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When the study of literature is undertaken, critical acuity is vital. One has to be critically informed while dealing with literature as it involves many genres - drama, poetry, fiction. But in the recent times, we are witnessing a phenomenal growth in the understanding and analysis of studies that mingle varied disciplines. The importance of interlinking different disciplines together for purpose of better understanding is fast taking pace. This was not the trend some decades ago. Scholars, Mary Taylor Huber and Sherwyn p. Morreale have said that, “each discipline has its own intellectual history, agreements, and disputes about subject matter and methods” and its own “community of scholars interested in teaching and learning in that field.” They believe that each discipline was complete and whole unto itself until the emergence of the interdisciplinary era. According to them in the last few years, such notions have undergone a drastic change. (Morreale)

1.1 Disciplines and Interdisciplinarity

More and more researchers are now enticed by undertaking researches that involve two or more disciplines. Let us first delve into the meaning of the word 'disciplines'. According to the Oxford Dictionary, the word discipline can be defined as 'noun - a
Simply put, a discipline is any particular stream of knowledge that one wishes to study with deep interest. In this sense, interdisciplinary would mean a study involving the study of two or more disciplines at the same time. Interdisciplinary studies have been around for almost a century now. In my understanding, we live in dynamic times where information is freely available and limiting the knowledge of one discipline to itself is simply not enough. A whole and complete understanding of any subject is only possible by delving into the associative disciplines. The entire world is drawing closer each passing day. As Marshall Mcluhan aptly puts it, we live in a 'global village'. (McLuhan) Nothing rings truer than this terminology to describe the world we live in today. This may be attributed to the emergence of satellite communication or advent of internet revolution ushering in the phenomenon of social networking utilities. But no one can deny the fact that the world is shrinking closer each passing day. In times as dynamic as these, we certainly must acknowledge the fact that the study of a single discipline by itself would not suffice. The disciplines may have developed at different points in time over the course of history but each discipline certainly does have some or the other affiliations with the other disciplines. In lieu of this understanding, we must recognize that time has come where one who
seeks knowledge must not rely on the study of a single discipline alone. Since these disciplines are interrelated, and the study of interdisciplines is vital today, we are profoundly blessed to be living in times where that which remains tacit may now be unfolded.

Here, what Barthes observed is quite relevant, 'Interdisciplinary studies ... do not merely confront already constituted disciplines ... it is not enough to take a 'subject' (a theme) and to arrange two or three sciences around it. Interdisciplinary study consists in creating a new object, which belongs to no one. The Text, is i believe one such object.' (Barthes)

All the varied artefacts and phenomena may be termed as 'texts', as Barthes puts it that these objects are nothing but vehicles to produce and disseminate cultural meanings. Structuralist criticism has laid down that narratology is a prolific zone of interdisciplinary studies. Critics such as Gerard Genette have developed theory of narratological poetics. He pointed out the elements such as temporal order, duration, frequency, perspective and point of view while examining narrative. (Lévesque)

1.2 Purpose of this Study

In this study, it has been expected to have an indepth look at the way in which the same narrative behaves when the form changes. For this purpose it seemed only appealing to conduct a study of work of film adaptations. The way fiction functions in
literature and the way it shifts form when it is adapted for a film seemed rather an exciting study to undertake. It is believed that the narratives to be studied do not change as the form changes. It is simply the way they are moulded in both written literature and visual arts. The plot and the setting form the plinth of narrative structures. A lot has been said and written about these basics of narrative structure. It is only mandatory to discuss these while considering the shifts in narrative. But that will not be the only parameter to look out for while conducting this research work. It is believed that as one delves deeper into the study of the the two disciplines, new challenges will present themselves and this study will help one understand how a work of art functions when it is put into a different mould than the one in which it was originally created.

