Vera Nikolić*
University of Belgrade
Faculty of Philology

PROCESS AND PRODUCT, TRANSFER AND ADAPTATION PROPER: THE ESSENTIALS OF TEXT-TO-SCREEN ADAPTATION

Abstract

Understanding the development of adaptation studies and the restrictions, requirements, and possibilities of literature-to-film adaptations enables an effective engagement with adaptations of narrative literature into film. An overview of the disparate approaches to defining adaptations, of Robert Stam's reevaluation of adaptations on the basis of 'intertextual dialogism', and of Linda Hutcheon's layered understanding of adaptations as processes and products sets up the essential framework for understanding text-to-screen adaptations. The demands for transfer and adaptation proper within adaptations of literary texts to films, and the similarities and differences between cinematic and literary codes complement the essential framework for effectively evaluating text-to-screen adaptations.

Key words: film adaptation, intertextual dialogism, adaptation as process, adaptation as product, adaptation reception, transfer, adaptation proper, novel-to-film adaptation, text-to-screen adaptation

1. Introduction

A close understanding of the theories underpinning adaptation studies, the similarities and differences between film and literature, the possibility of the direct transfer of elements of source novels and the demands of

---

* nikolic.veran@gmail.com

adaptation proper, are some of the crucial elements supporting the thorough observation, analysis and evaluation of film adaptations of novels and short stories. Adaptations hold a continuous cultural presence (Hutcheon 2006: 2) and the act of adapting is comparable to the process of telling stories, as: "[a]dapters […] use the same tools that storytellers have always used: they actualize or concretize ideas; they make simplifying selections, but also amplify and extrapolate; they make analogies; they critique or show their respect, and so on. But the stories they relate are taken from elsewhere, not invented anew" (Hutcheon 2006: 3). Hutcheon asserts that adaptations constitute "repetition, but repetition without replication" (Hutcheon 2006: 7) and that: "[w]e retell – and show again and interact anew with – stories over and over; in the process, they change with each repetition, and yet they are recognizably the same" (Hutcheon 2006: 177).

Initial adaptation analyses took a bimedial approach that identified adaptations as films based on novel, plays or short stories (Leitch 2012: 89–90). The assessment of adaptations further developed through the rejection of fidelity-based criticism that was rooted in the bimedial approach and the evaluation of the extent of film adaptations' similarity to their original texts (Leitch 2012: 89, 103), instead pivoting towards the perception of adaptations as instances of "intertextual dialogism" (Tripković-Samardžić 2016: 116). This approach to adaptation enables the acknowledgement of the supplemental character of adaptation, namely that "adaptation doesn't simply counterfeit (and reduce) but adds to the original narrative a battery of codes, both cultural and cinematic" (Cartmell and Whelehan 2007: 5). Adaptation as process and product also encompasses the conscious recognition of the audience of an adaptation as an adaptation in instances of familiarity with a source text, while film adaptations also necessitate the transition from telling to showing, and the act of transcoding a literary text demands extensive alterations (Hutcheon 2006: 6, 7, 21, 34, 36). Adaptations of literary texts call for the direct transfer of elements of the source text, such as its story, but also for the "adaptation proper" of functions that are inseparable from the literary form of the source (McFarlane 2007: 19–20).

Rejecting fidelity criticism, approaching adaptation studies on the basis of intertextual dialogism, considering adaptations as processes and products, developing a more detailed understanding of the interrelationship, and the similarities and differences between film and literature, strengthens the understanding of and engagement with film adaptations of literary texts.

2. An Overview of Theoretical Approaches to Adaptation

The varied approaches to adaptation attempt to establish a clear definition of the term, although the issue of establishing a precise range of what the term adaptation encompasses is recognized by Thomas Leitch (2012: 89). Instead of engaging with the question of what adaptations are, Leitch asserts that other questions are more relevant to adaptation studies, including where the line lies between „adaptations proper and improper" (2012: 89), why the line is drawn in a specific place, and whether there is relevance in posing this question in the first place, while his interrogation is based on the axiom that adaptation is a subcategory of intertextuality, and he subsequently notes nine different approaches to adaptations (Leitch 2012: 87–103). Namely, the nine different approaches to adaptation studies that Leitch highlights are:

