

Paper from the conference On the Move: ACSIS conference 11–13 June, Norrköping, Sweden 2013, organised by the Advanced Cultural Studies Institute of Sweden (ACSIS). Conference Proceedings published by Linköping University Electronic Press at [http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp\\_home/index.en.aspx?issue=095](http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp_home/index.en.aspx?issue=095). © The Author.

## **Feminist Translation / Feminist Adaptation: Ang Lee's *Sense and Sensibility***

E-chou Wu, Ph.D.

Department of English, Providence University, Taiwan

Department of Translation, Lingnan University, Hong Kong

Feminist translation is not only to subvert cultures of patriarchal hegemony of translation, but also to manifest womanish language characteristics. In discussion of relationships between translation and ideology, feminist translation (or gender and translation, including the translation of queer writing) is more than an issue of assailing linguistic dominance from patriarchy, and this issue has contributed to the establishment of women's subjectivity. Luise von Flotow's major strategies adopted by feminist translation are supplementing, prefacing and footing, and hijacking, apparently all of which are interventionist approaches, intended for uncovering evidence that males have dominated linguistic expressions and translational norms. The foci of the feminist translation are: translating women's body, recovering women's lost works, asserting the translator's identity, revising the rhetoric of translation, reading and rewriting existing translations. This paper is thus to, first, theorize how feminist translation studies can be appropriated by film adaptation, and then compare the novel of *Sense and Sensibility* to its film adaptations, based upon Emma Thompson's screenplay, directed by Ang Lee, and the 2008 BBC version, directed by John Alexander and adapted by Andrew Davies. The two film versions, one by male adapter, the other female, provide an opportunity for the novel "on the move" to debate the issue of feminist adaptation in the comparison by the use of the strategies suggested by von Flotow. Its aim: to expose the model of female aestheticism and to achieve equal treatment for female translation.

### **THEORIZING WOMEN'S LANGUAGE**

A multilingual environment provides Canada with a chance to develop its translation theory, especially in feminist translation, particularly contributed by Louis von Flotow, Sherry Simon, and Barbara Godard, whose arguments on feminist translation put forward for calling

attention to the suppression of women's voice in translation are inspired by feminism. Feminist translation presents another perspective on women's issues – it is trying to discontinue intentional or unintentional distortion of women in translation. An understanding of the feminism, French feminism particularly, which has a tremendous influence on feminist translation, is crucial to help grasp the spirit of the theory.

Elaine Showalter provides a blueprint for western feminist criticism: “English feminist criticism, essentially Marxist, stresses oppression; French feminist criticism, essentially psychoanalytic, stresses repression; American feminist criticism, essentially textual, stresses expression. All, however, have become gynocentric” (249). Feminist translation began as a purely theoretical offshoot of western literary feminism; it was undeniably influenced by British, American, and French feminisms, whose emphasis is rewriting literary history and reinventing women's language to establish its *écriture féminine*, i.e. “the inscription of the female body and female difference in language and text” (249). Showalter's gynocriticism is actually a guiding light for feminist translation that is specifically characteristic of women's translation. “Gynocritics” as the second phase of “feminist criticism,” coined and advocated by Showalter in “Toward a Feminist Poetics,” comes after the earlier male-oriented “feminist critique,” from which we learn only “what men have thought women should be” (130). Its concerns fit into the doctrines of feminist translation well.

Feminist criticism has gradually shifted its center from revisionary readings to a sustained investigation of literature by women. The second mode of feminist criticism engendered by this process is the study of women as writers, and its subjects are the history, styles, themes, genres, and structures of writing by women; the psychodynamics of female creativity; the trajectory of the individual or collective female career; and the evolution and laws of a female literary tradition. No English term exists for such a specialized critical discourse, and so I have invented the term 'gynocritics.' Unlike the feminist critique, gynocritics offers many theoretical opportunities. (Showalter, “Feminist Criticism” 248)

In alliance with Anglo-American and French feminisms, gynocriticism aims to reconstruct women's literary tradition and their language use by recovering the unrecognized female authors and reread the recognized. Showalter suggests scores of pioneering academic writings on women and by women, among them Patricia Spacks's *The Female Imagination*, Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*, Mary Ellmann's *Thinking about Women*, Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics*, Ellen Moers's *Literary Women*, Showalter's *A Literature of Their Own*, Nina Baym's *Woman's Fiction*, Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *The Madwoman in the Attic*, and Margaret Homans's *Women Writers and Poetic Identity* (“Feminist Criticism” 248). All of these books are to accentuate women as a literary group and to bring a focus on the difference from men's works.

