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Abstract
The present article focuses on screen adaptations as intersemiotic translation which gives an opportunity to transpose written word into the multimodal space of cinema. Taking up the role of translators who act as mediators between different semiotic systems, film-makers face a range of challenges associated with the meaning-making resources available to the creator of a book and a film, respectively. They have to take into account a variety of factors ranging from the need to preserve the spirit of the book and its aesthetic value to the obligation to ensure commercial success of the film. However, reinterpretation of a literary work for screen purposes inevitably produces a new work of art which starts its own life in the cultural environment it is meant for. Unleashing their creativity, film-makers decide which elements of the book they consider essential to convey the key message of the writer and which could be sacrificed to provide for the visual appeal of the work of cinema.

A vivid example of such a challenge is seen in filming “The Hours” based on the novel by M. Cunningham, a story of three women bound through time with a book. Virginia Woolf writing her “Mrs. Dalloway”, Laura Brown reading it and Clarissa Vaughn nicknamed Mrs. Dalloway by her former lover—all of them are struggling to find their true selves in the world, which dictates the way they must live their femininity. The battles they have to fight every single day without having the right to speak up are mostly represented in their internal monologues the novel abounds with. The film, in its turn, focuses on the main events in the story reinforcing them with powerful symbols such as the kiss that reveals true desires of Virginia and Laura while showing Clarissa that her life goes on; the cake that becomes an embodiment of Laura’s failure as a spouse and a mother; water that will swallow Virginia and become a point of no return for Laura, and flowers presaging death for Virginia but fortelling life for Clarissa. An intricate mixture of music, image, and unrivaled play of actors produce a coherent and eloquent narrative, which makes viewers rethink gender stereotypes as well as Virginia Woolf’s legacy.
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1. Introduction
Over the centuries, translation was considered as a purely linguistic phenomenon, a written or oral text being both its source and the eventual product. However, with the development of modern media it became evident that texts can enter into a much broader circle of interactions creating more complex forms of art that are based on several different modes.

O’Sullivan claims that art is itself a vague concept which encompasses countless semiotic communications (O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 15) while “all non-verbal codes are artistic codes” (Gorlie,
that are used for “making a specific message about a particular issue for a particular audience” (Kress, 2010, p. 28). The understanding of text is expanded to encompass, basically, any coherent entity meant to convey a message intended by the author. It is no longer important how many different modes interact in a single communicative space as long as it remains meaningful from the point of view of the writer/director/painter, etc.

It is a common knowledge that any message can be formulated in an almost infinite number of ways within one semiotic system, the same holds true for a mixture of several of them. Thus, translation is considered as “any process, or product hereof, in which a combination of sensory signs carrying communicative intention is replaced by another combination reflecting, or inspired by, the original entity” (Gottlieb, 2005, p. 3). Torop, in his turn, transforms understanding of translation from a single text to a polylogue where “a source text opens simultaneously from a new angle in several sign systems” (Torop, 2013, p. 242).

The present research focuses on the transformations that books undergo when adapted for screen purposes, an issue which has attracted significant attention over the recent years (Desilla, 2012; Stathi, 2015; Kaur, 2018; Aksei, 2019; Perdikaki, 2016, 2017a). It is based on “The Hours”, the novel by Cunningham and the film of the same name. This novel constitutes, in a sense, a unique phenomenon as it is built around another story, written by Woolf more than half a century before. It also starts a conversation with the cultural environment itself as one of the most complicated semiotic systems ever. Cunningham, thus, revisits gender stereotypes and evolution in the perception of the role of a woman in a society. By doing so, the writer reveals how much a person’s life can be influenced by their ability to have a choice in constructing their gender identity and living it to its fullest. Consequently, the novel allows the readers to redefine their own perspectives and reconsider the legacy of a great writer of the 20th century.

The main objective of the paper is to determine, which resources are employed to depict the images of the three main characters on page and on screen and their potential influences on the perception of the three women and their destinies by the readers and viewers, respectively. To reach this aim, the process of translation will be considered as resemiotisation, a complex interaction between different semiotic systems which requires a change of perspective on the concept of fidelity in a multimodal environment.