1. Adaptations are exclusively films based on novels or short stories (Leitch 2012: 89–90);
2. Adaptations are solely intermedial and include the transfer of narrative elements from one medium to another through intermedial, intramedial, or transmedial transfers (Leitch, 2012: 91–92);
3. Adaptations are "counter-ekphrases" (a terminological inversion of the narrow definition of ekphrasis as a literary representation of visual arts) (Leitch 2012: 92–93);
4. Adaptations are texts that the audience intentionally recognizes as adaptations, per the definition of Linda Hutcheon (Leitch 2012: 94);
5. Adaptations are a form of hypertextuality, one of the multiple transtextual modes, per the definition of Gérard Genette (Leitch 2012: 96);
6. Adaptations are translations, per the definition of Linda Costanzo Cahir (Leitch 2012: 97);
7. Adaptations are performances that utilize the text that they are based on as a "performance text" or a "recipe for a new creation" (Leitch 2012: 99);
8. Adaptations are central instances of intertextual practice, a viewpoint that indicates the hybrid nature of adaptations, which is opposed to the last approach (Leitch 2012: 100);
9. Adaptations are specific instances of intertextuality, but not central ones (Leitch 2012: 102).

These wide-ranging perspectives on adaptations have had varying influences on the fidelity discourse in adaptations. While the fundamental "dualistic, bimedial" (Leitch 2012: 90) approach to adaptations, which notes that adaptations are solely films based on novels, plays or short stores, simplifies the observation of adaptations by only considering textual transpositions in the page-to-screen direction, it excludes media other than films from adaptations (Leitch 2012: 89–90). This approach proves further deficient in identifying novels as words, and films as images, failing to recognize that both novels and films are amalgamations since novels are dependent on images that are implicated or inscribed while films depend on words that are written and spoken. Finally, the approach of binary opposition to adaptations as literature presented on screen conserves the fidelity discourse in adaptation, leading to the point of view that the novel undergoing adaptation holds a place of superiority in relation to the adapted film (Leitch 2012: 90). A stance opposing the dualistic approach, as seen in Linda Hutcheon's viewpoint on adaptations, asserts that adaptations are texts whose status as an adaptation depends on the audience's acceptance of the intentional invitation to interpret these texts as adaptations, in the process liberating adaptations from fidelity concerns (Leitch 2012: 94–95).

The hierarchy imposed by the evaluation of literary texts also influences the application of the faithfulness criterion and the subsequent evaluation of film adaptations. Namely, film adaptations of prestigious texts "at the top of the canon" are expected to maintain high degrees of faithfulness towards a source text (Cartmell 1999: 27). However, films based on texts, which are not ascribed a similar literary value, do not face critical evaluation from the standpoint of the same faithfulness criterion, nor is close attention given to their status as an adaptation (Cartmell 1999: 27). In opposition to traditional expectations that adaptations should maintain faithfulness, Deborah Cartmell suggests a more open approach to adaptations, highlighting that: "Instead of worrying about whether a film is 'faithful' to the original literary text (founded in a logocentric belief that there is a single meaning), we read adaptations for their generation of a plurality of meanings" (1999: 28).

Terms that aided Robert Stam's re-definition of adaptations as instances of "intertextual dialogism" and in turn directed adaptation studies away from fidelity criticism, include dialogism, intertextuality and hypertextuality (Tripković-Samardžić 2016: 309). The term "intertextuality" first arose

in Julia Kristeva's translation of the term "dialogism" coined by Mikhail Bakhtin, while dialogism refers to the essential link of each utterance to another utterance, which is defined as every "complex of signs", such as a poem or film (Stam 2000: 201). As Stam points out, dialogism shows that "every text forms an intersection of textual surfaces" (Stam 2000: 201). According to Stam, intertextual dialogism refers to "the infinite and open-ended possibilities generated by all the discursive practices of a culture, the entire matrix of communicative utterances within which the artistic text is situated, and which reach the text not only through recognizable influences but also through a subtle process of dissemination" (Stam 2000: 202). Intertextuality is an active process in which the artist functions as an active agent coordinating prior texts (Stam 2000: 203), and as a concept indicates "the importance of all additional texts and the dialogic reaction of the reader/viewer, which is not considered within fidelity criticism" (Tripković-Samardžić 2016: 120).