The oft-quoted saying from Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*, “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman” (301) claims that gender and body are acculturated: “No biological, psychological or economic fate determines the figure that the human female presents in society; it is civilisation as a whole that produces this creature, intermediate between male and eunuch, which is described as feminine” (301). Her French feminist successors, Helene Cixous and Luce Irigaray, believing that women's repression resulting from “phallogocentric discourse of the Western humanist tradition”, distinct from de Beauvoir's

thought that woman as second sex is a cultural signification, not biological (Kaufmann 121). To Cixous and Irigaray, women's freedom is contingent on their linguistic liberation.

Dale Spender argues that the myth of male superiority comes from language. In a male-as-norm world the semantic rules are all man-made, so women are imbued with man-made normative language. As Spender puts forward, "Language is our means of classifying and ordering the world: our means of manipulating reality. In its structure and in its use we bring our world into realisation, and if it is inherently inaccurate, then we are misled. If the rules which underlie our language system, our symbolic order, are invalid, then we are daily deceived" (2-3). In "The Laugh of the Medusa" Hélène Cixous proposes *écriture féminine* in which woman should disconnect her language use from male's rules by establishing women's "sexts" instead of men's "texts,"<sup>1</sup> creating their poetic language style through loosening rigid grammatical structures because the unconscious incarnates itself in poetry to obtain strength in "the place where the repressed manage to survive: women, or ... fairies" (1946). Female sexual arousal and physiological functions limned in "sexts" (women's writing) are what Cixous hails:

We've been turned away from our bodies, shamefully taught to ignore them, to strike them with that stupid sexual modesty; we've been made victims of the old fool's game: each one will love the other sex. I'll give you your body and you'll give me mine. But who are the men who give women the body that women blindly yield to them? Why so few texts? Because so few women have as yet won back their body. Women must write through their bodies, they must invent the impregnable language that will wreck partitions, classes, and rhetorics, regulations and codes, they must submerge, cut through, get beyond the ultimate reserve-discourse, including the one that laughs at the very idea of pronouncing the word "silence" ... Such is the strength of women that, sweeping away syntax, breaking that famous thread (just a tiny little thread, they say) which acts for men as a surrogate umbilical cord ... (1952)

Cixous's endeavors to build a feminist essentialism in the condition in which women have been subordinate to male's construct of the linguistic world are understandable, though she questioned who are the women who have to write in "white ink" (the mother's milk)<sup>2</sup>. Texts produced from the white-ink language are on a level with Walter Benjamin's "pure language" or Maurice Blanchot's "superior language," both of which are the word-for-word literal translation distinct from the sense-to-sense free translation. The language of literal translation is not normative; it is an unfeasible one-to-one rendering of syntax from the source language to the target instead of the sentence-based translation. This new linguistic combination is a seemingly new language resonating with Cixou's white-ink poetic dictions.

Luce Irigaray's criticism of phallogentrism, based upon Lacanian psychoanalysis, suggests that the ego is formed through the male body as the imaginary ideal, and therefore woman is as a lack, a hole. Irigaray necessitates the "speculum" to detect and to inspect sexual differences of woman's body in order to construct her subjectivity. Woman's sexuality has never been fully expounded: "She is reduced to a function and a functioning whose historic causes must be reconsidered: property system, philosophical, mythological, or religious

---

<sup>1</sup> Cixous coins "sext" to combine sex with text as what *écriture féminine* champions because, according to Cixous, women are bisexual and when they are free from sexual repression, they can say whatever they want (1950).

