

Alper TULGAR* 

TRANSFORMING THE SECRET GARDEN: A CRITICAL EXPLORATION OF ADAPTATION SHIFTS ACROSS MEDIUMS

GİZLİ BAHÇE'Yİ DÖNÜŞTÜRMEK: ORTAMLAR ARASINDAKİ UYUM DEĞİŞİMLERİNİN ELEŞTİREL BİR İNCELEMESİ

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the adaptation shifts between Frances Hodgson Burnett's classical children's novel *The Secret Garden*, published in 1911, and the movie of the same name, which was directed by Marc Munden and released in 2020. To conduct the analysis, the model proposed by Katerina Perdikaki, who employs the model of intersemiotic translation for analysing adaptations, is used. This interdisciplinary approach has identified common features in both translation and adaptation studies. For a systematic analysis of the film adaptation, descriptive/comparative and interpretive perspectives are investigated. At the descriptive level, certain adaptation shifts in plot structure, narrative technique, characterization, and setting are examined. Considerable shifts occur between the novel and the movie in both descriptive and interpretive levels. To explain the reasons for the shifts, economic, creative, and social explanations are given as suggested by Perdikaki. Prominent shifts are observed in the movie since certain characters are not included from the novel. While modulation occurs when certain elements are highlighted or downplayed, modification indicates considerable shifts (radical changes) from the source material. Finally, mutation occurs when scenes from the source material are not included (excision) in the adaptation or when new scenes are added (addition).

Keywords: adaptation shifts, intersemiotic translation, *The Secret Garden*, Frances Hodgson Burnett, Katerina Perdikaki

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, Frances Hodgson Burnett'in 1911 yılında yayımlanan klasik çocuk romanı *Gizli Bahçe* ile Marc Munden'in yönettiği ve 2020 yılında vizyona giren aynı isimli filmi arasındaki uyarlamada meydana gelen değişimlerini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Analizi gerçekleştirmek için Katerina Perdikaki tarafından önerilen uyarlamaları analiz etmek için göstergelerarası çeviri modelini kullanan yöntem kullanılmıştır. Bu disiplinlerarası yaklaşım her iki alanda da ortak özellikler belirlemiştir. Film uyarlamasının sistematik bir analizi için betimleyici/karşılaştırmalı ve yorumlayıcı bakış açıları araştırılmıştır. Betimleyici düzeyde olay örgüsü yapısı, anlatı tekniği, karakterizasyon alanlarındaki belirli uyarlama değişiklikleri incelenir. Roman ile film arasında hem tanımlayıcı hem de yorumlayıcı düzeyde önemli değişiklikler meydana gelmiştir. Değişimlerin nedenlerini açıklamak için Perdikaki'nin önerdiği ekonomik, yaratıcı ve sosyal açıklamalara yer verilmiştir. Romandan bazı karakterlere yer verilmemesi nedeniyle filmde belirgin değişimler gözlenmiştir. Modülasyon, belirli öğeler vurgulandığında veya önemsizleştirildiğinde meydana gelirken modifikasyon, kaynak materyalden önemli kaymalara (radikal değişikliklere) işaret eder. Son olarak, ana kaynaktan sahneler uyarlamaya dâhil edilmediğinde (çıkarma) veya yeni sahneler eklendiğinde (ekleme) mutasyon meydana gelmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: uyarlama değişimleri, göstergelerarası çeviri, *The Secret Garden*, Frances Hodgson Burnett, Katerina Perdikaki

* Lecturer, PhD, Atatürk University, School of Foreign Languages, Erzurum/Türkiye. E-Mail: alper.tulgar@atauni.edu.tr / Dr. Öğr. Görevlisi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Erzurum/Türkiye. E-posta: alper.tulgar@atauni.edu.tr

Introduction

The relationship between cinema and literature has been an inseparable feature since the very beginning. Narration or storytelling has been associated with cinema rather than identifying it with visual storytelling, which is inherently rooted in it. According to Ágnes Pethő, “[w]ord and image relations themselves have always been a privileged domain of studying cinematic intermediality”. The critic also states that word has always been a “companion” to cinema to convey its message (2008, p. 3). Confining words purely to literature and dispossessing cinema of language (in terms of narration) limits its ability to build excitement, suspense, and atmosphere and to tell stories through dialogues and direct narration. Cinema and the word share a long history and intertwined relationship connecting imagery with language, which helps evoke the audience’s emotions and ideas. Narration is not strictly limited to the domain of literature due to cinema’s reliance on images.

Transforming a novel into a film, however, is not an easy and straightforward process, which is considered to be the most challenging one due to the different natures of these two art forms: “The familiar move from telling to showing and, more specifically, from a long and complex novel to any form of performance is usually seen as the most fraught transposition” (Hutcheon, 2006, p. 36). A shift from an art form with a complicated use of language, a detailed account of the human psyche, and an intricate uncovering of the inner worlds of its characters to an art form with a heavy reliance on visuality and performative storytelling is considered to be a “fraught” transposition. Conveying the same message by condensing a detailed narration to a medium where the narration is conveyed through showing rather than telling is highly challenging. Linda Hutcheon states that in this process of transposition, the novel which is adapted loses its complexity and inescapably is condensed: “a novel, in order to be dramatized, has to be distilled, reduced in size, and thus, inevitably, complexity” (2006, p. 36)