For the purpose of this study, five texts of literary fiction and the film adaptations based on them are selected. The aim of the study the narrative structure of each text and in turn also that of the adapted work. It is my belief that the text will primarily remain the same irrespective of the change in the discipline. The treatment met out to the adaptive work may or may not change based on the filmmaker's own perception of the original work of art. Let me elaborate this statement, when the literary work is adapted by a film maker, he/she moulds the narrative of that work to suit the medium he/she deals with. While literature is an art of writing, film is a visual art that appeals to visual and aural senses both at the same time. Both forms are poles apart. And thus
it is mandatory to understand each discipline in the light of its own merits and
demerits. This can be elaborated such that the written text draws heavily on the
written word alone. Here the craft lies in weaving the words such that the reader is
mesmerized and taken into the realm of imagination simply by the power of words
alone. For visual arts such as the film, the visual and auditory subdivisions are at bay
and so the craft here lies in emulsifying these and the creator's own dimension of
imagination. The texts chosen for the purpose of my research are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work Type</th>
<th>Film Name</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Work Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Siddhartha - (1922)</td>
<td>Hermann Hesse</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>Siddhartha (1972)</td>
<td>Conrad Rooks</td>
<td>Feature Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The Old Man and The Sea (1952)</td>
<td>Ernest Hemingway</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>The Old Man and the Sea (1958)</td>
<td>John Sturges</td>
<td>Feature Film</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Understanding Cinema

Film, primarily a visual art has the capability to appeal to us on many levels. For this similar reason, there is a need to study this medium in a myriad of ways. One has to make use of a variety of methods and approaches to understand it fully. Film theory has been academized since the 1960s at various universities and educational institutions all over the world. Each component of a film functions on its own paradigm, and to this end myriad approaches to studying and analysing films have been formulated. These approaches are nothing but simply the various takes on theorizing film studies. Understanding films and film studies is vital to this research as much as understanding novels. The two disciplines go hand in hand and are intertwined in a complex yet beautiful way. The synthesis of the two is bound to create an art worth watching.

Film originated in the twentieth century, and as this new art form it has quite rapidly and incessantly attracted all men alike to make attempts to define the form and function of this medium. With respect to the other art forms, film is a fairly new medium and also the youngest of all arts, yet has gained considerable amount of acceptance over the years. French philosopher Henri Bergson's *Matter and Memory* predicted the progress of film theory at a time when cinema was just being born as a new medium. He commented on the need for new ways of thinking about movement, and coined the terms "the movement-image" and "the time-image". It was decades
later that the philosopher Gilles Deleuze found base in *Matter and Memory* as the basis of his philosophy of film and in his work *Cinéma I and Cinema II* (1983-1985), the he returned to Bergson's concepts, combining them with the semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce. (What is Film Theory?)

Early film theory arose in the silent era and was mostly concerned with defining the crucial elements of the medium. It largely evolved from the works of directors like Germaine Dulac who was one of the film makers who started the *Pure Cinema* Movement in France (Contributors, Cinéma pur), Sergei Eisenstein who pioneered the theory as well as practice of *Montage* (Contributors, Sergei Eisenstein), Lev Kuleshov who founded the world’s first film school, Moscow Film School. (Contributors) and film theorists like Rudolf Arnheim, known for his book, Visual Thinking (Contributors, Rudolf Arnheim) and Béla Balázs who in his book The Visible Man, helped to find ‘film as a language theory’ (Contributors, Béla Balázs). These individuals emphasized how film differed from reality and how it might be considered a valid art form. French film critic and theorist, André Bazin gave forth his view that the spirit of cinema lay in its ability to recreate reality, and not in being different from reality. (Contributors, Film Theory)

The 60s and 70s were the years when the film theory started penetrating academics. It also stared to borrow ideas from fields of psychology, anthropology, literature and so
The digital revolution in the 90s had an impact on film theory in ways more than one.

In his article, *Synthesizing Approaches*, Henry Bacon cites Paul Ricoeur, a French philosopher to state that one must look at mimesis as a way of reshaping reality. It is not simply imitation of reality. Thus narrative, look at human actions that are shaped by social norms and ideas. The queries related to action are asked with keeping narratives at the centre. This same understanding can be applied to narration in films. So, if we look at the way cinema is used to express ideas, beliefs, notions, and we might consider that it comes from some part of reality, it cannot be negated that at some point, a filmmaker too might have conformed to social rules and notions. (Bacon, www.mv.helsinki.fi)

All this is merely about certain possibilities for expression which the film medium offers. What it amounts up to is an understanding of cinema as an expressive system which allows for a powerful integration of the primarily phenomenological and the semiotic, the latter understood here as the sphere of socially constructed understanding of culture, including the limiting conditions, motivations, consequences and significance of human action. The way this actually works out in various historical circumstances belongs to the level of the social and the psychological.