<sup>2</sup> The metaphor "white ink" refers that women must write their own bodies with their own language, their own linguistic codes, not the ink supplied by men.

system – the theory and practice of psychoanalysis itself – all continually, even today, prescribe and define that destiny laid down for woman's sexuality” (129). Irigaray’s strategy is to mimic woman’s role assigned and confined by its system because she intends to subvert the male-oriented perspectives in psychoanalysis from its core, and then to manifest femininity excessively. Feminine subjectivity can be obtained from “your own experiences of life [you men!] or turn to the poets, or wait until science can give you deeper and more coherent information” (Irigaray 129). Irigaray emphasizes the importance of writing about body to construct femininity. Her "speculum" enables femininity through female genitals, like two lips, the metonymy of the doubleness of text and body, showing feminine multiplicity. The feminine text is not unified, nor cohesive; it is a split, but a "self-sufficient (w)hole." The difference between whole and hole "is a gap between a unified vision and an absence." Through the text the female writer creates "a vision without cohesion" (Johnston 76-77).

Julia Kristeva’s exposition of *écriture féminine* centers around the symbolic and the semiotic forms of language with a view to codifying different language uses. The distinctions of the two forms are elaborated in “The System and the Speaking Subject” where she finds the correlation between semiotics and ideologies. She indicates ideologies, such as myths, rituals, moral codes, and arts, are sign-systems that “the law governing, or ... the major constraint affecting any social practice lies in the fact that it signifies; i.e., that it is articulated like a language” (25 emphasis in the original). According to Kristeva, what semiotics discovers is a general social law, viz., the symbolic dimension given in language, and “every social practice offers a specific expression of that law” (25). The symbolic is connected to authority and order providing an illusion of a fixed and unified self; it is a matter of language “as a system of meaning (as structuralism and generative grammar study it) – a language with a foreclosed subject or with a transcendental subject-ego” (Kristeva “Speaking” 217). Contrary to the symbolic, semiotics contains two modes, genotext and phenotext. The genotext, expounded by Kristeva, is “the release and subsequent articulation of the drives as constrained by the social code yet not reducible to the language system;” the phenotext is the signifying system showing itself as “phenomenological intuition.” Moreover, the genotext exists within phenotext, termed as “semiotic disposition,” which will deviate from “the grammatical rules of language,” e.g. poetic language (“System” 28). As a metalanguage, semiotics will not be able to get out of the signifying system because it creates and recreates its own signifying system for discourse as long as it attempts to dismantle one (“System” 30). In a nutshell, the symbolic is a patriarchal mode regarding the world as control, dichotomy, repression, and rigidity; while the semiotic is a female mode reflecting the world as “displacement, condensation, metonymy, metaphor,” and continuity (“System” 29). The theory on language and female subjectivity postulated by Cixous, Irigaray, and Kristeva concludes that the semiotic is the language of poetry, challenging the logico-symbolic order and revealing a female world full of exuberant possibility. These three most notable French feminists, widely adapting the ideas of major post-structuralists, such as Lacan, Foucault, and Derrida, suggest that language use is gendered and male-oriented. A woman’s subjectivity is formed through language; she should be “reformatted” by *écriture féminine* to reconstruct herself: writing through her body, undermining patriarchal expressions, and inventing her own language. The language matter is the core of French feminist criticism; translation is regarded as a female language; feminist translation derives its poetics from the French feminist language theory.

## FROM FEMINISM TO FEMINIST TRANSLATION

Feminist translation, launched by Luise von Flotow, is not only meant to subvert cultures of patriarchal hegemony of translation, but also to manifest womanish language characteristics. In discussion of relationships between translation and ideology, feminist translation (or gender and translation, including the translation of queer writing) is more than an issue of assailing linguistic dominance from patriarchy; it also contributes to the establishment of women's subjectivity. Von Flotow emphasizes the role of gender issues in translation, looking into how woman's body is interpreted and translated. In *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism,"* she attempts to map out the practice of feminist translation, whose foci are, for example, translating women's body, recovering women's lost works, asserting the translator's identity, revising the rhetoric of translation, reading and rewriting existing translations. She probes into the translations of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le deuxième sexe*, *The Bible*, and the works of Sappho and Louise Labé, studying their mistranslation and gaps to recover the lost identity of women translators (49-66). Von Flotow poses quite a few compelling questions and lays the stress on women translator's subjectivity and her roles, gendered language, sexual consciousness, and the power of discourse. She questions:

