате були шпильки, пастки, незграбні виверти, які примушували її ненавидіти себе майже так само, як і його, хоча вона не сумнівалася, що вина найчастіше лежить саме на ньому. Вона не змінилася, змінився він – тут навіть нема про що говорити. Він встановлював дистанцію між собою і тією родиною, яка завжди була відкрита для нього й давала йому все. І тільки з цієї причини – передчуваючи його відмову і своє незадоволення – вона не запросила його на обід сьогодні ввечері. Хоча дистанцію – нехай йому буде (McEwan, 2008: 25).

As we can see, the author provides an extensive description of the atmosphere of emotional tension that existed between the characters at that moment; in the film adaptation, this description is compensated for by the protagonist's glances, nervous gestures, and a sharp tone

of voice in her conversation with family members when she says that she didn't invite him for dinner. The absence and almost impossibility of translating such a description into a frame certainly deprives the viewer of a complete picture of the relationship between the main characters. However, the language of cinema allows for the visualization of emotions and feelings, which, in turn, enables an adequate interpretation of the meanings embedded by the original author.

The next example (Table 1) of the episode is compositionally a unique development of the plot and is directly related to the characters and feelings of the main protagonists. It is precisely through this example, primarily through the linguistic material, that one can see that the possibilities of the language of cinema are more limited compared to the possibilities of literary language.

Table 1

	Source text (in English)	Translated text (in Ukrainian)
Literary work	<p>Her idea was to lean over the parapet and hold the flowers in the vase while she lowered it on its side into the water, but it was at this point that Robbie, wanting to make amends, tried to be helpful. "Let me take that," he said, stretching out a hand. "I'll fill it for you, and you take the flowers." "I can manage, thanks." She was already holding the vase over the basin. But he said, "Look, I've got it." And he had, tightly between forefinger and thumb. "Your cigarette will get wet. Take the flowers." This was a command on which he tried to confer urgent masculine authority. The effect on Cecilia was to cause her to tighten her grip. She had no time, and certainly no inclination, to explain that plunging vase and flowers into the water would help with the natural look she wanted in the arrangement. She tightened her hold and twisted her body away from him. He was not so easily shaken off. With a sound like a dry twig snapping, a section of the lip of the vase came away in his hand, and split into two triangular pieces which dropped into the water and tumbled to the bottom in a synchronous, seesawing motion, and lay there, several inches apart, writhing in the broken light.</p>	<p>Вона хотіла перехилитися через парапет і, не виймаючи квітів із вази, занурити її боком у воду, але саме в цей момент Робі, прагнучи загладити свою вину, вирішив допомогти. – Давай мені вазу, – сказав він, простягнувши руку. – Я наберу води, а ти потримай квіти. – Дякую, я сама, – вона вже тримала вазу над фонтанною чашею. Але він наполягав. – Та подивись, я вже тримаю її. – Він і справді міцно схопив її великим і вказівним пальцями. – Твоя цигарка намокне. Витягни квіти. А це вже була команда, якою він намагався утвердити неодмінну чоловічу владу. Сесилію це лише примусило сильніше схопитися за вазу. У неї не було ні часу, ні, безумовно, бажання пояснювати, що занурення вази у воду разом із квітами допоможе надати букетові того природного вигляду, якого вона прагнула. Вона міцно стиснула вазу й крутнулася всім тілом убік від нього. Проте його не так легко було спекатися. З таким звуком, наче хруснула суха гілка, шматочок шийки відломився від вази й розпався у нього в руці на два трикутнички, які впали у воду й, синхронно погойдуючись, пішли на дно і тепер лежали там у кількох сантиметрах один від одного, здригаючись у переломленому світлі.</p>
Film adaptation	<p>– Let me help with that. – No. I'm all right, thanks. – You take the flowers. – I'm all right!</p>	<p>– Дай допоможу. – Я сама. – Тримай квіти. – Я впораюся!</p>

As we can see, the language of cinema primarily appeals to the language of the characters' body, their gazes, gestures, and so on. In this case, the film characters acted in accordance with their literary prototypes, and the outstanding performances of the actors and the ambiguity of their actions left no room for interpretation other than the one embedded in the original work.

