

## On the Analogies between Translation and Film Adaptations of Literary Classics

The term “intersemiotic translation”, introduced to translation studies by Roman Jakobson (2000: 114) to form a famous triad along with interlingual and intralingual translation, is nowadays quite widely applied to screen/multimedia/audiovisual translation, which in fact should rather be considered as interlingual translation performed in the context of polysemiotic (or multimodal) texts, i.e. texts combining the use of the linguistic code with the use of images and other non-verbal means of communication (Tomaszkiewicz 2006: 97–100). This paper, however, will explore another possible understanding of Jakobson’s notion of intersemiotic translation, derived directly from his definition, which reads “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of non-verbal sign systems” (2000: 114) and is exemplified by cases such as transposition “from verbal art into music, dance, **cinema**, or painting” (2000: 118, emphasis added). Thus, film adaptations of literary classics will be considered here as cases of intersemiotic translation; it will be assumed that in such adaptations we deal with a source text expressed in a code consisting in using language in a certain literary convention and a target text expressed in a polisemiotic cinematic code, in which language use is combined with narration through motion pictures and the use of non-verbal auditory channels of communication (a code including visual, verbal and aural signifiers; McFarlane 1996: 26). In polisemiotic texts, interpretation depends on complex interrelations between visual and auditory information (Tomaszkiewicz 2006: 55–63).

251

The reflection and analysis to be presented here concerns parallelisms between interlingual translation and film adaptations of classical novels viewed as intersemiotic translation. In particular, it will be argued that some phenomena witnessed in film adaptations can be described by theoretical notions worked out in the field of translation studies and

actually provide a much more conspicuous illustration of those notions than interlingual translation.

My approach to these parallelisms is generally inspired by approaches to translation studies jointly labelled as “the cultural turn” (Bassnett 2007: 13–19), which postulate considering the process of translation and its outcome in the broad socio-cultural and historical perspective with special focus on the requirements of the target polysystem that condition the acceptance of a translated text and its functioning in the target culture. One of theoretical notions highly relevant in this respect is André Lefevere’s concept of translation as rewriting and manipulation. In short, Lefevere (1992: 1–40) argues that translation always involves a degree of manipulation, that is departures from the source text induced by the aesthetic and stylistic preferences of the target culture at a given time and by the impact of the current ideology (moral values, political agenda, etc.). One of the crucial manipulation-inducing factors identified by Lefevere is “patronage”, that is the commissioners of translations and the professional system translators work within.

It should be pointed out that the term “manipulation”, despite its rather negative connotations in general usage, is meant to be a neutral descriptive label, serving to explain certain phenomena in their cultural context rather than judge them unfavourably. But it should also be noted that although all the cultural-turn approaches claim that their primary interest is the target text’s functioning in the target culture and not the judgement of its “fidelity” or “infidelity” to the source text, the very notion of manipulation is crucially linked with comparing the target text with its source and identifying “departures”, otherwise it would be impossible to interpret their reasons. This obviously indicates that a very-well entrenched prototypical idea of a translation is a text very similar to its source, even if this prototype can rarely be realised in practice (cf. Szymańska 2011: 37–39). In this respect it is interesting to note that, as McFarlane points out (1996: 7–11), similar expectations surface in approaches to film adaptations: average audiences as well as some analysts tend to consider film adaptations of literary works in terms of “fidelity”. The approach taken here is descriptive and explanatory, therefore the notion of manipulation will be applied to film adaptations without implying any evaluation, as a tool for investigating and explaining the relationship between a film and its “source” literary text.

Another notion that will be useful in the analysis is that of a “cultural capital” (Bassnett 2007: 19) of text recipients, that is a whole complex body of cultural heritage shared by members of a certain group, which is needed to interpret texts. The role of the translators’ assumptions about their

prospective audience's knowledge and culturally-determined decoding skills has long been acknowledged both in translation studies (e.g. Nida 2000: 128; Gutt 2000: 26–28) and in film studies (McFarlane 1996: 29) and will be shown to be vital in the case of film adaptations.