In addition to these terms, Stam introduces Gérard Genette's terminology, providing a more comprehensive scope than Bakhtin's and Kristeva's, namely Genette's definition of literary "transtextuality", which defines textual interrelatedness as "all that which puts one text in relation, whether manifest or secret, with other texts", and includes five modes of transtextual relations (Stam 2000: 207). The fifth form of transtextuality, hypertetxtuality, refers to the relation of one text, a "hypertext", to a preceding text, a "hypotext" (Stam 2000: 209), which "the former transforms, modifies, elaborates or extends" (Stam 2000: 209). Hypertextuality, the relationship between one text to another text, which Genette subdivides into "transformation and imitation", provides an additional theoretical framework for observing adaptations (Leitch 2012: 96–97) and indicates "the relation between filmic adaptations and their source novels, now seen as hypertetxts derived from pre-existing hypotexts, transformed by operations of selection, amplification, concretization, and actualization" (Stam 2000: 209). Previous film adaptations of a source text can even be considered a part of the renewed film adaptation's hypotext (Stam 2000: 209).

3. Outlining Adaptations: Process, Product and Reception

Hutcheon states that adaptations are multi-layered works whose "overt relationship to another work or works" is announced (2006: 6). Their

autonomy notwithstanding, interpreting an "adaptation *as an adaptation*" (2006: 6), also allows for the recognition of adaptations as texts created in relation to other texts, indicating adaptations' intrinsic textual plurality (2006: 6–7). Hutcheon further provides a detailed delineation of the concept of adaptation, which firstly defines an adaptataion as „a formal entity or product… an announced and extensive transposition of a particular work or works" (2006: 7). Due to a difference in an adaptation's medium in comparison to its source text's medium, adaptations often involve " transmutation or transcoding", and can be viewed as „translations in the form of intersemiotic transpositions from one sign system (for example, words) to another (for example, images)" (Hutcheon 2006: 16). Besides adaptations existing as products, the act of adaptation simultaneously functions as "a process of creation", relying on "(re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation" (Hutcheon 2006: 8). While the motivations of artists who adapt texts diverge and can encompass the desire to surpass prior texts in an economic or artistic sense, to pay tribute to, or oppose them aesthetically or politically, no matter the adapters' intentions, adaptation always entails a dual process of interpretation and new creation. Instead of solely replicating the source text, the adapter can utilize the original text as a set of diegetic and narrative instructions in the interpretation (Hutcheon 2006: 20, 84). Additionally, the recognition of "adaptation as adaptation" is also crucial since the reader or viewer experiences an adaptation as "a kind of intertextuality if the receiver is acquainted with the adapted text", which makes adaptation an „ongoing dialogical process […] in which we compare the work we already know with the one we are experiencing" (Hutcheon 2006: 21). The immediate and overt connection to other recognizable texts makes the engagement of the audience with an adaptation an extended act, differentiating it from other passing intertextual parallels between works (Hutcheon 2006: 21). The complexity of certain media, including film, makes adaptation a collective process. Besides the involvement of a screenplay writer, director, cinematographer, set designer and composer, who may assume the role of adapters by utilizing and referencing the source text in varying degrees, the adapter's role is also assumed by an actor. Namely, actors primarily construct their performance from the screenplay, but often note that they found a deeper understanding of characters in the source text. Film editors who subsequently construct a film and the structure of its sounds and images also participate in the act of adaptation (Hutcheon

2006: 80–82). The motivations behind the act of creating adaptations, which are often criticized for their lack of faithfulness, are also manifold, as Hutcheon highlights that the intentions of adapters can include the possibility of economic gains (in spite of certain limitations posed by intellectual property laws), the possibility of gaining cultural prestige in the case of adaptations based on acclaimed or significant texts, as well as personal or political motives, such as paying homage to the source text or conversely criticizing the source text culturally, politically, historically, or socially (2006: 85–94). Hutcheon recognizes the significance of authors' intentions and their direct effect on the process and product of adaptation, since adapters' intentions leave overt traces in an adaptation. The multi-faceted contexts of creation and interpretation constituting the process of adaptation become visible in the final product of adaptation within the style and tone of the final product of the adaptation and the known extratextual intent of the final product (2006: 106–109). Understanding an author's intents affects the audience's interpretation of the adaptation's meaning. Hutcheon also reflects on the relevance of the audience's participation in the adaptation, as an audience member's engagement with the adapted text offers the pleasure of repetition, interspersed with difference (2006: 109, 114). Besides the comfort of engaging with familiar texts, an adaptation's audience also experiences intertextual pleasure in their recognition of the "interplay of works" (Hutcheon 2006: 117). However, the ultimate success of adaptations lies in their autonomy and availability to audiences that are familiar with the original and those that are not, audiences that have or do not have previous knowledge of a text (Hutcheon 2006: 121).

