

## Literature and cinema: link and confrontation

LINDA CATARINA GUALDA<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The objective of this paper is to discuss the relations between literature and cinema in theoretical levels considering that both arts have connections and differences. Just as the literature was the most important art expression in the 19th and 20th centuries, the cinema nowadays is considered the universal art. In other words, cinema is the art which unite the biggest number of interested people. Then, the comparative study between these art expressions allows an analysis of the extraordinary contribution that one art brings to another.

**Keywords:** literature, cinema, art

### INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the same way that literature was the artistic expression that had a great repercussion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the cinema stands out today as the most unifying of the arts, one that unite the biggest number of stakeholders. According to Bluestone (1973: 3), one third of the films produced in the studios of RKO, Paramount and Universal are adaptations of novels. This is why, besides being works more inclined to win awards, the public shows great interest in watching them, because they consider the renowned novels as having a highest quality.

At a time when the cinema is the biggest media culture and that literature has an audience so small, "the cinema should not be seen only as a cinematic phenomenon, not even as an artistic phenomenon, but as the possibility of acquiring the balance, freedom, the possibility of becoming human "(Bernardet, 1985: 34). Statistics show that the search for the source text significantly increases with the adaptations of novels (in the recent case of *The Da Vinci Code*, *The Lord of the Rings* and *Harry Potter*).

---

<sup>1</sup>Formada em Letras, mestre e doutoranda pela UNESP/Assis, com a tese *Literatura e cinema: representações do feminino em Washington Square, Daisy Miller e The Europeans*.

# MATRIZes

Sharing the idea that "the cinema is not only man's contemporary art, but the art created by contemporary man" (Silveira, 1966: 167) and that the romance "*makes life, makes interest, makes importance... and I know of no substitute whatever for the force and beauty of its process*" (James, 1987: 11).

The comparative study between these two expressions allows an analysis of the extraordinary contribution that one art brings to another. Furthermore, "in the era of interdisciplinary, nothing is healthier than trying to see the literature's verballity from the perspective of cinema, and the movie iconicity from the perspective of literature" (Brito, 2006: 131). Thinking about it, the aim of this paper is to discuss the relationship between literature and cinema in theoretical levels, whereas both the arts have links and differences. Our main interest is to investigate the specific technical language in each type of narrative, using as theoretical support the latest translation theory and theory of intertextuality.

In this sense, we will divide this study into four parts entitled: Novel and Film: Autonomic Works, The Link and The confrontation and The Concept of fidelity. The first one will address the issue of a film work can not be a mere copy of literary, but autonomous, independent, which is related to the work starting, but retains its own characteristics and motivations.

In the second part, we will stick solely to the similarities between the two artistic expressions mentioned. A comparative study intending to examine the relationship between a novel and a movie is possible because there are points of contact between them and are in this such close proximity that we will focus. In order not to dwell on too many, we prioritized only two similarities, which we believe to be most significant for the study that we intend to accomplish here. Namely: *the narrative structure* (the entire film is, in essence, a narrative, beyond the fact that before it came on screen it was a script) and the *impression of reality*, whose techniques used by the narrator are equivalent to the ones adopted by the director, always in accordance with their goals and ideology.

By the third subdivision, we will study what establishes a distance from an art and another. Early on, we will discuss the *literary language* and the *language of film* showing the main differences between them and how that distance allows the reading and enrichment of a work that reflects another one. Then we will talk about the principle

of equivalence between word and photo(gram) - since we are facing two different art expressions it is necessary to make brief remarks about the differences between film and literary milieu, as the act of writing expressed in images it is characterized by a greater distance of the literary arts for the film.

Just as in the previous section, where we chose only two points of contact, here too we choose only two differences: the question of literature's verblity in comparison to the iconicity of cinema and the relation between *time* and *space* that in the novel is quite different from the movie, since over time, the first reports what has happened while the latter tells what is happening; in relation to space, the movie is worth a lot more of the locations than the novel and they influence the behavior of characters and the unfolding of events.

Finally, the last part concerns the fact that we are here considering the film as a work autonomous. It means that, as such, we are confronted with an independent work, since it carries predetermined goals, the *ideology* of the director, but maintains close links with the work of starting. In this sense, it is important to study the definitions of *adaptation*, focusing on the concepts of transposition, recreation and *translation intersemiotic*, which concerns the search for equivalents of a given semiotic system of elements whose function resembles that of the other elements system of signs. For this reason, we cannot prioritize the fidelity to the original text, because you can not find a complete correspondence between two texts that belong to different semes.