How translatable is feminist writing from other societies and cultures? How meaningful is it to the translating cultures, and how can it be rendered so, if it is not ... What exactly is the role of the translator in making of the voices of third world women heard in the West? How should she translate? For whom is she translating? Is she merely contributing to these women's exploitation, or is her work a meaningful contribution to international feminist goals? (3)

Her questions of language are an eclectic mélange of French feminist legacy:

How do women use language? Is their different from men's? Do women carry out different communicative roles from those of men ... How are women and men represented in conventional language? How is women's and men's consciousness moulded through language? How is gender difference constructed and reinforced in language ... How is power enhanced or undermined through language? How are individuals or groups manipulated by language? Does gender difference in language also mean different kinds of access to public life and influence? (8)

Von Flotow implements the concept of writing through bodies in French feminist criticism with which she reinvigorates "translating the body." She uses two sexualized terms *jouissance* and *invagination* to illustrate women translator's strategies: the former has multiple meanings from enjoyment to organism; the latter refers to "the penetration of one text by any number of other." In this French bodywork, to "write the body" or to avoid the link between erotic writing and politics has become a big issue for translators (*Translation* 18). When feminist writers utilize sexualized vocabulary to manifest their political stance, women's awareness, or female subjectivity, how will translators come face to face with it if they cannot ferret out an equivalent? Von Flotow's major strategies, adopted by feminist translation are supplementing, prefacing and footnoting, and hijacking ("Feminist" 74-79; Simon 14-15), apparently all of which are interventionist approaches, intended for uncovering evidence that males have dominated linguistic expressions and translational norms. Her aims are to expose the model of female aestheticism and to achieve equal treatment for female translation. Consequently women translators are able to create new vocabulary, new poetic languages,

leaving the male-dominated symbolic system behind and swimming in and out their semiotic female world.

Sherry Simon's study of feminist translation in her landmark book, *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*, garners wide attention. Like most feminists, she pays particular attention to women's identity, language, and fidelity in the role of a translator. Feminism, according to Simon, has been of vital importance in the construction of cultural identity from a social and linguistic perspective over the decades. She adroitly brings together woman, translation with translators, relegated to a lower cultural status: "translators are handmaidens to authors, women inferior to men" (1). The relationship between women and translators can therefore be traced in gender hierarchies, the viability of fidelity, patriarchal linguistic representation, and universal meaning and value (8). In light of cultural identity, Simon demonstrates three stages of evolution of women's subjectivity: 1) an essentialist women's reality against patriarchy, 2) a constructionist model where difference comes into being by virtue of "historical positioning within language and culture," and 3) an understanding of women's "third position" resulting from difference that has been excluded. Stemming from the concepts of Derridean "*différence*" and Foucauldian "performative category," women's difference, according to Simon, expands the scope of cultural pressures, including race, class and the nation (141). Either "*différence*" or "performative category," explains that identities are shifting, in a poststructuralist sense, and are usually molded by when you are and where you are.<sup>3</sup> One's identities are formed and affected by social environments, cultural reality, linguistic acquisition, racial differences, social classes, and nationalities. What Simon assumes is that identities are constructed, not inborn, as what women will have to evoke their lost "third position."

Translation and women are a recognized subaltern part of the human world; however, from Simon's constructionist perspective, feminist translation aims to uncover and rectify this distorted continuity. That could be epitomized in the pithy saying of Susanne de Lotbiniere-Harwood: "I am a translation because I am a woman" (quoted in Simon 1). Translation is regarded as women's writing and shows their inferior position. Simon is prone to use the metaphor of "les belles infidèles" to imply the impossible coexistence of beauty (stylistic traits) and fidelity (faithful treatment). In the 17<sup>th</sup> century Gilles Ménage first introduced this commentary of a text referring to free translation in which the beautifully translated text is somewhat perfidious to the source text – that is to say, the more intimately a translation sticks to the original text, the less stylistic it is. This either-or concept of original/translation and author/translator (or translatress) indicates the ploy is that men/originals/authors are "production" and women/translations/translators, "reproduction." Translating is monitored and circumscribed. In the conventional sense, translators are reproducers, transcribers carrying one language into another and taking on the role of women as procreators. It is true that gender identity is structured through social-cultural consciousness; it is truer translation is described in the stereotype of "les belles infidèles," playing a lesser part in verbal culture.