2. Literature overview

The intersemiotic aspect of translation as an environment where different semiotic systems interpenetrate has given rise to a heated debate covering a variety of crossings between different codes (Marais, 2019; Aguiar et al., 2015; Troqe, 2015; Plastina, 2022) which further allowed for developing a view of translation as resemiotisation, a phenomenon where “a particular set of meanings is transformed from one semiotic system (and configuration of media and modes) to another as social processes unfold” (Jewitt, 2014, p. 467). All the changes taking place in the ways “texts” are formulated and transmitted exert a profound influence on the expectations functioning in the society as well as the choices artists make in a never-ending play within an inherently intersemiotic space of culture. All the modifications they introduce to adapt the original to the new semiotic environment serve the purpose of integrating the new work of art in the cultural context.

_The simile “translation as adaptation” has often been used in order to examine changes made in translation so as to address the needs and expectations of the target audience and culture. The reverse, “adaptation as translation”, has been deployed in a cognate field, i. e. Adaptation Studies, to refer to the changes made in literary works which are transposed to the big screen or the stage (Perdikaki, 2017, p. 2)._

Although the Adaptation Studies emerged in the middle of the 20th century and has been actively exploring interactions between different media and the related adjustments, there is still much to be
discovered in terms of the value of the source and target product. When Jakobson put forward the idea of intersemiotic translation (Jakobson, 1959), it opened infinite opportunities for exploring relations the different forms of art enter into. However, it also required changing the perspective on the issue of fidelity to the original and its status itself.

Using the term of transmutation to describe translation between various media, Eco identified five of its essential characteristics:

1. An adaptation provides for harmonious coexistence of the source and target texts in the field of culture where they support each other reciprocally. For example, “an adaptation of a musical piece for ballet involves the simultaneous presence of music (source text) and choreographic action (target text)” (Eco, 2001, p. 120).

2. An adaptation may manipulate the source. An adaptation of a musical piece, thus, may radically re-contextualize the source according to the adapter’s own interpretation (ibid, p. 121).

3. An adaptation may sometimes show something which remained unsaid in the source text. For example, film adaptation will add audio-visual details to better render the design, dress, or chromatic tone of a character, or a story, which the literary source did not prescribe (ibid, p. 121-124).

4. An adaptation may highlight a level of the original the adapter wishes to emphasize. For instance, a film adaptation may take the novel, isolate the narrative level, and drop its stylistic aspects (ibid, p. 125).

5. An adaptation may be perceived as a completely new work. For instance, where spectators would not judge an adaptation by considering whether it is better or worse than the execution of the original text, but would instead focus their attention on the way the adapter adapts the source through other semiotic languages (ibid, p. 127).

Thus, Eco placed an emphasis on all the variety of relations that the original and the target product can develop and the different roles that they play in the cultural environment once produced, considering “an unstable and ever-changing character of meaning constructed in multimodal discourse” (Shevchenko, 2019, p. 15).

Films constitute one of the most prototypical examples of such interactions as today, with the development of the film industry, more and more literary works started traveling to the screen to find a new life. Eisenstein claimed that “cinema is the heir of all artistic cultures” (Eisenstein, 2016, p. 109), which offers audio-visual devices to semantically support the filmmakers’ expressions (Zhang, 2020, p. 63), inevitably raising the issue of meaning-making in cinema. Text becomes not just a message, but a process of perception (consumption) (Torop, 2019, p. 21) where both the filmmaker and the target audience play an active role. While written texts constitute an environment favorable to conveying meanings implicitly, films require a significant degree of explicitation since “visual signs are less agile than the verbal in depicting abstract concepts” (Ketola, 2021, p. 107). Consequently, film-makers have to find other means to preserve the core ideas the author intended to transfer.

Some of the screen adaptations follow the original texts very closely; others preserve only the characters and some key events. However, considering the differences in the resources available to literature and cinema, it became obvious that the concept of fidelity and equivalence could no longer operate the same way it did for written texts. Pym, for instance, questioned the very source and target text paradigm, arguing that translation cannot be reduced to “an affair of two sides” (Pym, 2014, p. 2). He therefore suggests that these texts are all “tied up in never-ending translational networks” (ibid).

It is the culture and the target audience who decide on the path a work of art should take, whether music shall be composed on the basis of a painting, whether the plot of a novel written centuries ago should be staged in a 21st century setting, whether a painting should become part of a film.

If a certain degree of linguistic equivalence is a necessary prerequisite for a high-quality translation, screen adaptations are more focused on the socio-cultural context and creativity. “The adaptation process is now examined as a creative practice dependent on the socio-political context,
which accommodates it, and the film industry, of which it constitutes a motoring force” (Perdikaki, 2018, p. 171).

