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ABSTRACT

There is an increasing amount of research examining the parallels between the translation and adaptation processes, products, and studies themselves. Many Adaptation Studies scholars call for the use of Translation Studies' theoretical and methodological framework provided by the Polysystem theory to help further Adaptation Studies as a discipline. This study seeks to adopt this Polysystem theory to examine both Spanish adaptations and Spanish translations that have been published or released in the United States between 1980 and 2015. In doing so, it intends to not only reveal the preliminary, combined, and reception norms involved, but also to further demonstrate the parallel between these two processes and the value of a Polysystem approach in Translation Studies and Adaptations Studies.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

Since 2000, between 120,000 and 310,000 books have been published yearly in the United States, of which only three to five percent are translations, according to several studies (Levisalles, 2004; Bowker, 2013; Heilbron, 1999). Compared to countries like France, Germany, Spain, and Italy where translations comprise 15-25% of the published books, this percentage is startlingly low. While 50% of world's books are translated from English, very little foreign literature is translated into English and is imported into the United States (Levisalles, 2004). It is obvious that English literature has a much different position than foreign literature in the world literary system.

A similar phenomenon can be observed with foreign films. According to several sources, foreign language films account for less than 5% of the United States' yearly domestic market in the past few decades, and that number also appears to be gradually decreasing (Corliss, 2014; Kaufman, 2006). Since 1980, only 1,000 foreign language films entered the United States' market, and only 22 of those films earned more than $10 million in box offices (Ricky, 2010). On the other hand, 25% of the 2005 world box office earnings was accounted for by just 10 films, all of which were produced in the United Stated (Screen Digest, 2006). Just as is the case of foreign translations, American English films has a very different position in the world film system than foreign films in the United States.

Research regarding the importation of foreign literature through translation and foreign films can help to reveal these positions and, more significantly, the greater cultural world system they are a part of. In his article "Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World-System," John Heilbron argues that, considered from a sociological perspective, translations are "a function of the social relations between language groups and their transformations over time" (1999: 430). Cultural Studies scholar Tanfer Tunç, agrees, stating that both translation and adaptation are "transformative processes which serve as cultural and epistemological bridges" (Tunç, 2012). They can, therefore, be studied to reveal these social relations. Just as is the case with book translations, film importations can also be understood as constructing a cultural world system. This world system accounts for the uneven cultural
exchange of importations between language groups as well as for the different roles of translations and foreign films in language groups, and can be understood with a basic core-periphery structure.

In Translation Studies, researching imported foreign literature in the United States assumes a study of the translations published and the relationship of that translation as a part of a greater, complex system. In doing so, the focus is placed on the target text in its target context, and this study assumes the use of a particular theoretical and methodological framework. This framework is best provided by the Polysystem Theory, as introduced by Translation Studies scholar Itamar Even-Zohar, and to be expanded upon later in this paper. A Polysystem Theory approach is not only useful for studying translations, however. More and more studies comparing the fields of Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies and the processes of adaptation and translation have revealed many parallels between the two. From their similar transformative processes to the problematic notions of source-text fidelity and the evolution of the fields themselves, Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies have many things in common. Based on these parallels, recent research in the developing field of Adaptation Studies has been increasingly calling for the use of Translation Studies' Polysystem approach when studying film adaptations, as well.

Keeping in mind the parallels between these two processes, published books are therefore not the only way foreign literature arrives to the United States. Film adaptations of literary works are also a source of importation and can very usefully illustrate the intercultural link formed between two cultural literary and film systems simultaneously. This link can provide valuable information about the intercultural relationship between two countries that can be useful in Translation Studies, Adaptation Studies, and even other fields, such as Culture Studies.

Objectives and Outline

Bearing in mind this illustrative combination of intercultural exchange, this paper seeks to utilize Itamar Even-Zohar's Polysystem theory to examine the reception of Spanish literature in the United States of both translations and film adaptations. The focus will be placed on the reception of Spanish literary works imported in the United States between 1980 and 2015 as both film adaptations and translations. First and foremost, this paper seeks to further explore the
parallel between these two processes in the reception of Spanish literature in the United States. In doing so, the value of an interdisciplinary approach and descriptive Polysystem studies in the fields of Translation and Adaptation Studies will be demonstrated. In addition, this study will also provide useful information that illustrates the reception of Spain in the United States and the positioning of translated or adapted Spanish literature within the U.S. system. With these objectives in mind, this paper will present the following:

- A summary of previous studies in the interdisciplinary crossroad between the fields of Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies (Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies);
- A brief presentation and summary of the Polysystem theory as the theoretical framework for this paper and a description of its usefulness in both Translation and Adaptation Studies;
- A descriptive analysis of the cultural exchange between Spain and the United States focusing on the importation of Spanish literary works based on a corpus of literary works that arrived in the States as both adaptation and translations;
- Conclusions regarding the findings of the analysis as well as its theoretical, descriptive, and applied application;
- A summary of the limitations of the study and areas for future research.

With this basic outline in mind, it is important to emphasize that this paper does not just seek to examine the reception of Spain in the United States with regards to literary translations and film adaptations--a rather limited corpus--but also seeks to demonstrate the applicability of this interdisciplinary, descriptive, Polysystem approach in the fields for future, more exhaustive studies.

Definition of Concepts

Much has been debated in the field of Translation Studies and more recently in the establishing field of Adaptation Studies regarding the definitions of fundamental concepts, particularly regarding the definitions of culture, translation and adaptation themselves. Before
beginning the literature review, theoretical framework, and analysis, it is important to clarify several fundamental concepts that appear throughout this paper. The Polysystem theory will always be the baseline for these definitions.

To begin with, the concept and definition of *culture* has been largely discussed in Translation Studies and, naturally, Culture Studies (Cañuelo, 2008). From a Polysystem Theory perspective according to the Polysystem theory founder Itamar Even-Zohar, culture is defined as a "combination or repertoire of options that organize social interactions" (Even-Zohar, 1999: 73). In other words, Even-Zohar does not define culture as a social superstructure or reflection of social phenomena, but instead as the organizing axis of both individual and collective coexistence. This is the definition that will be used throughout this paper.

With regards to the concept of translation--a concept heavily debated in Translation Studies, and to a lesser extent, Adaptation Studies in the past few decades--the Polysystem Theory will once again be used to define translation using Gideon Toury's proposed definition. Toury states that:

"...for the purpose of a descriptive study, a translation will be taken to be any target-language utterance which is presented or regarded as a translation as such within the target culture, on whatever grounds" (Toury, 1985: 20).

In other words, any source-oriented language utterance that is regarded to be a translation on any grounds within the source culture can be considered a translation. This definition is useful because it frees researchers from the need to define translations based on normative and subjective notions of "equivalence," a term which has also consequently developed. From the point of view of Descriptive Studies, the term *equivalence* has evolved to refer to the existing relationship between two texts as long as one of those texts functions as a translation of the other in a determined socio-cultural system (Toury, 1985). While these definitions are not completely free from controversy, they result very useful by allowing researchers the ability to descriptively study a determined corpus and do away with the traditional and problematic issue of normative translation source-text loyalty when doing so. Because the term *translation* can refer to both the translation product and process of translating, I will distinguish between the two throughout this
paper by referring to the products as translations and the process as the translation process or simply translating. The study itself, however, will focus on the products.

This definition of translation can also be applied to film adaption, as advocated by Patrick Cattrysse in both his book *Descriptive Adaptation Studies* (2014) and his article "Film (Adaptation) as Translation" (1992). Cattrysse defines a film adaptation as:

> "a film which presents itself as an adaptation of (a) previous text(s) and/or is regarded as such by the public and critics, [which] can help do away with the traditional, normative definition of film adaptation, based on postulated relations of adequacy between the adaptation and its so-called 'original'" (Cattrysse, 1992: 59-60).

Film adaptations are therefore all films that present themselves as cinematic adaptations of texts originally written in another semiotic code\(^1\) (typically: to be read as a novel or performed on stage as a play). This will serve as the definition of film adaptation throughout the rest of this paper. Just as is the case with translation, the word *adaptation* can also refer to both the process of adapting a work and the product itself. In this paper, the terms *film adaptation* or *cinematic adaptation* will be used interchangeably to refer to the products, while *film adapting* or *cinematic adapting* will be used to refer to the process.

It is also important to note that, since much of this paper deals with studies in the fields of both Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies by scholars from both fields, a term for the interdisciplinary crossroads between these two fields was necessary. For this reason, I coined the term Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies, which will serve to refer to studies that combine areas of knowledge of both fields and could not fit perfectly in only one of these two fields.

---

\(^1\) This is described further in the Literature Review in Chapter 2.
The Translation and the Adaptation Processes: Where Does One End and the Other Begin?

“Is this a performance of a “translation” (…) Or is it an “adaptation” even though it labels itself as a version?” Katja Krebs, adaptation scholar and co-editor of the Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance asked when examining a contemporary Welsh version of a Greek play (Krebs, 2012, in Raw: 15). Krebs discovered that the distinction between the two is quite elusive, and questioned which of the two—if any—could be used as a label for the work. Indeed, Krebs asked quite a relevant and pertinent question, a question which scholars in both Adaptation and Translation Studies scholars are frequently asking and attempting to propose an answer to. Translation Studies scholars João Azenha and Marcelo Moreira reach a similar conclusion in their article “Translation and Rewriting: Don’t Translators “Adapt” when they “Translate”?“ (2012). Studies in expanding gray area between the two—“transadaptation” or “tradaptation”—like those of Jenny Wong and Susan Knutson further highlighted the difficulties in distinguishing between adaptation and translation. Translation scholar Susan Bassnett took a different stance in advocating the view that “all texts are translations of translations of translations,” (1991: 78-79), but this view has been questioned by Adaptation Studies critic Mark O’Thomas and many like him, who argue that adaptations differ from translations in the fact that they “take place across media rather than cultures” (O’Thomas, 2010: 48). These varying points of view and theoretical distinctions will be briefly presented in the Literature Review in Chapter 2. While the majority of scholars do agree that the two processes and products are different, it is often difficult to determine a universally applicable distinction between the two.

This paper does not seek to theoretically distinguish between the two but instead to explore their similarities and their links to analyze the reception of a peripheral world literature in a central literary system. For this reason, a working definition will be used to distinguish between the two that is concurrent with Mark O’Thomas's definition. For this paper, translations will be considered transfers that take place across cultures, while adaptations will be considered transfers that take place across media (2010: 48). This is, of course, merely a working definition to a relationship that, according to Laurance Raw, at present “seems to be an uneasy one” (2012: 1).
Film adaptations of Spanish literary works, then, are both a transfer of literature across cultures and across media. Keeping this definition in mind, the corpus of works selected for analysis later in this paper will be comprised of both translations and adaptations, the latter of which may or may not have been translated (dubbed or subtitled). This has been done in order to examine the reception of Spanish literature in the United States in its two main means of importation: as translated literature, or as a film adaptation of literature. In addition, this corpus will also reveal the influence that these products have on each other’s reception.
CHAPTER 2—LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction: Translation as a Metaphor for Adaptation

In a 2012 interview in The Wall Street Journal regarding the film adaptation of his novel Cloud Atlas, author David Mitchell commented on the complex structure of his novel and its implications for film adaptation. "Adaptation is a form of translation," Mitchell stated, "and all acts of translation have to deal with untranslatable spots" (in Trachtenberg, 2012). By using this metaphor, Mitchell introduced one of the parallels between the processes of translation and the film adaptation of a text, a metaphor which has been further expanded in Translation Studies, Adaptation Studies, and Culture Studies with regards to theories, processes, cultural exchanges and products. The following section seeks to briefly present and summarize studies done in the interdisciplinary crossroads between the fields of Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies (Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies), many of which highlight their similarities and how the two fields can benefit from one another. Before doing so, a brief history of the two disciplines will be presented in order to better contextualize the studies.

Translation Studies: A Brief History

While translations themselves date far back into early human history, Translation Studies as an academic discipline has only truly been developed within the past thirty years. Once viewed simply as a linguistic activity and a branch of the field of Applied and general Linguistics, translation scholar James Holmes was the first to propose Translation Studies as an academic discipline in its own right and the first to provide a framework for the discipline (Holmes, 1988). Much of Holmes’ basic framework still remains in place today, and his proposal opened the door for more scholars to further establish the field. To do so, many scholars made use of frameworks and methodologies borrowed from other disciplines such as Literary Studies, Philosophy, Psychology, Communication Studies, and more recently, Culture Studies. Various theoretical perspectives from which translation may be studied were developed, evaluated, and reevaluated, among which were the Linguistic approach, the Communicative/Functional approach, the Psychological/Cognitive approach, and the Polysystem theory. In the past two
decades, translation theories were further expanded with additional theories, among which the Polysystem theory, Skopos theory, Post-structuralism, Feminism and Post-Colonialism can be found thanks to developments not just in Translation Studies, but also in other academic disciplines. The field continues to advance with ever-expanding studies, as reflected by an increasing number of international journal publications, book publications, and translator training programs (Snell-Hornby, 2006).