It has been recently discovered that translation studies has much to contribute to adaptation studies, which has in the course of time developed considerably (Milton, 2009). Emphasizing the interdisciplinary side of translation studies, Maria Tymoczko, in her seminal book *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators* (2014), states that the interdisciplinarity of translation studies is indispensable. Borrowing the theoretical framework of translation studies and adapting it to the needs of adaptation studies have a lot to offer to the field. One of the most important books in the field is Julie Sanders’ *Adaptation and Appropriation* (2006/2016, pp. 22-23), in which Sanders answers the long-held question of what adaptation is and states that “[a]daptation can be a transpositional practice, casting a specific genre into another generic mode, an act of re-vision in itself . . . indulging in the exercise of trimming and pruning: yet it can also be an amplificatory procedure engaged in addition, expansion, accretion and interpolation”. Despite the common belief that an adaptation can be shorter (transforming a novel into a movie, for instance), the critic explains that adaptation can expand the storyline by adding new details and scenes that are missing in the source material. To enrich the original source, new ideas may be created. Sanders furthermore maintains that it is generally acknowledged that if the audience is already familiar with the source material, the impact of the film is higher: “In all these examples, it can be argued that the full impact of the film adaptation depends upon an audience’s awareness of an explicit relationship to a source text. In expectation of this, the most formal adaptations carry the same title as their source or informing text” (2006/2016, p. 27). To highlight the connection between the novel and the movie, formal adaptations habitually use the same title as the original source material

(this is also reflected in this study). Although the same title encourages viewers to compare and contrast the two materials, the critic insists that it is not necessary to be familiar with the original material to enjoy the movie. Sanders gives the example of Thomas Hardy's *Far from the Madding Crowd* and states that the movie would possibly reference the novel, and the critic would give reviews based on the similarities shared. The critic acknowledges that the adapted work is original material, and the audience would appreciate it even if they do not possess prior knowledge about the novel. The critic also states that "[k]nowledge of the adaptational work is not necessary for a satisfying experience of viewing such a film" (Sanders, 2006/2016, p. 28). It becomes evident that having a foundational understanding of the source novel is not required to fully appreciate a film adaptation. Without being familiar with the original novel, viewers can enjoy the movie as an original material. It should be acknowledged that the film, independent of the source novel, offers an original context and storytelling to viewers. Thus, it becomes redundant to familiarize the viewers with the novel the movie is based on. From this perspective, the adapted movie can stand on its own as an original work of art.

This study aims to analyse the novel *The Secret Garden* and the movie of the same name with Katerina Perdikaki's model (2017b), which adjusted van Leuven-Zwart's (1989) classification of translation shifts to adaptation studies. Emphasizing the similarities shared by the fields, Perdikaki states that "[t]ranslation and adaptation involve similar properties as processes since they both deal with the transfer of meaning and are context-dependent" (2017b, p. 3). According to the critic, translation and adaptation share certain grounds since, in both, moving meaning from one form to another is involved. While translation characteristically changes text from a source language to a target language with the aim of preserving its original meaning, adaptation similarly involves transforming a material from one medium to another.

Evolution of Adaptation Studies from 1.0 to 3.0

Adaptation studies have evolved as a field and methodology over the years. Thomas M. Leitch in his introduction for *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, a comprehensive exploration of adaptation studies from every perspective, defines the term "Adaptation Studies 1.0" for the time when adaptation studies first emerged as a field. Based on George Bluestone's highly influential work *Novels into Film*, published in 1957, Leitch states that the principles of the field during this period were medium-specific. According to the critic, Adaptation Studies 1.0 focused on the differences between novels and films and their distinct natures. The critic states that Bluestone, an influential figure, argued that comparing novels and films was practically impossible because of their fundamentally distinct natures, yet he still made comparisons in his work (2017, p. 2). According to Malcolm Turvey, the early film theorists or classical film theorists supported the idea of medium-specificity to establish that film is an authentic art form, equal to or even significantly superior to other arts. They supposed that to demonstrate cinema as an art form that could accomplish things that other art forms could not, they had to identify the distinct features of cinema and distinguish it from other art forms. (Turvey, 2022, p. 95). The idea of the medium-specificity "holds that each art form has its own domain of expression and exploration" (Carroll, 1985, p. 6). The medium-specificity thesis supports that "every medium is inherently 'good at' certain things and 'bad at' others" (Stam, 2000, p. 58). Thus, the term suggests that each medium, such as literature and cinema, has its own strengths and weaknesses. While a novel is capable of showcasing a character's inner conflicts, thoughts, and, psychological state, a film might be better at creating visual effects that a novel may fall short of. Siegfried Kracauer supports the idea of

medium-specificity and states “that each medium has a specific nature which invites certain kinds of communications while obstructing others” (1997, p. 3).

Over time, scholars had different ideas on how to approach adaptation. While some focused on how faithful films were to their source novels, others wished to explore the transformation and reinterpretation of the source material by that film. Robert Stam, for instance, questions the possibility of strict fidelity and claims that an adaptation can be considered to be an original work of art due to its medium change (2000, p. 55). Focusing on fidelity and ignoring the originality of the adapted work are futile efforts preventing the field from expanding since so far a “stubborn insistence on fidelity certainly has kept adaptation theory from maturing” (Albrecht-Crane & Cutchins, 2010).