A film, otherwise known as a movie, moving picture, motion picture or ‘flick’ is defined as: "sequence of photographs projected onto a screen with sufficient rapidity
as to create the illusion of motion and continuity” or “a form of entertainment that enacts a story by a sequence of images giving the illusion of continuous movement”.

A film provides us with the illusion of movement and sound and suspends our disbelief to provide an entertaining, immersive experience for the viewer. Film presents us with a story or narrative that is re-enacted through the interaction of characters. It can be argued that the cause and effect relationship in a film is governed largely by the characters’ actions that cause events to change. Characters are said to be the agents of cause-effect relationships. Films conform to a film structure or film grammar. Films can be split into episodes, acts, scenes, events (events span many shots but may also only be one shot long) and shots; a shot being the smallest unit of a collection of frames. Film can be considered to have a ‘film grammar’ which film directors commonly follow. “Like any other natural language this [film] grammar has several dialects but is more or less universal”. Edit-effects such as fades, wipes, transitions between shots and scenes can be seen as punctuation in film grammar. In the case of film it is made up of a plot and characters serve as the actors who act out a story. The story of a film can be considered the ‘original’ story a director/writer had in mind which considers only the important events that occur for a film’s narrative to progress. “The term plot is used to describe everything visibly and audibly presented in the film before us”. Film tells a story and has existents (characters, objects and locations) and events. In this work Film events describe events common to most films,
e.g. action, dialogue, suspense and emotional events. Its plot can be manifested in many ways and can be considered its discourse. When we talk of ‘going to the movies’ we almost always mean we are going to see a narrative film– a film that tells a story. Hence, film can be considered a narrative and thus we can argue it conforms to narrative theory.

The Oxford Online Dictionary defines narrative as: “A spoken or written account of connected events; a story” (“Narrative”) Narrative is described as a sequence of causally connected events, organised in space and time. It is argued that each narrative has two parts, the actual story and how it is communicated (discourse). Seymour Chatman, a leading narratologist, distinguishes between a story and discourse. He says, “In simple terms, the story is the what in a narrative that is depicted and the discourse is the how...”. Story is considered “…the narrative in chronological order, the abstract order of events as they follow each other.” The story is “the set of events tied together which are communicated” or “what in effect happened”; in an event something occurs. (Chatman)

A set of events can be considered as the ‘what happened’ in a certain sequence and this forms the idea of the story. Events are actions or things that just happen or can be termed as the happenings and are associated with characters that either make the event happen. Narrative theory tries to explain how these constituent elements form a narrative, where a story is more than the sum of the basic narrative elements. It also
describes how a narrative is transmitted. We understand media and data it emits, very systematically and succinctly. For instance a surveillance video of an examination hall where students are appearing in an exam would be immediately distinguished from that of a road accident. This is possible because humans grasp the context and meanings. Some types of video data, e.g. films, are made to entertain and others are made to educate, e.g. documentaries. Video data, in effect, is used for narration. Here it is important to understand what narration is.

Cinema is divided in terms of geographical areas where they are made, in terms of languages in which they are made, thematically and even generally in terms of ‘art’ cinema and ‘commercial’ cinema.