## **Novel and film: autonomous works**

The first consideration to make is that we are taking the film as a literary translation, since both are entirely independent, but at the same time, are closely related. From the time that is no longer considered translation as mimesis, rather, an activity interested in the conditions of production and reception, translation becomes seen as transformation. As a result of this transformational process, there is then a totally new structure and the text must be seen as an autonomous work which can not be adequately understood and judged if taken only as imitation. In this sense, one can not deny that the version is closely related to another, since it functions as its interpretant.

We also reject the notion of fidelity of the movie over the novel, because this notion is ahistorical, simplistic and subjective, especially when both works belong to

different historical contexts. Moreover, fidelity is impossible for the different material means of expression of the novel and film, which will be detailed later.

Thus, our interest lies in the adaptation procedures adopted by the director and how such changes are observed during a given film. We are aware that this metamorphic process that transforms fiction into new artistic entities - here, film - is a process based on fact that "changes are inevitable when it abandons the linguistic medium and goes for the visual" (Bluestone, 1973: 219).

However, although the original and translation are different as language, your aesthetic informations will be linked by a relation of isomorphism (Plaza, 1987:12) and these relations, also called touch points are the elements that both works have in common, obviously with the necessary modifications to the achievement of an autonomous work that dialogues with that source and not only reproduce it.

## **The link**

The book may suggest films that the viewer who has read it would wish he could do and that he observes, dismayed, that were not actually made. The movie may have been born of a smaller book and suggest things that, well harnessed, would be a literature of superior quality. The multiplicity of ways and possibilities proposes a debate that will never be exhausted. (Lopes, 2004).

Before we argue about the common ground between literature and cinema, we should treat the semiotics affinities, explaining what an art taught to another. According to Robert Richardson (1973), in *Literature and Film*, only a few procedures were already in literary texts: mounting, framing, angles, photography etc.

When the cinema came up, instead of following the vanguards of the twentieth century, it chose to stay behind and "preferred to follow the novel conventional model from the previous century, telling a story with a beginning, middle and end, and assumed to be three things at the same time: fictional, narrative and representational "(Brito, 2006: 8). But it was not just the cinema that has learned from the literature, the reverse also occurred, causing enormous influence of film language on many of the writers of the twentieth century, for example, Hemingway, Fitzgerald, Faulkner, Ruben Fonseca, among others.

Robert Richardson demonstrates that literature, oddly enough, is a visual art and lists a number of common points between the literary and film works: the dissolution of one image into another, the accumulation of images of things and places without the human presence ; targeting progressive centripetal and too large for the very small, the multiple point of view about a particular episode or character; the speed of the narrative, the work established with images, the ellipse deleting the superfluous, the characterization process of the protagonist, the soundtrack can find equivalents in certain prosodic procedures etc.

Considering the restricted space for a study that addresses all of these approaches, we choose to deal here with only two elements that approach the literary work of the film: the narrative structure and the impression of reality. That choice was guided by the degree of importance of these categories and that is what we will talk about below.

## **The narrative structure**

A comparative study focusing on literature and film takes place only because there are some similarities between both arts, and perhaps of all the elements that keep literature and cinema in synchronic state of comparison, the narrative structure is presented as the main link between both.

To Michel do Espírito Santo (1973: 49), the feature length motion picture is almost always a story, a complex message presenting a series of situations, events and actions set in a unit history. Both in literature and in cinema, the theme of the book is the one action and its fundamental, and "certain details and accessories, apparently free form, when used intelligently, a unifying action" (Bastos, 1961: 172).

Indeed, the entire narrative is based in the alternation of good and bad sequences, or in the development of the topics it treats.

But the chain from end to end of these contrary phases only gets a start of order when instead of being succeed in a contingency that does not mean anything, not even his own absurdity, they require and are explain one by another (Bremond 1973: 85).

This linkage also occurs in the thematic organization, whose purpose is to ensure that the narrative sequence is meaningful to the reader / viewer. Considering that "the content of a movie presents itself in reality as a set of themes combined, more or less

integrated into the overall message of the film" (Espírito Santo, 1973: 59), they require only awaken interest and rapport when give rise to reflection, when put "on the boil, the collective representation of the group, a focus of intellectual excitement, emotional, imaginary linked to unsatisfied desires, to the unresolved conflicts of individuals" (Bremond, 1973: 82).

That's why there is no innocent theme. According to Walter da Silveira (1966: 17), the film is a narrative art and resembles the novel, because its existence is in the account management in the chain of ideas, the intertwining of themes. To him, the viewer sees the film as the reader reads the novel: "by what is going on. Indeed, beyond what the reader sees in the novel. The movie may contain more ellipses, more suggested facts than romance. Requires, however, much less intellectual work for its assimilation" (Silveira, 1966: 18).