However, when it comes to the feelings and emotions of the characters, there may be doubts about different interpretations of the meaning of a certain object in the literary text compared to its portrayal on screen. For example, the antique vase accidentally broken by Cecilia and Robbie, according to the original work, is an extremely valuable item not only in terms of its material worth but also as a cultural artifact, as a remnant that has survived and "experienced" a lot. The father didn't want the vase to be "hidden behind glass," he wanted the family to use it, expressing a desire to "give life" to this ancient object:

Sometime in her teens a friend of Cecilia's father who worked in the Victoria and Albert Museum had come to examine the vase and declared it sound. It was genuine Meissen porcelain, the work of the great artist Höroldt, who painted it in 1726. It had most certainly once been the property of King August. Even though it was reckoned to be worth more than the other pieces in the Tallis home, which were mostly junk collected by Cecilia's grandfather, Jack Tallis wanted the vase in use, in honor of his brother's memory. It was not to be imprisoned behind a glass case. If it had survived the war, the reasoning went, then it could survive the Tallises. His wife did not disagree (McEwan, 2001: 19).

Колись давно – вона ще була підлітком – батьків приятель, який працював у Музеї Вікторії й Альберта, приїздив оглянути вазу й заявив, що вона автентична. Це була справжня майсенська порцеляна роботи видатного художника Герольдта, який розписав її в 1726 році. Ваза майже напевно належала колись королю Августу. І хоча вважалося, що вона значно цінніша, ніж інші речі в домі Толлісів – переважно мотлох, зібраний дідом Сесилії, – проте Джек Толліс хотів, щоб на згадку про його брата вазою користувалися, його дружина не заперечувала. Її не слід ховати під склом. Аргументи зводилися до того, що якщо вона пережила війну, то переживе й Толлісів (McEwan, 2008: 22).

So, the vase holds a certain value that cannot be measured solely in material terms. In a sense, the breaking of this vase signifies something inevitable, tragic, particularly for the people who actually broke it. Such a sign can also be interpreted in the film, but the value of the vase is limited only to its material aspect (without providing evidence for it) due to the absence of information about the history of this artifact. In contrast, in the novel's text, the author once again emphasized the significance of the vase through Cecilia's thoughts that flashed when the fragments fell into the fountain (Table 2).

However, Cecilia's line, "You realize this is probably the most valuable thing we own," suggests that the vase is simply expensive. In other words, all the memories, emotions, associated with this vase, as well as its material value, are condensed into a single line.

This example also illustrates the extent to which the language of cinema differs from literary language. At the same time, we have the opportunity to see how the language of cinema uses emotional and expressive means. In the novel's text, we read:

For a moment he thought she was about to step backward onto the vase, and he raised his hand and pointed, though he said nothing. – Йому раптом здалося, що вона збирається ступити назад, просто на вазу, і він показав на неї рукою, але нічого не сказав. On the screen, we see that Robbie didn't just raise his hand silently; he shouted, "Careful!" with fear that the girl might step on a piece of the vase. Cecilia stiffened and froze in place for a few seconds, while the shards lay directly near her bare feet. This interpretation can prompt the viewer to contemplate the imminent danger, which is reasonably motivated considering the story's plot.