The discussion on art cinema has generally focused around these main points: art cinema as a mode of narration and art cinema as an institution. To look at cinema in the light of these two points, one can rely on David Bordwell's article "The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice," which appeared in Film Criticism in 1979. (Gierse) . Art cinema has long been viewed with a keen eye by the critics. Even though it is generally considered that art cinema is difficult to comprehend and uses symbols to convey messages, it is becoming more and more popular worldwide. The viewers look at these films and the symbols in them in their own way and comprehend them in their own ways.
The arena of ‘art’cinema has become such a debatable area that, there is a need to understand it carefully. Bordwell, framed and formulated the term ‘art cinema’ in his article mentioned above for the first time. He deemed that such cinema developed with the growth of national cinemas in various countries all over the world and the emergence of new waves in these national and regional cinemas. These new waves were felt during the 1950s and 1960s, in many parts of Europe and the spread over the world. Jean Luc Godard, Ingmar Bergman, Alain Resnais are some of the famous new wave filmmakers. Godard introduced a very distinctive cut technique in his film, “ A Bout de Souffle” called the “Jump Cut” which went on to become an editing technique discussed at many a film schools. (Morrow) The moving portrayal of the Holocaust in “Nuit and Brouillard” by Resnais. It was a French documentary made in 1955 that portrayed the horrors of the Nazi holocaust. (James Monaco). One cannot overlook, the contribution of Bergman to the new wave films and cinema in general. His prodigal works such as The Seventh Seal, Persona have left lasting marks on viewers, cinema students and inspiring filmmakers over the years.

In their article, Eleftheria Thanouli states that, the cinema is governed by narrative that are either based on objective realism, subjective realism or the authorial presence. The Objective Realism is that which concerns a narrative where the reality portrayed is caused by the cause and effect cycle. (Thanouli). It also concerns creating a plot
that has an uninterrupted cycle of events. It also gives way to shooting at various locations instead of film sets to give a credible feel of time and space, and the use of lighting that is natural. The Subjective Realism, focusses on displaying characters in light of their psychological persona. These can be represented symbolically or through dialogue or through the use of cinematic techniques such as editing/lighting and special effects. The use of mise-en-scene techniques for display of psychological traits is very effective in films. The ‘mise-en-scene’ is nothing but the arrangement of how everything looks on screen. It is the physical arrangement of all the elements together. The way a filmmaker warrants the use of how elements look on screen can be very particular and may be used to depict particular emotions or themes. For example in the film, The Metamorphosis of Franz Kafka the use of golden light and gothic furniture, placed in a definite way is a perfect example of how ‘mise-en-scene’ should be used to depict psychological state of characters.

The authorial presence is best manifested through the way a filmmaker lends his touch to the film as his own art. These stylistic and thematic devices, help the filmmaker leave his own mark on the film.

1.4 The Two Disciplines: Literature and Films

In portraying the broader film and literature field, then focusing more narrowly on adaptation, this thesis would like to suggest the pervasive nature of the interest in this
confluence of two art forms. Partly this would also look at how a film draws from a novel, through its own practices of narrative complexity and mimetic richness. In the twentieth century the film has surfaced as a popular narrative form. In the times, when films have become a major source of entertainment as well as information, the popularity of films is unmatched. This can be seen from the number of films that are made each year, and the way they are loved by the audiences. Undoubtedly, the films have become a very popular medium that narrates stories of human interest in a well-packaged form.

Many scholars from Andre Bazin to George Bluestone have spoken about the correspondence of the two media (viz., literature and film), some have spoken about the affinities of the two, while others have stated about the film's indebtedness to literature. Modern theoretical works from writers such as Roland Barthes and Christian Metz have raised some interesting views by raising a comparison of the two media, though none are concerned with adaptation. They talk about the semiotics of literature and semiotics in film. In fact Christian Metz, in his book From Film Language states that, in a film there are many dialects, and each of them can be analyzed separately. He goes on to say that even though students have always looked to language when it comes to normative grammar and studying meanings, even though grammatical and language specific phenomenon exist in any medium that relates to transferring information. (Metz)
This thesis aims to study the process of transposition from novel into films. By the application of certain theoretical concepts, a wider understanding of the transmission process can be attained and by looking at the discussions prevalent on adaptation, one can assume whether or not a text adapted in another medium becomes a new form of art or not.

The texts selected for the purpose of this study are no doubt a personal preference but at the same time care has been taken to select texts that are not just representative of simply a single culture or country. The texts selected are representative of American, English, Indian and many other backgrounds. Thus the selection is global. All the texts are canonical in their stature. The film adaptations of these texts are not very well known. The reason for choosing these texts is that when texts of caliber as great as these are adapted into another form of art, it certainly raises immense challenge.