**Adaptation Studies: A Brief History**

Much like Translation Studies originated from the field of linguistics, Adaptation Studies originated from the fields of Literary Studies and Film Studies. The field (although currently in the process of defending its status as a discipline in its own right) originated from critical comparisons between films and their source texts in the early 1900's. This type of criticism became especially popular in the late 1950's, during which time scholar George Bluestone published his influential book *Novels into Film* in 1957, often cited as the “founding text” of Adaptation Studies (Cattrysse, 2014: 27). As academic interest in the study grew, it became less about criticizing adaptations as inferior works and more about understanding the relationship between a text an its adaptation. Unlike Translations Studies, however, the field has not theoretically and methodologically developed nearly as rapidly and is still criticized for the same shortcomings as four decades ago, listed by Adaptation Studies scholar Patrick Cattrysse. According to Cattrysse, the problems facing Adaptation Studies achieving the status as a discipline and moving forward as such are the following:

- Adaptation Studies consists mostly of an endless accumulation of *ad hoc* selected case studies comparing one literary text with its film adaptation.
- As such, (Literary) Adaptation Studies generally focuses on the adaptation of canonical literary texts reducing, thereby, the concept of film adaptation to that of only Literary film (with a capital L).

---

2 Cattrysse states that "adaptation studies as a discipline has had and still has to struggle for acceptance in the academic world," which may be due to the valorization of the older art of literature over the modern art of cinema, the views of literature as a more elevated art, or the views of adaptation as lacking originality, among other reasons (2014: 27-28).
As such, Literary Adaptation Studies is mainly interested in the faithful reproduction of literary masterpieces. Adaptation Studies shows a lack of methodological coherence and also a lack of meta-theoretical reflection (Cattrysse, 2014: 23).

Translation scholar Cynthia Tsui agrees, claiming that the discipline must “develop a systematic and refined methodology of its own,” and she is not alone in this belief (2012: 57). In the past two decades, several Adaptation Studies scholars (Cattrysse being one of the strongest voices among them) are seeking to advance the field by developing a more established theoretical framework. In order to do so, many are turning to Translation Studies for an answer. “If adapters want to improve themselves, they should learn from translators, who have been working with texts for thousands of years,” Lawrence Raw advises in the introduction to his book *Translation, Adaptation and Transformation* (2012: 4). There is a clear call for a more methodological and theoretical framework in the field.

**Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies**

**Introduction: The Similarities**

Naturally, author David Mitchell was far from the first to have observed the parallel between adapting and translating. In his book *Descriptive Adaptation Studies: Epistemological and Methodological Issues* (2014), Patrick Cattrysse describes a long list of similarities between the two studies that have been presented and examined in the past few decades, which include:

---

3 Translation scholar Cynthia Tsui also cites this as a major problem facing Adaptation studies, stating that adaptation is considered “somehow derivative or inauthentic, implying the presence of an 'original' text,” a similar notion to that of a translation in earlier translation studies theories (2012: 55). Hendrik van Gorp agrees and states that, because of this, adaptations have “gradually acquired more negative connotations,” when compared to translations due to the fact that translation creates an “ideal image” of a source text while an adaptation may subvert that image (Van Gorp, 2009: 66).

4 See also Linda Hutcheon’s *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006).
Both translations and adaptations present man-made products that result from a production process, which implies that there are context-based creators, actions, end products, users, and recipients.

Both production processes are applied upon utterances or texts and produce utterances or texts, and are therefore considered intra- or inter-textual or intra- or inter-semiotic.\(^5\)

- Both translating and adapting are considered irreversible, one-directional processes.\(^6\)

- One of the reasons for which the processes cannot be reversed is that their production is largely dependent upon the context in which they are produced.

- The notion of source/target "equivalence" can be applied to both processes.

- The notion of source/target fidelity can be applied to both processes, which, according to Cattrysse, is connected to the "widespread but erroneous belief that the translation process would be more faithful to the source text than the adaptation process" (2014: 47-49).

Translation Studies scholar Cynthia Tsui agrees, stating that “Adaptation and translation, in fact, share a similar set of debates: these include fidelity vs. creativity, author vs. adaptor/translator; and adaptation or translation practices such as the interpretation, contextualization, and transformation of meaning” (Tsui, 2012: 55). These similarities have helped contribute to the growth that Comparative Adaptation and Translation Studies have seen in the past few decades.

**An Interdisciplinary Nature**

In addition, both Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies are academic interdisciplines\(^7\) that draw upon other fields of study. Some of these fields include Linguistics, Film Studies, Literary Studies, Theater Studies, Culture Studies, Sociology, Psychology, Language and Literature, Media and Cultural Studies, and Communication Studies.

---

\(^5\) This is explored further later in *Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies: Origins to Today*.

\(^6\) Gideon Toury originally based this view on the observation that translating back from a translation does not produce the same source text. The same occurs in film adaptation if it is attempted to return a film to book form. Translation and adaptation processes are therefore considered uni-directional since both processes cannot be reversed (Toury, 1980).

\(^7\) The term "interdiscipline" was first used by Mary Snell-Hornby to refer to Translation Studies in her book *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* that compiled a group of papers presented in the 1992 Translation Studies Congress in Vienna.
Philosophy, Philology, History, Computer Science, Semiotics, and Terminology. While this interdisciplinary nature also made it difficult for Translation Studies to establish itself as its own branch of study and appears to be presenting the same difficulties for Adaptation Studies, the majority of scholars agree that the interdisciplinary nature of the fields is mutually beneficial to them and to the other fields they draw upon.

In 2006, Translation Studies scholar John Milton used the work of Brazilian translator Monteiro Lobato to differentiate between the processes of translation and adaptation. While translation was seen as the process of recreating the source texts in Brazilian Portuguese, adaptation was seen as the process in which the text was domesticated for Brazilian readership (Milton, 2006). Because of this, Adaptation Studies is often viewed with a “subaltern status,” much as Henrik van Gorp had concluded in his study (Milton, 2009: 58).

In 2007, translation scholar Lawrence Venuti proposed that Adaptation Studies should learn from “the recontextualizing process” studied in Translation Studies rather than drawing from a predetermined methodology (Venuti, 2007: 30). Patrick Cattrysse agreed, stating that "a growing number of scholars have come to realize that both Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies have more to gain than to lose by working together" (2014: 49). In his book Descriptive Adaptation Studies, adaptation scholar Patrick Cattrysse highlighted the need for a descriptive, Polysystem approach like that of Translation Studies.8

Scholars in both disciplines--and in other disciplines such as Culture Studies--are also in agreement with this, as seen in many of the studies of translation and adaptation that will be summarized in the following section. Dirk Delabatista, in his article “Status, Origin, Features: Translation and Beyond” (2008), develops an open model of translation that questions and rejects the notion of “autonomous disciplines,” highlighting the interdisciplinary nature of Translation Studies and its reliance on other fields. Delabastita makes reference to two conferences, one in Philadelphia in 2006 and one in Istanbul in 2007, which focused on the value of exploring translation as a metaphor in other disciplines. When referring to his open model, Delabatista states that:

This scheme’s greatest merit may be that it encourages us to take the international turn. It invites us to study linguistic, literary, discursive, cultural repertoires across the world.

---

8 This approach is described further in Chapter 4, Theoretical Framework.
(features) and makes us wonder what textual and intertextual categories (status) exist in non-English and non-Western cultures, and what kind of discursive practices they correspond with (in terms of origins and features). A frame is created for their comparison and for the study of their mutual interactions. (Delabastita, 2008: 245)

Clearly, interdisciplinary, international collaboration can aid not only Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies in their advance, but can also be valuable to other studies, as well. The following literature review seeks to present a brief, chronological summary of studies that have explored any of these similarities with regards to the translating and adapting processes, theories, or products themselves, some of which also have taken place in other disciplines, particularly Culture Studies.

**Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies: Origins to Today**

The notion that adaptation can be considered a form of translation made an early appearance in Translation Studies in the late 1950's with the work of linguist and Translation Studies scholar Roman Jakobson. In 1959, Jakobson explained the existence of various forms of translation in his article “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation” which differentiated between "intralingual translation" (translation within the same language), "interlingual translation" (translation from one language into another or the reinterpretation of a message in another linguistic code), and "intersemiotic translation" (translation from one linguistic system to another between mediums, or between a verbal and nonverbal system ) (1959). Film adaptation, then, according to Jakobson, would be considered an "intersemiotic translation" between two mediums. While this definition was not without its criticism following publication, it also paved the way for studies relating translation to other areas of knowledge.

One such study can be found Translation Studies scholar André Lefevere's work, summarized in the preface to his anthology *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992). Drawing upon the notions of Polysystem theorists, Lefevre theorized that translation was a form of rewriting that manipulates literature to ideological and artistic ends that

---

9 Francisca Garcia Luque provides a summary of some of this criticism in her article "Tecnicas de la traduccion aplicadas a la adaptacion cinematografica: nuevos horizontes para la traductologia" on pages 23-24.
are almost--if not equally--as important in establishing the reception and reputation of a literary work as the text itself. This means that every written text takes on a new, and sometimes subversive, historical or literary status. Lefevre did not only refer to translation as a process of rewriting, but also mentioned other forms of rewriting, from the compilation of anthologies to historiography to literary criticism and even adaptation (Lefevre, 1992).

Following the work of earlier translation theorists such as Jakobson and Lefevre, Translation Studies continued to go through many theoretical and methodological "transformative changes" (Tsui, 2014: 55). Adaptation Studies, however, continued to be dominated by what Cattrysse calls "an endless accumulation of ad hoc selected case studies comparing one literary text with its film adaptation" (2014: 23). The disciplines remained relatively separate until 1985, when Adaptation Studies scholar Patrick Cattrysse performed an investigation of 604 film noir adaptations in order to assess the value of a Polysystem research method for Adaptation Studies. The study later transformed into a PHD thesis in 1990 which he called L'adaptation filmique de textes littéraires: Le film noir américain, and an abbreviated version of the study was published two years later under the title “Pour une théorie de l'adaptation filmique: Le film noir américain” (1992). His article "Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals" that later appeared in the Target: International Journal of Translation Studies concluded that a Polysystem approach provided a strong basis for a systematic and coherent method with theoretical foundations that could allow scholars a working and functional approach to descriptive film Adaptation Studies. In all of his works, Cattrysse assured that “PS (Polysystem) theories provide some promising tools to start developing a theory of film adaptation without forcing researchers to start working from scratch” (1992: 59). In the article, he cited the descriptive, functional, target-oriented nature of the Polysystem approach and all that it entails as these promising tools. The research project, however, was discontinued shortly after.

According to Cattrysse (2014), a few more attempts were made to "test and launch" PS Adaptation Studies a decade later (12). In A Polysystem Approach to British New Wave Film Adaptation, Screenwriting and Dialogue, Aline Remael (2000) conducted a PS study of several British New Wave film adaptations that examined norms with respect to screen and dialogue writing. In addition, other scholars have repeated the main principles of Polysystem Adaptation

---

10 This is explained and explored further in Chapter 3.
Studies, such as Mireía Aragay in *Books in Motion. Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship* (2005), have criticized it, or have applied it to a small set of adaptations. Examples of the latter of these studies include those of Lindiwe Dovey, who examined how a colonial past is represented in a postcolonial present by African filmmakers (2005), and Pedro Garcia, who observed how the 1994 film adaptation of Mary Shelly's *Frankenstein* was conditioned not just by the source text, but also previous adaptations, as well (2005). Cattrysse concluded, however, that "in general, the PS approach as such has not caught on in Adaptation Studies" (2014: 23).

While more focus had been placed on the methodological and theoretical benefits that Adaptation Studies can gain from Translation Studies, translation scholar Francisca García Luque studied the parallel between the translation and adaptation processes themselves. In her 2005 study “Técnicas de traducción aplicadas a la adaptación cinematográfica: nuevos horizontes para la traductología,” García Luque proposed the application of translation techniques, as defined and expanded by Amparo Hurtado and Lucía Molina (2002), to analyze the film adaptation process of a literary work in order to better understand the nature of the transformations that occur during the process. García Luque then examined some of these translation techniques in a case study of the film adaptation of Umberto Eco’s *El Nombre de la Rosa*. She observed and described how the work had undergone amplification, compensation, linguistic compression, substitution, discursive creation, elision, literal translation, and generalization. She concluded that a detailed analysis of observable translation techniques in film adaptations could contribute to a better understanding of the relationships between film and literature (García Luque, 2005).

