

РОЗДІЛ 9 ТЕОРІЯ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

УДК 821.161.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2024.34.2.33>

FEATURES OF LANGUAGE IN CINEMA AND LITERATURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FILM ADAPTATION OF S. ANDRUKHOVYCH'S NOVEL "FELIX AUSTRIA"

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ МОВИ КІНО ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРИ В КОНТЕКСТІ КІНОАДАПТАЦІЇ РОМАНУ С. АНДРУХОВИЧ «ФЕЛІКС АВСТРІЯ»

Zemliana S.V.,

*orcid.org/0009-0007-5109-603X**PhD student at the Department of Literary Theory and comparative literature
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv*

This article investigates the intricate relationship between literature and its cinematic adaptations, specifically focusing on the distinct narrative strategies each medium employs. It explores the historical precedence of novels in shaping reader perceptions and narrative conventions, juxtaposed with the visual and auditory storytelling techniques characteristic of cinema. Utilizing C. Peirce's semiotic theory, the article delineates between literary «signs» and cinematic «icons», elucidating their respective methods of meaning-making.

The study scrutinizes how cinematic language simplifies reality through visual imagery and sound, while grappling with the depiction of internal states and abstract concepts. Conversely, literature excels in illustrating characters' psychological depth and internal experiences through descriptive prose and varied narrative perspectives. Central to this analysis is the adaptation of S. Andrukhovich's novel «Felix Austria» into the film «Viddana» («Віддана»), examining how the film reinterprets subjective narratives and challenges viewer perceptions.

The article delves into the narrative techniques used in «Felix Austria», such as the diary format that offers a rich, introspective exploration of the protagonist's inner world, providing ample interpretive latitude. It contrasts this with the cinematic adaptation's use of voiceovers and point-of-view shots to maintain the protagonist Stefania's subjective perspective, while highlighting the limitations of the visual medium in conveying abstract literary elements.

Further, the article addresses the complexities of translating literary symbolism and metaphor into cinematic visuals, acknowledging the interpretative disparities inherent between these mediums. It discusses the limitations and potentials of both forms of storytelling, highlighting how each medium uniquely shapes narrative interpretation and audience engagement. The cinematic adaptation of «Felix Austria» serves as a case study to illustrate these broader thematic concerns, demonstrating the nuanced process of adapting literary works for the screen.

In conclusion, this study enriches the understanding of how cinematic and literary languages contribute to narrative interpretation and adaptation in contemporary contexts. It underscores the distinctive semiotic potentials and cultural impacts of both literature and film, providing insight into the dynamic interplay between these forms of artistic expression. The analysis emphasizes the importance of recognizing the unique capabilities of each medium and the inherent challenges in translating narratives from one form to another.

Key words: S. Andrukhovich, Felix Austria, Viddana, cinematic language, literary adaptation, semiotics, narrative perspective, intermediality, Ukrainian literature.

Ця стаття досліджує складний зв'язок між літературою та її кінематографічними адаптаціями, особливо зосереджуючи свою увагу на різних наративних стратегіях, які використовує кожен із засобів. Стаття досліджує історичне передування романів у формуванні сприйняття читача та наративних конвенцій у порівнянні з візуальними та слуховими техніками оповіді, характерними для кіно. Використовуючи семіотичну теорію Ч. Пірса, у статті проведено розмежування між літературними «знаками» та кінематографічними «іконами», з'ясовуючи їхні відповідні методи смислотворення.

У дослідженні розглядаємо як кінематографічна мова адаптує реальність за допомогою візуальних зображень і звуку, звертаючи особливу увагу на труднощі зображення внутрішніх станів і абстрактних понять. І навпаки, звертаємо увагу на спроможність літератури чудово демонструвати психологічну глибину й внутрішній досвід персонажів за допомогою описової прози та різноманітних оповідних перспектив. Центральним у цьому аналізі є адаптація роману С. Андрухович «Фелікс Австрія» та фільм «Віддана». Текст звертає особливу увагу на те як фільм переосмислює суб'єктивні наративи та кидає виклик сприйняттю глядача.