Randal Johnson (1982) also shares this view that the most shared code of a novel and its filmic translation is the narrative code, which can also be called the narrative discourse. This code is an autonomous layer of meaning with a structure that can be isolated from the specific language that it conveys. For the theoretical, "the novel and the film are basically equal in terms of capacity to signify. Both media use and distort time and space, and both tend to use figurative or metaphorical language" (Johnson, 1982: 29).

Claude Bremond says the feature length motion picture is almost always a narrative, ie, "a complex message presenting a series of situations, events and actions set in a unit of a history" (1973: 49). However, the cinema "preferred to follow the model of the novel from previous century, telling a story with a beginning, middle and end, and assumed to be three things simultaneously: fictional narrative and representational" (Brito, 2006: 8.)

In a narrative, the narrator moral responsibility is committed to the value judgments which he attributes (or refusal to grant) to the events he narrates. In the cinema, these judgements are presented, explicitly, but indirectly, by the mouth of a character permitted, for example, or indirectly, but implied by the adoption of a *tone of narration*. It's that tone that marks a kind of offshoot of the message that communicates on the one hand, a particular story, the other, a judgement on this story. By the tone, the narrator commits himself to the contents that he shows (Espírito Santo, 1973: 69).

This *tone of narration*, combined with many other elements, also ensures the impression of reality captured on screen, the subject of the next sub-item.

## **The impression of reality**

Another similarity between a visual work and a verbal one is the impression of reality builded from specific techniques. According to Jean-Claude Bernardet (1985: 17), this illusion of truth has probably been the basis for the enormous success of the cinema, because, in fact, this kind of artistic expression gives us an impression of life being expressed on the screen. For the critic, "not only the cinema would be the reproduction of reality, but also it would be the reproduction of man's own vision" (Ibid.).

Furthermore, when we go to the movies, even though we know that everything is fiction, that each element presented went through a selection process, by fits and that everything is creation of the director, contradicting our certainties, reality imposes itself in a very strong way. However, the success of the cinema "does not lie in the degree of realism that it can get, but in the exploitation of cinematographic resources and in the use of it to create the context for action" (Diniz, 1999: 31).

It is interesting to consider that the context of the action is carefully planned, following a mind-set idea, it has clear objectives and reveals certain ideology. The techniques chosen by the director and his formal strategies such as assembly, the distance of the camera, close-up, for example, are some of the ways found to break up with the real world and build a meaning that no pre-exists the representation.

Thinking about it, Ismail Xavier (1984) notes that

if in front of the cinematic image, occurs the famous *impression of reality*, this is because it reproduces the codes that define the *visual objectivity* according to the dominant culture in our society, which means that the photographic reproduction is objective just because it is the result an apparatus built to confirm our visual ideological notion of visual objectivity (ibid.: 128).

In the novel, there are also these types of techniques and are used by the narrator: the director is replaced by the writer who creates a voice to represent him. The idea of reality, known as verisimilitude, is also given through language, the ability of work to make sense (cohesion and coherence), the position taken by the driver of the presentation and characterization of the characters and a series of elements chosen by

# MATRIZes

author able to convey us the feeling that every event happens to someone we know, in familiar surroundings and at the moment we live. The truth is that one perceives a rhythm which fluency leads the viewer, who gets "the impression of watching a continuous stream and is not aware of seeing a succession of plans that do not last longer than a few seconds" (Bernardet, 1985 : 42).

In cinematographic works (most of them, at least) actors pretend to be people who are not to have experiences not previously experienced. According to John Caughie (2000: 119), to pretend they learn through practice and observation of an individual vocabulary of signs that are recognizable and reproduced. Moreover

actors also enact (en-act) and incorporate (in-body) feeling as if they were real in a way that they become real for them and for us. For (...) incorporate feelings, the actors learn relaxation techniques, risk games and believe to minimize the gap between feeling and its expression: the expression of a truth that is maintained - as if miraculously, despite all pretensions - always inside the actor (Caughie, 2000: 119).

In this sense, the ability to pretend may explain why, when watching a movie, we forget our own reality and dive into a constructed world, where everything is symbolic. Immediately we are transported to a fictional reality and previously planned that not only move with our feelings and emotions, but makes us rethink our life course and question our surroundings from the serving of a particular value judgments. Identification with the scene, the narrator, with the protagonist or another character, with the atmosphere or else to the storyline explains why we are kept within the narrative. Just as the identification with what the actor does when he represents, what one character suffers may also explain our smiles and tears.