Thus, translation stops being regarded as a one-way process where the original prevails. A film based on a book constitutes a unique work of art which implies “a multilevelled negotiation” (Naremore, 2000, p. 67), “a dialectal exchange between literature and cinema” (Lhermitte, 2005, p. 99). Screen adaptation requires significant transformations which balance varying degrees of “sameness and difference” (ibid). “The issue is not whether the adapted film is faithful to its source, but rather how the choice of a specific source and how the approach to that source serve the film’s ideology” (Flanagan, 2009, p. 17).

When a book is reinterpreted for screen purposes, it is up to the film-maker to choose the aspects of the literary work they value most and it is their right as translators to do so. Films, thus, operate as “mediators in the communicative process between film-makers and film viewers” (Krysanova, 2019, p. 57).

Film-makers act as translators but also as co-authors who target their own audience, whose task is to ensure understanding between “two historical periods, two cultures, two media and/or two languages” (Lhermitte, 2005, p. 101), which is also true for translation. Meanwhile, a film is expected to possess a different dynamics where language is to some extent subordinated to the image and at the same time interacts with it in order to ensure the right balance of implicitness and explicitness. It is the film-makers’ vision that shall provide not only for coherence of the narrative but also for a certain space open for interpretation which allows the viewers to complement the story with their own experiences. Millicent (1992) claims that

> the successful adaptation performs the process of its [book] transit, makes explicit the way in which the literary work is passed through the filmmaker’s imagination, the new cultural context, and the technology of the medium, to emerge as a full-fledged, autonomous retelling of the tale (Millicent, 1992, p. 20).

It is believed that any film is a product of the film-maker’s creativity, their personality and talent as well as “individual intertexts through which are filtered the materials being adapted” (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 84).

Representation of the literary work on the screen also heavily depends on the cultural context and the audience it is meant for. The reasons for any modifications and adjustments introduced “appear to move between the poles of crass commercialism and high-minded respect for literary works” (McFarlane, 1996, p. 6). Such changes may take place at the macro- or micro-level. While the former are rather related to the linguistic representation of the text, the latter apply to perception of the characters and the general perspective on the events unfolding. Chatman coins a term of a ‘satellite’ (Chatman, 1978), a minor event which is less relevant to the story and, thus, can be omitted, however the researcher states that a decision to preserve some events in the story while removing others can have a profound impact on the fundamental ideas embedded in the book.

3. Results and discussion
Characterisation plays a vital part in the way the entire film is interpreted. The images of characters can be either amplified on the screen or, on the contrary, played down, which, in its turn, leads to changes in the general aesthetics of the film and perception of the story. As a form of visual art, film is much more explicit, on the one hand, but on the other, film-makers challenge their viewers to take an active part in the interpretation process. Films combine language, visual images, and music. However, it is the actors and their performance that determine whether the film will resonate with the viewer in the first place. While books constitute an environment favorable to the description of emotions and beliefs of the character, on screen it is the actor’s talent that counts, which is vividly shown in the screen adaptation of “The Hours” by Cunningham.
The novel itself is intertextual in nature as one of its principal characters is Virginia Woolf who is writing her “Mrs. Dalloway”, a book which connects the author with the other two protagonists, one who is reading it and the other who is living it. Thus, it is all the more interesting to follow the future path of this work being reworked for screen purposes. The story revolves around only a few main events, however, they are supplemented with a broad background that gives sense to each of the core plot stages.

The novel deals with gender stereotypes existing in the eras when the three women live, their struggles and attempts to become their true selves. The book describes a single day in the life of each of them.

Interestingly, the female images in the book are depicted from the author’s perspective as if he is able to see their hearts, their greatest fears and deepest desires, every single thought crossing their mind. It gives an impression that everything women experience as well as the world around them form a unique synergy, no detail is excessive or unimportant. Certain elements of their surroundings become symbolic, representing the feelings that the women do not have the right to express as they are limited to the roles the society assigned to them.

Virginia, taken to a small town by her husband which only aggravates her mental illness, Laura, a woman trapped in her own marriage, and Clarissa, struggling to forget her relations with Richard and be happy here and now with Sally. Nevertheless, there is a difference in their stories, stereotypes deeply rooted in the societies Virginia and Laura are part of prevent them from living their sexuality. Clarissa has her choices in front of her but her memories hold her back.