Like von Flotow, Simon also follows French feminist linguistic theory in that she thinks an overturning of the male mode of symbolic order is a must. Translation and language are inseparable: "there has emerged a clear sense of language as a site of contested meanings, as an arena in which subjects test and prove themselves ... it is hardly surprising that translation studies should be nourished in important ways by feminist thought" (8). She poses two

---

<sup>3</sup> I use the plural form because a person has more than one identity.

intriguing questions for feminism and translation: “how are social, sexual, and historical differences expressed in language and how can these differences be transferred across languages? What kinds of fidelities are expected of women and translators—in relation to the more powerful terms of their respective hierarchies?” (8-9). Echoing *écriture féminine*, Simon borrows from Barbara Godard the term of “transformance,” i.e. a female poetics of identity, to create a subjectivity through women’s own memories and life stories. Feminist translation has strands of feminist philosophy in common with *écriture féminine* in its interest in continual re-readings and rewritings. The feminist translator derides the signs of her translational handling—as Godard says, “*Womanhandling* the text in translation would involve the replacement of the modest self-effacing translator ... Feminist discourse presents transformation as performance as a model for translation.” Susan Bassnett furthermore strategizes a sexual situation to assert an “orgasmic theory of translation, the result of elements [that] are fused into a new whole in an encounter that is mutual, pleasurable and respectful” (qtd. in Simon 13). Aiming at the relation of sexuality and translation, Bassnett, as the translator of Sylvia Plath’s poetry, has a heartfelt understanding that translation has its insidious messages similar to the desire concealed in women’s body. Translation metaphors in connection with sexuality as explored by George Steiner truly reveal how translation, language and body are interwoven (Round 55). As Steiner states:

Eros and language mesh at every point. Intercourse and discourse, copula and copulation, are sub-classes of the dominant fact of communication ... Sex is a profoundly semantic act. Like language, it is subject to the shaping force of social convention, rules of proceeding, and accumulated precedent ... It is likely that human sexuality and speech developed in close-knit reciprocity ... Kinship system, which are the coding and classification of sex for purposes of social survival, are analogous with syntax. The seminal and semantic functions determine the genetic and social structure of human experience. Together they construe the grammar of being. (39-40)

In a traditional Freudian mold, Steiner compares coition to dialogue, masturbation to monologue, and he therefore concludes that ejaculation is a physiological and a linguistic concept.

Impotence and speech-blocks, premature emission and stuttering, involuntary ejaculation and the word-river of dreams are phenomena whose interrelations seem to lead back to the central knot of our humanity. Semen, excreta, and words are communicative products. They are transmissions from the self inside the skin to reality outside. At the far root, their symbolic significance, the rites, taboos, and fantasies which they evoke, and certain of the social controls on their use, are inextricably interwoven. (40-41)

The link between language and sexuality is obvious; translation shares its peculiarities, for example, impotence and semantic void, premature emission and undertranslation, involuntary ejaculation and indeterminacy of meaning. In a linguistic sense, women are subordinated to Steiner’s male-oriented discourse of sexuality. In art creation, unlike men who are productive, women are reproductive because of the “gender-based paradigm concerning the disposition of power in the family and the state,” a paradigm in which originality and creativity are closely related to men, i.e., paternity and authority, but women are viewed from the paradigm of secondariness (Chamberlain 57). Central to the feminists’ language strategy is the desire to

redirect female language away from men's usage. By doing so, women's awareness, consciousness, and "authority" could be advanced.