This situation, the act of watching a movie or reading a book, suggests that we engage a new world, and because of this, we have different experiences every time we get in contact with the work. In other words

while identification with the camera explains how we are kept within the narrative, identification with what the actor is doing when he represents can sometimes explain the lump in the throat or the emptiness in the stomach, which suggests that you having an experience (Caughie, 2000: 120).

# MATRIZes

According to Christian Metz (1972: 19-20), a cinematographic reproduction well compelling triggers in spectator a phenomena of participation at the same time affective and perceptual, which help to strengthen the impression of reality. According to the critic, is the movement that gives the impression of reality. It means that the cinema has "an additional level of reality (since the shows of real-life are mobile), it also brings much more than that (...): movement gives objects an *embodiment* and an *autonomy*" ( Metz, 1972: 20).

This idea of physical reality by the apprehension of the visual image actually is just a play of light and shadow where the illusion of reality is produced by an apparatus that disappears in the assembly process. Therefore, the film gives us the feeling of being in front of a near real spectacle, because it

triggers the spectator a process perceptual and affective of *participation*, it achieves an instant credibility (...) finds the means to contact people in the tone of the evidence, (...) without difficulty (...) reaches a kind of enunciation that the linguist would describe as fully so (Metz, 1972:: 16-17).

For Metz the secret of the cinema is to place many indexes of reality in images, in other words, "inject into the unreality of the reality of motion picture and thus upgrade the imagination to a degree never before achieved" (1972: 28) and this sense of movement is often perceived as synonymous of life.

## The confrontation

*"Literature means, cinema expresses"* Christian Metz (1972:10)

### *The literary language and cinematographic language*

<b>Literary language</b>	<b>Cinematographic language</b>
Representations of images	Reproduction of images
Linking of basic ideas (images)	Sequence of mental images towards sound and not sound images.

It starts from the word to the visible image (Calvin, 1990: 98).	It starts from the visible image to reach verbal expression (Calvin, 1990: 98).
Idea of imagination as communication with the soul of the world (Calvino, 1990: 103) and of "imagination as a repertoire of potential, hypothetical, of what is not, nor was it and maybe not, but it could have been" (Ibid : 106).	Communication from images with the potential implied. "Around each image lurk other, they form a field of analogies, symmetries and oppositions (Calvino, 1990: 104).
Privileges "the direct observation of the real world, the ghostly and dreamlike transfiguration, the world figurative (...) and a process of abstraction, condensation inteorização of sense experience" (Calvin, 1990: 110).	Privileges immediate reception, ready and linear.
Conceptual and of media effects - space seems to be "temporalized" (Brito 2006: 146).	Actualizing show, made present - time seems "spatialized" (Brito 2006: 146).
It is necessary a creative collaboration, subjective and emotional (illusion of ownership of what was thought).	Simple and easy understanding, "the viewer is more frivolous, more committed to entertainment, to have fun, to thrill or not" (Lopes, 2004).

*The reading of the word and the reading of the photo*

<b>The Word</b>	<b>The photo(gram)</b>
Evokes, refers to an object or idea.	Show, refers to a series of objects.
Makes sense only in the relationship it establishes with other words in context.	Closes an idea in itself, does not depend on another to create meaning.
1 <sup>st</sup> level: <i>complex reading</i> , because we do two simultaneous activities - mental representation and elaboration of meaning.	1 <sup>st</sup> level: <i>simple reading</i> , because it captures only the following of facts.

<p>2<sup>nd</sup> level: <i>reflective reading</i> – enables returning to capture the other senses, or understand certain times of the text.</p>	<p>2nd level: <i>reflective reading</i> – reception + construction of meaning.</p>
--	--

## **Literature verbality and cinema iconicity**

The main difference that exists between film and book comes to language: one is visual and the other is literary. George Bluestone (1973: 20) describes such a disparity with the difference between an essentially symbolic media and a media that works with the physical reality. In relation to film work, the adhesions are always easier and simpler, but for the second one there must be cooperation of the imagination of the reader, "a creative collaboration, of an subjective and emotional color very strong, which may give the reader even an illusion of emotional ownership of what they envisioned (which gives in propensity to find the transpositions depleting)" (Lopes, 2004).

It is noteworthy that literature and cinema communicate differently and makes little sense to find exact parallels between the two means at the level of denotative communication. The film image is not like a word, more like a sentence or a serie of sentences. The expansion of the action is essential to the film, the novel also expands the action, through the experience of the characters and the description and analysis of the events narrated. However, "the audio experience has improved fluidity and immediacy than fiction, is more varied and alive" (Lawson, 1967: 366).