The third idea that will figure importantly in the following analysis is that of a translation series. The concept of translation series, developed by Edward Balcerzan (1997: 17–19) and Anna Legeżyńska (1999: 188–215), points to the fact that multiple renditions of a single literary work in a given language is a normal, expected way of literary translations functioning in the target culture. Retranslations of famous literary works reveal changes in the interpretation of a given text, the aesthetic conventions and norms of translation practice, as well as translators' and publishers' views on the readers' expectations. The notion of series also highlights that multiple translations of the same text are interrelated, as translators often react to their predecessors decisions, either contesting them, which results in polemical translations, or drawing inspiration and "borrowing" from them (see a wider discussion of this issue in Szymańska (2009).

Let us now trace those phenomena known from translation studies in film adaptations. Starting with the last issue mentioned above, my reflection was in fact primarily inspired by the existence of adaptation series, parallel to translation series. Let us note that the powerful Anglo-American film and television industry constantly produces re-adaptations of literary classics, especially of 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century English novels. Among the best examples of such inspirations are the novels by Jane Austen, all of which have been many times adapted: practically every several years the English-speaking and then international audience is presented with a new adaptation of one of them, produced either for the screen or for television. Much more conspicuously than in literary retranslations adaptation series show rapid changes in the stylistic and aesthetic conventions of the target (i.e. cinematic) code: they reflect changing styles of acting and even enouncing, changes in film-making techniques and editing conventions, in the tempo of action and dialogue, in the proportion of information conveyed by dialogue and picture, in the attention to the quality of the setting and costumes, etc.

All this is obviously connected with the rapid technological advances and the financial power of the film industry, which is parallel to Lefevere's "patronage". Film-making teams, which in the case of adaptations are parallel to translators, work within the conditions set by the producers, including the budget and the length of the film planned, which have a direct impact on how they tailor their adaptations, i.e. what sort of manipulation is applied in the intersemiotic translation process.

The influence of producers on script-writers and directors is much more overt than the impact of publishers on translators. One of the interesting sources for studying those influences, and generally the decision-making process of adaptors, is producers', directors' and scriptwriters' commentaries, which are nowadays so often included in DVD releases of films and television miniseries.

Commentaries of that sort also point to the vital and increasing role ascribed by adaptors to the viewer's "cultural capital", especially that in the case of adaptations of literary classics there is usually a considerable temporal gap between the time of the action and the contemporary film audience. Furthermore, film-makers usually assess the film audience as much more varied in terms of education and cultural background than the reading audience, which implies that in the process of adaptation certain manipulations are considered necessary to make the film understandable and enjoyable and thus achieve a commercial success. The expectations of the audience projected by the adaptors also surface in more or less overt ideological manipulations, e.g. reinterpreting or adding certain values and messages.

254 Due to all those factors, combined with the very basic fact that the polisemiomatic code of the film is different in nature from the code of the original, unlike in the case of interlingual translation, in adaptations we can expect massive and very well-motivated manipulation in Lefevre's sense. To follow the idea of tracing parallelisms with established translation-theory notions, we could say that in interlingual translation manipulation is realized through techniques such as omissions, additions, condensation, explicitation, modernising the language, etc., that is by choosing elements of the target code in such a way that the **intended** message (which does not have to overlap fully with the original message) is decodable for the recipients without unnecessary processing effort.<sup>1</sup> Adaptors in fact do what translators also do, but as they operate with a different type of code than the original and are under more overt pressures of their patronage and their prospective audience, they need to apply their "translation" techniques on a much larger scale.