In 2008, Translation Studies researcher Susana Cañuelo utilized many of Cattrysse’s earlier proposals by applying a descriptive Polysystem approach to study the reception of Spanish films and translation in Germany between 1975 and 2000. In *Cine, Literature y Traducción: Análisis de la recepción cultural de España en Alemania en al marco europeo*, Cañuelo sought to develop a theoretical model that allowed for the systematic and coherent study of the intercultural exchange of literary translation, audiovisual translation, and film adaptation. She then sought to apply this model to analyze the cultural reception of Spain in Germany through film and literature. Her study demonstrated both the utility of a Polysystem-based model

---

11 See Barton Palmer’s *The Sociological Turn of Adaptation Studies: The Example of Film noir* (2004) and Lawrence Venuti’s “Adaptation, Translation, Critique” (2007).
in the analysis of intercultural exchanges and the illustrative nature of the link formed between literary translation, audiovisual translation, and film adaptation (2008). Her theoretical framework will be drawn upon later in this study's analysis.

It is also important to mention what Cattrysse refers to as a “pioneering” congress that took place in 2008. Entitled *Adaptation as translation*, the conference sought to bring together scholars of both disciplines and led to the launching of *The Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance*. According to Cattrysse, both the conference and this journal have “significantly contributed to the start of more interdisciplinary work” (2014: 49).

In 2012, Translation Studies scholar Lawrence Raw published an anthology of recent works in Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies in order to explore the theoretical relationships and debates in the two fields entitled *Translation, Adaptation, and Transformation*. In “Identifying Common Ground” (2012) Raw’s introduction to the book, he proposed a framework for Translation and Adaptation Studies that both avoided value judgments and viewed both disciplines as essentially different but interrelated processes. He used examples taken from the Republic of Turkey, as well as other countries, to demonstrate how the supposed distinctions between translation and adaptation are both culturally and historically determined. He additionally proposed that Adaptation Studies should draw upon research to examine the relationship between Psychology, Psychoanalysis and—like in Translation Studies—move forward from the problematic notions of objectivity and fidelity to instead focus more on the significance of perspective (2012: 1-20). In her article “The Authenticity in 'Adaptation': A Theoretical Perspective from Translation Studies” that appeared later in the anthology, translation scholar Cynthia Tsui agreed with this, and stated that Adaptation Studies lags behind Translation Studies as an emerging academic discipline. According to Tsui, Adaptation Studies should benefit from “the experience of Translation Studies, a discipline that provides practical directions and theoretical inspirations, which are highly relevant and useful in conceptualizing adaptation” (Tsui, 2012: 58). Raw further highlighted the value of interdisciplinary collaboration in these fields not only to benefit research, but also to “ensure the continued survival of the humanities in secondary and higher education” (Raw, 2012: 4). The following studies can also be found in Raw's anthology.

In “Adaptation and Appropriation: Is there a Limit?” translation scholars Hugo Vandal-Sirios and Georges L. Bastin used the example of translating texts across cultures in the
advertising industry to demonstrate the need for cultural adaptation in translation. According to them, even though adaptations “certainly go beyond very often the normal work of pragmatic translators…They are essential to Translation Studies and should not be seen any more as ‘non-translations,’ ‘treasons,’ or ‘transgressions’ of a source text” (Vandal-Sirios and Bastin, 2012: 37). They viewed adaptation as a part of the translation process and provided examples of its use in international advertising. In addition, they urged Translation Studies scholars to rethink Adaptation Studies’ inferior status and consider its usefulness in Translation Studies.

In “Translation and Adaptation—Two Sides of an Ideological Coin,” Katja Krebs, co-editor for the Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance, examined the definition of “translation” and “adaptation” in theater productions in order to demonstrate how elusive the various descriptions are. With this in mind, she proposed that scholars in both disciplines would benefit from “an equal and mutually beneficial exchange of ideas, which will, no doubt, strengthen our understanding of contemporary as well as historic constructions of culture” (Krebs, 2012: 50).

The elusive boundary between adaptation and translation is further explored in João Azenha and Marcelo Moreira’s article “Translation and Rewriting: Don’t Translators ‘Adapt’ When They Translate?” which presents a case study comparing different translated versions of Tatiano Belinky’s book A Saga de Siegfried. Azenha and Moriera concluded that, while translation and adaptation are different, it is often difficult to distinguish between the two because academics from different disciplines and different cultures view adaptation and translation differently (2012).

Raw’s anthology also presents two studies in the gray area between adaptation and translation: Susan Knutson’s “Tradaptation Dans le Sens Quebecois: A Word for the Future” and Jenny Wong’s “The Transadaptation of Shakespeare’s Christian Dimension in China’s Theatre—To Translate, or Not to Translate?” (2012). Both studies examined cases in which it was not clear which process played a more determinate role. Knutson’s study of Quebecois “tradaptations” introduced the concept of the mixture of translation and adaptation as a form of writing that has contributed to the survival of the local Quebec language and improved the status of French in Quebec. In Wong’s study of “transadaptation,” she analyzed the adaptation of religious material

---

12 “Is this a performance of a “translation” […] Or is it an “adaption,” even though it labels itself a version?” Krebs questions, referring to Mike Pearson’s 2010 production of The Persians, which was adapted from a previous version by Kaite O’Reilly of the classic Greek play by Aeschylus. The play is not labeled as an adaptation.
in the Chinese version of *The Merchant of Venice*, which was based on a translation by Fang Ping that had culturally adapted the work by removing all Christian references. In the study, Wong asserted that the adaptation and translations processes need to be distinguished, although the study presented no real distinction between the two since both, in this case, established a cultural bridge between the East and West (Wong, 2012).

This cultural bridge was further explored in Culture Studies scholar Tanfer Emin Tunç’s piece "Adapting, Translating, and Transforming: Cultural Mediation in Ping Chong's *Deshima* and *Pojagi" (2012). Tunç looked beyond distinguishing between adaptation and translation and instead highlighted their similarities as "transformative processes which serve as cultural and epistemological bridges, especially between East and West" (Tunç, 2012: 83). She analyzed how Ping Chong had used both translation and adaptation interchangeably in order to reconcile his own identity struggle and to transform the" building blocks of culture” to the stage. Seen from the point of view of Theater Studies, translating and adapting "have the potential to revolutionize theatrical performance," according to Tunç (2012: 82).

From the perspective of Adaptation Studies, Eirik Frissvold Hansen and Anna Sofia Rosshom’s case study of the Russian silent film *Terje Vigen* argued that, even though a direct translation between two different media is impossible, both texts interacted with each other. Like adaptation scholar Sarah Artt who studied three cinematic versions of Choderlos de Laclos’ *Les Liaisons Dangereuses*, they rejected the notions of source text fidelity. In addition, they challenged Roman Jakobson’s definition of intralingual and intersemiotic translation by arguing that film adaptation, in reality, involves both.

Raw also included practicing theatre translator Kate Eaton’s account of translating (and culturally adapting) two works by the Cuban playwright Virgilio Piñera, music studies scholar Mike Ingham’s examination of how A.E. Housman’s *A Shropshire Lad* collection has undergone adaptations through several generations of composers (none of which concerned themselves with source text fidelity), and Culture Studies scholar Ruther Cherrington’s “Cultural Adaptation and Translation,” a study of how Chinese students psychologically translated and adapted themselves to living in a different country (2012). Overall, Raw’s anthology not only brought together

---

13 Tunç provides the examples of visual images, music, material objects and historical texts as some of these building blocks (2012: 82).
14 Hansen and Rossholm mention the work’s fragmented, elliptical narration and the use of repetition as some ways in which they clearly draw from each other.
relevant studies in the fields of translation and film Adaptation Studies, but also defended the value of Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies while connecting it to other fields, as well.

In 2013, Katja Krebs, co-editor of the Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance and one of the most visible scholars in the field, published Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film, a similar anthology to Raw's. In the anthology's introduction, Krebs acknowledged the need for a continuing collaboration between translation and Adaptation Studies and mentioned some "truly global translation and adaptation phenomena" (2013:2). She argued that, while many projects have been analyzed only from the point of view of one of the disciplines, their nature would be better investigated "by opening up a dialogue between these two fields of enquiry" (3). The anthology consisted of a collection of studies that did just that, from theoretical articles to extensive case studies to essays by practicing artists.

In translation scholar Marta Minier's investigation "Converging agendas. Definitions, dyads, triads and other points of connection in translation and adaptation discourse" (2013), Minier examined a series of definitions and terms used in both adaptation and Translation Studies and traced them back to their early origins.15 She considered the theoretical contact zones between the two studies in order to better understand their terminological similarities. In the essays that followed in Kreb's anthology, investigators Dennis Cutchins and Eckart Voigts-Virchow discussed intertextuality as a way to avoid falling back to the traditional and problematic notions of source-text fidelity. Cutchins, in "Bakhtin, translation and adaptation" applied literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of dialogism to adaptation and to prove that it was a valuable approach to examining intertextuality (2013). In "Anti-essentialist versions of aggregate Alice: a grin without a cat," Voigts-Virchow discussed the instability of literary texts that is usually revealed during the translation or adaptation processes (2013).

In the second part of the anthology, Krebs compiled several texts that demonstrated why "the screen and stage offer an abundance of case studies that blur the boundaries between adaptation and translations" (2013: 4). The recognition of theater studies' value in the mixture is a view that is shared by theater studies scholar Phyllis Zatlin in her book Theatrical Translation and Film Adaptation (2005). Several case studies were presented to support this, including John Milton's analysis of the translation and film adaptation of Vishal Bharadwaj's modern Indian

15 Minier cites a tripartite pattern originally found John Dryden's 1680 essay on translation (Minier, 2013).
version of Omkara, based on Shakespeare's Othello, Jessica's Wiest's examination of the
foreignizing of The Thief of Baghdad, and Adrienne Mason's study of the English translations of
Molier's theater (2013).

In the last section of the anthology, Krebs compiled a more loosely related series of
studies that gathered translators and adaptor's accounts and experiences. In "Emerging Practices.
Half-masks and stage blood," Translator Richard Hand discussed his work in theater translation
and how the adaptation of French works has disrupted the English speaking world's perception of
theater history (2013). In "Bridging the Translation/adaptation divide: a pedagogical view,"
scholars and professors Lawrence Raw and Tony Gurr write about their experiments teaching
British and comparative cultural studies to Turkish students that have led them to "propose an
alternative framework for looking at translation and adaptation that identifies both processes as
different yet fundamentally interrelated" (2013: 63). Finally, scholar Ildikó Ungvari Zrínyi
examines the intertwined relationship between film and theatre in the Romanian stage production
of Ingmar Bergman's Cries and Whispers, and performer and dramaturge Pedro de Sena
suggests that the fields of Performance Studies and Deaf and Disability Studies should also draw
from the progress made in Adaptation and Translation Studies (2013). In addition to highlighting
the theoretical similarities between the two fields and demonstrating this with case studies and
articles written by practicing professionals, Kreb's anthology also demonstrates the value of their
interdisciplinarity and both field's usefulness for other studies, such as Pedagogy and Culture
Studies.

Finally, in 2014, Patrick Cattrysse published one of the most recent publications in
Studies' theoretical and methodological descriptive Polysystem approach in the field of
Adaptation Studies and provided a detailed, thorough methodological outline for its use. From a
theoretical point of view, the book addresses and discusses arguments that support Adaptation
Studies being considered a legitimate discipline and argues that, in order to do so, the field must
draw from Translation Studies' descriptive Polysystem approach and methodology. From a
practical perspective, Cattrysse's book outlined how to better conduct a descriptive adaptation
study, advice that will be explained in this paper theoretical framework and followed in the
proceeding analysis.
Conclusion

An increasing amount of research has been done regarding the relationship between translation and Adaptation Studies, particularly in the past 25 years. From case studies to theoretical and methodological proposals, Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies is proving itself a promising new area of research. Among the variety of studies and publications in both interdisciplinary fields—as well as other complementary fields such as Culture Studies—several common notions can be found:

- The notion of the similarity of the two fields based on their comparable histories, problems, techniques, processes, theory, and methodology
- The recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of the fields
- A call for Adaptation Studies to draw from Translation Studies in order to further develop itself as a discipline, and for Translation Studies to draw from the research of Adaptation Studies to further its research, as well.
- A call for both fields to draw from other studies in complementary fields, among which Culture Studies and Theater Studies are most frequently mentioned
- A call for further research

Despite this, the present relationship between the two “seems to be an uneasy one,” according to Lawrence Raw in “Identifying Common Ground,” his introduction to Translation, Adaptation, and Transformation (2012:1). While scholars in the field agree on many things, they disagree on just as many, from the definition of adaptation and translation themselves to whether or not theoretically differentiating between the two is necessary. Even though Comparative Adaptation and Translation Studies does hold promise, there is clearly much more work to be done in the field.
CHAPTER 3—THEORECTICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction and Objectives

In his recent publication Descriptive Adaptation Studies. Epistemological and Methodological Issues (2014), Adaptation Studies scholar Patrick Cattrysse advocated the use of Translation Studies’ descriptive theoretical and methodological Polysystem approach in Adaptation Studies. Cattrysse argued that the approach not only helps solve some of the fundamental issues of Adaptation Studies, but also provides very valuable theoretical and methodological tools for descriptive Adaptation Studies research. Keeping in mind the value of a Polysystem approach in Adaptation Studies and the proven value of this approach in Translation Studies, it can also be an extremely useful approach to Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies. The purpose of this section is to provide an outline of the Polysystem theory and the valuable tools it provides in Descriptive Translation and Adaptation Studies. These tools will later be used to perform a descriptive analysis of the reception of Spanish literature in the United States in the past 35 years through literary translations and film adaptations.