The joint element of an adaptation is the story, which undergoes transpositions regardless of the medium or genre, and adaptations seek to establish the equivalence of a story's different elements, which involve "themes, events, world, characters, motivations, points of view, consequences, contexts, symbols, imagery" (Hutcheon 2006: 10). Namely, Hutcheon points out that themes are the most easily transferable elements across different media, genres and contexts, that the transfer of characters and their psychological development enables the engagement of the audience's imagination, that the different story units can be transferred across media, that pacing, point of view, focalization and story time can all be altered (2006: 10–11).

Hutcheon defines three modes of engaging with stories across media ("the material means of expression of an adaptation" (2006: 34)) –

showing, telling and interacting (2006: 12). In the telling mode, such as narrative literature, the reader's involvement with the story occurs in the imagination, which is instructed by the text's words, beyond the limits of sounds or images, with a certain level of control over the pace and volume of reading. In contrast to the telling mode, showing engages the text's receiver in a story that is constantly moving forward in a process of directly perceiving visual, gestural, aural elements (Hutcheon 2006: 23).

As a medium, film integrates multiple forms of expression, including photography, music, phonetic sound, dance, architecture, painting and theatre, while transposing a novel into a film is seen as the most complex form of transitioning into a different mode of engagement, which necessitates the reduction of story length and a simplification of a story's complexity (Hutcheon 2006: 35–36). With regard to the requirements of this transposition, Hutcheon states that: "In the move from telling to showing, a performance adaptation must dramatize: description, narration, and represented thoughts must be transcoded into speech, actions, sounds, and visual images", adding that conflicts need to be shown visually and aurally (2006: 40). In the process of transcoding literary texts, films use "indexical and iconic signs" (specific people, places and objects), as opposed to literature's use of "symbolic and conventional signs" (2006: 43). Within the story transfer, film holds the possibility for the point of view to be presented in a myriad of cinematic methods: the use of camera angles, focal length, mise-en-scène, acting, costume design, as well as music and voice-over narration (Hutcheon 2006: 54–55). By deconstructing the clichés that often accompany evaluations of transitions from one mode of telling to another, Hutcheon questions the biased notion that telling is the best mode for representing interior states, while showing is the best mode for representing the exterior world. Despite critical assertions that film represents exterior action effectively but fails to represent the inner worlds of characters (Hutcheon 2006: 56–57), i.e. that it cannot show "interior monologues and analyses of inner states" (Hutcheon 2006: 57), which are found in narrative literature, Hutcheon indicates that film finds ways to establish cinematic equivalents to interior events and thoughts (2006: 58). The close-up, which can be utilized so that "external appearances are made to mirror inner truths" (Hutcheon 2006: 58), presents a visual equivalent for showing interior states (Hutcheon 2006: 58). Additionally, film's visual capacities are able to create externalized equivalents of subjectivity through the use of "slow motion, rapid cutting,

distortional lenses (fish-eye, telephoto), lighting, or the use of various kinds of film stocks" (Hutcheon 2006: 59). The inner states of characters can be communicated to the audience through sound, which is separate from the image, regardless of whether characters' states are shown on the screen, as music deepens inner states through its ability to provide direction to emotions shown on screen, resulting in a stronger connection of the viewer to the film (Hutcheon 2006: 41, 59, 60). The different modes of engagement also require a different "mental act" from the audience (Hutcheon 2006: 130). Telling calls for conceptualization, for the reader to visualize the story based on the written letters, while showing requires "perceptual decoding abilities", in the process of giving meaning to the perceived sounds and images (Hutcheon 2006: 130).

Finally, Hutcheon concludes that a story's different versions are not secondary to their original story, that they are "lovingly ripped off" (2006: 169). Hutcheon provides a general definition of an adaptation as an "extended, deliberate, announced revisitation of a particular work of art" (2006: 170), while the "continuum model" that Hutcheon establishes, recognizes the reinventive character of adaptations as "(re-) interpretations and (re-)creations" (2006: 172). Adaptations offer the following possibility: "[t]o repeat without copying, to embed difference in similarity, to be at once both self and Other", in turn obstructing concepts of "priority and authority" within texts (Hutcheon 2006: 174).