A key difference between literary discourse and film discourse is quantitative: it is almost always small in the film (a single plane, for example) is something very big in the literary text (a phrase or sentence long), and vice versa, to what is big in the film, can equal a small element - as a word - in the literature. This quantitative disagreement (which naturally has consequences qualitative!), in our case, can be illustrated by the treatments given to the same diegetic situation (Brito, 2006: 65).

## **Time and space**

The measurement and control one has in relation to space and time differ in the novel and film, although both means of expression need not unfold chronologically. The memories can be narrated in unordered tables that are linked by associations or even evidences, within the mind of a certain character and, thus, can result in visual images.

# MATRIZes

Explaining better: the films may follow a sequence of jumps or lags one time to another or otherwise avail themselves of the literary techniques of flashback or flashforward, but will need some effect on the screen (change color - usually the memories appear to spectator in black and white or pale, aged - speed takes, no action or even speeches etc.) while in literature these changes can easily be represented using a time counter - adverb or tense.

The cinema does not count with these markers, given that the taking of a woman crying, a man running, a child dropping, for example, is timeless. In film work, "the notion of time can only be created through the context of the relationship between the outlet and the rest of the film, or through verbal (Diniz, 1986: 99-100). Remember that another example of temporal manipulation is the ability of film of showing simultaneous actions or by splitting the screen or when there is change of scene without making any changes.

In novel, time is linguistically encoded, the film is presented with images of concrete actions. The time of the film is perceived as similar to real time in which we noted action and movement and not time. The space dominates the film, however, time dominates the novel. The conceptual space is the novel, but the time is expressed intensely since the succession of episodes. John Baptist de Brito (2006) summarizes well the difference

As the novel is conceptual and has media effects, and the film eminently actualizing spectacle, made present, the space always appears at first as if temporalized, while the second appears at this time as it always spatialized. This is because the result is that in literature (the construction of the mental image that came from the decoding of the discursive line), the film is a starting point (the actual image) (Ibid.: 146).

There are three levels of chronological time in romance: 1) the duration of the narrated events, 2) the time of the narrator and 3) the time of reading. In the film, the time that takes the viewer to watch the movie usually coincides with the time of the narrator. Both can compress and extend the time: the novel works with the difference between the reader's time and the time of the events narrated, the film draws on the camera, which can be slow or fast.

To the cinema doesn't matter the recall or contemplation, is also not needed a narrator to create a link between past action and present narration. Furthermore, "the

# MATRIZes

movie may have the events in any temporal order, while appreciating the immediate impact, it focuses on the past and even the future as if they were this time" (Lawson, 1967: 267). Therefore, one can say that the film deals with a very broad temporal scheme, although it is essentially an art of remembrance, as the novel.

The novel concerns what happened, since the screen shows us that what is happening is of paramount importance because it is not an isolated event in time, by contrast, refers to something situated between the past and future. So it is easy to understand why "only the cinema can provide a temporal scheme in which all parts are equally vivid, producing all the same audiovisual impact on our consciousness" (Lawson, 1967: 383). This is because the film time, even though an elaboration of the real, to be organized based on the actual chronology. "The film has a specific instrument to explore the relationships of time: a synthesis and expansion of time '(Lawson, 1967: 383-4.)

The eternal present is something inherent to cinema and for that reason it is difficult to narrate the past and future in a cinematographic work, because the viewer will always have the impression that everything unfolds in present time. Regarding this matter, the theorist Yuri Lotman states that "in any art related to vision, there is only one artistic time as possible this. (...) Even being aware of the unrealistic nature of what unfolds before you, the viewer emotionally live it as a real event "(1978: 64).

## **The notion of fidelity**

### *Adaptation*

The issue of adapting a novel for the cinema has never been a peaceful activity. The writers argue the lack of fidelity to the original or the distance between the two languages semiotics. Moviegoers, for their part, argue that there must be freedom in any creative work, because

the reading of literary forces us to an exercise of fidelity and respect the freedom of interpretation, because they propose a speech with many reading plans and put us in the ambiguities of language and life and (Eco, 2003: 12 - emphasis added ).

# MATRIZes

In fact, "there is no other viable criterion, but the know-how far the outcome different or similar to the original, traitor or submissive, dependent or independent, has quality" (Brito, 2006: 75-6).

First of all, a big movie is a story of an argument. The great works of cinema since its origin, were alternately adaptations and innovations. The writers would be unable to discover every year, hundreds of new situations, so they resort to the masterpieces of literature or to books about success. The frequency with which they adapt literary works to the screen makes the debate about the quality and even the loyalty of these adjustments resulted in controversies that are often unnecessary and unproductive. Therefore, doubts arise: Should a movie be faithful to the novel adapted or can afford to betray him?, As far as the (in) fidelity would be something desirable? There would be rules to adapt a novel?