How Barbara Godard translated Nicole Brossard, a Quebec feminist writer of international fame, is in order to bring out women's consciousness. According to Simon, Godard presents a good mode for theorizing feminist translation through translations, prefaces, research papers, and the translator's diaries, so that the translator is able to reveal the author's gender identity – female or queer (22). Godard traces feminist theories on the one hand and, on the other, explores the problems and processes of translation in her diary. Her research-oriented articles and the inner workings of her mind while doing translation restore "the reality of translation as a truly associative process, an ongoing appeal to memory and to a private thesaurus, a pingpong of potentially infinite rebounds" (Simon 23). The diary-keeping translation project of Brossard's *Picture Theory* responds with a record of "interdiscursive production of meaning," including not only the relationship between the text and its social and intellectual contexts, but also the verb forms, wordplay, and rhythm of the source text. This diary-keeping translation strategy, in the words of Simon, accentuates "the ongoing movement of writing and translation as 'arts of approach'" (24). But as far as the present writer is concerned, its spirit, in a broader sense, proves to be that of adaptation. Godard writes:

No final version of the text is ever realizable. There are only approximations to be actualized within the conditions of different enunciative exchanges. As such, translation is concerned not with "target languages" and the conditions of "arrival" but with the ways of ordering relations between languages and cultures. Translation is an art of approach. (qtd. in Simon 24)

Essential is the translator as an interventionist "solicited" and "oriented" by texts, and in that case this mode of translating is similar to an adaptation of a text that is revived. Simon deduces that feminist translators not only negotiate with relationships of "word to object, word to emotion, word to word," but integrate "writing with translation and transformation," which has been at war with equivalence (27). Feminist writing and translation practice, says Simon, "come together in framing all writing as re-writing" (27-28 – adaptation in effect).

## FEMINIST ADAPTATION AND ANG LEE'S *SENSE AND SENSIBILITY*

Being part of its contemporary cultural representations, feminist adaptation is socially and politically oriented. It integrates with feminist points of view and revisions of previous adaptations by feminist scholars and authors. There is no unified understanding of feminism because different disciplines put emphasis differently on what they need; therefore theoretical postulations are crisscrossed. Feminist translation borrows the conception of female's unique expression and language use from Anglo-American and French feminisms; feminist adaptation, when it takes place across media, would be more far-reaching because it includes the manipulation of images. From a historical perspective, in the three distinctive phases that Elaine Showalter explicates in *A Literature of Their Own* – the feminine (1840-1880), the feminist (1880-1920), and the female (1920 to present) – each of them has its own goals. Feminist adaptation on screen, of course, has its own particular characteristics of producing meaning in a filmic text when examined in its historical, social, political, cultural, and sexual contexts.

Contextual analyses of feminist adaptation provide various views on women's subjectivity: female language, female identity, female body, female sexuality, female psychological



positioning – all these can be investigated from the perspectives of the characters and adapters. Questions to ruminate on are how female writers present a different relationship between gender and adaptation, how women read and respond to men's adaptation, whether or not there are feminist adaptation strategies, and what kinds of adaptation can satisfy a different need for women (Bradley 273). Feminist adaptation, an emerging and ongoing issue related to the concern for female subjectivity, has to borrow theoretical constructs from translation studies, especially its concepts of translating women's peculiarities, such as women's body, language, identity, sexuality, etc.

A comparison of the novel, *Sense and Sensibility*, first to its film adaptations, based upon Emma Thompson's screenplay, directed by Ang Lee, and second to the 2008 BBC version, directed by John Alexander and adapted by Andrew Davies will provoke thinking about an effective approach to general female adaptation studies. Its aim is to highlight the model of female aestheticism and to give equal treatment to female translation and adaptation. My examination of the two adaptations is based upon Luise von Flotow's major strategies used in feminist translations: supplementing, prefacing and footnoting, and hijacking, apparently all of which are interventionist approaches, intended to uncover evidence that males have dominated linguistic expression and translational norms. As pointed out in von Flotow's "Feminist Translation: Contexts, Practices, Theories," supplementing is useful in translation, especially in handling the untranslatable, and it resonates with Benjamin's concept of afterlife. As a strategy for feminist translation, supplementing makes the translator a political mediator, who "compensates for the differences between languages, or constitutes 'voluntarist action' on the text," – she "recoups certain losses by intervening in" and provides the original text with an opportunity of making itself a critique (74-75).