Table 2

	Source text (in English)	Translated text (in Ukrainian)
Literary work	<p>Cecilia and Robbie froze in the attitude of their struggle. Their eyes met, and what she saw in the bilious mélange of green and orange was not shock, or guilt, but a form of challenge, or even triumph. She had the presence of mind to set the ruined vase back down on the step before letting herself confront the significance of the accident. It was irresistible, she knew, even delicious, for the graver it was, the worse it would be for Robbie. <i>Her dead uncle, her father's dear brother, the wasteful war, the treacherous crossing of the river, the preciousness beyond money, the heroism and goodness, all the years backed up behind the history of the vase reaching back to the genius of Höroldt, and beyond him to the mastery of the arcanists who had reinvented porcelain.</i> "You idiot! Look what you've done." He looked into the water, then he looked at back at her, and simply shook his head as he raised a hand to cover his mouth. By this gesture he assumed full responsibility, but at that moment, she hated him for the inadequacy of the response. He glanced toward the basin and sighed. For a moment he thought she was about to step backward onto the vase, and he raised his hand and pointed, though he said nothing. Instead he began to unbutton his shirt. Immediately she knew what he was about. Intolerable. He had come to the house and removed his shoes and socks—well, she would show him then. She kicked off her sandals, unbuttoned her blouse and removed it, unfastened her skirt and stepped out of it and went to the basin wall. He stood with hands on his hips and stared as she climbed into the water in her underwear. Denying his help, any possibility of making amends, was his punishment. The unexpectedly freezing water that caused her to gasp was his punishment. She held her breath, and sank, leaving her hair fanned out across the surface. Drowning herself would be his punishment.</p>	<p>Сесилія і Робі застигли, наче вражені громом. Їхні очі зустрілися, і в тій осоружній мішанині зеленого й жовтого вона побачила не жах, не вину, а свого роду виклик чи навіть торжество. Їй ще вистачило глузду поставити пошкоджену вазу назад на сходинку і лише тоді осмислити всю вагомість того, що сталося. Вона знала, що не здатна опиратися цьому бажанню, навіть насолоджувалася ним, бо чим похмуріше все це виглядало, тим гірше для Робі. <i>Її мертвий дядечко, улюблений брат її батька, руйніщяка війна, небезпечний перехід через річку, дорогоцінність, яку не виміряти ніякими грішми, героїзм і великодушність, усі ті роки, які стоять за історією вази, сягаючи таланту Герольдта і ще далі – аж до секретів тих умільців, які вдруге відкрили таємницю порцеляни.</i> – Ідіот! Дивися, що ти наробив. Він глянув у воду, потім знову на неї і лиш похитав головою, прикривши долонею рота. Цим жестом він брав на себе всю відповідальність, але в ту мить вона ненавиділа його за неадекватність реакції. Він ще раз подивився на фонтан і зітхнув. Йому раптом здалося, що вона збирається ступити назад, просто на вазу, і він показав на неї рукою, але нічого не сказав. Тоді почав розстібати сорочку. Вона одразу ж здогадалася, що він хоче зробити. Це нестерпно. Він прийшов у дім і зняв черевики й шкарпетки – гаразд, вона йому тепер покаже. Вона скинула босоніжки, розстебнула блузку, зняла її, розстебнула спідницю, вискочила з неї і рушила до фонтану. Він стояв, поклавши руки на пояс, і зачудовано дивився, як вона, в самій лиш нижній білизні, влазить у воду. Відмовитись від його допомоги, від будь-якої можливості примирення – ось йому кара. Неочікувано холоднюча вода, від якої в неї перехопило дух – ось йому кара. Затримавши подих, вона пірнула, а її волосся розпливлося віялом по поверхні води. Якщо вона потоне – отоді він буде покараний.</p>

Table 2 (continuance)

Film adaptation	<p>– <i>You idiot! You realise this is probably the most valuable thing we own.</i> – <i>Not any more, it isn't.</i> – <i>Careful!</i></p>	<p>– <i>Ти – ідіот! Це – найкоштовніша річ у будинку!</i> – <i>Тепер вже ні.</i> – <i>Обережно!</i></p>
-----------------	--	---

We can observe a distinct development of meaning during the translation of such a textual element into a screen frame: *Their eyes met, and what she saw ... was not shock, or guilt, but a form of challenge, or even triumph.* – *Їхні очі зустрілися, і ... вона побачила не жах, не вину, а свого роду виклик чи навіть торжество.* On the screen, Robbie's emotions can be read not only in his gaze; he smirked, somewhat arrogantly, as if triumphing over Cecilia completely.

The ending of this episode in the novel is quite emotional, but the key point is that the characters avoid looking at each other:

When she emerged a few seconds later with a piece of pottery in each hand, he knew better than to offer to help her out of the water. The frail white nymph, from whom water cascaded far more successfully than it did from the beefy Triton, carefully placed the pieces by the vase. ... Her movements were savage, and she would not meet his eye. He did not exist, he was banished, and this was also the punishment. He stood there dumbly as she walked away from him, barefoot across the lawn, and he watched her darkened hair swing heavily across her shoulders, drenching her blouse. Then he turned and looked into the water in case there was a piece she had missed. It was difficult to see because the roiling surface had yet to recover its tranquillity, and the turbulence was driven by the lingering spirit of her fury. He put his hand flat upon the surface, as though to quell it. She, meanwhile, had disappeared into the house (McEwan, 2001: 27).