The opinion is divided, there are an infinite number of critics who support adaptation. Philippe Durand (cited Brito, 2006) argues that the process of adaptation is highly advisable, as novel and film have the same vocation. Andre Bazin (in 1987) presents two arguments for the adaptation of a historical and social and other more practical: the cinema became a popular art reaching all social strata and, moreover, the cinema, to adapt the great works, provides greater access to the classics, considering that after the screening of the adjustments, the demand for new editions of works skyrocketing.

However, there are critics who see no correspondence between the visual and literary work, believing it is impossible any attempt at reconciliation. Claude Gauteur in *Elogie de la spécificité* (cited Brito, 2006: 149), believes that not every literary work might be applied to the film, and her claim radicalized the concept of specificity. He said "this intransponibilidade is reciprocal, ie, not only of literature but of cinema itself, which is also a specific language, has no equivalent in other modes of language" (ibid.).

Thinking about it, adapter, however that is faithful to the work of beginning, suppresses certain episodes to enlarge others that seem much more interesting to his purposes, since fidelity is prevented by different means of expression of the novel and movie. "Some passages, outlined only by the writer, provide it, through its expansion, the visual equivalent of certain comments or descriptions that cinema can not be transplanted" (Sadoul, 1956: 83). In this sense, adaptation is a process based on the fact

# MATRIZes

that "change is inevitable when it abandons the language environment and applies to the visual" (Bluestone, 1973: 219).

For this reason, Haroldo de Campos proposes a theory of translation as recreation, as the impossibility of translating messages aesthetic is evident. He

we have one in another language other information aesthetics, autonomous, but both are linked together by a relation of isomorphism: while language will be different, but as the bodies isomorphous, crystallize will be within the same system (1976: 24).

Thus, besides being an act of recreation, the translation is also a critical reading of the original work, because "to perform a re-creative translation, the translator must first submerge critically on work to be translated" (Johnson, 1982: 6). In this sense, the adaptation process intersemiotic can be seen as "shape of transmutation, rebirth and, indeed, critical-reading artistic production of original work, revitalizing it and creating another information aesthetics, autonomous" (Martins, 2007: 151). In other words, often adaptations should

shaping the tastes of the day the old themes, or adapt them openly. We can never shoot a novel or a play to the letter, exactly following the original. Cinema show. The writer, the words, invoke or describe (Sadoul, 1956: 82).

This is equivalent to say that

the translation is defined as a process of transformation of a text, constructed through a particular semiotic system, in another text, another semiotic system. That implies that, when decoding an information given in a language and encode it through another semiotic system, it becomes necessary to modify it, because every semiotic system is characterized by qualities and restraints, and no content exists regardless of the medium that incorporates (DINIZ, 1999: 32-33).

Jean Mitry (apud Diniz, 1999) provides two options for a filmmaker who wants to adapt a novel, or it follows the story step by step and not try to translate the meaning of words, but those things for them (in which case the movie does not is an autonomous creative expression, only a representation or illustration of the novel), or it attempts to rethink the matter in full, giving him another development and another direction. This

second translation corresponds to the theory of translation of Haroldo de Campos as recreation and criticism.

Most films are not interested in analyzing the meaning inherent to the text, but the conditions of production potential of their senses. In this regard, the director of a film might not only fulfills the task of the translator, but also a reader, ie, one that builds respect. The text of the translation product contains an implicit way "the whole history of his reading, in turn subordinated to the cultural context. We can, therefore, set the text as a set of reactivations of reading and translation is one "(ibid.: 28).

Considering that translation involves the whole context in which the text is inserted and that meaning is created from reading, it disregards the notion that what is transported to another text is meaningless. According to Diniz (ibid.: 29), there are five categories to be considered for the analysis of any translation: knowledge, credibility, authority, image of a text, or culture that the author or translator design and audience, ie the readership to whom the translation is intended.

### **Movie maker responsibility: ideology**

If the filming can be seen as the cut-space by choosing from a certain angle (position the camera takes in what she shoots) with an expressive purpose, we can say that film is an analysis activity. After this process, the composition of the film, the images shot are placed one after the other. This union of the images, known as the assembly is then a synthesis activity (Bernardet, 1985: 36-7.)

So there is a process of manipulation that exists in any kind of art: when the director intervenes, it prioritizes a specific goal, pre-determined and made clear their ideology. Therefore, it is naive to any interpretation of cinema as a reproduction of the real.