The invisible thread between them is extremely important for understanding the ways their stories are interwoven. While the book is rather intended for intellectual readers familiar with the legacy of Woolf, the film presupposes a much broader audience which may not trace this connection through time. Daldry, the film director, emphasizes:

"The audience all the time is trying to work out what is the connection between these three women, and again not just the emotional or thematic connection but what's the simple, direct narrative connection. And when those connections start to be made, it always felt to us there was a huge dramatic rush to the story, as indeed there would be to the film" (Manufacturing Intellect, 2017).

Consequently, the film-makers explicitly show (Fig. 1) Virginia writing “Mrs. Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself” (Daldry, 2002, 00:11:16), while Laura is reading the same line and Clarissa is saying “Sally, I think I'll buy the flowers myself” (Daldry, 2002, 00:11:28). Their lives are also overlapping in a fast change of shots at the very beginning of the film when the women are starting their day. At this moment, the viewer already sees the drastic difference between Virginia and Clarissa.

![Fig. 1. The Hours by Paramount Pictures (00:10:45; 00:10:53; 00:10:58)](image-url)
While Virginia incarnated by Nicole Kidman is combing her hair without looking into the mirror and shudders when accidentally meets her own look, Clarissa, Meryl Streep, has no fear and smiles at her own reflection. Cunningham tells his reader that Virginia considers her reflection dangerous, “it sometimes shows her the dark manifestation of air that matches her body, takes her form, but stands behind, watching her, with porcine eyes and wet, hushed breathing” (Cunningham, 2002, p. 30-31) as if it is a ghost, not who she feels deep inside.

Clarissa, on the other hand, looks business-like, she is thinking about a party she is having to celebrate the award Richard has won. She opens the curtains to meet a new day. The writer describes her as “the old beauty, the old hippie”, still having “a certain sexiness; a certain bohemian, good-witch sort of charm”. But perhaps more importantly, she feels alive, “she loves Richard, she thinks of him constantly, but perhaps loves the day slightly more” (Cunningham, 2002, p. 11-13).

Julianne Moore, playing the part of Laura, wakes up and hears her husband making breakfast for their son and himself. It is his birthday but she cannot make herself get up immediately. When she goes downstairs, according to Cunningham, she feels “about to go onstage and perform in a play for which she is not appropriately dressed, and for which she has not adequately rehearsed” (Cunningham, 2002, p. 43). She has no feelings either for her husband or her little son, Richard. Moore brilliantly reproduces it with her frozen, detached look when nobody sees her and a well-trained smile to please her husband, a war hero who is in love with her.

Even the cake Laura makes for him, seems to be one more proof of her failure as a wife and a mother (Fig. 2.).

![Cake](image.png)

**Fig. 2. The Hours by Paramount Pictures (1:30:19)**

This birthday cake constitutes a vivid symbol of her life which is simply not good enough even if her husband says the opposite. The decision to have this family was never hers. Having returned from war, having survived, “he could (in the words of his own alarmed mother) have had anyone... What could she say but yes? How could she deny a handsome, good-hearted boy, practically a member of the family, who had come back from the dead?” (Cunningham, 2002, p. 40).

One of the key events in the plot for Virginia and Laura is a kiss which reveals their true desires (Fig. 3.). Both women realize they can never pursue this path which pushes them towards escape and later suicide.
Laura goes to a hotel to be alone with her book. While reading, a thought of ending her life crosses her mind but there is too much that stops her (Fig. 4.).

(1) She strokes her belly. I would never. She says the words out loud in the clean, silent room: “I would never”. She loves life, loves it hopelessly, at least at certain moments; and she would be killing her son as well. She would be killing her son and her husband and the other child, still forming inside her (Cunningham, 2002, p. 152).

The film uses the metaphor of water to convey Laura’s thoughts. She is lying on the bed when suddenly water is coming to swallow her and still she is reemerging from the flow with the words “I can’t” (Daldry, 2002, 01:08:05) while Virginia is talking to Vanessa’s daughter about her new book “I was going to kill my heroine but I’ve changed my mind. I fear I may have to kill someone else instead” (Daldry, 2002, 01:07:55).