W. J. T. Mitchell addresses the complicated relationship between images and text: “The image/text problem is not just something constructed ‘between’ the arts, the media, or different forms of representation, but an unavoidable issue within the individual arts and media. In short, all arts are ‘composite’ arts (both text and image); all media are mixed media, combining different codes, discursive conventions, channels, sensory and cognitive modes” (1994, p. 95). Based on Mitchell’s interpretation, it can be concluded that the image/text problem is not entirely related to cinema and literary texts but includes all forms of media. In other words, Mitchell suggests that no art form or medium depends entirely on visual or textual elements to convey its message. To convey its narrative and message, all art forms use both these visual and textual components to some extent depending on the form. For example, while a novel might create vivid mental images in the readers’ minds through description, a movie, instead of relying heavily on visual elements, might depend on dialogues and narration. Therefore, Mitchell emphasizes that all arts and media are inherently formed by different layers of communication and representation, blending all the components rather than relying purely on one form. Based on W. J. T. Mitchell’s perspective, medium-specificity is challenged by the assumption that each medium is more complicated and intertwined by the unique characteristics of each medium. Mitchell’s view suggests that no medium is purely limited to one form of story-telling. Therefore, instead of supporting the idea of medium-specificity and considering each medium with strict limitations, Mitchell claims that all art forms are interconnected, which challenges the traditional idea of medium-specificity in Adaptation Studies 1.0. Despite their different views, during this period of Adaptation Studies 1.0, scholars mostly agreed that each medium (novel and film in this context) has unique strengths and weaknesses. The boundaries between two forms of art are fluid, and there are no strict limitations that prevent one form from using the unique characteristics attributed to another. Ágnes Pethő discusses this issue, emphasizing that film is necessarily intertwined with other art forms in terms of its connections with music, visual images, and narration and states that theorists have already explored it extensively (Pethő, 2008, p. 1). Noël Carroll opposes the idea of medium-specificity and questions the reason why the essential characteristics of a medium should limit the outcome created within that art form: “why suppose that the essential characteristics of a medium necessarily have any directive consequences for the art made in that medium?” (1985, p. 7). The critic thus challenges the idea that the inherent qualities of a medium limit the incorporation of further elements borrowed from other forms of art. Restricting the medium to its essential features is opposed, and a more overarching approach is demanded. By adopting a more inclusive perspective and implementing the techniques of different art forms and by not confining a form of art to its traditional values and features, more diverse and innovative forms can be created,

encouraging artists to find new techniques to articulate themselves. Noël Carroll asks the medium-specificity theorists three questions: “If film and the novel both excel in narration, (1) should neither art form narrate since narration fails to differentiate them? or (2) should film not narrate since narration will fail to differentiate it from the novel and the novel claimed the domain of narration first? or (3) should the novel give up narration and let the newcomer have its chance” (1985, p. 12). Carroll questions what should be done when two different art forms excel, for example, in story-telling, in this case, movies and novels. Three options are presented by the critic emphasizing that all these options are absurd. The first option is that since narration fails to differentiate them from each other, neither of them should focus on it. The next option is that since narration is the novel’s main characteristic, film should create its own distinguished technique so as not to overlap with the novel’s main strength. The final option is that novels can quit narrating and let the newcomer claim the domain of narration. It is clear that the critic uses sarcasm to highlight the absurdity of these three options, emphasizing that medium-specificity is not a dominant principle in guiding artists. In other words, according to Henry John Pratt, just because a medium has a particular inherent strength in storytelling (in this case, the way film uses visual effects or the way novels explore inner thoughts) should not necessarily lead us to make an ethical judgment about that medium (2009, p. 99).

According to Leitch, adaptation studies has undergone three main stages since its introduction. While Adaptation Studies 1.0 focused on one medium specificity, the second stage rejected the idea of medium-specificity constraining an art form to its inherent specific traits and did no longer support the notion of fidelity: “If medium specificity was the lodestar of Adaptation Studies 1.0, intertextuality was the leading principle of Adaptation Studies 2.0” (2017, p. 3). Instead, the critics adopted the idea of intertextuality inspired by the works of Mikhail Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva. Leitch defines Adaptation Studies 3.0 amidst the rise of digital technologies and asserts that depending on intertextuality alone might lead to a blur between intertextuality studies and adaptation studies and criticizes Adaptation Studies 2.0’s heavy dependence on intertextuality, which may threaten “to dissolve adaptation studies into intertextual studies” (2017, p. 5).

Guy Spielmann discusses the development of adaptation studies as a disciplinary field and demonstrates the complicated evolution of the field: “the concept of ‘adaptation’ seemed so self-evident that George Bluestone could simply title his foundational study *Novels into Film* (1957), omitting entirely whatever verb(s) could encapsulate what happens when a text becomes a film” (Spielmann, 2024, p. 5). The critic shows how the idea of “adaptation” in the beginning was introduced as an almost self-explanatory field, which is so straightforward that George Bluestone, in his seminal work *Novels into Film*, did not even feel the need to put a verb between novels and film. In the early days of adaptation studies, the process of adapting a novel into a film was considered not to need further explanation. Comparing the early days of the field to the recent developments within the field demonstrates that adaptation studies is now more nuanced and complicated, requiring close reading, interpretation, transformation, and recognizing intertextuality. The field is no longer considered via its simplicity, which does not need detailed instructions and complex terms. Adaptation is also not limited to purely films and novels. It can include a variety of media and art forms. In the comprehensive analysis of the field titled *A Theory of Adaptation*, Linda Hutcheon (2006, p. xi) highlights this fact: “If you think adaptation can be understood by using novels and films alone, you’re wrong”. The critic states that especially during the Victorian period, adaptation extended across multiple art forms: “the stories of poems, novels,

plays, operas, paintings, songs, dances, and *tableaux vivants* were constantly being adapted from one medium to another and then back again” (2006, p. xi). Hutcheon resembles postmoderns to the Victorians in terms of adapting; furthermore, we postmoderns adapt “not only film, television, radio, and the various electronic media, of course, but also theme parks, historical enactments, and virtual reality experiments” (Hutcheon, 2006, p. xi). The new materials which are historically acquired offer new opportunities and perspectives to offer to readers, audiences, players, and social media users. Hutcheon emphasizes that we are the inheritors of adaptation, and like the Victorians, we now have more methods to engage in the practice of adaptation.