Стаття заглиблюється в методи оповіді, використані у романі «Фелікс Австрія», такі як формат щоденника, який пропонує багате, інтроспективне дослідження внутрішнього світу головного героя, надаючи широку свободу інтерпретації. Це резонує з використанням у кінематографічній адаптації голосу за кадром і POV Стефанії, щоб зберегти суб'єктивну перспективу головної героїні, підкреслюючи при цьому обмеження візуального середовища в передачі абстрактних літературних елементів.

Крім того, у статті розглядаємо складності перекладу літературного символізму та метафори у кінематографічні візуальні ефекти, визнаючи відмінності в інтерпретації, властиві цим засобам. Також обговорюємо обмеження та потенціал обох форм оповідання, підкреслюючи, як кожен засіб унікальним чином формує інтерпретацію оповіді та залучення аудиторії. Кінематографічна адаптація роману «Фелікс Австрія» служить прикладом для ілюстрації цих ширших тематичних проблем, демонструючи нюанси процесу адаптації літературних творів мовою кінематографу.

Це дослідження збагачує розуміння того, як кінематографічні та літературні мови сприяють інтерпретації та адаптації оповіді в сучасному контексті. В статті підкреслюємо відмінний семіотичний потенціал і культурний вплив як літератури, так і кіно, надаючи розуміння динамічної взаємодії між цими формами художнього вираження. Дослідження підкреслює важливість визнання унікальних можливостей кожного медіа та властивих проблем, пов'язаних з перекладом нарративів з однієї мови в іншу.

Ключові слова: С. Андрухович, Фелікс Австрія, Віддана, мова фільму, літературна адаптація, семіотика, нарративна перспектива, інтермедіальність, українська література.

Formulation of the Problem. Cinematography represents a convergence of ancient artistic traditions, utilizing visual narratives to explore and interpret life, paralleling the profound storytelling capabilities of literature, which continues to influence cinematic expression. As emphasized by L. Bryukhovetska [14, p. 15], the reciprocal influence between literature and cinema within a broader cultural milieu captures only a portion of the overarching artistic trends. This phenomenon emerges from the intricate intersection of diverse artistic forms, rooted fundamentally in the realities of human experience.

The extensive history of film adaptations prompts theoretical inquiries into the complexities of translating literature to the screen. The examination of the interface between literature and cinema holds significant sway in contemporary studies of intermediality. Amidst various forms of artistic collaboration, the dynamic interplay between these media serves as a central focus engaging scholars and artists alike.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Despite the pivotal contributions of international scholars such as Bluestone G. [4], Hutcheon L. [7], Andrew J. [1], Hopfinger M. [6], Wagner G. [10], Hendrykowski M. [5] and Ukrainian academics including Bryukhovetska L. [13], Generaliuk L. [15], Dubinina O. [16, 17], Arkhypova L. [12], Trimbach S. [20], Nalyvaiko D. [18], comprehensive exploration of the intricate dynamics and evolutionary dimensions of literature-cinema interaction remains insufficient. Significant gaps persist within literary and art studies, particularly concerning contemporary adaptations of Ukrainian literature.

Therefore, **this investigation aims** to elucidate the nuanced semiotic features of cinematic and literary language in the context of the film adaptation of S. Andruhovych's novel «Felix Austria» [11].

People frequently draw comparisons between a novel and its cinematic adaptation that narrates the same story, positing that films struggle to surpass novels. This proclivity may arise from the primacy of the novel in acquainting readers with history, solidifying the author's rendition in their minds as

the sole «correct» method of storytelling. However, the intrinsic differences between novels and films indicate that the two mediums exert disparate effects on the recording of history. Central to this dichotomy is the distinctive semiotic language employed by literature and cinema, each possessing signs that are not entirely interchangeable.

C. Peirce [8, p. 4–10] elucidated a connection between the two concepts using the terms «sign» and «icon», forecasting instances where one meaning supplants the other. The term «sign» denotes an arbitrary linkage between two concepts; for instance, the word «cloud» signifies a cloud. Conversely, a cloud image can be construed as a cloud icon, exhibiting a less arbitrary relationship. Clearly, the image of a cloud bears a closer resemblance to the cloud itself than the word «cloud».

