**Abstract**

The discourse on intersemiotic translation, film adaptation, film language, and their translatological aspects has been ongoing for many years – among researchers specializing in Translation Studies as well as in Film Studies, Literary Studies, and Linguistics. But for all these years, it rarely diverged from the original question of translatability; specific translation procedures used by adaptors have seldom been analyzed. Only a few attempts to use translatological tools to study film adaptations were made, and on a small scale – focusing only on the problem of translatability instead of a comprehensive analysis of how those tools may be used.

The aim of this thesis is to prove that the analogy between the interlingual translation and the adaptation of literature into film (first mentioned by Roman Jakobson) is not only justified; it also allows to apply translation tools developed and used to study interlingual translation to analyze intersemiotic translation: for the purposes of this study, I have chosen figures of translation first described by Jerzy Brzozowski in *Stanąć po stronie tłumacza* [Brzozowski 2011], as it is a tool allowing to study various aspects of translation; moreover, it is one of the few research methods focusing on examples of translators’ creativity instead of on translation errors.

The ‘Theory’ section is an attempt to sort out and define two crucial terms: language of film (or ‘language of moving pictures’) and intersemiotic translation. The problem of the linguistic nature of film is presented within the context of historical evolution of film thought and Film Studies, with special attention paid to semiotic and semiopragmatic schools; intersemiotic translation, on the other hand, is presented from the point of view of the ‘common denominators’ it shares with interlingual translation, based primarily on research by Henrik Gottlieb and Seweryna Wysłouch; I also briefly discuss the arguments raised by their opponents, e.g. Alicja Helman.

The third – and last – chapter of the theoretical part – *Film as a product* – refers to the examples studied in the analytical part of my thesis: seeing as they represent the (broadly understood) ‘classical cinema’, i.e. use standards and principles created in Hollywood, it was necessary to introduce the readers to those principles as well as to the notion of ‘model/target audience’ of Hollywood cinematography.

This chapter mentions another important problem: it introduces the concept of ‘screen-worthiness’ (in Polish: *kinowość*), i.e. various visual, narrative, and emotional aspects of motion pictures making them attractive to audiences – it is a concept evoked (albeit indirectly) by all filmmakers when they explain decisions they made adapting a book into film.

The analytical section discusses each figure of translation, i.e. creative solutions used by authors of film adaptations of literary works; and seeing as each figure reaches its ‘full potential’ in one specific element of the cinematographic work – editing, acting, narrative, music – each chapter is preceded by a short introduction on each of those elements within the context of film adaptation and figures of translation. I also present examples of specifically ‘cinematic’ phenomena – materials accompanying the product that motion pictures constitute today, i.e. trailers and documentaries from behind the scenes of Hollywood blockbusters that contain examples of shifts within specific functions of language.

Even Brzozowski himself emphasizes that the list of figures proposed by him is not definitive; therefore, in my analysis, I suggest where that list should be modified or complemented due to the specificity of the medium; it should be noted, however, that those changes are few, as the list of figures is extensive and covers all the important aspects of translation, including intersemiotic translation.

When selecting examples for my analysis, I was guided – on the one hand – by their explicitness and clarity, on the other – by the comprehensibility of solutions used by adaptors to the target viewer, i.e. procedures based on mechanisms described in ‘film language grammars’, that is to say, acceptable from the point of view of the translation tradition, cognitive horizon and – particularly important in the case of the classical cinema – horizon of expectations of the model audience; they are fully intelligible and understandable to the viewer, but at the same time innovative and creative enough to be treated as a deviation from routine techniques and norms of translation – in other words, to be classified as figures of translation.

Furthermore, as observed by Brzozowski in the context of interlingual translation, none of the figures functions in isolation; shifts in one of the ‘layers’ of film usually lead to modifications within other functions of language. It is therefore very important to identify the dominant function in each case; it is, however, not always possible to establish definitely, which is clearly visible in the case of intertextuality – hence its particular position in the dissertation: between phatic and poetic functions.

My secondary (although not necessarily less important) goal was to draw the readers’ attention to the (somewhat controversial) fact that has long since been known to American scholars I cite in the theoretical section: Hollywood cinema, even works considered ‘mainstream’, is an important, indelible element of the world cultural heritage and, as such, deserves to be treated seriously not only by critics, but also by researchers. By presenting various creative solutions that can be found in works created by mainstream filmmakers I wanted to show that, apart from its undeniable entertainment and escapist qualities, films made at the Metropolis of Make-Believe can also have artistic value.

The use of figures of translation as a tool for analysis of multimodal texts, such as film adaptations of literary works, allows to draw a number of interesting conclusions, first and foremost of which is the fact that the analysis of film adaptations using a translatological tool, i.e. analysis of film adaptation as translation, is possible. If we approach literature and film like Łotman, Hopfinger and Wysłouch do – that is to say, as equivalent, secondary modeling systems, built over signs of primary systems – i.e., respectively, natural language and audiovisual code; in other words, if we disregard the ‘building block’ level which, in the case of interlingual translation is also seldom important, and concentrate on the ‘semantic’ and the ‘semantic-cultural’ levels, we can study intersemiotic translation the same way we analyze interlingual translaltion – taking into account all the important features typical for both texts.

Some of the figures, due to the specificity of the target medium, as well as to the global and commercial character of the final product, had to be modified: adaptation to ‘cultural scripts’ was replaced, for the purposes of this dissertation, by ‘social scripts’, as their role in the international cinematographic industry is much more significant; linguistic shifts (such as explicitation and adaptation in referential function) are understood as solutions referring to technical elements of moving pictures – the language of film, or the so-called ‘semantic-cultural level’; in the section dedicated to the ‘silence threshold’, I added the ‘visual monotony threshold’, as the usually dynamic nature of editing makes longer, monotonous sequences seem like a ‘visual equivalent of silence’. Figures of translation in the poetic function also required certain modifications – especially modulation, as in the ‘interlingual’ version of Brzozowski’s tool it is based on purely lexical material. However, these changes do not interfere with the mechanism upon which the figures are based – they were necessary from the point of view of the multimodal nature of film; the ‘principle of operation’ of the tool, therefore, remains unchanged.

To show the universal character of the method chosen for my study, the set of examples I selected for the analytical part are extremely diversified: most of them come from film adaptations of novels, but vary in terms of genre: biographical novel, fantasy science-fiction, psychological drama, an 18th-century epistolary novel, two novellas, and a play. The same applies to film genres: apart from feature films, I have also included a short film and an episode of a television series in my analysis. Seeing as I wanted to study the film language in its current state, as well as its ‘standard’, traditional use, I chose classical cinema of the end of the 20th and of the 21st century; however, in order to illustrate certain mechanisms and phenomena, I also quote some remarkable movies from several decades ago, including works by Eisenstein, Delluc, or Fellini.