Table 1. The descriptive/comparative component of the adaptation model according to Katerina Perdikaki (2017a, p. 253)

Descriptive Categories	Plot Structure	Narrative Techniques		Characterisation	Setting	
		Temporal sequence	Presentation		Temporal	Spatial
Shift Types						
Modulation	Amplif. Simplif.	Duration	Narration→ Narration	Amplification Simplification	Amplification Simplification	
Modification	Alteration	Order	Narration→ Monstration	Dramatization Objectification Sensualisation	Alteration	
Mutation	Addition Excision	Addition Excision		Addition Excision	Addition Excision	

As shown in Table 1. (Perdikaki, 2017a, p. 253), modulation shifts present significant changes in plot structures, narrative techniques, characterisation, and settings. An adaptation may emphasize or deemphasize certain elements in the original work. These shifts may change the plot structure considerably, resulting in infidelity charges. Certain elements and events in the plot may be amplified or simplified by the director. According to Perdikaki, mutation refers to the absence of certain elements either in the original or the adapted work. In a film adaptation, if the original novel’s narration is preserved for the most part verbally through voice-over or dialogue, this is considered to be a modulation shift since there are not considerable changes; however, if it is shown visually (monstration) without the need for voice-over or dialogue, this is considered to be a modification shift (2017a, pp. 253-254). Perdikaki classifies these changes into the descriptive category.

According to Perdikaki, the interpretive component is the second category, explaining the motives behind the shifts in the descriptive category. Certain reasons why these shifts appear in the adapted version of an original work are explained based on economic, creative, and social explanations. The economic reason, according to the critic, for the adaptation shifts is to make the film more profitable by making it more appealing to a wider audience. To maximize its profits, the movie may resort to making certain alterations. The second one is the creative reason, emphasizing the artistic choices the director may have. By reinterpreting the original work, the director may adapt it to make it more appealing for the big screen. The final reason for these alterations, according to Perdikaki, is based on social context. These shifts may occur to make parallels with the societal values and expectations of the audience (2017a, p. 254). In essence, Perdikaki’s approach examines not only certain adaptation shifts, including plot structures, narrative techniques, characterization, and settings, but also economic, creative, and social reasons why those changes take place. These reasons depend on the director’s financial goals, artistic

reinterpretation, and societal influences stemming from society's values during the movie's release. It is concluded that these reasons may intertwine or overlap. It should be highlighted that, because of space limitations, the following analysis will concentrate on the most significant changes, leaving out the countless minor adjustments. The rationale behind those changes between the movie *The Secret Garden* and the novel of the same name will be given.

Adaptation Shifts in *The Secret Garden* by Frances Hodgson Burnett

Notable shifts are observed in the movie with certain characters not included from the source novel, and some chapters are entirely removed considering the time constraints of the movie; therefore, some of the characters from the source novel are missing in the movie. The movie of the same name, directed by Marc Munden, was released in 2020. Dixie Egerickx, who was born in 2005, plays Mary Lennox, and Colin Firth portrays Archibald Craven. The screenplay was written by Jack Thorne. The following part will discuss the shifts that change the plot structure of the movie. Shift types such as modulation, modification and mutation will be included in terms of the plot structure, characterisation, setting, and narrative techniques.

The novel, which is considered to be the most enduring novel of Frances Hodgson Burnett, was written in 1911. *The Secret Garden* is written by an omniscient narrator in the third person. The omniscient narrator of the novel describes at the outset of the novel Mary Lennox, a ten-year-old girl who is unsightly and unpleasant with no affection for her parents or for her nanny. Mary and her parents live in post-World War II, India, on the brink of a devastating cholera outbreak. Apart from her unpleasant and sickly looks, Mary, due to her upbringing by Indian servants, exhibits the attitudes of a spoiled and narcissistic child without any empathy towards others. Separated from her mother upon her mother's own request because of being embarrassed by her own daughter, Mary does not show any affection for other people. Being left to the care of the servants, Mary grew up in an environment without love, affection, or guidance. The narrator describes Mary's ill-mannered and self-absorbed personality to the reader. Instead of creating an empathetic protagonist, which makes the character more relatable and multidimensional early in the novel, Burnett creates an indifferent character who lacks genuine concern for or interest in others' emotions or well-being. Growing up in a loveless atmosphere, Mary shows signs of an emotionally insensitive and immature character.

When the Lennox household is destroyed by the cholera outbreak, killing Ayah, Mary's nanny, and her parents, Mary is forgotten without anybody to take care of her. After being found by soldiers, Mary, for a short time, lives with an English clergyman and his wife and children. Later, she is sent to England, Yorkshire to live with her reclusive uncle, Archibald Craven, who still mourns for her late wife, in Misselthwaite Manor. At Misselthwaite Manor, where Mary discovers a hidden garden that has been abandoned since the death of Mr. Craven's wife, Mary begins to forge relationships with a boy named Dickon and her cousin named Colin Crave. Colin, who was previously bedridden and unable to walk, gains his ability to walk again. The garden's return to its previous glory transforms Mary into a completely different character with a more caring, passionate, and empathetic personality. Mary and the garden's transformations align with the intention of the author to create an emotionally detached protagonist at the outset of the novel and then gradually turn her into a compassionate and understanding character.