The Polysystem Theory

Origins and Evolution

The Polysystem theory originated in the 1970’s in the writings of Israeli scholar Itamar Even-Zohar based on his research in translation. The theory primarily drew upon the conceptual framework provided by the late Russian Formalists who had developed a versatile, structural theoretical framework integrated with a historical dimension. In a brief 1928 paper by Jakobson and Tynyanov, they suggested the “innovative view” that a system is always a system of systems (Ben-Ari, 2013: 144). Working off of this concept, Even-Zohar developed his Polysystem theory in order to capture the features of adaptability and diversity in time and place, which was

---

16 Cattrysse mentions the traditional, problematic notions of source-text fidelity, the problems of defining translation and adaptation, and the fields' difficulties in achieving the status of disciplines among these.
17 Yuri Tynyanov, Boris Ejkenbaum, Roman Jakobson and Petr Bogatrev are most often mentioned as these scholars.
complemented by the work of Israeli translation theorist Gideon Toury. This theory allowed literature to be viewed not just as a codified collection of texts, but as a set of factors governing a wide variety of behaviors, from the production of the texts to their reception. The two theorists adopted this approach and developed its ideas by applying them to studies in Comparative Literature, paving the way for the Polysystem theory. Since then, an “invisible college”\textsuperscript{18} of scholars in Europe, North American, and more recently in Asia have continued Even-Zohar’s work. Their research in the field of Translation Studies has contributed to the widespread development and use of the Polysystem approach in the field and—as seen in the Literature Review—an increasing call for its use in other fields. The Polysystem approach has been called by many different names— including the functional, empirical, descriptive, target-oriented approach—but no matter what the name, this approach possesses the same fundamental concepts (Cattrysse, 2014).

In the introduction to 	extit{The Manipulation of Literature}, Hermans lists the most fundamental characteristics of the PS theory at the time. The list captures the essence of the basic Polysystem concepts presented by the papers collected in the anthology:

- The concept of literature as a complex, dynamic system,
- A functional character,
- A target-orientated, descriptive orientation,
- Interest in the norms that govern the production and reception of translations,
- Interest in the relationship between translations and other forms of textual production,
- Interest in the role of translation within a literature and in the interaction between systems (Hermans, 1985).

As seen in many of the studies presented in the Literature Review, these concepts have proved to be useful tools in Translation Studies and there is an increasing call for their use in other fields.

\textsuperscript{18} A term coined by Theo Hermans (1985) to describe the growing number of scholars adapting and advocating a PS theory for research.
Basic Concepts

The Polysystem theory is most known for its two most prominent concepts: the notion of systems, as developed by theorist Itamar Even-Zohar, and the notion of norms, developed by theorist Gideon Toury as an compliment and expansion to the theory. Both of these notions can be applied to any systematic phenomenon, from literature to translation to film and other cultural systems and activities.

Systems

Even-Zohar defines the notion of system as “the network of relations that can be hypothesized for a certain set of assumed observables” (1990: 27). When this notion is applied to literature, literature can be considered a system in that literature—like any other form of human communication—establishes a series of relationships between the elements that make it up and the rest of the systems that make up a culture. A determined national literary system is, then, an element that makes up a higher socio-cultural Polysystem which is, in turn, composed of other systems. Cinema, for example, could be considered one of these other systems. The term “Polysystem” was proposed by Even-Zohar to highlight the dynamic, complex nature of systems and applied to literature in his article “The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem.” A Polysystem, then, is essentially a complex system of systems (Even-Zohar, 1990).

According to Theo Hermans, a Polysystem is “a differentiated and dynamic conglomerate of systems characterized by internal oppositions and continual shifts” (1985: 11). Hermans refers to the series of opposing (or binary) relationships that cause tension in a Polysystem, therefore provoking it to continuously evolve and change. There are three basic binary relationships, according to Even-Zohar:

1. The opposition between canonized and non-canonized literature

The word “canonized” is understood to refer to the works and norms that are accepted as legitimate literature within the dominating circles of a culture, and whose products are preserved by the greater community because of this. “Non-canonized,” on the other hand, refers to works and
norms rejected by these circles and, for the most part, ignored by the greater community. Canonicity, then, is not an inherent feature of literature, but a property attributed to literature by a group of individuals or institutions. This status can change, just as the groups that determine it change. This binary opposition between canonized and non-canonized is, in reality, what allows and encourages a system to remain dynamic and continuously define and re-define itself.

2. The opposition between the center and periphery of the system
   According to Even-Zohar, “the center of the whole Polysystem is identical with the most prestigious canonized repertoire” (1990: 17). Keeping this in mind, the strong, organized center of the system accepts canonized repertoire, while the non-canonized literature remains in the periphery of the system, threatening to replace the center.

3. The opposition between primary and secondary literature, or between conservation and innovation
   Primary literature is that which introduces new elements into the repertoire and doesn’t adjust to the rules of the repertoire, contributing to literary innovation. It serves as a model. Secondary literary, on the other hand, seeks to adjust itself to fit and conserve the pre-established rules of the repertoire. This makes secondary literature result predictable. A primary model becomes a secondary model after it remains in the center of the literary Polysystem for a long period of time (Even-Zohar, 1990).

Even-Zohar’s notion of systems helped provide scholars with a way to better define and study literature by recognizing it as dynamic and functional. It encouraged the use of systematic, descriptive investigation instead of prescriptive or normative studies. In doing so, it also created a much more scientifically-based theoretic framework for the field. It also provided the theoretical framework necessary to apply this approach to other fields, as Cattrysse (2014) proposes with regards to Adaptation Studies.
Norms

The notion of norms is also crucial to the Polysystem theory. In "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation," Gideon Toury defined norms as socio-cultural phenomena that are governed by socio-cultural constraints (1978). The concept original stemmed from the field of Sociology. In his article and subsequent work, Toury argued that norms are "the key concept and focal point in any attempt to account for the social relevance of activities, because their existence, and the wide range of situations they apply to (with the conformity this implies), are the main factors of social order" (1995:55). Naturally, this sociological stance travelled beyond Translation Studies, and was also further explored in Sociology and Culture Studies. When applied to translation as an activity, norms are extremely valuable in the attempt to account for the behavior of translators and, by extension, how their work is received in its target culture. While the concept of norms is quite different in different branches of Translation Studies, in the Descriptive branch, norms are considered patterns of recurring behavior that condition a translation. They govern the entire translation process, from the selection of the work to translate to the translator's decisions while translating and how the translation is received in its target culture.

According to Toury (1978), there are several different types of norms that determine a translation. First of all, norms can be either positive or negative. Positive norms determine adequate behavior patterns in the form of obligations or recommendations. Negative norms, on the other hand, determine the inadequate behavior patterns in the form of recommendations or prohibitions. Essentially, positive norms guide what a translator should do, whereas negative norms guide what a translator should not do. Apart from distinguishing between the impact a norm has on behavior, Toury also distinguished between three different types of norms based on their place within the translation process. Hermans, in "Norms of Translation," summarizes them:

- The initial norm governs the translator’s decision to adhere to the active norms of the source culture or to adhere to the norms of the target culture.

---

19 James Holmes, in The Name and Nature of Translation Studies (1988) distinguished between the theoretical, descriptive, and applied branches of translation studies, terms that are still used today.
Preliminary norms govern the selection of what to translate in the first place as well as the translator’s tolerance of the use of versions in intermediary languages.

Operational norms guide a translator’s decision making during the translation process. Operational norms are further divided into matricial norms, which regulate the macrostructure of the text, and textual-linguistic norms, which regulate the text on a micro-structural level.

This concept proved very useful in Translation Studies as it allowed researchers to go beyond simply comparing a translated text to its source text and instead encouraged them to examine the many aspects that shape the final product. Therefore, the approach became target-text centered instead of source-text centered. As stated by Hermans in his introduction:

The relevance of norms in this outlook is that the sum of the choices made by the translator determines the shape of the end product and hence not just the nature of the relation between the translation and its proto-text but also the way the translation is likely to be perceived by the audience for which it is intended (Hermans, 2013: 3).

Translation scholar Andrew Chesterman further expanded upon the notion of norms, but instead of approaching norms from the point of view of translators' decision making, he also took the interaction between translators and receptive audiences into account. Chesterman distinguished additional translation-specific norms, or "technical" norms, which he divided into two categories: product/expectancy norms and process/production norms (1997: 175-186). Product or expectancy norms reflect the expectation as to what a translation should look like and they determine what will be accepted as a legitimate translation by a particular community.\(^{20}\) Process or production norms are then further broken up into three different types:

---

\(^{20}\) These norms can be compared to Christine Nord's concept of the constitutive conventions of translation, which distinguish between translation and other kinds of writing (1991, in Hermans, 2013).
1. **Accountability norms** are ethical norms that regulate personal relations between translators and other stakeholders in translation such as clients, authors, readers, commissioners, and fellow translations.

2. **Communication norms** are norms that require that translators should make communication more efficient by the use of Gricean Cooperative Principle Maxims.  

3. **Relations norms** ensure that "an appropriate level of relevant similarity" is established and maintained between the source text and the target text" (Chesterman, 1997: 69).

Susan Cañuelo, in her previously cited PHD thesis, also recognized and defined two other types of norms: **combined norms** and **reception norms**. In Cañuelo's study, combined norms referred to the different ways in which adaptation, translation, and audiovisual translation can be combined. Cañuelo developed a model to illustrate these (2008). Cañuelo also identified reception norms, which are further broken down into general reception norms and individual (case specific) reception norms. General reception norms include the form/s of the film adaptation, its distribution, and its placement and function within the literary system into which it arrives. Individual/case specific reception norms involve the identification of the adaptation or translation as an adaptation or translation, the placement and function of the literary work and film adaptation in its home literary system, and the influence of the literary work on the reception of the adaptation, or vice versa (Cañuelo, 2008).

**The Benefits of a Polysystem Approach**

Overall, the introduction of the notions of systems and norms in Translation Studies has proved significantly beneficial to the field, and the Polysystem approach been advocated by many scholars. One such scholar is translations theorist Dirk Delabastista, who claims that Toury's "greatest single gift" to Translation Studies is that he "has sharpened our sense of the

---

21 British language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice developed a theory (published in 1970) of cooperative communication which included the use of four maxims: the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

22 According to Chesterman, what constitutes "relevant similarity" and what is considered appropriate depends on the circumstances surrounding the translation (1997).
historical variability of translation" by providing researchers with the theoretical tools to model variability and observe it more efficiently (Desabastista, 2008: 233). From Even-Zohar's concept of systems to Toury's theory of norms and the extensions of these studies, the Polysystem theory has provided Translation Studies with many useful theoretical tools. Cattrysse (2014) highlighted the essential benefits of a Polysystem approach in both Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies:

1. **The Polysystem approach is descriptive rather than prescriptive, which entails a "functional" definition of the object of study.**

   A Polysystem approach does not seek to evaluate translations (or adaptations) based on their faithfulness to their often celebrated source text or criticize or prescribe how a translation or adaptation should be made. Instead, it seeks to describe the features of a translation (adaptation) and explain why these features exist. Since a translation (adaptation) is defined as anything that "functions as a translation (adaptation) in one particular space-time context" (Toury, 1985: 20), studies are no longer limited to prestigious texts, but instead can focus on anything that functions as a translation (adaptation) in a particular place and time.

2. **The Polysystem approach is target (con)text-oriented rather than fidelity-based.**

   A Polysystem approach to translation or adaptation focuses on the end product of translation (adaptation) and how that product functions as a translation (adaptation) in its particular context. Instead of comparing a target text to its source text, the Polysystem approach seeks to describe the target text and explain how its context shaped the final product.

3. **The Polysystem approach utilizes a trans-individual, systemic, and corpus-based approach.**

   Studies are no longer based on the author's intentions and what the author considers to be worth studying, but instead places works in their historical, socio-cultural context and seeks explanations with trans-individual or societal facts. In this way, the Polysystem approach assumes a systematic examination, instead of a simple comparison between the
source text and target text or format. The approach also encourages the selection of works based on their target context, not their source context (for example: "Translated/adapted English literature in the 1950's" vs. "Shakespeare in translation/adaptation"). This assumes a more trans-individual, systemic, and corpus-based study.