The above parallelisms will be demonstrated with several examples from two television miniseries and one feature film based on Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*, focusing on how an adaptation series,

<sup>1</sup> The notion of "processing effort" is drawn from Relevance Theory (Gutt 2000: 31–35). It can be assumed that the conditions of relevance, spelling out the balance between processing effort and communicative gain as basis for successful communication, are very much applicable to the analysis of communication through the polisemiomatic cinematic code.

parallel to a translation series, allows us to trace the systematic nature of certain manipulations, their similarity to translation techniques and their conditioning. The basic data about the adaptations considered are given below:

Adaptation 1

BBC 1981, 7 episodes, total time: 174 minutes

Dramatised by Alexander Baron, directed by Rodney Bennet

Starring: Irene Richard (Elinor Dashwood), Tracey Childs (Marianne Dashwood), Robert Swann (Colonel Brandon), Bosco Hogan (Edward Ferrars), Peter Woodward (John Willoughby)

Adaptation 2

Columbia Pictures 1995, total time: 136 minutes

Screenplay by Emma Thompson, directed by Ang Lee

Starring: Emma Thompson (Elinor Dashwood), Kate Winslet (Marianne Dashwood), Alan Rickman (Colonel Brandon), Hugh Grant (Edward Ferrars), Greg Wise (John Willoughby)

Oscar for the best adapted screenplay

Adaptation 3

BBC/WGHB Boston 2008, 3 episodes, total time: 180 minutes

Screenplay by Andrew Davies, directed by John Alexander

Starring: Hattie Morahan (Elinor Dashwood), Charity Wakefield (Marianne Dashwood), David Morrissey (Colonel Brandon), Dan Stevens (Edward Ferrars), Dominic Cooper (John Willoughby)

The first aspect of adaptation worth a comment in this respect is how dialogues progressively “shrink” and the text transferred from the book is condensed and modernized. To demonstrate this fully it would be necessary to quote large portions of dialogue, but let us just look at a short example of a scene that is derived directly from the book and is present in all the three adaptations. It is a highly dramatic and emotional scene when Marianne receives a letter from Willoughby, trying to terminate their acquaintance. In the book the letter is long and elaborate, its coldly formal style cruelly contrasting with the couple’s previous closeness:

MY DEAR MADAM,

I have just had the honour of receiving your letter, for which I beg to return my sincere acknowledgments. I am much concerned to find there was anything in my behaviour last night that did not meet your approbation; and though I am quite at a loss to discover in what point I could be so unfortunate as to offend you, I entreat your forgiveness of what I can assure you to have been perfectly unintentional. I shall never reflect on my former acquaintance with your family in Devonshire without the most grateful pleasure, and flatter myself it will not be broken by any mistake or misapprehension of my actions. My esteem for your whole family is very sincere; but if I have been so unfortunate as to give rise to a belief of more than I felt, or meant to

express, I shall reproach myself for not having been more guarded in my professions of that esteem. That I should ever have meant more you will allow to be impossible, when you understand that my affections have been long engaged elsewhere, and it will not be many weeks, I believe, before this engagement is fulfilled. It is with great regret that I obey your commands in returning the letters with which I have been honoured from you, and the lock of hair, which you so obligingly bestowed on me.

I am, dear Madam,

Your most obedient humble servant,

JOHN WILLOUGHBY (Austen 2000 [1811]: 120)

The letter is followed with a long fragment of narration, and then a crucial dialogue between the sisters, which highlights the difference in their character.

Elinor could no longer witness this torrent of unresisted grief in silence.

"Exert yourself, dear Marianne", she cried, "if you would not kill yourself and all who love you. Think of your mother; think of her misery while you suffer: for her sake you must exert yourself".

"I cannot, I cannot", cried Marianne; "leave me, leave me, if I distress you; leave me, hate me, forget me! but do not torture me so. Oh! how easy for those, who have no sorrow of their own to talk of exertion! Happy, happy Elinor, you cannot have an idea of what I suffer".

"Do you call me happy, Marianne? Ah! if you knew! And can you believe me to be so, while I see you so wretched!"

"Forgive me, forgive me", throwing her arms round her sister's neck; "I know you feel for me; I know what a heart you have; but yet you are – you must be happy; Edward loves you – what, oh what, can do away such happiness as that?"

"Many, many circumstances", said Elinor, solemnly.

"No, no, no", cried Marianne wildly, "he loves you, and only you. You can have no grief".

"I can have no pleasure while I see you in this state".