Adaptation Shifts in the Plot Structure

In *The Secret Garden*, the setting is British Colonial India around the beginning of the twentieth century. In the movie, the setting is more precise as in the location card; the time period and the geographical location are provided to establish the setting. In the movie, it is 1947 in India before the partition of India and Pakistan. The novel opens by portraying the protagonist, Mary Lennox, a nine-year-old girl, as a spoiled, self-centred, and selfish girl. The Cholera outbreak kills Mary's parents, her nanny, Ayah, and some of the servants who live in her house. Other servants leave the house without noticing Mary. She lives in the house for some time alone until Colonel McGrew finds her in the middle of the room.

The movie begins with a scene showing Mary in fear hearing the chaos outside in post-World War II India in 1947. Mary is in her bed trying to soothe herself with a tale about Rama and Sita. The setting reflects Mary's sense of loneliness and her being neglected by her parents from the beginning of the movie. The tale of Rama and Sita is a traditional and well-known story in Indian culture and literature. Delving into the historical evolution of Ram legend in India, Suvira Jaiswal asserts that "[t]he exaltation of Ram as the complete incarnation of Vishnu had significant theological and philosophical implications and contributed to the multiplicity of the Ram symbolism" (1993, p. 95). The critic states that Rama was both an exemplary human with the highest virtues and morals and was also God, an omnipotent and omnipresent self without a beginning. The passage explains how the exaltation of Rama as the embodiment of Vishnu highlights Rama's role in Hinduism as God. Rama is considered to be a perfect example of human beings and a God with divine qualities. He is both a flawless man and a limitless God, which allows for a duality in symbolism in Hindu theology and philosophy. The novel, however, does not begin with this ancient tale. The author introduces Mary Lennox who is "the most disagreeable-looking child" (Burnett, 1911/1995, p. 7) with a thin face and body. The author portrays the main character in a negative way, describing her as ill-tempered, unloved, and unloving. She lives in India with her parents and servants. During Mary's infancy, she was kept out of sight due to her ugliness. She was given to the care of Ayah, one of the servants and was not allowed to see her parents. The author, by showing Mary as a neglected and unloved child, evokes a sense of sympathy despite her negative personality traits.

The movie demonstrates Mary's imagination. Mary reimagines the ancient tale of Rama and Sita, especially Sita's abduction by the evil demon Ravana. In her adaptation, Mary takes on the role of Sita, while her beloved toy, Jemima, becomes her Rama. The film's narrative focuses on Mary's profound loneliness when the outbreak of cholera destroys the Lennox household, while in the novel, the author does not stress her isolation.

Setting

A part of the second chapter, titled *Mistress Mary Quite Contrary*, is not included in the movie (mutation-excision). In this chapter, Mary is given a nickname identical to the chapter's title. Mary, in the novel, stays with the English clergyman, his wife, and five children. The movie, like the novel, starts in India, and then Mary embarks on the long voyage to England with an officer's wife, who is taking her children to a boarding school; however, in the movie, Mary is accompanied by Mr. Archibald Craven's housekeeper, Mrs. Medlock. The main setting of the novel remains the same in the adapted version. The story takes place in Misselthwaite Manor, which is a large Gothic manor, even though it is stressed in the movie that it is not a manor but an

estate, with hundreds of rooms located in the Yorkshire moors of England in the early 20th century. At the beginning of the novel, Gothic elements are present in the manor, reflecting Mary's cynical, dark, and sarcastic personality. The tone shifts towards the end of the novel with the transformation of the secret garden. The location of the story is limited to the manor in the early 20th century.

Characterisation

While Mary is portrayed as an ugly girl with bad demeanours, she is played by Dixie Egerick, a pleasant girl. This contrast is attention-grabbing since from the beginning of the novel, the author stresses the negative features of Mary to the reader; however, in the movie, Mary's ugliness or unsympathetic manners are not stressed by the director. This sharp contrast can be observed with Ben Weatherstaff's remarks on Mary's appearance: "Tha' looked like a young plucked crow when tha' first came into this garden. Thinks I to myself I never set eyes on an uglier, sourer faced young 'un" (Burnett, 1911/1995, p. 88). Written in Yorkshire's dialect, the gardener, Ben Weatherstaff describes Mary's appearance when she first stepped into the mansion. Not only does the narrator stress Mary's ugliness, but also other characters bluntly and directly express her unpleasant and unhappy look. Ben compares Mary to a "young plucked crow," suggesting she looks unattractive, ill-tempered, and unsympathetic.

In Chapter X, Dickon is introduced to the reader: "He was a funny-looking boy about twelve. He looked very clean and his nose turned up and his cheeks were as red as poppies and never had Mistress Mary seen such round and such blue eyes in any boy's face" (Burnett, 1911/1995, p. 92). Dickon is alternately described as a "moor boy". Two years older than Colin and Mary, Dickon, who has an intimate relationship with nature and animals, has lived on Missel Moor his entire life. With his rosy cheeks, rough curly hair, and blue eyes, he is described as a boy who charms people and animals around him. However, in the movie, although Dickon has rough, curly hair, his eyes are not blue, and he does not have rosy cheeks. Dickon is portrayed by Amir Wilson who was born in the UK to an English father and a Sudanese mother. His power to charm and tame animals is still one of the most significant focuses of the movie as well. He is the brother of Martha and the son of Susan. However, in terms of physical appearance, the movie and the novel differ. Dickon, in the novel, is described as a twelve-year-old boy with red cheeks, big blue eyes, his nose turning up, and curly and rust-colored rough hair (Burnett, 1911/1995, pp. 92-93). In the movie adaptation of the novel, the character's appearance differs from the original description in the novel, as the director made clear changes to align with their creative vision.