It is at that moment that Virginia seems to have made her mind and it is water that is going to take away her life. But at that moment she is holding onto the only place where she feels alive. Virginia is suffocating in the small town where she has to live (Fig. 5), she believes that the only way to avoid madness is to return to London. She is aware that Leonard, her husband, means well, he wants her to live in peace.

(2) She is better, she is safer, if she rests in Richmond; if she does not speak too much, write too much, feel too much; if she does not travel impetuously to London and walk through its streets; and yet she is dying this way, she is gently dying on a bed of roses (Cunningham, 2002, p. 169)
Just like the bird who she helped Vanessa’s children to bury. This symbolism in the film is reinforced through the yellow color of roses Virginia brought for the bird, in some eastern cultures it means death.

Film-makers also transform the internal dialogue of Virginia in a real conversation with Leonard and even enrich it with some crucial ideas. Having found his wife at the train station ready to go to London, Leonard is trying to convince her that doctors know better, that he wants to keep her safe. However, Virginia responds:

(3) *This is my right; it is the right of every human being. I choose not the suffocating anesthetic of the suburbs, but the violent jolt of the Capital, that is my choice. The meanest patient, yes, even the very lowest is allowed some say in the matter of her own prescription. Thereby she defines her humanity. I wish, for your sake, Leonard, I could be happy in this quietness. But if it is a choice between Richmond and death, I choose death* (Daldry, 2002, 01:23:17).

This conversation touches upon much more than just a place to live, it is a matter of choice which is fundamental to the entire story. Virginia is bound to fight her demons every single day and she claims her right to regain those bits of life that she can still have. She feels stuck in this town and in her own mind but is seeking to live and eventually die on her own terms. However, even Leonard’s agreement to leave does not suffice, Virginia can no longer withstand her suffering:

(4) *The voices are back and the headache is approaching as surely as rain, the headache that will crush whatever is she and replace her with itself. The headache is approaching and it seems (is she or is she not conjuring them herself?) that the bombers have appeared again in the sky* (Cunningham, 2002, p. 4).

Meanwhile the viewer sees the woman running towards the river as if something or somebody is chasing her, a river that will wash her away (Fig. 6).
Clarissa, in her turn, is living her own torture, asking herself whether it is here, in this flat, with this woman that she is supposed to be. However, she is free to rethink her path, to choose where to go from now. She shares her struggles with her old friend Lewis and her daughter without any fear of being judged by them. She ponders over the meaning of happiness that seems to have remained in that summer when Richard and her were together. Still, Richard’s death on the very day of the party she prepared for him appears liberating for her as much as the conversation with his mother, Laura, who came to his funeral.

This scene differs significantly from that of the book where the writer shows that Clarissa cannot help judging this woman who left her son when he was so young. Film-makers, however, allow Laura to say what Clarissa needs to hear to move on:

(5) *It would be wonderful to say I regretted it. It would be easy. But what does it mean, what does it mean to regret when you have no choice. It’s what you can bear... It was death. I chose life”* (Daldry, 2002, 01:45:24).

Life has no ready-made answers, everybody finds one for themselves. Clarissa chooses life as well:

(6) *And here she is, herself, Clarissa, not Mrs. Dalloway anymore; there is no one now to call her that. Here she is with another hour before her* (Cunningham, 2002, p. p. 226).

This day is finally over and it is the start of something new.
Unlike Laura and Virginia for whom the time seems to have stopped, Clarissa is allowed to decide who to be, who to love and she is eager to see what is coming next: “Still, we cherish the city, the morning; we hope, more than anything, for more” (Cunningham, 2002, p. p. 225). This message is powerful, it shows that times change and it is part of the reason why Clarissa is able to survive, kiss Sally and step into the new day (Fig. 7). However, film-makers take a decision to finish their story with Virginia walking into the river and her last words in a letter she left for Leonard:

(7) ...To look life in the face, always, to look life in the face and to know it for what it is, at last, to love it for what it is and then to put it away” (Daldry, 2002, 01:49:09).

On the one hand, such an ending seems to close the time loop binding the three protagonists and fortelling a start of a new story for some and the end of the journey for others. Nevertheless, at that very moment, the film steps away from the original book. Focusing on Virginia Woolf and her work that seem to guide the entire lives of Laura and Clarissa, the film-makers attach paramount importance to the scene of her death that the film opens and closes with. Meanwhile, Cunningham meant to start his story with death but finished with life. However, this effect is somewhat compensated by the musical background of the story, which shows a contrast between Virginia’s life and that of Clarissa. If the music playing when Virginia is going deeper and deeper into the river is solemn and tragic, “Choosing Life” which marks the end of the day for Clarissa is filled with hope.