The technique of film director - but not looking directly addressing the look - is one way to find a meaning that was there waiting to be discovered. For one, the spectator is to be addressed, their worldview shaped and changed, for another, the viewer, in an act of imaginative identification, discovers the meaning of the world that was previously hidden in the noise and distraction (Caughie, 2000 : 119).

In a narrative, the moral responsibility of the narrator is committed to the value judgments which he attributes (or refusal to grant) to the events he narrates. In the

cinema, where the narrator addresses only exceptionally to the public, these judgments are expressed, either explicitly, but indirectly, by the mouth of a character authorized, directly, but implied, by adopting a tone of narration. "The tone marks a kind of offshoot of the message that communicates, on one hand, a story of another, a trial on this story. The tone, the narrator undertakes with the contents that shows "(Bremond, 1973: 69).

These contents that the director shows us, also known as film elements (the argument, the ambiance, the choice of shooting angle, the characterization of the characters, the assembling techniques etc..) Relate to the passions of man. Therefore, they are never free from

emotional impact or involvement of ethics. The choice of a topic, the integration of a development theme of this issue (excluding treatment is that the narration does suffer) already are acts that engender the moral responsibility of the cinematographer (Bremond, 1973: 49).

Therefore, nothing on film is ideologically neutral, and from the moment the filmmaker interfere, in other words, the camera focuses, it adopts certain tone, and the elements and even socialized socialized not become ideologically committed.

## **Intersemiotic translation**

The expression *intersemiotic translation* was given by Roman Jakobson in 1959 to conceptualize the transmutation or interpretation of verbal signs by means of non-verbal signs. In this sense, the translation intersemiotic includes "the search in a particular semiotic system, components whose function resembles elements of another system of signs" (Apud Diniz, 1996: 9).

However, this procedure assumes the existence of a particular meaning in the text to be translated into one another the text (or system), ie, it is understood that the meaning is inherent in the text comes directly from its structure. That said, by altering the message, carrying it to another system, or better, translating it opens up the hand of fidelity to the original text, given that even establishing semantic equivalents for the elements of two different systems of signs, it is impossible to cover all the nuances of each system. "Therefore, as well as recognize all theories of translation, no one can find

# MATRIZes

a complete correspondence between two texts (whether or not different systems)" (Diniz, 1996: 10).

Therefore, every translation will always offer something beyond the source text and its success "will depend not only on the skill or creativity, but the decisions taken by the translator, is sacrificing something or finding any cost an equivalent" (Ibid. ).

Recalling that the sense is nothing more than the result of an interpretation, a reading, a look over the text, we can never evaluate a translation based on criteria that prioritize loyalty. This is because, although the translation is carried out from a communicative intentionality whose goal is the construction of meaning, meaning is constantly frustrated since this procedure varies itself and the conditions under which it is held.

Installed inside the communicative processes and engaging exchanges, references, mistakes, omissions and silences, the translation can also be understood as an activity often referred to new modeling (Pereira, 1996: 247).

Thinking in this procedure, Keith Cohen (1979: 32) used the term to refer exchange dynamics of this interdependence of the texts. The procedures for inter-semiotic translation, influenced by new technologies, the explosion of media and communication processes, provide the appearance of new types of texts, new art forms, new systems of representation. The study of these procedures was named interart studies. Thus

the film text (specifically the adaptation of literary texts to film) is no longer rated as a static product being studied as a final form where research on imitation and influence, originality and fidelity are preponderant to become the object of study in dynamic, originated not only in literary but in several other types of text, whose relationship can be understood as translation, interdependence, or even fusion of arts study interart (Diniz, 1996: 10-11).

The translation of many films intersemiotic favors an independent and autonomous work. Connected to the literary work, the film is nonetheless an reinterpretation of the novel and so give new dimensions to the work starting. Whereas the literature in the movies "es una expansión de la dicción estricta, hermoçada por la poesia y la prosa, en um nuevo reino een el cual la imagen deseada se materializa directamente en percepciones auditivas e visuales" (Eisenstein, 1959: 202), some works

# MATRIZes

are solved very differently from the novel: the characters are more dramatic, the context justifies the changes of names, places, professions, settings and even the ending is consistent with all the action shown.

## Final considerations

That said, when one realizes the difference between the means of expression mentioned here, you can glimpse the rich contribution that art brings to one another. In fact, the viewer must not only be interested in the well-filmed, mainly due to worry as it is being filmed, which suggests much broader evaluative implications.

In many contemporary films, in significant detail is provided by a camera that operates, which invades us, which compels us to think, that excites us and coerces the emotion, suffering, who accuses and reveals the complicated situation expressed on screen. This type of work, the characters are not the result of a trial, it's complex characters.