4. The Transfer and Adaptation Proper of Novels to Films

Adaptation is the central relationship between film and literature within cinema that has occupied film theorists, critics, as well as the audience, even though it is not the sole relationship between literature and film (McFarlane 2007: 15). Brian McFarlane's distinction between film and literature notes that faithfulness is not a useful or appropriate criterion for examining the adaptation of literature into film (2007: 15). Faithfulness is ultimately ascertained on the basis of subjective interpretation, as each viewer examines the adapted text for "one's own vision of the literary text" (McFarlane 2007: 15). McFarlane also dispels the notion that watching films is a less engaging act than reading narrative literature, since it involves perceiving different levels of meaning, including mise-en-scène, editing and sound (McFarlane 2007: 16). In addition to rejecting this notion,

McFarlane negates that some forms of literary works are more suitable to adaptation than others, and that some texts cannot be adapted at all (McFarlane, 2007: 16), stating that film can establish "narrative voice" (2007: 17), and possesses an inherent capacity to move through space and time. While literature yields its artistic value, its "subtlety and complexity" (McFarlane 2007: 18), from deft word use, film produces its own subtlety and complexity with mise-en-scène, montage and sound (McFarlane 2007: 18). The practice of adapting literary texts into films exists in a wider and mutually influential relationship between literature and film. Sergei Eisenstein claimed that the characteristics of the Victorian novel directly influenced film, and Kamilla Elliot provides a summary of this claim:

> [t]he Victorian novel's attention to visual detail, empirical psychology, atmospheric close-ups, alternating omniscient and character viewpoints, and shifts from one group of characters to another, all shaped Western film techniques, which in turn influenced and shaped film art more generally (2004: 4).

Aside from literature's influence on film, film has also had a marked influence on literature as "modern novels were shaped by cinematic techniques, like ellipsis, temporal discontinuity, fragmented vision, crosscutting, and multiple viewpoints" (Elliot 2004: 4). Novels, in contrast to plays, short stories and poems, are the most common types of texts that are adapted (McFarlane 2007: 18–19). Novels and films share a use of narrative, a "series of events, sequentially and/or consequentially connected" (McFarlane 2007: 19), and that encompasses a permanent group of characters, while they diverge most in terms of narration, the means with which the narrative is presented to the reader or viewer (McFarlane 2007: 19). Namely, the novel is comprised of functions that are subject to direct transfer, as they are not dependent on the literary text, such as events, in addition to being comprised of functions inextricably linked to literature, such as characterization and atmosphere, which call for "adaptation proper" (McFarlane 2007: 19–20). Elements that are most susceptible to transfer exist on the deeper levels of a narrative, such as events unveiling the involvement of characters or prompted by it, psychoanalytic patterns and "character functions" defined by Vladimir Propp (McFarlane 2007: 20). As per McFarlane, films and novels also share a "potent sense of diegesis" (2007: 20), which makes the world unravelling beyond the page or screen realistic, due to a close engagement with a novel's words or

film's codes (visual, linguistic, non-linguistic, cultural) (McFarlane 2007: 20). Both novels and films hold the capacity to present dimensions of place and time, while achieving this in different ways. Most novels are narrated in the past tense, while present tense narration is rarely utilized. Conversely, film is always progressing in the present tense and a direct cinematic equivalent of the grammatical past does not exist. The use of flashback techniques (transitioning to a close-up, connecting shots with a dissolve, or playing sound from a different time during a shot transition), can intimate a change in the past, without the use of a direct counterpart to a change in tense, past or future. A change in temporality can be indicated in the juxtaposition of sounds and images, by playing sounds of present events over shots of previous events, by playing sounds of events from the past over shots of present events, or by playing sounds of current events over shots of events set in the future. Film also successfully utilizes mise-en-scène to indicate changes in time (years, centuries). In terms of space, novels and films share a "mobility" in the representation of place. In novels, one narrative thread can be interrupted, so that a different or opposing narrative thread in a different place can continue, while film possesses an equal efficiency in presenting changes of place (McFarlane 2007: 21–23). McFarlane adds that novels and films are directed towards "revealing "lives" in a fullness perhaps denied" to other art forms (2007: 23). Novels achieve this revelation through what their characters say about themselves, what other characters say about them, as well as presenting what authors reveal within the prose (McFarlane 2007: 23). Film's revelation does not occur through an equivalent of the independent word, or signifier, which could indicate different meanings for different readers, and it is the film's image, sound, movement and editing that elicit a "complex response" from the viewer (McFarlane 2007: 23–24).