Considering the many theoretical tools that a Polysystem approach provides, the following study seeks to utilize this descriptive approach in studying the reception of Spanish literature through translations and film adaptation in the United States. The Polysystem theory offers a valuable methodological framework to analyze the contexts of these transferred texts and the relationships between them. Its descriptive, functional, context-oriented, systematic and corpus-based methodology will allow for the study of a determined, functional, context-oriented corpus. It will also demonstrate the relationship between these two intercultural processes and systems and how they are shaped by their respective contexts.
CHAPTER 4—ANALYSIS

Research Design

This analysis seeks to apply the theoretical and methodological framework offered by the Polysystem theory to examine the reception of Spain in the United States bearing in mind the value of both translations and adaptations in studying intercultural literary exchange. The study will be based on a corpus of Spanish literary works that have arrived in the United States both as translations and film adaptations between 1980 and 2015. These works will then be examined using three types of norms: preliminary norms, combined norms, and reception norms.

Preliminary norms, as defined by Gideon Toury (1995: 58), are the norms that operate before the transfer process. For this study, the analysis of preliminary norms will be divided into the following: an analysis of the target literary and film Polysystems, a quantitative analysis of the products being transferred, and an analysis of several selection factors, including genre, authors/directors, and source text language. The analysis of the American literary and film Polysystem will be completed based on previous research done in the field and articles written on the topic and published in reputable print or online newspapers. The quantitative analysis will be performed by collecting a corpus of data that represents the number of Spanish literary translations and film adaptations that have arrived in the United States between 1980 and today. This corpus will then be used to analyze the selection factors. All of these are examined with reference to the final products in their target literary systems.

Combined norms, as defined by Susana Cañuelos in her 2008 thesis, refer to the different ways in which the two forms of cultural transfer can be combined. A corpus of works that are both adaptations and translations of Spanish literature will be used in order to perform a quantitative analysis of these works and to examine the order in which they arrived. Once again, the emphasis is placed on the final products in their culture of arrival.

Reception norms seek to find a pattern in the reception of film adaptations and translations in their corresponding target systems (Cañuelos, 2008). In order to do so, both

23 The term "Spanish" refers specifically to works from Spain, and not just works that are written in the Spanish language.
24 June, 2015 is the cutoff used for this timeline.
systems must be analyzed separately and the focus is, once again, on the final products in the target system. In this case, their function in the target system will be compared to their function in their source system with respect to awards won by the authors, directors and the works themselves.

The following table illustrates all of the aspects of this analysis:

Table 1: *Research Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Literary Translation</th>
<th>Film Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preliminary Norms</strong></td>
<td>• Description of target literary Polysystem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quantitative analysis of Spanish translations that have been published between 2009 and 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis of several selection factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Norms</strong></td>
<td>• Quantitative Analysis of works that are both translations and adaptations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Order of arrival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reception Norms</strong></td>
<td>• Function and position of the work in its source system (awards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Function and position of the work its target system (awards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Function and position of the work in its source system (awards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Function and position of the work in its target system (awards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corpus and Data Collection

In order to best study the reception of Spain in the United States from 1980 to 2015 through its literature and film adaptations of literature, it was necessary to research and compile a corpus of Spanish literary works that have also been adapted to film and have arrived to the United States as both translations and adaptations. The corpus for this study was compiled based on several categories and using a process of gradual elimination, for which tables will later be included. Since the gathering of the data for the corpus was highly limited by the sources available, research began with the use of broader categories and sources that provide a greater amount of information and later narrowed down as the combined norms the corpus needed to fit became more demanding and limiting. The corpus was compiled by researching several phenomena in the following order:

1. Translations, foreign films, and adaptations the US literary and film Polysystems

   Since it would be impossible to cover all translation and foreign film arrivals in the United States in the past 35 years in detail and the resources available do not provide such information, there were three basic, achievable goals for this section:

   A. The first objective was to provide a brief, basic portrait of the role of translated and adapted literature in the US literary and film Polysystems. To do so, a brief description of the two systems was written using previous research done in the field and data provided in news sources and reports, as well as data regarding the number of movies produced per year in the United States and the number of adaptations per year in the United States from the Theatrical Market Statistics reports and the Mid-Continent Public Library database.

---

25To my knowledge, there are no—or very few—completely exhaustive scholarly sources that provide lists of either the number of translations that have arrived in the United States between 1980 and 2015 and the number of published literary translations. If similar lists exist, they are either limited by date or do not provide the adequate information (country, name of author, year of publication, etc.) to be used exclusively for this study.
B. The second objective was to compile a list of all Spanish films that have arrived to the United States since 1980,\textsuperscript{26} for which several websites were of particular use: the United States Academy Awards database and the Academia de las Artes y las Ciencias Cinematográficas de España database, as well as the Internet Movie Database (IMDb). The Wikipedia yearly listing of each year in film was also very useful in providing information regarding the (few) movies that did not arrive via film festival or awards ceremony or arrived via another film festival.

C. The third objective was to provide information regarding Spain's presence in the translated literature that arrives in the United States, for which only data in the past seven years was available using the University of Rochester's Translation Database that is dedicated to recording the translations that have been published in the United States yearly since 2009.

2. Spanish films that have arrived in the US between 1980 and 2015

Based on this research, it soon became apparent that there was far more data available regarding foreign films and film adaptations in the United States than translations, and an overall lesser number of films. Because of this, this film data was used to compile the corpus of Spanish films that have arrived in the United States between 1980 and 2015. Once again, the United States Academy Awards database and the Academia de las Artes y las Ciencias Cinematográficas de España database, as well as the Internet Movie Database, were used to compile this data. The Wikipedia yearly listing of film releases in the United States was also used.

\textsuperscript{26} This list will later be used in order to create the corpus of works that have arrived both as adaptations and translations.
3. **Films that are adaptations of Spanish literary works released between 1980 and 2005**

Working off of the previous list of movies, I then researched which of the films that had arrived and were based on Spanish literary works using the Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes database of Spanish film adaptations (until 2005), Wikipedia, and the Internet Movie Database (all years). The Wikipedia films by year database was also searched in order to account for the possibility that some of the film adaptations of Spanish literature may not have been made by Spanish directors, which was the case for one work. All of these sources were also used to verify each other's information and, in all cases, were consistent with each other.

4. **Spanish literary works that had been translated into English and are available in the United States that had also been adapted to a film that had been released in the United States between 1980 and 2015**

For this final step in completely narrowing down the corpus, the existing list of films that were adaptations of Spanish literary works between 1980 and 2015 was used to perform a WorldCat library search to find all literary works that have also arrived to the United States and are available in at least one U.S. library. This narrowed down the corpus further since several of the literary works had not been translated into English and/or were not available in the United States.

Both the process and the result of compiling this corpus of combined norms proved very useful in the examination of the reception of Spanish literature in the United States. Not only did the results provide an exhaustive--or nearly exhaustive--list of all works that had arrived in the past 35 years as both translations and adaptations, but the process itself also served to reveal the presence of norms involved in the selection and reception of these works.

---

27 These films do not necessarily have a Spanish director, but are based on a work written by a Spanish author and first published in Spain.
Analysis

The following section presents an analysis of this study. Following the previously mentioned research model, the analysis of Spanish literature through translation and films in the United States is broken down into three sections: preliminary norms, combined norms, and reception norms. These are further broken down into other analyses.

Preliminary Norms

Translated literature in the United States

It's no secret that very few translations are published in the United States. According to several studies, only three to five percent of U.S. publications are translations (Heilbron, 1999). When compared to the 15-25% of translated literature published annually in the French, Spanish, German, or Italian literary systems, this is a startlingly low percentage. While 40% of world's books are translated from English, very little foreign literature is translated into English and is published in the United States (Levisalles, 2004).

According to Johan Heilbron in his 1999 article "Book Translations as a Cultural World System," book translations can be understood as constructing part of a cultural world system. This world system accounts for the uneven cultural exchange of translations between language groups as well as for the different roles of translations in language groups. It can be understood with a basic core-periphery structure. According to Heilbron, the international translation system is a hierarchical structure with central, semi-peripheral, and peripheral languages. A language is considered more central when it has a larger amount of books translated worldwide. Considering that more than 40% of the world's books are translated from English, the English language has a "hyper-central" role (Heilbron, 1999: 434). Spanish, on the other hand, is considered a "semi-peripheral" language, as it contributes to only approximately 1-3 percent of the world's translated literature (434).

These positions are reflected in the United States literary system, a system that publishes very few translations yearly, according to many sources. "The more central a language is in the international translation system, the smaller the proportion of translations into this language,"
Heilbron states (1999: 439). Translated literature in this system thus generally maintains a peripheral, non-canonized, and secondary role in the literary system.

**Spanish Translated Literature in the United States: Quantitative Analysis**

Since translated literature is clearly limited to the periphery of the United States literary system, the number of translations that are published in the United States is very limited. The following table presents the total number of translations that were published in the United States per year according to the University of Rochester Translation Database. The table is further broken down into the number of these translations that are from Spain and the percentage of Spanish literature within the translated literature, as well as how Spain ranks compared to other countries with regards to translations that are published in the United States.

Table 2: *The Number of Translations Published in the United States per Year (2009-2015) and Percentage and Ranking of Spanish Translations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Translations Published</th>
<th>Number of Spanish Translations</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
<td>3 (tied with Japan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
<td>7 (tied with Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td>6 (tied with Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>6 (tied with Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The University of Rochester Translation Database)

Much as the United States literary system can be viewed as a complex, dynamic and constantly-changing system of (sub)systems, so, too can the system that makes up translated literature that is published in the United States. In this system, literature from all other countries

---

28 Updated June 11th, 2015.
of the world translated into English competes for both entry into the system and for a central, canonicized, primary location in the system. As can be observed by the table, Spanish literature in the past seven years has made up between 3.91% and 5.51% of the system and consistently maintained a place among the top seven of the most represented countries. Considering that the translated literature of between 64 and 75 countries has arrived per year, Spanish translated literature is ranked in the top 6-7% of this literature. In the past seven years, Spanish literature can therefore be seen as occupying a more central position within the U.S. translated literature system, albeit a peripheral position in the entire U.S. literature system itself. Countries whose literature constantly occupies a more centralized position include Germany and France, with the largest number of translations arriving from France (between 10-17 percent of all translations). France, therefore, has the most centralized role, a fact that is verified by Levisalles (2014).

Depending on the year, more translated literature from Japan, Italy, Russia, Sweden, Argentina, and Israel has arrived than from Spain (University of Rochester). French translated literature is the most consistently located in the center of the U.S. Polysystem of translated literature, however.

It is also interesting to note the genre of the Spanish works that have arrived to the United States. Within the Spanish translations that have arrived in the past seven years, the majority of these works--between 77 and 86 percent-- have been classified as works of literary fiction. Poetry translations have a much smaller presence of between approximately 13 and 22 percent.

Table 3: Spanish Translated Literature in the U.S. by Genre (2009-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fiction %</th>
<th>Poetry %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>80.17%</td>
<td>19.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>77.94%</td>
<td>22.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>81.89%</td>
<td>18.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>84.13%</td>
<td>15.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>81.89%</td>
<td>18.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>83.59%</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>85.75%</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(University of Rochester Translation Database)

In order to delve a little bit deeper and provide more information regarding the original publishing years, authors, translators, and original languages of some of these translated works, I examined all of the Spanish translations that have arrived in one year for this information. The
year 2015\(^{29}\) was chosen for several reasons. First, when compared to the other years with data available, the year 2015 provided the most representative sample with regards to the average percentage of Spanish translations that have been published 2008 and 2015 and the percentage of Catalan language texts. Second, this year provided the most recent data.

Table 4: 2015 Spanish Translations in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translated Title</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Source Text Publishing Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Plimsoll Line</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>La línea Plimsoll (Serie Trilogía de la enfermedad 01)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Juan Gracia Armendariz</td>
<td>Jonathan Dunne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, October</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Agosto, Octubre</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Andres Barba</td>
<td>Lisa Dillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Debts</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Deudas pendientes</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Antonio Jimenez Barca</td>
<td>Benjamin Rowdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sea</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>El mar</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Blai Bonet</td>
<td>Cathy Sweeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confessions</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>Jo confesso</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jaume Cabre</td>
<td>Mara Faye Lethem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point of Balance</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Punto de Equilibrio</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>J.G. Jurado</td>
<td>Martin Michael Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Last Passenger</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>El Último Pasajero</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Manel Loureiro</td>
<td>Andres Alfaro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{29}\) The data provided for 2015 included the entire year up until June 11th.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Same City</em></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td><em>La Misma Ciudad</em></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Luisge Martin</td>
<td>Tomasz Dukanovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>An Englishman in Madrid</em></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td><em>Riña de gatos. Madrid 1936</em></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Eduardo Mendoza</td>
<td>Nick Caistor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Map of Chaos</em></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td><em>El mapa del caos</em></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Felix Palma</td>
<td>Nick Caistor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Life Embitters</em></td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td><em>El quadern gris</em></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Josep Pla</td>
<td>Peter Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>War, So Much War</em></td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td><em>Quanta, quanta guerra</em></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Merce Rodoreda</td>
<td>Maruxa Relano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Private Life</em></td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td><em>Vida privada</em></td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Josep Maria de Sagarra</td>
<td>Mary Ann Newman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Because She Never Asked</em></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td><em>Porque ella no lo pidió</em></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Enrique Vila-Matas</td>
<td>Valerie Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Brief History of Portable Literature</em></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td><em>Historia Abreviada de la literatura portátil</em></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Enrique Vila-Matas</td>
<td>Anne McLean and Tom Bunstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Illogic of Kassel</em></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td><em>Kassel no invita a la lógica</em></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Enrique Vila-Matas</td>
<td>Anne McLean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(University of Rochester Translation Database)

In 2015, five of the 16 Spanish literary translations were from Catalan (approximately 31%), a percentage fairly representative of the 4.16 Catalan translations per year average between 2009 and 2015. The rest were from Spanish. Of the works that were translated, there was a wide range of different time frames between the work's original publication and the translation's publication. Five of the translations were published the same year or within two years following the source text's translation, three of the works between three and five years following first publication, four of the works between 6 and 10 years following first publication,
three of the works between 30 and 50 years following first publication, and one work more than 80 years after the source text's first publishing date. Of the authors translated, all authors were translated once with the exception of Enrique Vila-Matas, who was translated three times, two of which were by the same translator (Anne McLean). Of the 14 authors whose works were translated, the majority (10) are still alive, according to various sources (Instituto Cervantes, Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport, Penguin Random House Grupo Editorial). With regards to the translators, British translator Nick Caistor and Canadian translator Anne McLean both either published or collaborated on two translations that were published in 2015.