"And you will never see me otherwise. Mine is a misery which nothing can do away".

"You must not talk so, Marianne. Have you no comforts? no friends? Is your loss such as leaves no opening for consolation? Much as you suffer now, think of what you would have suffered if the discovery of his character had been delayed to a later period; – if your engagement had been carried on for months and months, as it might have been, before he chose to put an end to it. Every additional day of unhappy confidence, on your side, would have made the blow more dreadful".

"Engagement!" cried Marianne, "there has been no engagement".

"No engagement!"

"No, he is not so unworthy as you believe him. He has broken no faith with me".

"But he told you that he loved you".

"Yes – no – never absolutely. It was every day implied, but never professedly declared. Sometimes I thought it had been – but it never was".

"Yet you wrote to him?"

"Yes: could that be wrong after all that had passed? But I cannot talk".

Elinor said no more. (Austen 2000 [1811]: 122–123)

Below are the transcripts of the corresponding scene from the three adaptations (with M and E standing for Marianne and Elinor, respectively):

1. [M sobbing]

E [reading Willoughby's letter, giving an impression she is only quoting the most shocking fragments]: *Dear Madam, I am much concerned to find there was anything in my behaviour last night that did not meet your approbation... He is at a loss to know how he could have offended you...begs forgiveness...perfectly unintentional... If my esteem for your whole family has given rise to a belief of more than I felt, I reproach myself for not having been more guarded in my conduct... That I should ever have meant more you will allow to be impossible, when you understand that my affections have been long engaged elsewhere...a pledge for life...*

[M throws her letters sent back by Willoughby into fire and cries with despair]

E: *You will recover, my love. I'd rather you did before mother saw you.*

M: *Recover!! You don't know how I suffer!! You have no idea of suffering!!*

E: *If you only knew...*

M: *You must be happy! Edward loves you! What can do away with that?!*

E: *Many things.*

M: *No! As long as he loves you can have no grief. My misery will never end.*

E: *You must muster your feelings, you must not talk so.*

M: *Leave me then, leave me if I distress you!! Hate me, forget me, but don't you tell me to muster my feelings!!*

E: *Very well.* [leaves the room]

2. M [paralyzed by shock, reading Willoughby's letter to E]:

*My dear Madam, I am quite at a loss to discover at what point I could be so unfortunate as to offend you. My esteem for your family is very sincere but if I have given rise to a belief of more than I felt or meant to express I shall reproach myself for not having been more guarded. My affections have long been engaged elsewhere and it is with great regret that I return your letters and the lock of hair which you so obligingly bestowed upon me. I am, etc. John Willoughby*

E: *Oh, Marianne... dearest... It is best to know what his intentions are at once. Think what you would have felt if your engagement had carried on for months and months before he chose to put an end to it.*

M: *We were not engaged.*

E: *But you wrote to him; I thought that he must have left you with some sort of understanding.*

M: *No. He is not so unworthy as you think him.*

E: *Not so unworthy?! Did he tell you that he loved you?!*

M: *Yes! No! Never absolutely. It was everyday implied but never declared. Sometimes I thought it'd happen but it never was! He's broken no vow.*

E: *He's broken faith with all of us! He's made us all believe he's loved you!!*

M [bursting into tears]: *He did!!! He did!!! He loved me as I loved him!!!*

3. M [very softly, crushed with pain]:

*Oh, Elinor, it's the worst... worse than I ever imagined... as if I never knew him...*

E: [reading Willoughby's letter]: *Dear Madam, I am very much concerned to find there was anything in my behaviour last night that did not meet your approbation. If I have been as unfortunate as to give rise to a belief of more than I felt, I entreat your forgiveness. My*

*affections have long been engaged elsewhere. I return your letters as you request, together with the lock of hair which you so obligingly bestowed on me. I am, Dear Madam...*

M: *I can't understand it, Elinor. We were like two halves of the same soul.*

E: *It's contemptible... Marianne, if this is what he is truly like, you are well rid of him. Just think, if your engagement had been carried on for months before he chose to put and end on it...*