The process of adapting novels, as opposed to short stories or plays, requires for whole parts of novels to be shortened or removed, as well as minor plots and characters, in order to direct the focus of the adaptation to the main plot (McFarlane 2007: 24). However, film is not solely a product of the adapted novel but also reflects other texts and influences, and the novel is "only one element of the film's intertextuality" (McFarlane 2007: 26–27). The intertextual effect of the adaptation also relies on viewers' familiarity with the source text, which may or may not influence their impression of the adaptation (McFarlane 2007: 27). Additionally, the process of engaging with an adaptation can be inverted, and if a viewer

first views an adapted film and only subsequently reads the source text, the impression of the adapted film will influence the reading of the source text. This influence of the adapted text on the source text also extends to readers who are returning to a source text that they first read, subsequently viewed its film adaptation and then ultimately read the source text again following the viewing of the film adaptation (McFarlane, 2007: 27).

On the basis that the narrative is the main transferrable element in the adaptation process, McFarlane distinguishes between functions of the narrative that can be transferred and those functions that require "adaptation proper", basing this distinction on Roland Barthes's theory of narrative functions and their grouping into distributional and integrational functions (1996: 13). Namely, distributional functions, i.e. "functions proper", are "actions and events […] strung together linearly throughout the text" (McFarlane 1996: 13), which are further divided into "cardinal functions", key points of the narrative that result in "alternative consequences to the development of the story" (McFarlane 1996: 13) thus creating the essential story structure, and "catalyzers", smaller events, which complement the cardinal functions and situate them in a specific reality (McFarlane 1996: 14). Cardinal functions and catalyzers are "directly transferrable" (McFarlane 1996: 14) elements as they signify the "story content (actions and happenings)" (McFarlane 1996: 14), which can be presented with language or a combination of sound and images. Their exclusion or alteration is often the central cause of an audience perceiving that the original text's faithfulness was betrayed, while a recognition of faithfulness rests upon the mutual transfer of cardinal functions and catalyzers (McFarlane 1996: 14). Cardinal functions also entail functions occurring prior to the start of the plot. When transferring the story of the novel into a film, some cardinal functions can be invented to complete the story, they can be shown directly even if they are only implied in the novel, they can be set in an earlier or later place in the story, while changes to certain cardinal functions can entirely alter a film adaptation's meaning (McFarlane 1996: 48–49). In contrast to cardinal functions, integrative functions, i.e. "indices", which involve "psychological information relating to characters, data regarding their identity, notations of atmosphere and representations of place" (McFarlane 1996: 13), are not fully subject to direct transfer (McFarlane 1996: 14). Indices are subdivided into "indices proper", relating to characters and atmosphere (McFarlane, 1996: 14), and "informants", such as characters' names, ages and occupations, and the details concerning surroundings (McFarlane 1996: 14). Informants can be directly

transferred, but indices proper require adaptation proper. Cardinal functions and catalyzers comprise the formal content of a story independently of the form in which the story is realized (novel or film), while informants provide specificity to the formal content (McFarlane 1996: 14–15).