While this data is only taken from one year, it is interesting to note several patterns that are indicative of selection factors that can also be observed in previous years by examining the University of Rochester Translation Database. First, all—or almost all—of the works that are translated and arrive in the United States have been successful in Spain or are written by well-known Spanish or Catalan authors. The fact that certain authors have more than one work translated also supports this and, in the case of Enrique Vila-Matas, many of his works have been both bestsellers and praised for their literary merit (Sygulla, 2011). The majority of works translated and published are relatively recent, since 11 of the 16 had been published after 2000. On average, approximately four Catalan texts have been translated into English and published in the United States each year, making up roughly 1% of the total translated works. With regards to translators, it is interesting to note a similar phenomenon as can be observed with authors: the more prolific, established translators (as demonstrated by simple Google searches) are published more frequently than others. Once again, even though this data only describes one representative year from the data available, a longer, more detailed analysis could prove very useful in analyzing the selection factors involved in foreign translations that arrive in the United States. This analysis, as well as any other parallel analysis of translations from other countries, has much potential for future research.
Foreign Film in the United States

In his article "Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World-System," John Heilbron argues that, considered from a sociological perspective, translations are "a function of the social relations between language groups and their transformations over time" (1999: 430). They can, therefore, be studied to reveal these social relations. Just as is the case with book translations, film importations can also be understood as constructing part of a cultural world system. This world system accounts for the uneven cultural exchange of importations between language groups as well as for the different roles of films in language groups, and can also be understood with a basic core-periphery structure. Just like the literary system, the international film system is also composed of a hierarchical structure with central, semi-peripheral, and peripheral languages. A language is considered more central when it has a larger amount of films exported worldwide.

Much as it is a central language in the cultural world system, English is also a central language in film production. Within this central language, the American film market plays the largest role. In 2005, 25% of the world’s box office earnings was accounted for by just 10 films, all of which had been produced in the United States (Screen Digest, 2006). As the center of the international film system, the American film system exports a significant amount of films, but imports very few. In the United States, foreign language films only account for approximately 5% of the yearly domestic market in the past few decades (Corliss, 2014; Kaufman, 2006). Once cited at 10%, there is evidence that this percentage may now rest at a mere 1%. Since 1980, only 1,000 foreign language films entered the United States' market, and only 22 of those films earned more than $10 million in box offices (Ricky, 2010). Once again, the English language (and American English, in particular) has a hyper-central role in the system. Spanish, on the other hand, could also be considered a semi-peripheral language, since it only contributes to a moderate share of the world’s film distribution, with 50 active distributors in 2005, a number only surpassed by India, the United States, France, the UK, Germany, and South Korea (Screen Digest, 2006).

30 According to the PriceWaterhouseCoopers data, U.S. exports of film and entertainment often attain shares of over 90% in international markets (PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2015).
Spanish Film in the United States: Quantitative Analysis

After providing a brief quantitative analysis of recently translated Spanish literature in the United States based on the data available, the same was done with regards to Spanish films. Since much more data is available regarding film arrivals than translation publications, this analysis will cover the entire time span of this study, from 1980 to 2015. In order to attain this information, data was collected using a series of sources, from the list of films sent to the United States from Spain as representatives for the Academy Awards to the award winners themselves, to film information detailing awards won in international films festivals on the Internet Movie Database, to lists provided the titles of all films released in the United States by year. While being able to use these sites to double-check each other helped prove their reliability and provide a more exhaustive list, it is important to note that many had either gaps in the information provided, such as years missing, release dates not specified or data limited to a single awards ceremony. For this reason, it is possible that some Spanish films released in the United States between 1980 and 2015 may not be present in this list.

Table 5: Spanish films that have arrived in the United States 1980-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Translated Title</th>
<th>Director/s</th>
<th>Means of Arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Mamá cumple cien años</td>
<td>Mama Turns 100</td>
<td>Carlos Saura</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>El Nido</td>
<td>The Nest</td>
<td>Jaime de Armiñán</td>
<td>Oscar Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Volver a Empezar</td>
<td>Begin the Beguine</td>
<td>José Luis Garci</td>
<td>Oscar Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>La colmena</td>
<td>The Beehive/The Hive</td>
<td>Mario Camus</td>
<td>Chicago International Film Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Carlos Saura</td>
<td>Oscar Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Sesión continua</td>
<td>Double Feature</td>
<td>José Luis Garci</td>
<td>Oscar Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Los santos inocentes</td>
<td>The Holy Innocents</td>
<td>Mario Camus</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>¿Qué he hecho yo para merecer esto?</td>
<td>What have I done to Deserve this?</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>La mitad del cielo</td>
<td>Half of Heaven</td>
<td>Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 See Variables and Limitations section later for more details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Film Title</th>
<th>English Title</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>El amor brujo</td>
<td>Love, The Magician, or Wedded by Witchcraft</td>
<td>Carlos Saura</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Asignatura aprobada</td>
<td>Course Completed</td>
<td>José Luis Garci</td>
<td>Oscar Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mujeres al borde de un ataque de nervios</td>
<td>Women on the Verge of a Nervous Breakdown</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>Oscar Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>El Sur</td>
<td>The South</td>
<td>Víctor Erice</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Entre tinieblas</td>
<td>Dark Habits</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Angustia</td>
<td>Anguish</td>
<td>Bigas Luna</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Montoyas y Tarantos</td>
<td>Montoyas y Tarantos</td>
<td>Vicente Escrivá</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Sangre y arena</td>
<td>Blood and Sand</td>
<td>Javier Elorrieta</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>¡Ay, Carmela!</td>
<td>Ay, Carmela!</td>
<td>Carlos Saura</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Tacones lejanos</td>
<td>High Heels</td>
<td>Pedro Olea</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>El maestro de esgrima</td>
<td>The Fencing Master</td>
<td>Pedro Olea</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Amantes</td>
<td>Lovers</td>
<td>Vicente Aranda</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>El sol del membrillo</td>
<td>Dream of Light</td>
<td>Víctor Erice</td>
<td>New York Film Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Belle Époque</td>
<td>Belle Époque</td>
<td>Fernando Trueba</td>
<td>Oscar Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Vacas</td>
<td>Cows</td>
<td>Julio Médem</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Huevos de oro</td>
<td>Golden Balls</td>
<td>Bigas Luna</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Canción de cuna</td>
<td>Canción de cuna</td>
<td>José Luis Garci</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>La flor de mi secreto</td>
<td>The Flower of My Secret</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>El día de la bestia</td>
<td>The Day of the Beast</td>
<td>Alex de la Iglesia</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Esposados</td>
<td>Linked</td>
<td>Juan Carlos Fresnadillo</td>
<td>Oscar Nomination (Live Short Action Film)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Bwana</td>
<td>Bwana</td>
<td>Imanol Uribe</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Secretos del corazón</td>
<td>Secrets of the Heart</td>
<td>Montxo Armendáriz</td>
<td>Oscar Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Flamenco</td>
<td>Flamenco</td>
<td>Carlos Saura</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Carne tremula</td>
<td>Live Flesh</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>New York Film Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>El abuelo&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>The Grandfather</td>
<td>José Luis Garci</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Todo sobre mi madre</td>
<td>All About My Mother</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>Oscar Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>La lengua de la</td>
<td>Butterfly/Butterfly's</td>
<td>José Luis Cuerda</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>32</sup> Third adaptation of Benito Perez Galdos' novel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Film Title (Original)</th>
<th>Film Title (English)</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>You’re the One (una historia de entonces)</td>
<td>You're the One</td>
<td>José Luis García</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Goya en Burdeos</td>
<td>Goya in Bordeaux</td>
<td>Carlos Saura</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Juana la Loca</td>
<td>Mad Love</td>
<td>Vicente Aranda</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Sobreviviré</td>
<td>I will Survive</td>
<td>Alfonso Albacete, David Menkes</td>
<td>Other (Los Angeles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Los lunes al sol</td>
<td>Mondays in the Sun</td>
<td>Fernando León de Aranoa</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Lucía y el Sexo</td>
<td>Sex and Lucia</td>
<td>Julio Medem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Balseros</td>
<td>Rafters</td>
<td>Carles Bosch, Josep Maria Domènech</td>
<td>Oscar Nomination (Best Documentary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Hable con Ella</td>
<td>Talk to Her</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>Oscar Winner (Best Director)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Soldados de Salamina</td>
<td>Soldiers of Salamina</td>
<td>David Trueba</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Planta 4ª</td>
<td>The 4th Floor</td>
<td>Antonio Mercero</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Beyond Re-Animator</td>
<td>Animator</td>
<td>Brian Yuna</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Mar adentro</td>
<td>The Sea Inside</td>
<td>Alejandro Amenábar</td>
<td>Oscar Winner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Te Doy mis Ojos</td>
<td>Take my Eyes</td>
<td>Icíar Bollaín</td>
<td>Seattle Film Festival Winner: Best Actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7:35 de la maniana</td>
<td>7:35 in the Morning</td>
<td>Nacho Vigalondo</td>
<td>Oscar Nomination (Live Action Short Film)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Obaba</td>
<td>Obaba</td>
<td>Montxo Armendáriz</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Volver</td>
<td>Volver</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Binta y la gran idea</td>
<td>Binta and the Great Idea</td>
<td>Javier Fesser</td>
<td>Oscar Nomination (Live Action Short Film)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Éramos pocos</td>
<td>One Too Many</td>
<td>Borja Cobeaga</td>
<td>Oscar Nomination (Live Action Short Film)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>El orfanato</td>
<td>The Orphanage</td>
<td>Juan Antonio Bayona</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Salvador (Puig)</td>
<td>Salvador (Puig)</td>
<td>Manuel Huerga</td>
<td>Seattle Film Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

33 Remake of Juan de Orduña's 1948 film "Locura de Amor."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title (Spanish)</th>
<th>Title (English)</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Film Festival/Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Los girasoles ciegos</td>
<td>The Blind Sunflowers</td>
<td>José Luis Cuerda</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>El baile de la Victoria</td>
<td>The Dancer and the Thief</td>
<td>Fernando Trueba</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>La Dama y la Muerte</td>
<td>The Lady and the Reaper</td>
<td>Javier Recio</td>
<td>Oscar Nomination (Animated Short Film)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>También la lluvia</td>
<td>Even the Rain</td>
<td>Icíar Bollaín</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Celda 211</td>
<td>Cell 211</td>
<td>Daniel Monzón</td>
<td>Seattle Film Festival Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>La piel que habito</td>
<td>The Skin I Live In</td>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>Chicago International Film Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Chico &amp; Rita</td>
<td>Chico &amp; Rita</td>
<td>Tono Errando, Fernando Trueba, Javier Mariscal</td>
<td>Oscar Nomination (Animated Film)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Bon Apetite</td>
<td>Bon Apetite</td>
<td>David Pinillos</td>
<td>Seattle Film Festival Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Pajaros de Papel</td>
<td>Paper Birds</td>
<td>Emilio Aragón Álvarez</td>
<td>Seattle Film Festival Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Pa Negre</td>
<td>Black Bread</td>
<td>Agustí Villaronga</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Blancanieves</td>
<td>Snow White</td>
<td>Pablo Berger</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15 años y un día</td>
<td>15 años y un día</td>
<td>Gracia Querejeta</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Aquel no era yo</td>
<td>That Wasn't Me</td>
<td>Esteban Crespo</td>
<td>Oscar Nomination (Live Action Short Film)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Vivir es fácil con los ojos cerrados</td>
<td>Living is Easy with Eyes Closed</td>
<td>David Trueba</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Rodrigo Sorogoyen</td>
<td>Chicago International Film Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Artico</td>
<td>Artico</td>
<td>Gabriel Velázquez</td>
<td>Chicago International Film Festival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Academia de las Artes y las Ciencias Cinematográficas, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Internet Movie Database, Wikipedia)

First of all, the number of Spanish films that have been shown in the United States per year has more or less remained the same since 1980, although a gradual increase can be observed after the year 2000. This may be due to an increase in American film festivals, the increasing presence of foreign film in these festivals, and the result of increasing globalization. Upon examining this list, several patterns (selection norms) can also be observed. First of all, the
means of arrival is almost entirely limited to film festivals and awards ceremonies. Of the 72 films that have arrived, 44 arrived as Oscar representatives (selected by Spain and sent in hopes of nomination), Oscar nominations (nominated by the Film Academy for an award), or Oscar winners (winner of an award. Two films won Best Foreign Film, and in one case, Best Director). Six films won awards at the Seattle International Film Festival (The Golden Space Needle for Best Actor or Best Director). Five films were shown at the Chicago International Film Festival, two at the New York Film Festival, and one at the Cleveland Film Festival, some of which also won awards. “Other” refers to films that arrived by other means not specified in the databases or as film releases in at least one U.S. city. Overall, 58 of the total 72 films (approximately 81%) arrived by means of awards ceremony or film festival, greatly limiting the presence of Spanish films in the United States to what many would refer to as “film literature.”