Another protagonist of the novel, Colin Craven is Archibald Craven's ten-year-old son and heir, who is unable to walk on his own. Born shortly after the death of his mother, Colin was accused by his father of causing his mother's death at birth. His father is still unable to look at him because of his striking resemblance to her. Colin has spent his entire childhood confined to bed, which made his father pity him, resulting in Colin's every whim being fulfilled by his servants. As a result, Colin has become awfully authoritative, gloomy, and whimsical. The transformation as a theme is not limited to the garden but to all the characters in the novel. At the novel's end, he transforms from a gloomy and whimsical character to an optimistic and vivacious boy.

Mary's friend and maidservant, Martha is distinguished both in the movie and the novel by her pleasant frankness and honesty. Her simplicity, her use of simple and direct language and her kindness and guidance help Mary greatly upon her arrival at Misselthwaite, which was initially filled with uncertainties. Martha represents the kindness and goodness of all the local people of

Yorkshire. While there are direct similarities between the original and adapted character, some parts of Martha's utterances are omitted in the movie. The dialogue between Mary and Martha, the housekeeper, is omitted in the film adaptation. The following sentences are uttered by Mary in the novel, showcasing her harsh and racist nature: "What! You thought I was a native. You-you daughter of a pig!" (30). When Martha mentions that she assumed Mary would be dark-skinned because she came from India, Mary becomes furious: "You don't know anything about natives! They are not people-they're servants who must salaam to you. You know nothing about India" (30). In the novel, these sentences convey Mary's perspective shaped by colonial attitudes and depict the complex dynamics and cultural misunderstandings between British colonizers and Indian natives. Mary's reluctance to be mistaken for an Indian native reveals her sense of superiority toward Indian people, whom she considers mere servants existing to serve her and her family. When she first meets Martha, she immediately assumes her to be like Ayah; however, Martha is not submissive at all. In this context, colonialism can be described as the practice of having control over the colonized group. While the colonizer establishes and maintains dominance, the colonized becomes submissive (Nayel & Mohammed, 2024). It is claimed that postcolonial studies investigate the dynamics of power between the colonizer and the colonized and aim to highlight the colonizer's control over the colonized not just politically but also socially, culturally, and psychologically (Pakzad, 2010). The fact that these lines are omitted in the film adaptation shows that it is a careful choice to avoid harsh criticism and direct confrontation with the colonial attitudes which are extensively reflected by Mary in the source novel.

Some of the more controversial and offensive remarks made by certain characters in the novel have been deliberately omitted in film adaptations to align with modern sensibilities and promote political correctness. With this deliberate choice, the director avoids reinforcing harmful and racist stereotypes and direct criticism from the audience. However, the movie fails to reflect the outdated perspective of the era when the novel was written. With these omissions, it is aimed to soften the harsh statements made in the novel. The following statement is also omitted in the movie: "Indian servants were commanded to do things, not asked. It was not the custom to say 'please' and 'thank you' and Mary had always slapped her Ayah in the face when she was angry" (Burnett, 1911/1995, p. 28). In the quotation above, the depiction of physical abuse is clear, and Mary is portrayed with evident racist attitudes. Her behaviour reflects the deep-seated prejudices of her time, which highlights her lack of empathy and understanding toward others from different backgrounds and ethnicities.

One of the most significant changes in the movie is replacing the robin who showed Mary the way to the secret garden with a dog. This can be justified on several grounds, the first of which must be practicality for filmmaking. Handling a bird in a film can be quite difficult and would eventually require the use of animation or CGI to ensure reliable and detailed actions on screen. The actions written by the author would not be involved in the movie with an actual robin. Secondly, training a dog to perform specific actions on screen is easier than working with birds, which can be unpredictable. This replacement must have yielded more reliable results for the filmmakers and been more suitable for a visual medium.

Narrative Techniques

In the movie, the narrative technique of flashbacks, which is not employed in the source novel, plays a vital role in unveiling Mary's past and her being ignored by her parents. This

technique gives the audience a deeper and clearer understanding of her quick-tempered and unempathetic personality. These short scenes reveal that Mary had a troubled and distant relationship with her mother, which made her feel a sense of neglect. Mary is portrayed as a character who was severely neglected by her parents during her childhood and as a character whose needs were consistently ignored. These flashbacks serve to illustrate how this neglect has shaped Mary's current personality. Her interactions with people had a lasting effect on her and her emotional well-being. The film utilizes these pivotal moments in Mary's life to delve into Mary's self-actualization towards the end of the movie while also delving into the intricate themes of family dynamics, the importance of healthy relationships, and the enduring consequences of parental neglect.