Film's extensive narrational capacities are described by Christian Metz in the following way: "Film tells us continuous stories; it "says" things that could be conveyed also in the language of words; yet it says them differently. There is a reason for the possibility as well as for the necessity of adaptations" (1974: 44, as cited in McFarlane 1996: 12). David Bordwell further describes film narration stating that: "All materials of a film function narationally – not only the camera, but speech, gesture, written language, music, color, optical processes, lighting, costume, even offscreen space and offscreen sound" (1985: 20, as cited in McFarlane 1996: 17). Within adaptation and the transfer of narration, mise-en-scène, blocking, cinematography or other film techniques, are not direct or identical equivalents to omniscient narration (McFarlane 1996: 17). Nevertheless, through the control of mise-en-scène, montage and editing, film can adapt certain functions of narrational prose, and while words that are spoken by characters can be directly transferred without any alteration, the "knowledge about characters, periods, places" (McFarlane 1996: 18), which narrational prose possesses, undergoes adaptation proper through film's narrational functions (McFarlane 1996: 18). Additionally, descriptive functions of narrative prose such as descriptions of "places, objects, activities" can be adapted in film, as film possesses a descriptive ability that is equal to literature (McFarlane 1996: 18). Seymour Chatman also recognizes film's descriptive abilities, noting that description does not solely refer to the "discrete, discontinuous, heterogeneous citation of details characteristic of literature" (Chatman 1990: 40), and that film also entails a capacity for description, which is tacit and not explicit (Chatman 1990: 38). Visual representation is much more common in film than verbal, and refers to the choice of certain actors, costumes, set design, lighting, as well as camera angles and framing (Chatman 1990: 38). As Chatman stresses "the very cinematic projection of images entails Description" (Chatman 1990: 40) and film "cannot help describing" (Chatman 1990: 40). While cinematic description does not offer the precision of literary description, its tacit description is intrinsically rich, arising from the heterogeneity of visual details contained in an image (Chatman 1990: 39–40). Brian Gallagher also compares film and literary images stating that "the film image is both more

345

immediate and more restricted than the literary image" (1978: 159) as "[f]ilm works directly with physical reality, reproducing its visual and auditory components with a startlingly mimetic accuracy" (Gallagher 1978: 159). Literature, which is permanently distanced from what it signifies in the signification process, can directly suggest or explain what the image it is creating means. Conversely, film must use indirect ways of indicating the meaning behind the images that it consists of, through camera movement and editing (Gallagher 1978: 160–161). Still, the partial limitations of the cinematic image in terms of direct commentary, is surpassed by the intensity of the effect that the cinematic image has on viewers, and this is described by Peter Brook in the following way: "When the image is there in all its power, at the precise moment when it is being received, one can neither think, nor feel, nor imagine anything else" (Brook 1987: 190, as cited in Hutcheon, 2006: 131).

Characterization and psychological action are more difficult to adapt, as film does not possess the same immediately available interpretation of action that is available to the omniscient narrator within a novel. In spite of film's overall lack of direct interpretation within its discourse, film is characterized by a continuous omniscience as it is always showing more than the characters know. The processes of film narration reside in camera angles, framing, the establishment of relations between shots, as opposed to literary narration, which relies on the person and tense of narration (McFarlane 1996: 18, 20). Therefore, narration requires adaptation proper within the adaptation of a novel into a film and is not transferrable, while the narrative is transferable as it does not rely on the semiotic system presenting it, indicating that the means for adaptation proper in novel to film adaptations are enabled by film's ability to establish cinematic counterparts of narrational commentary through the "manipulation of space, through its use of camera angle, focus, distance from its object, through the quality of its lighting, and through its editing procedures" (McFarlane 1996: 20, 61). Finally, according to Chatman, the novel and film share the existence of the implied author, a text's "inscribed principle of invention and intent" (Chatman 1990: 83), who produces the narrator and everything that occurs in the narrative (Chatman 1978: 148). The implied author serves readers and viewers as a "source of instruction about how to read the text and how to account for the selection and ordering of its components" (Chatman 1990: 83–84).

Besides the differences between distributional and integrational functions, which vary in their transferability, the transfer of the novel into the film is also affected by the difference between the story ("basic succession of events") and the plot (the way that the story is orchestrated) (McFarlane 1996: 23). A novel and film can share the story, while diverging in their use of plot and the "plot strategies which alter sequence, highlight different emphases" of a story (McFarlane 1996: 23). While the plot/story distinction can affect the transfer of the novel into a film, adaptation proper is shaped by the various similarities and differences between novels and films and how they are received (McFarlane 1996: 26). Importantly, novels function conceptually, as words hold a "high symbolic function" (McFarlane 1996: 27), and films function perceptually, as the film sign entails "high iconicity" (McFarlane 1996: 27). Based on the filmmaker's choice, adaptation can aim to visually represent the key verbal signs pertaining to people and places (McFarlane 1996: 27). An additional difference involves the way films and novels unfold. Despite a surface-level similarity between film's relentless progression, as films unfold frame by frame, and literature's linearity, as novels are read word by word, film opposes literary linearity and is characterized by its "spatiality" (McFarlane 1996: 27). The film's frame is a unit that is rarely registered individually in the way that a single word is and consists of more visual information (as well as verbal and aural) at any given moment than one word, offering the film a "spatial impact" that is not available to the novel (McFarlane 1996: 27, 29). Finally, the "novel's metalanguage" (McFarlane 1996: 29) can partially be replaced with mise-en-scène, although a film's story does not require telling since it is presented, and narrational voice is replaced by film's immediacy (McFarlane 1996: 26, 29).