Cinema utilizes icons as its semiotic language, whereas prose relies on signs. This dichotomy implies that images in film establish a more direct correlation with their referents, whereas words maintain a relatively indirect relationship. As O. Dubinina [17, p. 89–97] observes, in addition to visual elements, cinematic language encompasses other components, such as sound, to facilitate audience comprehension. This aspect renders the depiction of reality in film more straightforward and lucid. This accessibility, however, entails a trade-off, as films grapple with representing abstract concepts such as the inner realms of human cognition. The camera, confined to displaying the external attributes or «shells» of objects, necessitates unique linguistic tools to convey internal aspects such as thoughts and experiences. The inherent inconsistency of the linguistic signs of cinema and literature underscores that films and novels indeed leave different impressions on viewers and readers.

The researcher [17, p. 89–97] further notes that the film, as a narrative devoid of a narrator, can be perceived as a story without an author – a narrative unfolding directly before the viewer without mediation. This characteristic stems from the intrinsic nature of films that visually present a story, while novels narrate a story. The narrator of a literary story

can be the first person or the so-called «omniscient author», whereas cinema predominantly employs the perspective of the «omniscient narrator», providing the audience with a comprehensive view orchestrated by the director.

The method of transposing the narration of S. Andruhovich's novel «Felix Austria» [11] is particularly noteworthy. In the novel, the story is presented in the form of a diary, which offers ample scope for interpretation while unambiguously suggesting the form of film narration. The authors of the film «Viddana» («Віддана») [19] do not employ this technique, or at least use it inconspicuously, only occasionally hinting at such a solution. The film commences with the voiceover of the main character, establishing her as the narrator, thereby indicating that we will perceive everything through Stefania's eyes. The authors of the film revisit this several times, literally depicting the world from her perspective. For instance, in the dinner scene, with the aid of appropriate camera settings, we observe the scene from the heroine's point of view (POV – a shot in which we perceive reality not objectively, but subjectively, from someone's perspective). Additionally, the names of the sections that appear in the film are formatted as diary entries, indicating a connection with excerpts from the diary or a book. Consequently, Stefa's story can be classified as a private discourse, as she describes the world from her perspective, discussing what directly concerns her (primarily matters related to household management, but also her feelings and emotions).

This method of narration, in turn, provides considerable latitude for maneuvering when transposing the work into the cinematic language. For example, in the film «Viddana» («Віддана») [19] we see that the world the viewer perceived through Stefania's worldview turned out to be fictitious. The viewer realizes that everything that seemed true has transformed into an illusion. Using the cinematic language, the creators managed to convey this effectively (utilizing the same scenes that the audience identified as true, but now from a completely different, even opposite, perspective). For instance, we see the scene of Stefa's last conversation with Dr. Adler twice, at the beginning and at the end of the film. This scene appears as a flashback of the heroine's memory. Since the story is told precisely from her perspective, the viewer (as well as the reader) perceives all information as true. Thus, contemplating this scene at the end, but altering the last phrase of the dialogue between Stefania and the doctor, we acquire a completely different vision of reality.

Another critical aspect is sound in movies. It significantly enhances audience comprehension, offering information through both visual and auditory cues, unlike literature, which relies solely on textual information.

In terms of sound and silence, cinematic language employs sound as a powerful element, including dialogue, music, and «noise» (i.e., sound effects). Silence is used strategically for emphasis. Literary language relies exclusively on written words. Although descriptions can convey auditory impressions, silence in literature is more subjective and depends on the reader's interpretation.

Divided into speech, music, and «noise» (environmental sounds), film sound can, in certain scenarios, independently convey a narrative. While literature adeptly articulates characters' emotions and feelings, cinematic sound creates an environment where the audience can viscerally experience the characters' emotions. The cinematic craft lies in the reproduction of real sounds combined with visual effects to authentically bring life to the audience. A. Bazin [3, p. 72] successfully delineates this concept, incorporating it into the notion of «technical realism». Literature, by contrast, is predominantly limited to words and can merely describe events. Thus, the director can orchestrate a vivid ball scene with enchanting music, joyous laughter, lively conversation, and a variety of noises – effects that a writer can only achieve with words. Multidimensional film creates and conveys «real life» much more effectively. At the same time, it is the silent and arbitrary nature of the signs in the novel that opens up unlimited space for the reader to create the most beautiful and outstanding «film» in their imagination.