The following quotation reveals another technique used in the novel but not in the movie: "He put out his hand a little toward Mary, and I am glad to say that, her own tantrum having passed, she was softened too and met him half-way with her hand, so that it was a sort of making up" (Burnett, 1911/1995, p. 168). With the statement "and I am glad to say that", the author adds another narration to the novel other than the third person omniscient narrator. The technique is often called intrusive narration or authorial intrusion. From the beginning of the novel, although the novel employs third-person omniscient narration, the author here adds direct commentary indicating the narrator's mood. The narrator's subjective commentary is clear in the example. The example shows both the omniscient view and reflects the narrator's attitude towards Mary's tantrum. In the film, this technique, when the narrator provides personal commentary, is called voice-over narration. With this technique, the unseen narrator recounts the events or reveals the characters' thoughts and feelings. While the voice-over can be omniscient as well, it may also be limited to a specific character. There are certain advantages of voice-over narration, such as providing insight into the characters' inner worlds and exposition. However, this technique is not used in the movie, unlike the situation in the novel. In the original novel, the traditional third-person omniscient narrator and intrusive narrator are used together to shape the reader's perception of Mary. The narrator makes their protagonist highly unlikable and unrelatable and even encourages the reader to develop a deep aversion to Mary: "Everybody said she was the most disagreeable-looking child ever seen. It was true, too" (Burnett, 1911, p. 1). The narrator determines the reader's emotional response to the character's erratic behaviours while maintaining a third-person omniscient viewpoint. These moments of intrusive narration are employed to influence the reader's opinion of Mary. The narrator directly narrates their feelings towards Mary, which are mainly critical and negative, based on their all-knowing power. The author explicitly uses the third-person narrator of the novel to create a negative perception of Mary: "So when she was a sickly, fretful, ugly, little baby she was kept out of the way, and when she became a sickly, fretful toddling thing she was kept out of the way also" (Burnett, 1911, pp. 1-2). The narrator in this excerpt takes on a more detached and unsympathetic tone while Mary. The narrator uses rather blunt expressions and emphasizes her negative traits with adjectives like "sickly, fretful, ugly." While describing Mary's physical appearance, the narrator is rather sarcastic: "She had a little thin face and a little thin body, thin light hair and a sour expression" (Burnett, 1911, p. 1). In this excerpt, while the narrator starts objectively describing Mary, later the narrator takes on a more sarcastic and critical role. This could indicate that the narrator does not limit themselves to merely reflecting the views of the people around Mary but presents their harsh perspective on her. The use of such language and expressions like "a sour expression, implies that the narrator wishes to

shape the reader's perception of her early life as an ignored and unvalued child. The narrator criticizes Mary's characteristics: "But she did not intend to look as if she were interested. That was one of her unhappy, disagreeable ways. So she sat still" (Burnett, 1911, pp 18-19). This both shapes how the character's actions and development are understood within the story. In the movie, the omniscient point of view is not maintained. The narrator in the movie shows only the actions and behaviours of the characters without delving into their inner worlds or revealing their thoughts or emotions. The movie distinctly employs objective narration or external focalization. The internal thoughts and feelings of the characters are not revealed to the audience. With this technique, the audience's perception is not shaped by the narrator. Instead, they only observe the characters' external behaviours, and what they say and how they interact with each other. The audience is required to infer the characters' emotions based on their actions. This approach allows the audience to interpret the events without interference from the narrator; however, it does not directly reflect the characters' thoughts or feelings. While the narrator in the novel is more critical, the narrator in the movie is more neutral and merely observational. In the novel, Mary, by the narrator, is reflected as a cold and indifferent character who does not have intimate feelings even for her mother: "She did not miss her at all, in fact, and as she was a self-absorbed child she gave her entire thought to herself, as she had always done" (Burnett, 1911, p. 10). The narrator's interference in the novel is profoundly felt, in contrast to the movie.

Interpreting the Adaptation Shifts

To reach a broader audience, the movie omits Mary's harsh remarks (colonial, racist, or degrading) to avoid harsh criticisms and respect cultural sensitivities. The movie, in this sense, is less critical of the colonial period, thereupon depicting Mary in a moderate manner, ignoring her ill-mannered personality. In the adaptation, Mary is not an unsympathetic character with an unpleasant appearance but rather a lonely girl lacking the presence of parents or close friends. These omissions highlight the disparities between the source novel and its visual adaptation. The director adapts the content of the novel for the screen to suit the medium and to be mindful of cultural sensitivities. This results in potentially losing some of the depth or social commentary found in the original text. Mary's insults and racist remarks are excluded for social reasons. As Perdikaki states, "Paratexts can help deconstruct the rationale behind the changes between the source novel and the adaptation" (2017a, p. 259). Based on this analytical perspective, during an interview, Marc Munden, the film's director, elucidated his intention to diverge from the traditional Gothic interpretations of the narrative in his adaptation: "The adaptations have been quite gothic of the novel, and it starts off almost like a ghost story" (The Movie Times, August 6, 2020). The film adaptation intentionally minimizes the novel's focus on colonial commentary made by a British character to broaden its appeal and reach a wider audience. It can be suggested that the novel's emphasis on colonial power dynamics, especially with the relationship of Mary and Ayah, is intentionally downplayed or overlooked altogether in the film adaptation to make it more accessible and appealing to a broader audience. From this perspective, economic considerations may be referred to since by omitting Mary's degrading and colonial remarks, the movie avoids successfully referring to the complexities of colonialism. It is intended to create a movie that is less controversial, particularly focusing on the transformation of Mary and similarly, the garden.

From a creative perspective, which can also be intertwined with economic reasons, Archibald Craven's early introduction in the movie compared to the novel through brief scenes is

noteworthy since Archibald Craven is portrayed by Colin Firth, who won an Oscar for best performance by an actor in a leading role with his role in *King's Speech*. Colin Firth's early appearance in the film is crucial to capture the attention of viewers, particularly those who want to see more of his performance. By featuring him early on compared to the novel (since in the novel Mr Craven is a reclusive man who does not want any interaction), the movie appeals to his fans to ensure more engagement. In this instance, the changes are driven by both economic and creative motivations to capture the audience's attention and to use Colin Firth's star power.