M: *There was no engagement.*

E: *What?*

M: *He is not so unworthy as you believe him...*

E: *But he told you he loved you?*

M: *Yes... No... Never in so many words, but everything he said... and did... He knew I loved him and he made me think he loved me... You do believe me, Elinor?*

E: *Of course I do, I saw you together, no one could have doubted that you were in love.*

The treatment of the letter is a perfect illustration of the techniques of omission and condensation as well as the progressive simplification and modernization of the text that remains in the film. As for the dialogue, it is well visible here how only parts of the lengthy dialogues from the novel are chosen and then rewritten by film adaptors, focusing on different aspects of relations between the characters; this is of course interrelated with the style of acting chosen for the given exchange. In adaptation 1, for instance, Marianne is weeping throughout the scene, while Elinor is almost unnaturally cold and composed. The scene emphasizes the emotional difference between the sisters and Marianne's self-centeredness, unlike in adaptations 2 and 3, where Elinor is much more supportive and the focus is clearly on the emotional bond between the sisters. Interestingly, in adaptation 1 no attempt is made at this stage of the action to defend Willoughby and the fragment explaining that there was no engagement is omitted. In each case the language of the dialogue is modernized, and thus the contrast between the cold formal tone of the letter and the highly emotional dialogue is intensified.

Manipulations of that kind, regarding dialogues and scenes (e.g. the dramatic scene of Willoughby's confession to Elinor in Cleveland, when Marianne is ill, disappears from adaptation 2), are similar to local omissions and condensations that are sometimes found in interlingual translation. Adaptors, due to the nature of the cinematic code, also apply very interesting large-scale global omissions and condensations, unavailable to literary translators within the usual norms of translation practice. Examples of that are omitting certain characters or merging the functions of two characters in one. Of the three adaptations concerned it is especially the second one that applies this technique (obviously a major reason is the expected duration of a feature film). Of the important background characters it omits lady Middleton, making sir John Middleton a widower and transferring some of her functions to her mother, the



delightfully comic Mrs Jennings. Ann Steele disappears completely while Mrs Ferrars, the mother of Edward Ferrars and Fanny Dashwood, is often mentioned but never actually shown; some of their functions in the plot are transferred to, respectively, Lucy Steele and Fanny Dashwood. An interesting case is Margaret, the youngest of the Dashwood sisters, who in the novel is a curiously underdeveloped character, mentioned but not really acting. In adaptation 1 Margaret is omitted altogether. Adaptation 2, in contrast, develops Margaret into a fully-fledged personality, a particularly charming girl of exploratory nature. In her very absorbing commentary available on the DVD release of the film, the scriptwriter Emma Thompson explains that she made Margaret the “voice of the audience”, using the spontaneous and open twelve-year-old to ask questions that contemporary viewers would probably want to ask, and which the adult characters do not ask, as they know the conventions and customs of their time. The idea of developing the third sister was borrowed into the third adaptation and, some might say, pushed to extremes: here Margaret is an assertive girl anachronistically reminiscent of 21<sup>st</sup> century children, making overt and sulky remarks, probably intended to help the contemporary audience in interpreting the film (e.g. “It is not fair!”, “Girls do nothing, they only wait!”). Whenever her sisters and mother are having an important conversation, Margaret is certain to appear like the Cheshire Cat in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*: under a bed, behind a hedgerow or up on a tree, to offer her comments and news, making an impression that she is always eavesdropping. Margaret’s case is just one of the many examples of adaptation 3 borrowing ideas from adaptation 2,<sup>2</sup> which is parallel to what translation series sometimes reveal about translators’ ideas. It is also a good example of a technique parallel to addition and explicitation in translation.