With regard to prefacing and footnoting, von Flotow thinks of the rule that feminist translators "reflect on their work in a preface, and to stress their active presence in the text in footnotes;" in doing so they can womanhandle, to borrow Godard's idea, the text to deliberately produce their own meaning (76). In addition, through footnotes the translator becomes an interferer, the translation an intertext, and the feminist translation "an educational tool supported with scholarly research" (77). Von Flotow appropriates the notion of "hijacking" from Homel, a Montreal journalist and translator, for whom Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood "hijacks the author's work" in her translation of Lise Gauvin's *Lettres d'une autre* with undue interference. However, de Lotbinière-Harwood responds to Homel:

Lise Gauvin is a feminist, and so am I. But I am not her. She wrote in the generic masculine. My translation practice is a political activity aimed at making language speak for women. So my signature on a translation means: this translation has used every possible translation strategy to make the feminine visible in language. Because making the feminine visible in language means making women seen and heard in the real world. Which is what feminism is all about. (qtd. in von Flotow "Feminist Translation" 79)

Von Flotow endorses de Lotbinière-Harwood's "hijacking" of the text, appropriating it and making it her own to reflect her political intentions. The most important is for the translator to write in her own right. In a nutshell, Von Flotow's strategies comprise: a) revising source texts in the dual contexts by supplementing, b) making the silenced female characters heard by prefacing and footnoting, and c) challenging gender representations of the original text by hijacking.

The strategy of supplementing is designed in the following episodes. In the opening scene of Ang Lee’s *Sense and Sensibility*, as Fanny Dashwood moves to Norland, she derides Mrs. Dashwood and her daughters, but in the novel, she behaves politely. Edward in the 2008 BBC version, directed by John Alexander and based on a screenplay by Andrew Davies, is more expressive, a sharp contrast to the conventional Edward, who is shy and even faltering. This articulate Edward portrayed by Andrew Davies is used to show that he could fall in love with a virile efficiency; this panders to the female audience. The Barton Cottage, introduced in the novel and imaged in Ang Lee’s film, is located on a hill, with the inviting pervasive greenery of mountainous terrains. John Alexander’s Barton Cottage, situated in a bay and facing the stiff and majestic cliffs, seems to propagandize tourism. John Middleton is portrayed as a good-looking man in the novel, but he becomes a rotund funny perso in both versions of the movie and the BBC mini series roaring with laughter – to meet the stereotype of a matchmaker.



Original	Ang Lee	John Alexander
<p>“The prospect in front was more extensive; it commanded the whole of the valley, and reached into the country beyond. The hills which surrounded the cottage terminated the valley in that direction; under another name, and in another course, it branched out again between two of the steepest of them” (21).</p>	<p>Being located on a hill, inviting pervasive greenery of mountainous terrains.</p> 	<p>Sitting in the bay and facing the stiff and majestic cliffs, seems to propagandize tourism.</p> 

Figure 1. Supplementing: Barton Cottage

The strategy of prefacing and footnoting is adopted in the episode of John Willoughby’s going to the rescue of Marianne, who suffers a serious ankle injury and is treated differently by the three versions. In the novel Willoughby goes hunting with his rifle and black hound when he comes to her rescue; Ang Lee arranges for his Willoughby to appear as a Prince Charming riding a white horse to rescue Marianne; however, John Alexander does not particularly put any emphasis upon the rescue scene. Jane Austen insinuates that Marianne falls prey to the hunter Willoughby (with a gun and two hounds) at their first encounter, but Alexander’s Willoughby loves another girl feverishly in the opening scene. Towards the end of the TV adaptation from a male-oriented point of view, Willoughby not only sends a letter to Marianne but also visits her in person, revealing his uneasiness in front of Elinor. Today’s audience will be inclined to sympathize with his desertion of Marianne. In the original text Marianne is sleeping during his visit; however, in the two movies, she moves to listen to Willoughby’s conversation with Elinor and later marries Brandon to show an unflinching determination to sever her relationship with Willoughby.



Original	Ang Lee	John Alexander
<p>“A gentleman carrying a gun, with two pointers playing round him, was passing up the hill and within a few yards of Marianne, when her accident happened. . . The gentleman offered his services. . . took her up in his arms without farther delay, and carried her down the hill” (30-31).</p>	<p>Willoughby appears as a Prince Charming riding a white horse to rescue Marianne.</p> 	<p>Faithful to the original text, the rescue scene is not particularly emphasized.</p> 

Figure 2. John Willoughby's going to the rescue of Marianne

Unlike John Alexander's faithfulness to the novel, Emma Thompson and Ang Lee use a fairy-like image, a handsome young man on a white stallion, to romanticize the rescue. It is the adapter's footnoting and critique with which Thompson and Lee can convince the audience of Marianne as an incurable romantic.