The scene from «Viddana» («Віддана») [19] is illustrative, where Stefania throws tenches out of the window. Despite the fact that this element of the literary work is too literally transferred to the system of the cinematographic language, it appears somewhat strange and even inappropriate. The creators of the film attempted too literally to convey the metaphorical nature of the literary text, resulting in a rather odd outcome. A metaphor is not a literal figure, hence it cannot be translated literally. However, from an auditory perspective, this scene is also telling. It is constructed exclusively on sound and visual effects without additional semantic load. Here, with the aid of sound and image, the film's creator endeavors to convey the effect of a metaphor in a literary work. However, due to its untranslatability, the meaning was ultimately lost. For viewers who lack a broader context and are not familiar with the literary work, this scene seems strange and out of context.

In general, when discussing symbolism, metaphoricity, and semiotic methods of representation, cinematic language employs visual elements such as symbols, iconic images, camera movement, frame perspective, repetition of images, and color correction to convey meaning. Visual elements often exert a direct and immediate impact. Literary language, on the other hand, depends on words to create metaphors and symbols, necessitating interpretation by the reader, thereby promoting interpretation and imagination. This presents significant challenges in transposing the signs of one semiosphere to another, but as Y. Lotman [18, p. 84–90] posits, to implement literary signs in the realm of cinematography, one must first master its language.

Thus, the properties of cinematic and literary language arise from differences in their means of expression. The principal attribute that determines their difference is the so-called visual expression of film and the imaginary expression of literature. Cinematic language depends on visual elements: moving images, composition, light, and colors. It offers a concrete and literal representation of the plot, whereas literary language utilizes the reader's imagination. Descriptions in literature encourage readers to create their own images, contributing to a more subjective and personalized experience.

The realism of the film sign can provoke the deformation or absolute reduction of the literary sign, as this property sometimes entirely precludes the possibility of literal transposition. This is particularly relevant concerning the chronotope. As O. Dubinina [16, p. 40–53] points out, cinematic language tends to present the plot linearly, contingent on the flow of time, enhancing the immediacy of events, whereas literary language can manipulate time through various narrative techniques, such as flashbacks or changing points of view, offering a different temporal experience. It is much easier to construct a character in a literary work using a non-linear narrative, that is, oscillating in time from the present to the past. In the film text, the authors of «Viddana» («Віддана») [19] employ numerous flashbacks to depict Stefania's memories. Interestingly, we see flashbacks and memories solely from the maid's point of view. This is explained by the type of narration chosen by both the author of the literary work and the film's creators. Namely, the film attempts to emulate the narrative style of its literary counterpart – the maid's diary.

In terms of narrative and perspective, cinematic language typically uses an omniscient perspective, where the audience observes events as external spectators. Characters' voices or narratives are often presented visually, whereas literary language offers a

variety of narrative perspectives: first-person, third-person, or an omniscient narrator. The narrator can even reveal the inner thoughts and feelings of the characters.

Regarding a multidimensional experience, L. Hutcheon's [7, p. 61–70] viewpoint is noteworthy, asserting that cinematic language engages several sensory organs simultaneously through visual, auditory, and occasionally even tactile impressions, providing a complex sensory experience. In contrast, literary language primarily involves visual and auditory analyses. Descriptions stimulate the reader's imagination but are constrained by what can be conveyed through language.

A. Bazin [3, p. 119–121] notes that due to translatability, cinematic language is often adapted from other forms, such as novels or plays, presenting the challenge of translating written narratives into visual and auditory experiences. Literary language allows for the exploration of characters' inner worlds and complex ideas, which are often challenging to directly convey in visual form.

Understanding these differences aids in appreciating the unique potentials of literary and cinematographic signs, affecting their semiotic meaning when translated from one semiosphere to another.

Conclusion. The distinct semiotic languages of literature and cinema result in fundamentally different ways of encoding and interpreting narratives. While novels use arbitrary signs that engage readers' imaginations and offer deeper explorations of internal states and abstract concepts, films rely on more immediate, iconic representations that utilize visual and auditory elements to create a direct and multifaceted sensory experience. This divergence in expression underscores the inherent challenges in adapting literary works into cinematic forms. The translation from text to screen involves more than mere replication; it requires an intricate recoding of narrative techniques to fit the visual and auditory language of film. Understanding these semiotic differences enhances our appreciation of each medium's unique capabilities and limitations, emphasizing that novels and films, despite telling the same stories, ultimately provide distinct interpretive and experiential encounters.