Manipulating characters obviously induces a need to rewrite whole subplots and relocate information between scenes. It may also reflect ideological influences, which are so prominent in Lefevere’s idea of manipulation and rewriting. A very good example of progressive manipulation of that sort, affecting the interpretation of the whole film, is how the three adaptations deal with Colonel Brandon and his relation to Marianne. In the book Brandon is a taciturn man, reliable, honourable and helpful but rather dull. His final engagement to Marianne, a “reward” for his patience and constancy, promises her security and perhaps even

<sup>2</sup> Even though the scriptwriter Andrew Davis claimed that he had intended his adaptation to be very different and to make viewers forget the 1995 film (Thorpe 2007). The very conscious objective of proposing a new interpretation and a new aesthetics is again parallel to what often happens in translation series, resulting in polemical translations.

affection, but not passion or romance. At the end of the novel Marianne is “cured” of her excessive exaltations and contempt for conventions, and she learns to appreciate reason and balance, which in fact is a rather sad compromise for contemporary audience, which seems to appreciate Austen’s social comedy turned to romantic comedy more than her sharp and sometimes bitter social irony. Understandably then, filmmakers manipulate this subplot a lot. In the first adaptation, Brandon is plain and quiet in comparison with the very handsome, sociable and charming Willoughby, who discusses poetry and novels with Marianne as well as sings duets with her. Brandon only wins by his character when Willoughby’s dishonesty is revealed. However, Brandon is also endowed with taste for books, which at the end of the miniseries changes Marianne’s attitude and promises a lot in terms of shared literary interests. It is worth mentioning here that in adaptation 1 Marianne is fascinated with gothic novels, Cowper’s poetry and Walter Scott, while at the end Brandon starts to introduce her to Milton, Shakespeare and Edward Gibbon, so she is shown as inferior to a man in literary taste and perhaps even in intellectual capacities conditioned by women’s education and social role at the time of the action. In adaptation 2 Brandon and Willoughby are from the start created as potentially equally interesting: both are handsome, elegant and very masculine: for instance, both are shown riding but Willoughby is endowed with a white horse, which evokes an obvious romantic stereotype, very useful at the beginning of the story. Brandon shares Marianne’s passion for music and he even sends her a piano, which she does not have in the small cottage (a motif borrowed by the adaptors from Austen’s *Emma*). Willoughby, on the other hand, discusses “Shakespeare, Scott and all forms of poetry” with her, and brings her wild flowers. Adaptation 3 goes even further in promoting Brandon: Willoughby, styled after a portrait of Lord Byron, is talkative and sentimental, full of himself and constantly showing off. He brings Marianne wild strawberries and discusses Byron’s poetry and Pope’s essays with her, but on the whole he makes an impression of a shallow dandy, while Brandon is so attractive in his reserve, so manly (it is him who rides here, and it is him who has a white horse<sup>3</sup>), so interested in music and literature and in fact so romantic (at the end of the film Marianne calls him “a true romantic”) that the heroine’s initial dislike for the Colonel can only be interpreted as youthful contrariness provoked by the elders trying to suggest Brandon

<sup>3</sup> The scriptwriter Andrew Davis reveals that the symbolism of horse-riding, physical effort and exercise is used very consciously by makers of period dramas to suggest certain interpretations to modern viewers (Thorpe 2007).

as an eligible match for her, while her initial fascination with Willoughby becomes an inexplicable mistake in judgement. The ending of the third adaptation suggests, through images and music, without dialogue, that Marianne's developing relation with Brandon is not a compromise, but a modern and model partnership based on honesty and trust as well as fascination, tenderness, passion and common interests (on top of financial stability, of course). Two modern ideological trends are revealed by the adaptation series, both feminist in spirit: firstly, Marianne is increasingly independent and intellectually refined, in adaptations 2 and 3 being an equal partner for men in discussing literature or music. Secondly, the vision of marriage is evolving to match the expectations of the modern audience, modifying the interpretation of the whole story, which in adaptations 2 and 3 no longer ends with an emotional compromise for Marianne.