Original	Ang Lee and John Alexander
<p>A silent character of little importance</p> 	<p>In the two movies she has been endowed with significant strengths, keeping a balance between rationality and sensibility, reminding the adult of a return to childlike naiveté as well as nature symbolized in her tree house.</p> 

Figure 3 Hijacking: Margaret Dashwood

The reconstruction of the character of Margaret is typically a hijacking strategy of adaptation. Margaret is a silent character of little importance in the novel, but in the two movies she is endowed with significant strength, keeping a balance between rationality and sensibility, reminding the adult to return to childlike naiveté and to return to nature as symbolized in her tree house. Apparently John Alexander appropriates Emma Thompson's adaptation to grasp the girlish spirits in Margaret.

## CONCLUSION

Image has been becoming more legitimate than language in a world of YouTubization; how written texts have been translated or adapted into images of the film is now emerging as one of the most likely source for discourse studies. From novel to screenplay, and then to an image text, this textual migration is all the time looking for its haven, a pastoral or an environmentally-protected. The text on the move, be it a translation, an adaptation, or an intermedial representation, attempts to anchor itself in a new and safe harbor. A myriad of films are adapted from literary texts as codes, being reinterpreted by the adapter and the

director through the description and direction in the screenplay and the auteurism, such as the deletion or addition of characters, scenes, and plot, the use of color, angle, lighting, sound, and editing. Feminist translation helps tackle the complexity of feminist linguistics with verve and panache, and furthermore pave the way for feminist film adaptation studies. The examination of feminist adaptation, in a sense, builds a path through the complicated interconnectivity of textual neurons.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, John, dir. *Sense and Sensibility*. BBC, 2008. DVD.
- Austen, Jane. *Sense and Sensibility*. New York: Modern Library, 2001. Print.
- Bradley, Lynn. "Meddling with Masterpieces: The On-going Adaptation of *King Lear*." Diss. U of Victoria, 2008. Web. 11 Mar. 2013.
- Chamberlain, Lori. "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation." *Rethinking Translation: Discourse Subjectivity Ideology*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 1992. 57-74. Print.
- Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Eds Vincent B. Leitch, William E. Cain, Laurie Finke, Barbara Johnson, and John McGowan. New York: W. W. Norton, 2010. 1942-59. Print.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Tran. H. M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Books, 1973. Print.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Trans. Gillian c. Gill. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1985. Print.
- Johnston, Georgia. "Exploring Lack and Absence in the Body/Text: Charlotte Perkins Gilman Prewriting Irigaray." *Women's Studies* 21 (1992): 75-86. Print.
- Kaufmann, Dorothy. "Simone de Beauvoir: Questions of Difference and Generation." *Yale French Studies* 72 (1986): 121-131. Print.
- Kristeva, Julia. "The Speaking Subject." *On Sign*, ed. Marshall Blonsky. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1985. 210-20. Print.
- . "The System and the Speaking Subject." *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986. 24-33. Print.
- Lee, Ang, dir. *Sense and Sensibility*. Columbia Pictures, 1995. Film.
- Round, Nicholas. "Translation and Its Metaphors: The (N+1) Wise Men and the Elephant." *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation*. 1.1 (2005): 47-69. Web. 3 April 2013.
- Showalter, Elaine. "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." *The New Feminist Criticism*. 243-70. Print.
- , ed. *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature, and Theory*. New York: Pantheon. 1985.
- . "Toward a Feminist Poetics." *The New Feminist Criticism*. 125-43. Print.
- Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Spender, Dale. *Man Made Language*. London: Routledge, 1980. Print
- Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1975. Print.
- Thompson, Emma. *The Sense and Sensibility Screenplay and Diaries: Bringing Jane Austen's Novel to Film*. New York: Newmarket Press, 1995. Print.
- Von Flotow, Luise. "Feminist Translation: Contexts, Practices, Theories." *TTR* 4.2 (1991): 69-84. Print.
- . *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism"*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome. 1997. Print.