Of the 48 total directors, 13 directors had more than one film that has reached the United States, representing 41 of the total movies since 1980 (approximately 57%). Over half of the films shown between 1980 and 2015 had been produced by the same 13 directors. The directors present are also clearly very well known names in their culture of origin. Of the 48 directors, 13 (27%) had been awarded a Goya or Gaudí for Best Director/Best Direction, and it is interesting to note that of these award winners, four had more than one film arrive to the United States. The Spanish directors most shown in the United States were Pedro Almodóvar (10 total films), José Luis Garci (6 total films), and Carlos Saura (6 total films).

**Combined Norms**

Naturally, some of this film literature had its origins in traditional literature. Once this list was compiled, the next step was to use this list of film arrivals to research which of these films were also based on literary works. To do so, each work was individually examined using several sources.\(^{34}\) It was also taken into account that not all films that are adaptations of Spanish literature are necessarily directed by Spanish directors. It is very possible that a Spanish literary work may be adapted to film by a director of another nationality. In order to research this, professor Gloria Gómez’s adaptation database was an especially useful tool, as it provided a list of all film adaptations based on Spanish literary works from 1900 to 2005. Thanks to this

---

\(^{34}\) These sources included the Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes database, Wikipedia, and the IMBD database.
information, one additional film was then added to this list: *The Ninth Gate*, a film by French and Polish director Roman Polanski based on Arturo Perez-Reverte´s novel *El Club Dumas* (highlighted in gray in Table 6). Similarly, films that were adaptations but not of a Spanish literary works were removed, which included *Carmen*, based on French composer Bizet´s opera, Fernando Trueba´s *El baile de la Victoria*, based on Chilean writer Antonio Skármeta´s novel of the same title, and Pablo Berger´s *Blancanieves*, very loosely based on the fairytale by the Grimm brothers. What remained was the following list:

Table 6: Films that are Literary Adaptations of Spanish works 1980-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Translated Title</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Means of Arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td><em>La colmena</em></td>
<td>The Beehive/The Hive</td>
<td>Mario Camus</td>
<td>Chicago International Film Festival (Best Feature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td><em>Montoyas y Tarantos</em></td>
<td>Montoyas y Tarantos</td>
<td>Vicente Escribá</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td><em>Sangre y arena</em></td>
<td>Blood and Sand</td>
<td>Javier Elorrieta</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>¡Ay, Carmela!</td>
<td>Ay, Carmela!</td>
<td>Carlos Saura</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td><em>El maestro de esgrima</em></td>
<td>The Fencing Master</td>
<td>Pedro Olea</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td><em>Canción de cuna</em></td>
<td>The Cradle Song</td>
<td>José Luis García</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td><em>El abuelo</em></td>
<td>The Grandfather</td>
<td>José Luis García</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td><em>The Ninth Gate</em></td>
<td>Roman Polanski</td>
<td>U.S. Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td><em>La lengua de las mariposas</em></td>
<td>Butterfly/Butterfly´s Tongue</td>
<td>José Luis Cuerda</td>
<td>Cleveland International Film Festival (Best Film)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Juana la loca</em></td>
<td>Mad Love</td>
<td>Vicente Aranda</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Soldados de Salamina</em></td>
<td>Soldiers of Salamina</td>
<td>David Trueba</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td><em>Salvador (Puig Antich)</em></td>
<td>Salvador (Puig Antich</td>
<td>Manuel Huerga</td>
<td>Seattle Film Festival Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><em>Los girasoles ciegos</em></td>
<td>The Blind Sunflowers</td>
<td>José Luis Cuerda</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td><em>Celda 211</em></td>
<td>Cell 211</td>
<td>Daniel Monzón</td>
<td>Seattle Film Festival Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td><em>Pa Negre</em></td>
<td>Black Bread</td>
<td>Agustí Villaronga</td>
<td>Oscar Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Academia de las Artes y las Ciencias Cinematográficas, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Gómez (2005), Internet Movie Database, Wikipedia)
Of the 72 total Spanish films that arrived in the United States between 1980 and 2015, a
total of 15 (approximately 21%) were adaptations of Spanish literary works. Thus, about one in
five of the Spanish films that arrived in the United States between 1980 and 2015 were based on
Spanish literature. Of the total 15 films that appear on this list, one film was an adaptation of a
Spanish literary work, but not directed by a Spanish director (marked in gray on the table). Their
means of arrival is also interesting to note: 8 out of 15 (53%) arrived for the Oscars (of these,
none were nominees or Oscar winners), four of the 15 (27%) were shown and won an award at a
film festival, two were released in U.S. theaters in at least one location (13%) and one film was
released nationwide by a director of a different nationality. Overall, 80% of the films that were
based on Spanish literary works arrived via awards ceremony or film festival, a statistic very
similar to the one found on the previous list of all film arrivals. With regards to the directors, two
directors—José Luis Garci and José Luis Cuerda—directed two films that were adapted from
literary works and arrived to the United States. Of the 12 Spanish directors, four had been
awarded a Goya or Gaudí award for best Director/Direction in Spain.

Works that Arrived as both Adaptations and Translations

In order to further narrow down this list to the criteria needed in order to study combined
norms, one more step was necessary. While all of these films arrived in the United States and
were based on Spanish literary works, it could not be assumed that their corresponding literary
works were also translated into English and were available in the United States. In order to study
this, I searched a library database for the film’s corresponding English translation and, in cases
where no translation could be found, verified this with further research. The database used was
the WorldCat Online Computer Library Center database, which would reveal whether or not the
works were available in English in U.S. libraries. After performing this search, it was revealed
that five of the films had either not been translated or had not yet arrived to the United States.
Thus, a final list of 10 works that have arrived in the United States both as translations and
adaptations was created. These works are:

1. *El abuelo* by Benito Pérez Galdós
2. *Sangre y arena* by Vicente Blasco Ibáñez
3. *Canción de cuna* by Gregorio Martínez Sierra
4. *La colmena* by Camilo José Cela
5. ¡*Ay, Carmela!* by José Sanchis Sinisterra
6. *El maestro de esgrima* by Arturo Pérez-Reverte
7. *El club Dumas* by Arturo Pérez-Reverte
8. “*La lengua de las mariposas*” by Manuel Rivas
9. *Soldados de Salamina* by Javier Cercas
10. *Los girasoles ciegos* by Alberto Méndez

Thanks to the unique intercultural interaction provided by works that have arrived as both translations and adaptations, it is possible to study the influence of these two intercultural exchanges upon each other. With regards to combined norms, this can be done by examining the order of arrival of the translation and film adaptation. The following table lists the years that the first publication, translation, and film adaptations of these ten works first arrived in the United States:

**Table 7: Combined Norms: Order of Arrival**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year Published</th>
<th>First Published Translation</th>
<th>Film Arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>El Abuelo</em></td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sangre y arena</em></td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cancion de cuna</em></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>La colmena</em></td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡<em>Ay, Carmela!</em></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>El maestro de esgrima</em></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>El club Dumas</em></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“<em>La lengua de las mariposas</em>”</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Soldados de</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On average, it took approximately 15.4 years for these Spanish literary works to be translated and published in the United States. It is interesting to note, however, that the time elapsed between first publication and translation changed after the late 1990’s. With the exception of Ay, Carmela!, translations published after 1995 arrived, on average, only four and a half years after the first publication of the Spanish novel. In contrast, translations published before 1995 (once again, with the exception of Ay, Carmela!) were published an average of 28.5 years after the source text’s first publication.

The arrival of the film adds another unique dynamic to this study. Of the ten total works, half of the translations arrived after the film adaptation, and the most recent translation (of Los girasoles ciegos) arrived in the same year as its film adaptation. Most of the works that arrived as translations first were published before 1915 (with the exception of El club Dumas), a time when very few motion pictures were being produced in Spain in general. This reveals the most illustrative combination norm: in the case of Spanish works published after 1950 that can be found in the U.S. as both translations and film adaptations, the film adaptation tends to arrive first.

The Case of Theater

It is also important to note the unique intercultural exchange created when a play is translation, performed, published, or adapted to the screen in the United States. Of the ten total Spanish works that have arrived to the United States as both literary works and translations, two were originally published as plays—Canción de cuna and Ay, Carmela!—and one—El Abuelo—was adapted from its original genre to the stage by its original author, Benito Pérez Galdós. Unfortunately, the year of the first published translation is not listed for José Sanchis Sinisterra’s play Ay, Carmela!, and the play El abuelo was never performed in the United States. Cancion de

---

cuna, however, was performed in 1927 at the Civic Repertory Theater on Broadway, in New York City. The translation of the script was officially published two years later in 1929 and the movie arrived to the United States 67 years later in 1994 (Internet Movie Database, Online Computer Library Center, Wikipedia). In this one case, the U.S. play was performed before both the arrival of the published translation and the film adaptation.

Reception Norms

While there are many possibilities for examining the reception norms of these ten works, this study sought to analyze two basic aspects of the works in their system of origin to their system of arrival. These aspects included whether or not the author's other work had been translated to English or adapted to film and the awards given to the author for either this particular work or others.

Of the nine authors whose works had arrived to the United States as both translations and film adaptations, eight of these authors had other works that were also previously translated into English. The majority of these works were available in at least one U.S. library. The only exception was Alberto Méndez, whose novel Los girasoles ciegos is his only published novel. It will be interesting to see if any of his future novels (if written) are translated or adapted based on the success of his first work. Six of the eight authors—with the exception of Javier Cercas and Alberto Méndez, whose novels are most recent—had published other works that were also adaptations, whether on television or on the big screen. El abuelo, Sangre y Arena, and La canción de cuna all had previous film adaptations, as well (Internet Movie Database, Online Computer Library Center, Wikipedia).

All of these authors were, in some way, celebrated in their source cultural literary system. Camilo José Cela was awarded the Principe de Asturias de las Letras award (1987) the Nobel Prize in Literature (1989), and the Premio Cervantes (1995). José Sanchis Sinisterra was given the Premio Nacional de Teatro award (1990), among others. Manuel Rivas was awarded the Premio Nacional de Narrativa and Premio Torrente Ballester for his collection of short stories in which "La lengua de las mariposas" appears (1996). Arturo Pérez-Reverte was selected for the Fundacion Letras del Mar San Telmo gold medal (2006) (among others), Alberto Méndez was awarded the Premio Setenil for best book of short stories (among other awards), and Javier...
Cercas’s *Soldados de Salamina* was selected for many awards, including the *Premio Salambó de Narrativa* (2001). Benito Pérez Galdós was almost nominated for a Nobel Prize in Literature several times, and is “considered by some critics the greatest Spanish novelist since Cervantes” (Davies, 1999). These authors—and their works—clearly occupy a central position in their literary system of origin.36

In the target literary system, however, these works and authors are limited to the periphery of the system. Of the ten works and ten authors that have arrived to the United States, no information could be found regarding any literary prizes awarded in the United States. It is interesting to note, however, that *Soldados de Salamina* did win the United Kingdom’s Independent Foreign Fiction Prize in 2004 (as well as similar prizes in Italy and Chile), and *El club Dumas* was awarded the Palle Rosenkrantz Prize for crime fiction in Denmark in 1994. Despite international recognition, however, these novels were not as recognized in their literary system of arrival.37

A similar phenomenon can be observed with the films. Of the nine Spanish film adaptations,38 eight were highly awarded in their film system of origin. *La colmena* was given several awards at the Spanish Cinema Writers Circle Awards, the Fotogramas de Plata, and the Premios ACE between 1983 and 1984. Between 1991 and 1992, *Ay, Carmela!* took away many Goya awards, as well as Spanish Cinema Writers Circle Awards, ADIRCAE Awards, and Fotogramas de Plata. *El maestro de esgrima* also was nominated for and won many Goya awards, as well as Spanish Cinema Writers Circle Awards, ADIRCAE Awards, and Fotogramas de Plata. *La lengua de las mariposas* won Best Adapted Screenplay in the 2000 Spanish Cinema Writers Circle Awards, as well as several Goya Awards and an Ondas Award, in addition to other nominations. Likewise, *Soldados de Salamina* took home several Goya awards, Spanish Cinema Writers Circle awards, ACE Awards, and a Sant Jordi Award in 2004. In 2009, *Los girasoles ciegos* swept the boards with nominations and awards from the Cartagena Film Festival, Spanish

38 *The Ninth Gate*, in this case, will be considered an American Film.
Cinema Writers Circle Awards, the Goya Awards, the Fotogramas de Plata awards, and ACE Awards, from Best Adapted Screenplay to Best Director to Best Film. These films clearly occupy a central position in their film system of origin.39

Only two of these films, however, received awards in their target film system in the United States. *La colmena* was the winner of the Chicago International Film Festival category for Best Feature, and *La lengua de las mariposas* won the Best Film award at the Cleveland International film festival. Despite the fact that the majority of these films received many awards in Spain and arrived to the United States because of awards ceremonies and film festivals, very few received the same attention in their film system of arrival.40

**Variables and Limitations**

First and foremost, it is important to highlight the difficulty of attaining the data necessary for analyzing literary texts, authors, translations, translators, directors and film adaptations in both their source systems and target systems. The sources used (WorldCat, Wikipedia, the Internet Movie Database, etc.) were selected because of the amount of data available, their user friendliness, and the fact that they are, to many, the go-to websites and databases for receiving information on these topics. Despite this, their reliability could be questioned, and future research may be necessary to verify their published data with more reliable, peer-reviewed sources.