5. Conclusion

Understanding the essential concepts underpinning adaptation studies, the specific constraints and possibilities of adapting narrative literature into film, as well as the practical perspective on adaptation, offers a foundation for understanding, analyzing and appreciating film adaptations. Adaptations on the whole can be approached from a myriad of theoretical viewpoints, originating from the dualistic viewpoint, as well as the recognition of adaptations as intermedial transfers, counter-ekphrases,

translations, performances, or examples of intertextual practice. The development of these diverging approaches has assisted the rejection of the fidelity discourse, has engendered the recognition of adaptations as instances of intertextual dialogism, highlighting the importance and diversity of relations between text, and has brought about the observation of film adaptations as hypertexts altering and extending previous hypotexts. The development and multiplicity of approaches recognizing the variety of textual connections has also enabled a more open investigation of the possibilities and contributions of adaptations.

The varied exploration of adaptations has also contributed to the recognition of adaptations as products, or announced transpositions of certain texts, and processes comprising of re-interpretation and re-creation influenced by different intentions, subsequently complemented by an audience's awareness of the adaptation's direct link to its preceding text, resulting in the pleasure of repeated stories, the joint element of adaptations and source texts, as well as a strong understanding of the extensive changes necessitated by film adaptations of narrative literature. This understanding reveals the essential characteristics of film adaptations of novels, from the creation of film adaptations to the audience's engagement with them.

The observation of film adaptations also extends to the textual possibilities of transfer and adaptation proper. The potential for narrative literature to undergo film adaptation is not limited as film is able to establish narrative perspective using techniques that are different from literary ones, as films and literature share narratives, and diverge in narration. A novel's content, which includes actions, events, and key points of the narrative, is subject to direct transfer from a novel to a film, as these elements do not hinge on the mode of showing or telling. A novels' elements which are not subject to direct transfer and require adaptation proper concern characters and descriptions of atmosphere and places. The story and plot can also be directly transferred or changed in their transfer to a film. Film and literature also possess key similarities and differences affecting the process of adaptations and their reception. They can both represent space and time in their different semiotic systems, they share a mobility in space, while diverging in how they convey time and tense, and can both utilize descriptive representation in different ways. Finally, novels function conceptually and films function perceptually, a key difference in a novel's telling and film's showing. Understanding the necessities of transfer and adaptation proper, as well as the similarities and differences between novels and films, promotes a thorough understanding of the

requirements of film adaptation, as well as the susceptibility of a novel and its components towards the process of film adaptation.

References

Cartmell, D. (1999). Introduction. In D. Cartmell and I. Whelehan (eds.), *Adaptations: from text to screen, screen to text*, New York: Routledge, 23–28.

Cartmell, D. and I. Whelehan (2007). Introduction – Literature on screen: a synoptic view. In D. Cartmell and I. Whelehan (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*, Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1–12.

Chatman, S. B. (1978). *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Chatman, S. (1990). *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Elliott, K. L. (2004). Novels, Films, and the Word/Image Wars. In R. Stam and A. Raengo (eds.), *A Companion to Literature and Film*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1–22.

Gallagher, B. (1978). Film Imagery, Literary Imagery: Some Distinctions. *College Literature*, 5(3), 157–173.

Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York/London: Routledge.

Leitch, T. (2012). Adaptation and Intertextuality, or, What isn't an adaptation, and What does it matter?. In D. Cartmell (ed.), *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 87–104.

McFarlane, B. (2007). Reading Film and Literature. In D. Cartmell and I. Whelehan (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen,* Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 15–28.

McFarlane, B. (1996). *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stam, R. (2000). *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Tripković-Samardžić, V. (2016). *Američka drama na filmu: Tenesi Vilijams*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Belgrade].