To make it credible and accepted reluctantly by the viewer the reality presented by the narrative, the director opts for total absence of sensory action in favor of a conceptual action, in which words and tone of the narration takes a broad sense, so that whoever watching the movie does not leave indifferent.

## References

- BASTOS, Baptista. *O filme e o realismo*. Lisboa: Editora Arcádia, 1961.
- BAZIN, André. Pour um cinema impur: défense de l'adaptation. In: *Qu'est ce que le cinéma?* Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1987.
- BERNARDET, Jean-Claude. *O que é cinema?* São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1985.
- BLUESTONE, George. *Novels into Film*. Berkeley, University of Califórnia Press, 1973.
- BREMOND, Claude. Ética do Filme e Moral do Censor. In: ESPÍRITO SANTO, Michael. (org.). *Cinema, Estudos de Semiótica*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes Ltda, 1973.
- BRITO, João Batista de. *Literatura no cinema*. São Paulo: Unimarco, 2006.
- CALVINO, Ítalo. *Seis propostas para o próximo milênio: lições americanas*. Trad. de Ivo Barroso. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1990.
- CAMPOS, Haroldo de. *Metalinguagem*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1976.
- CAUGHIE, John. O que fazem os atores quando representam? In: CORSEUIL, Anelise & CAUGHIE, John (org.). *Estudos Culturais: Palco, Tela e Página*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2000.
- COHEN, Keith. *Fiction and film: the dynamics of exchange*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

DINIZ, Thais Flores Nogueira. Interdisciplinaridade: Literatura e Cinema. In: *Fragmentos: O Ensino de Literatura e Culturas de Língua Inglesa no Brasil*. Revista de Línguas e Literatura Estrangeiras. Vol.7 – Nº 1. Florianópolis: Editora da UFSC, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. (org.). *Cadernos de Tradução: Tradução Intersemiótica*. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Centro de Comunicação e Expressão. Núcleo de Tradução. Nº 7 (2001/1). Florianópolis: Núcleo de Tradução, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Literatura e Cinema: da semiótica à tradução*. Ouro Preto: Editora UFOP, 1999.

ECO, Umberto. *Sobre a literatura*. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2003.

EISENSTEIN, Sergei. *Teoria y Técnica Cinematográficas*. Tercera Edición. Trad. Maria de Quadras. Madrid: Ediciones RIALP, 1959.

ESPÍRITO SANTO, Michel do. *Cinema, Estudos de Semiótica*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 1973.

JAMES, Henry. *The Complete Notebooks*. Ed. Leon Edel and Lyall Powers. Oxford, 1987.

JOHNSON, Randal. *Literatura e Cinema – Macunaíma: do modernismo na literatura ao cinema novo*. Trad. de Aparecida de Godoy Johnson. São Paulo: T.A. Queiroz, 1982.

LAWSON, John Howard. *O processo de criação no cinema*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1967.

MARTINS, Gilberto Figueiredo. De pisantes e pisados – Representações da Falta (Percurso intertextuais e interdiscursivos com Alberto Moravia e Plínio Marcos). In: CAIRO, L.R. et al. (org.). *Nas malhas da narrativa – Ensaio sobre literatura, história, teatro e cinema*. Assis: UNESP, (pp. 141-154), 2007.

METZ, Christian. *A significação no cinema*. Trad. e posfácio de Jean-Claude Bernardet. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1972.

PEREIRA, Maria Antonieta. Performance e mímica – processos de tradução no cone-sul. In: DINIZ, Thais Flores Nogueira. (org.). *Cadernos de Tradução: Tradução Intersemiótica*. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Centro de Comunicação e Expressão. Núcleo de Tradução. Nº 7 (2001/1). Florianópolis: Núcleo de Tradução, 1996.

PLAZA, Júlio. *Tradução Intersemiótica*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1987.

RICHARDSON, Robert. *Literature and film*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973.

SADOUL, Georges. *O cinema: sua arte, sua técnica, sua economia*. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria-Editora da Casa do Estudante do Brasil, 1956.

SILVEIRA, Walter da. *Fronteiras do cinema*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Tempo Brasileiro, 1966.

XAVIER, Ismail. *O discurso cinematográfico: a opacidade e a transparência*. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1984.

## Website

LOPES, Chico. *Cinema e Literatura: Dança e Tropeço*.

<[http://www.verdestrigos.org/sitenovo/site/cronica\\_ver.asp?id=246](http://www.verdestrigos.org/sitenovo/site/cronica_ver.asp?id=246)>. Access 19 feb. 2004.

Article received in March 31st and approved August 13th, 2009.