Conclusion

The relationship between cinema and literature has been an integral duality since the very start. Transformations of literary texts into engaging storytelling visuals have paved the way for an interdisciplinary literary theory. While narration is often linked to literature, it is important to recognize that narration is inherently part of cinema, making intermediality essential. Thus, restricting narration to literature while reserving visuals for cinema oversimplifies the two forms of art. There is a clear and strong connection between cinema and language, and both forms of art combine imagery with words. The fact that cinema primarily depends on visuals rather than narration does not necessarily confine it to solely visuals. To conduct the comparative analysis, the model proposed by Katerina Perdikaki (2017a), who employs the model of intersemiotic translation for analysing adaptations, has been used. This interdisciplinary approach reveals common features in both translation and adaptation studies. A systematic analysis of film adaptations examines both descriptive/comparative and interpretive perspectives. At the descriptive level, specific shifts in plot structure, narrative technique, characterization, and setting have been analysed. It has been revealed that significant changes occur between the novel and the film at both levels. To explain these shifts, economic, creative, and social factors are discussed, following the insights of Perdikaki. The film often shows notable changes, including the omission of certain characters and dialogues from the novel. Archibald Craven's early introduction in the movie, unlike in the novel, due to the fact that Archibald Craven is portrayed by Oscar-winning Colin Firth, is one of the significant changes. The movie also omits Mary's insensitive remarks, whether colonial, racist, or humiliating, to avoid harsh criticism from the audience and to be more culturally sensitive. In terms of the narrative techniques, the use of flashbacks, which is not used in the source novel, is observed in the movie since it reveals Mary's past and to present her as a more relatable character due to her neglect by her parents. As a last remark, Adaptation Studies is a complicated field delving into the transformative process of one medium to another. The field is inherently interdisciplinary, benefitting from the theories of Translation Studies. In analyzing adaptations, this intertwined relationship between Adaptation and Translation Studies needs to be explored more, providing the reader with a more comprehensive understanding of the movie and the literary text.

References

- Albrecht-Crane, C. & Cutchins, D. R. (2010). Introduction: New beginnings for Adaptation Studies. In C. Albrecht-Crane & D. R. Cutchins (Eds.), *Adaptation Studies: New Approaches* (pp. 11-22). Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp.
- Burnett, F. H. (1911). *The Secret Garden*. The Phillips Publishing Co

- Burnett, F. H. (1911/1995). *The Secret Garden*. Penguin Books
- Carroll, N. (1985). The Specificity of Media in the Arts. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 19 (4), 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3332295>
- Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. Routledge. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=P2iyLLy3oigC>
- Jaiswal, S. (1993). Historical Evolution of the Ram Legend. *Social Scientist*, 21 (3/4), 89-97. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3517633>
- Kracauer, S. (1997). *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. Princeton University Press. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=-5-VX822Ma0C>
- Leitch, T. (2017). Introduction. In T. Leitch (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies* (pp. 1-20). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199331000.013.41>
- Milton, J. (2009). Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies. *Translation research projects*, 2, 51-58.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. (1994). *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. University of Chicago Press. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=YLZWtQAACAAJ>
- Nayel, D. K. & Mohammed, Z. D. (2024). The Colonizer and the Colonized: The Creation of New Social Structure in *A Passage to India*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14 (1), 241-247.
- Pakzad, N. (2010). The Colonizer and the Colonized: A Postcolonial Approach to *Brave New World*. *Teaching English Language*, 4 (2), 141-151.
- Perdikaki, K. (2017a). Film Adaptation as Translation: An Analysis of Adaptation Shifts in *Silver Linings Playbook*. *Anafora*, 4, 249-264.
- Perdikaki, K. (2017b). Towards a Model for the Study of Film Adaptation as Intersemiotic Translation. *inTRAlinea* (Special Issue).
- Pethő, Á. (2008). Introduction: Words and Images in the Context of Moving Pictures. In Á. Pethő (Ed.), *Words and Images on the Screen: Language, Literature, Moving Pictures* (pp. 1-13). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pratt, H. J. (2009). Medium Specificity and the Ethics of Narrative in Comics. *Storyworlds: A Journal of Narrative Studies*, 1, 97-113. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25663010>
- Sanders, J. (2006/2016). *Adaptation and Appropriation* (Second ed.). Routledge.
- Spielmann, G. (2024). "Adaptation studies": Steps towards a Necessary Re-foundation. *Word & Image*, 40 (1), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02666286.2023.2278123>
- Stam, R. (2000). Beyond fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation. In J. Naremore (Ed.), *Film Adaptation* (pp. 54-78). The Athlone Press.
- The Movie Times. (August 6, 2020). *Marc Munden: The Secret Garden*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gszfesE0Lqg&ab_channel=TheMovieTimes

- Turvey, M. (2022). The Medium Matters! In Defense of Medium-specificity in Classical Film Theory. In K. Stevens (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Film Theory* (pp. 95-116). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190873929.013.37>
- Tymoczko, M. (2014). *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Taylor & Francis. <https://books.google.to/books?id=TvsJBAAAQBAJ>
- van Leuven-Zwart, K. (1989). Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, *II. Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 1 (2), 151-181. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/target.1.2.03leu>

Ethical Statement/Etik Beyan: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited. / Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.

Declaration of Conflict/Çatışma Beyanı: It is declared that there is no conflict of interest between individuals or institutions in the study. / Çalışmada kişi ya da kurumlar arası çıkar çatışmasının olmadığı beyan olunur.

Copyright&License/Telif Hakkı&Lisans: Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0 / Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.