It is also important to note that the analysis of the norms present in this study (preliminary norms, combined norms, and reception norms) is not exhaustive. There are, undoubtedly, further areas of research that could be performed with the data present that would reveal even more about the complex cultural exchange that occurs with the introduction of translations and film adaptations. Once again, more future research is necessary to exhaustively explore this promising area of study.

---


CHAPTER 4—CONCLUSIONS

Discussion of Findings

First and foremost, this paper sought to utilize a Polysystem approach to further explore the parallel between translation and adaptation with regards to the reception of literature. The theoretical and methodological tools provided by the Polysystem theory proved extremely valuable in this study for several reasons. First of all, this approach allowed me to escape the necessity of addressing the problematic definitions of translations and adaptations themselves by providing an existing definition of them as processes that "function" as translation and adaptations in their target context. It also encouraged a descriptive--rather than prescriptive--study that sought to judge the translations or adaptations based on their faithfulness to their source texts. The target-text and target-context orientated nature of the approach also encouraged this and allowed for the study of how the context culture may have influenced the importation of Spanish literature. Consequently, this context-based nature promoted a trans-individualistic, systemic, and corpus-based approach that went beyond a simple comparison between texts I find interesting and instead formulated a corpus based on their historical, socio-cultural context and sought to describe this context. The concepts of systems and norms were also fundamental to this study in order to describe the position of literature within a larger, more complex system and to reveal the socio-cultural phenomena that determine it.

In addition, examining both Spanish adaptations and Spanish translations in the United States revealed further parallels between the two. In both cases, Spanish works occupied a peripheral position in the U.S. literary and film systems, revealed by the very few published translations and films that are released in the United States. The selection factors for the works that do arrive are also quite similar, since typically, only works that are found in the center of the Spanish literary and film systems make it into the United States systems. The parallel between translation and film adaptation provides a promising area for future research. In addition, the study of literary works that arrived as both translations and adaptations allowed for a revealing study of combined norms with regards to their order of arrival.

The reception of Spanish literature in the United States served as an excellent case to demonstrate the value of this theoretical and methodological framework in an interdisciplinary,
descriptive, target-oriented, corpus-based analysis. In addition, the analysis itself revealed fascinating information about the relationship between adaptation and translation and the reception of Spanish literature in the United States. Several interesting patterns were revealed after examining the preliminary, combined, and reception norms using both the final corpus and the process of compiling this corpus itself.

To begin with, there was—and is—no doubt that literary translations are limited to the periphery of the United States literary systems. The “hyper-central” role of the English language means that many works are translated from English, but very few are translated into English. Thus, many sources calculate that the translated works that arrive in the United States each year make up only 3-5% of the total publications. Keeping in mind this preliminary limitation, only a few translations are received yearly, and these works are therefore often limited to the periphery of the U.S. Polysystem where they consequently have a secondary (non-innovative) role and face more difficulties in becoming a part of the literary canon. Of this 3-5% of literature that is translated in the United States, Spanish literature has made up between 3.91 and 5.51% in the past seven years. Despite this small percentage, Spain ranks within the top seven most translated countries in the United States. If the translated literature that arrives to the United States is seen as making up a system within the U.S. literary Polysystem, then Spanish literature has a central or semi-central role in this system. These works, however, are limited to the periphery of the U.S. literary Polysystem as a whole.

This is the case of the Spanish literature examined in this study. The status of both the author and the work in Spain—reflected through awards received, adaptations or translations of the work, and adaptations or translations of the author’s other works—indicates that they are part of their source system's literary center. In the system of arrival, however, these authors and works are very seldom recognized with awards, multiple translations, or adaptations. Of the ten total literary works studied, only one had been adapted by a director that was not Spanish (Arturo Pérez-Reverte’s *El club Dumas*), indicating that the majority did not attract the attention of directors outside of their culture of origin. All of the works—or the authors that wrote them—had received recognition in the form of a literary award (or awards), and almost all of the authors had written other works that had also been translated to English, although in many cases, these
works were much more difficult to find.\textsuperscript{41} The case of the oldest work, Benito Pérez Galdós’s \textit{El abuelo}, can provide an interesting demonstration of this. While cited as being considered “the greatest Spanish novelist since Cervantes” and almost nominated for a Nobel Prize in Literature, the work of Galdós, when translated into English and adapted to film, received no awards and little recognition in its system of arrival (Davies, 1999). Similarly, the film adaptation of \textit{El abuelo} was chosen by Spain as the country’s representative in the Academy Awards (demonstrating the belief of its merit), but did not win the award—or any film award—in the United States. Even though it was highly awarded in its system of origin, it received little recognition in its system of arrival. The same phenomenon can be observed with the other films. Almost all of them arrived to the United States via awards ceremony or film festival, therefore limiting the Spanish films that arrive in the U.S. to “film literature,” or the highest quality films in their systems of origin. Much like their literary works of origin, though, upon being transferred across cultures, these films shifted from a central placement in their source system to a peripheral placement in their target system.

A further study of the combined norms—Spanish works that arrived to the U.S. as both translations and adaptations—also revealed several interesting patterns. First of all, the time elapsed between original publication and translation decreased in the case of works published after 1995. Similarly, the time elapsed between original publication and film adaptation also has decreased. This is perhaps due to an increase in film production or the increasingly role of globalization that allows us to access literary works faster than ever before. Most interestingly, however, is the fact that over half of the translations arrived after (or in the same year as) their film adaptations, especially in the case of works published after 1915. This seems to suggest that a translation is more likely to be published in the United States if a film adaptation of that work has already arrived. Overall, this study served to both highlight the similarities between translation and film adaptation as activities that can be descriptively studied to reveal the process of intercultural transfer and the reception of its products, and the unique relationship that the intercultural link between translations and their film adaptations provides for a study.

While all of these findings aid in the understanding of the reception of Spanish literature in the United States, perhaps the most significant findings of this study are the value of the

\textsuperscript{41} This was revealed when searching for translations of the other’s other works, which were more difficult to find in the WorldCat database and on Amazon.com, and in many cases were not available.
parallel between translation and adaptation and the utility of its methodology in future research. The Polysystem approach proved extremely useful in studying the intercultural transfer of literature since it encouraged a descriptive, functional, target-context based, trans-individual, systemic, corpus-based study that could be used in future research in Adaptation Studies, Translations Studies, and even other fields.

**Practical Application of Results**

This study sought to not only examine the reception of Spanish works in the United States but also to further explore the parallel between adaptation and translation and the value of the Polysystem theory in descriptive research. Because of this, the most efficient way to discuss the practical application of its results is by dividing the results into three different categories parallel to the three different branches of Translation Studies: 42Theoretical, Descriptive, and Applied. While this division does not exist in Adaptation Studies, for the purpose of this paper and considering the similarities between the two fields and the call for Adaptation Studies to further imitate Translation Studies, these branches will also be extended to Adaptation Studies.

**Theoretical Application**

This study has proven the value of the Polysystem theory in both Translation and Adaptation Studies. Instead of simply comparing translations and film adaptations to their source texts, this study sought to examine works in a determined context. The corpus was therefore determined by the context, and not by the supposed merit of the works studied or by my personal preference as a researcher. By focusing on this context and what was considered a translation or adaptation in it, I was able to bypass the problematic (and dead end) necessity to define what is or is not a translation or adaptation, and to instead simply focus on what functions as a translation or adaptation in its source and target system. This then allowed me to develop a systematic methodology to compile a corpus and to examine this corpus for the existence of patterns (norms) that help to reveal information regarding the intercultural reception of Spanish literature in the United States.

---

42 As defined by James Holmes in The Name and Nature of Translation Studies (1988)
**Descriptive Application**

In Descriptive Translation and Adaptation Studies, this study utilized a function-oriented approach that has been little explored in Adaptation Studies. A more exhaustive study or further studies that descriptively examine the intercultural exchange that becomes visible through the importation of translations and foreign films could further our understanding of the cultural world system. This is an understanding that is useful in Translation Studies, Adaptation Studies, Culture Studies, and Sociology.

**Applied Application**

Even the majority of this study took place in what Holmes refers to as the “pure” branch of Translation Studies, some of the information revealed regarding the translations and film adaptations that arrive in the United States could also have a more applied, practical application. Since so little translated literature arrives to the United States, it is quite useful for literary translators of Spanish languages to be aware of what arrives, how it arrives, when it arrives, and whether or not any other factors influence its arrival. In the case of this study, the existence of a film adaptation appeared to significantly increase the probability of a translation being published, which is something that would be useful for translators to keep in mind when selecting a work to translate. On a more personal level, I was shocked to discover how few foreign (and Spanish) literary works and films arrive in the United States each year. I hope that studies like this do not just help to further our understanding of the extreme cultural isolation present in the United States, but can also encourage the bridging of this cultural gap and provide us with the information necessary on how best to do so.

**Limitations**

As previously mentioned, this study was significantly limited by the information available. To the best of my knowledge, there are very few accessible, exhaustive, scholarly

---

43 In "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies," Holmes defines the pure branch as the branch composed of Theoretical and Descriptive Translation Studies, or studies that pursue knowledge for the sake of knowledge.
resources that provide lists of the literary and film importations in the United States, despite the fact that these lists would prove quite useful for research in several fields. This study, therefore, was often quite limited by the information available. For example, while it would have been ideal to study all Spanish translations that have arrived to the United States since 1980, the only data to be found was the University of Rochester database, which was started in 2009. Thus, in order to compile the corpus, I had to improvise by using the more complete lists of film importations and perform extra research to check if any of the films listed were also literary works. In addition, I would have originally liked to study the reception of works based on their sales, but this information was not available online and is difficult to attain. Likewise, what little information available was often not provided by an academic, peer-reviewed source, which also could impact the quality of the data.

Obviously, this study was also not an exhaustive study of all norms at play or the possible combinations of these norms. There are, for example, many more aspects of the works in this corpus that could be examined, including the existence of multiple editions of a translation or publication, multiple versions of a film adaptation, their subject matter, whether or not the works were identified as a translation or adaptation, their sales, etc. The lack of information available greatly determined which aspects to study. It also would have been very interesting to examine each translated work for operational norms (particularly for signs of domestication), but such an extensive study would require a significant amount of more research and time.

It is also important to note that this study was limited to the reception of Spain in the United States, and did not examine the complete intercultural exchange between the two. Further research regarding the number of translations of American works and American films published and released Spain would be an interesting addition to be able to better understand the intercultural exchange between the two countries.

**Future Research**

An interdisciplinary project like this provides many opportunities for future research in nearly all of the fields involved. The emerging field of Comparative Translation and Adaptation Studies promises great potential for future theoretical and applied research that could aid both Translation and Adaptation Studies. Clearly, Adaptation Studies can also benefit from a similar
theoretical methodology as Translation Studies, and there is a growing call for the field to do so. In addition, a descriptive study of the cultural importations that are manifested in the form of translations, films, and film adaptations can benefit not just Translation and Adaptation Studies, but Culture Studies and Sociology, as well. One of the benefits of this study's methodology is that it is not limited to the two countries examined, but could also be applied to any country or combination of countries in future research in order to better understand the cultural world system. With the proper theoretical and methodological tools, researchers in many fields can begin to better strengthen their understanding of the complex constructions of culture.
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