Коли вона через кілька секунд виринула з черепком у кожній руці, він збагнув, що не слід допомагати їй вибратися з води. Тендітна біла німфа, з якої вода стікала значно ефектніше, ніж із кремезного Тритона, обережно поклала черепки біля вази. ... Рухи в неї були розлючені, вона уникала його погляду. Він не існував, він був ігнорований – і це теж була кара. Він мовчки стояв і дивився, як вона йде геть від нього, босоніж по траві, і бачив, як із її потемнілого, обважнілого волосся, що ритмічно колихалося, тече на блузку вода. Потім він обернувся й заглянув у фонтан – раптом там є ще один черепок, якого вона не помітила. Проте важко було щось розгледіти, бо збурена вода ще не заспокоїлася, немов ті хвилики й досі котив незримо присутній демон її розлюченості. Робі поклав долоню на поверхню води, наче хотів утихомирити її. Сесилія тим часом вже зникла в будинку (McEwan, 2008: 29).

In the novel, there is a moment when Cecilia and Robbie lock eyes as they both reach for the vase. However, in the film adaptation, a few seconds after Cecilia emerges from the water, they both maintain eye contact, creating incredible emotional tension in the scene and demonstrating the beauty and power, as well as the doomed nature, of both characters. The appearance, emotions, and skillful acting of the actors, among other factors, contribute to the proper realization of this scene on screen.

5. Conclusions

Therefore, during the process of translating from the language of literature to the language of cinema, the skill and emotional expressiveness of the actors, as well as the abilities of the director and screenwriter to highlight key elements of the literary work that must be conveyed in the language of film, play a significant role.

Adapting a work into a film, as a form of intersemiotic translation, is a complex phenomenon, and the final product, the film, is a synthesis of the language of cinema and verbal language, creating new possibilities for interpreting the meanings embedded in the original work. Intersemiotic translation embodies the realm of new linguistic processes, as they tend to generate various interpretations of signs. Furthermore, it entails a pragmatic view of the processes that result from a direct comparison of distinct semiotic systems. Since there are currently few theoretical and practical works dedicated to this phenomenon, further research is relevant and will be conducted.

References

1. *Atonement*. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atonement_\(2007_film\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atonement_(2007_film))
2. *Atonement*. Movie. <https://ww1.123moviesfree.net/movie/atonement-5362/watching.html>
3. Eco, Umberto. (2000). *Experience in translation*. University of Toronto Press, 112 p.
4. Ekranizatsiia. Entsyklopediia Suchasnoi Ukrainy [Film adaptation. Encyclopedia of modern Ukraine] <https://esu.com.ua/> [in Ukrainian]
5. Jakobson, Roman. (1959). *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*, in Brower, *On Translation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 232–239.
6. Lyntvar, Olha (2015). *Linhvostylistychni zasoby vyrazhennia idiosyliu V. M. Tekkereiia v oryhnali i perekladi (na materialy tekstu romanu «Yarmarok suiety» ta joho ekranizatsii)* [Linguistic means of expressing the idiosyle of W. M. Thackeray in the sourced and translated text (based on the text of the novel «Vanity Fair» and its film adaptation)] *Dys. kand. fil. nauk.* [in Ukrainian]
7. McEwan, Ian. (2001) *Atonement*. Jonathan Cape, 371 p.
8. McEwan, Ian. (2008). *Spokuta*. Novel. Translated from English by Viktor Dmytruk. Lviv, 344 p. [in Ukrainian]
9. *Metafiction*. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Literature*. <https://oxfordre.com/literature>
10. Metz, C. (1974). *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. New York, Oxford university Press, 268 p.
11. Naremore. (2000). *Film Adaptation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press.
12. Perdikaki, K. (2016). *Towards a model for the study of film adaptation as intersemiotic translation*. *Intralinea*. https://www.academia.edu/35334562/Towards_a_model_for_the_study_of_film_adaptation_as_intersemiotic_translation
13. *Spokuta*. Film. <https://uakino.club/filmy/militaries/611-spokuta.html> [in Ukrainian]
14. Torop, P. (2013). *The Ideological aspect of intersemiotic translation and montage*. *Sign System. Studies*. 41(2/3). 241–265. <https://doi.org/10.12697/SSS.2013.41.2-3.07>