Specifically, in the case of S. Andruhovich's novel «Felix Austria» [11] and its cinematic adaptation «Viddana» («Віддана») [19], the narrative techniques and perspectives underscore these challenges and differences. «Felix Austria» [11], presented as a diary, allows for a rich, introspective exploration of the protagonist's inner world, providing

ample interpretive latitude. The film «Viddana» («Віддана») [19] attempts to emulate this narrative style through the use of voiceovers and point-of-view shots, striving to maintain the subjective perspective of the protagonist, Stefania. However, the film's reliance on visual and auditory elements means that certain abstract concepts and internal states depicted in the novel are less accessible. The film's creators faced the challenge of translating the metaphorical language of the novel into a visual medium, resulting in scenes that may appear disjointed or out of context to viewers unfamiliar with the source material.

The adaptation highlights the difficulty of transposing the subjective, introspective nature of a diary format into a visual narrative while retaining the depth and nuance of the original literary work. Despite these challenges, «Viddana» («Віддана») [19] succeeds in capturing the essence of Stefania's perspective and the fictional reality constructed by her worldview. This case study illustrates the broader complexities and potential of adapting literary narratives into cinematic form, affirming the unique interpretive and experiential value inherent in both mediums.

REFERENCES:

1. Andrew J. The well-worn muse: adaptations in film and theory. Narrative strategies. Illinois, 1980. 308 p.
2. Barthes R. Wstęp do analizy strukturalnej opowiadań. *Pamiętnik Literacki*. 1968. № 4. S. 327–359.
3. Bazin A. What is Cinema? / trans. Gray H. California: University of California Press, 1967. V II. 200 p.
4. Bluestone G. Novels into Film. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968. 237 p.
5. Hendrykowski M. Przekaz filmowy a język filmu. *Język ruchomych obrazów*. Poznań: Ars Nova, 1999. 149 s.
6. Hopfinger M. Adaptacje filmowe utworów literackich. *Problemy teorii i interpretacji*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1974. 197 s.
7. Hutcheon L. Theory of Adaptation. London: Routledge, 2006. 273 p.
8. Lotman, J. Semiotics of Cinema. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1981. 107 p.
9. Peirce C. The Essential Peirce. Selected Philosophical Writings. *What is a sign?* Indiana University Press, 1998. V. 2. P. 4–10.
10. Wagner G. The novel and the cinema. Vancouver: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975. 394 p.
11. Андрухович С. Фелікс Австрія. Львів: Видавництво Старого Лева, 2014. 288 с.
12. Архипова Л. Переклад як інтерпретація. *Записки «Перекладацької майстерні 2000–2001»* / упоряд. Прокопович М. Львів: Львівський національний університет ім. І. Франка, Центр гуманітарних досліджень, 2002. Т. 3. 360 с.
13. Брюховецька Л. Кіномистецтво. Київ: Логос, 2011. 391 с.
14. Брюховецька Л. Література і кіно: проблеми взаємин : літературно-критичний нарис. Київ: Рад. письменник, 1988. 183 с.
15. Генералюк Л. Шляхи формування інтермедіальних досліджень. *Слово і Час*. 2020. Вип. 3. С. 3–27.
16. Дубініна О. Екранізація літературного твору як предмет компаративного дослідження. *Слово і час*. 2016. Вип. 2. С. 40–53.
17. Дубініна О. Екранізація літературного твору: семіотичний аспект. *Іноземна філологія*. 2014. Вип. 126 (1). С. 89–97.
18. Наливайко Д. Стан і завдання українського порівняльного літературознавства. *Літературознавство*. 2000. Вип. 2. С. 42–50.
19. Сиволап Х. (реж.) «Віддана», 2020.
20. Тримбач С. Олександр Довженко. Загибель богів: Ідентифікація автора в національному часопросторі. Вінниця: Глобус-Прес, 2007. 800 с.