4. Conclusions

As can be seen from the research results, the film-makers have been making every effort to preserve the intent of the author who aimed to show the lives of three women profoundly marked by the stereotypes determining the place of a woman in the society. Cunningham not only masterfully shows their struggles but also changes that have taken place in the world. In the 1920s, an era when Virginia is living, women had no other option but to follow their husbands, being exemplary wives and hostesses, something she was simply unable to become. Laura makes a choice most reprehensible from the point of view of the society; but for her it was a choice between life and death. Clarissa, living in the modern times, can freely decide who she is going to be and who she is going to love.

The writer skillfully depicts every painful thought, every torturing memory the characters have to live with. The film, in its turn, uses all the power of actors’ play to tell the story. Close-ups allow the viewer to catch the smallest detail in the faces of actresses, the slightest changes taking place in them when they do not have to play their role any more. The film-makers also make full use of the visual symbols embedded in the book such as flowers, water, the cake, the kiss, sometimes even reinforcing them on the screen.

The intertextual nature of the novel posed a significant challenge for the film-makers who have to make all the connections between the three characters plausible for the audience. This requires employing all the visual resources available to them as well as a musical background which creates a mirroring effect. Even the actresses themselves were astounded by the work of the film-makers. Reflecting on her experience of watching the entire film, Moore shares her feelings:

After I first saw the film, I was really pleased and astonished by how well the stories kind of rely on each other, the way they interact, the way the women, that we, the characters, seem to be relating to each other. It’s kind of a wonderful feeling of universality and that sense of reaching across time” (Hollywood Archives, 2015).

A film can never be completely faithful to the book, however, all the emerging semiotic tools feed a whole ocean of creativity that just needs to be tapped into. Consequently, further analysis is required
to study a broader range of resources on a more ample empirical material employed by film-makers in order to transform a written work into a multimodal entity.
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Анотація
Проведене дослідження присвячено питанню екранізації як одному з типів інтерсеміотичного перекладу, що передбачає перетворення літературного твору до мультимодального середовища кінематографу. Виконуючи роль перекладачів, що діють як посередники між двома семіотичними системами, творці фільму стикаються з низкою труднощі, що пов’язані з відмінностями інструментів конструкції смислів, що доступні літературі та кінематографу відповідно. Існує цілій комплекс факторів, які необхідно брати до уваги: від потреби зберегти “дух” книги та її естетичну цінність до забезпечення комерційного успіху фільму. Водночас реінтерпретація літературного твору для потреб екрану неминуче призводить до появи нового витвору мистецтва, що розпочинає власне життя у культурному просторі, для якого він призначений. При цьому творці фільму використовують творчий підхід, щоб визначити, які елементи вони вважають ключовими для відтворення головної ідеї, що прагнув передати письменник, а якими можна поступитися, щоб зберегти привабливість фільму для аудиторії.

Яскравим прикладом такого виклику є екранізація роману “Години” за авторством М. Каннінгема, історії трьох жінок, чиї долі зв’язані часом і однією книгою. Вірджинія Вулф, яка пише “Місіс Деловей”, Лора Браун, яка читає той самий роман, та Клариса Вон, яку колишній коханець називав Місіс Деловей - усі вони намагаються віднайти себе у світі, який диктує як вони мають проживати свою жіночість. Роман сповнений внутрішніх монологів, що розповідають про щоденні битви героїннь, про які вони не мають права говорити. Фільм, у свою чергу, сфокусовано на основних подіях сюжету, що підсилюється потужними символами, такими як поцілунок, завдяки якому Вірджинія та Лора дізнаються, чого бажають насправді, для Клариси ж він означає, що життя продовжується; торт, що уособлює нездатність Лори бути дружиною та матір’ю, на яку заслуговує її родина; вода, якій судилося поглинути Вірджинію та яка стає поворотним моментом для Лори та квіти, що віщують смерть для Вірджинії, а для Клариси символізують життя. Вигончене поєднання музикованого зображення та неперевершеної гри акторів створює послідовний та виразний нарахів, який змусить глядачів переосмислити гендерні стереотипи на фоні творчої спадщини Вірджинії Вулф.
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