Finally, let us look at the very filmic type of manipulating image, induced by the need to convey in picture huge portions of information which in novels are conveyed by dialogue and narration. In *Sense and Sensibility* it is crucial to grasp the financial situation behind the story and one of the ways to achieve it instantly in films is to show the characters' houses. Therefore, Norland Park, the house the Dashwood sisters have to leave because the estate is entailed to their half-brother, grows in grandiosity: in adaptation 1 it is a large but unimpressive country manor with unpretentious interiors,<sup>4</sup> in 2 it has a more imposing and elegant exterior and very elaborate refined interiors, while in 3 it becomes a huge palace. As may be expected, Barton Cottage, where the Dashwood ladies move from Norland Park, evolves in the opposite direction: in adaptation 1 it is a very neat and comfortable stone cottage with two parlours, situated next to the road, as in the novel. In adaptation 2 it is rather small and austere, and situated further from the road, but still quite decent. The scriptwriter in her commentary points to Vermeer's paintings of women confined in austere rooms as inspiration for set design in this case. In adaptation 3 the cottage becomes a crooked farm house badly in need of new roofing, situated in the middle of a deserted wind-lashed valley close to the sea, whose sound is constantly audible. This location, and also many amazingly beautiful landscape shots, show how much adaptation 3 romanticizes the story (as well as how film aesthetics and conventions change). Emma Thompson in her commentary to adaptation 2 says

---

<sup>4</sup> This was certainly partly conditioned by the budget, as well as the technologies available at the time, which resulted in shooting large portions of period dramas in modest studio sets, a practice prevailing in British television productions in the 1960s–1980s.

overtly in connection with Norland Park: “we made them richer than in the book”, explaining that for the needs of the contemporary – especially American – audience, the idea that the ladies find themselves in reduced circumstances had to be conveyed very explicitly with images, therefore the gap between Norland Park and Barton Cottage was widened. It seems that the makers of the third film thought that for their audience, thirteen years later, the gap had to be made even more obvious.

To conclude, film adaptation series reveal rapid changes in filmmakers’ assumptions about the audience’s expectations and cultural capital within relatively short periods. Manipulation in film adaptations is much more radical and overt than in translation, and its reasons are easier to trace in the nature of the film code as well as in mechanisms of contemporary culture. Thus, applying the manipulation approach and the idea of translation series to this kind of intersemiotic translation may lead to comparative research on changing norms of film adaptation, parallel to research on translation norms in literary polysystems postulated by Gideon Toury within the framework of Descriptive Translation Studies.

## References

- Austen, Jane (2000) [1811]. *Sense and Sensibility*. Ware: Wordsworth.
- Balcerzan, Edward (1997). *Literatura z literatury. Strategie tłumaczy*. Katowice: Śląsk.
- Bassnett, Susan (2007). “Culture and Translation”. In: *The Companion to Translation Studies*. Eds. Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karin Littau. (13–23). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gutt, Ernst-August (2000). *Translation and Relevance. Cognition and Context*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Jakobson, Roman (2000) [1959]. “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation”. In: *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. (113–118). London: Routledge.
- Lefevere, André (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
- Legeżyńska, Anna (1999). *Tłumacz i jego kompetencje autorskie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- McFarlane, Brian (1996). *Novel to Film. An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Nida, Eugene A. (2000) [1964]. “Principles of Correspondence”. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. (126–140). London: Routledge.
- Szymańska, Izabela (2009). “Serie translatorskie w polskich przekładach anglojęzycznej literatury dziecięcej. Obraz adresata jako motyw łączący

- serię". In: *50 lat polskiej translatoryki*. Eds. Krzysztof Hejwowski, Anna Szczesny, and Urszula Topczewska. (513–527). Warszawa: Instytut Lingwistyki Stosowanej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Szymańska, Izabela (2011). *Mosaics. A Construction-Grammar-Based Approach to Translation*. Warszawa: Semper.
- Thorpe, Vanessa (2007). "Austen Film to Open with Seduction". [theguardian.com/media/2007/may/27/broadcasting.uknews](http://theguardian.com/media/2007/may/27/broadcasting.uknews). *Observer* 27 May [accessed Aug. 20, 2013].
- Tomaszkiewicz, Teresa (2006). *Przekład audiowizualny*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.