Making films is a creative and technical art. Unlike with writing, where the tool employed by the writer is a pen and a paper, the complications of making a film is what makes it a gigantic task. While for an author the basic and sole task is penning down all that his creativity has to offer, the filmmaker has a much bigger task to assume.

In most cases, an adaptation is seen as an all-encompassing transposition of an already existing product. This transposition can be a shift of medium or genre or for that matter the context; telling the same story but from a different point of view. Any
and all of these can change the way a story is interpreted. We can also understand transposition as a shift from real to fictional. Another way of looking at adaptation is to see it as a process of re-creation and re-interpretation. But this relies heavily on one's perspective. The film adaptations of African myths and legends are seen as a way of preserving a rich heritage in an audio-visual method. (Cham).

Another interesting way of looking at adaptation in the era of post modernism is from the point of view of the spectator. This involves how a work of adaptation is received by the audience. Here we can interestingly look at adaptation as a form of intertextuality. The way a film is perceived will depend heavily on the original work of art it has relied on and in turn how each audience connects with the work of art in the first place and then the film that is a work of adaptation. This leads us to a palimpsestic observation that a work of adaptation is a derivation from a previous work without really being imitative.

"Adaptation includes almost any act of alteration performed upon specific cultural works of past and dovetails with a general process of cultural recreation."

(Fishclin)

### 1.5 Brief History of Films

Ever since the time the first films were made till date, the scholars of film studies and critics alike have been puzzled by the similar fundamental questions; the most basic
of these is, the debate between the real and the reel world. How can one justify whether silence or sound is more accurate to express that what this medium has to offer? how original is the art of film making since it relies heavily on other arts? Much of these inquiries initially came from the base of literary criticism, art history and studies of aestheticism. Yet the gigantic proportion of this medium and its appeal to huge masses simple undeniable in its own way.

The history of film studies may be broadly divided into three categories, where each stage overlaps another. The first stage, known as Formalism comprised mainly of silent era. From the early 1920s to the mid thirties theorists made attempts to establish film as an art. They believed and argued that film making was not simply recording events on a camera, in fact it was an intricate art. Notable theorists of this era include Sergei Eisenstein and Rudolf Arnheim. These theorists not only questioned the purpose of film but they also justified it in their own ways. (Andrew)

After the onset of sound films, a new wave of thoughts took over film critics and academics. The Realists were more interested in defining film as an art of nature rather than an art in contrast with nature. Andre Bazin proclaimed the dependence of cinema on reality. (Gray).

The historical conditions throughout the world was challenging the classical thoughts on film theory by 1960s and 1970s. The Vietnam war and the student revolutions in France and the United States were speaking of times changing. It was around this
time that film studies was separated from the study of arts and literature at universities and it was academized. The era that succeeded known as the era of contemporary film theory had writers and theorists questioning the classicists on their use of the terms such as art, reality and illusion, self, performance, nature. They focussed on the nouvelle ideas of language, gender and class representation in films. The most powerful influence on films in this era was that of linguistics. The works of Ferdinand de Sausesure, Noam Chomsky and the likes opened new windows of ideating. Films were now viewed through the help of structural and semiotic models the closely followed by the Marxist and Feminist probing of films. Freudian psychoanalysis and the deconstructionism of Derrida only seemed to create wider avenues for film understanding and appreciation. Each new approach faced turbulence and barely maintained its relevance though not without polemic. All the approaches added to the basics laid down by the classicists and took it further from there. While the third phase provided much to think about and learn and understand it also created an awareness for interdisciplinary learning. From mid 1980s a more heterogeneous era emerged. This era has films critiqued individually as well as in general. The viewer was also taken into consideration. Also this phase brought about the need to accept and understand that globalisation was real and film or cinema was also being globalised and digitized. These new technologies changes the totalitarian necessities of the medium by a great extent.
1.6 Understanding Adaptations

While looking at adaptation, a good understanding of adaptation theories is a requisite. For many years, the film adaptations of books were seen as inferior by the critics and film enthusiasts. Most opined that the film version of the text lacked the essence of the original book. The films were simply penurious versions of the high standard texts. The cinematic versions could do no justice to the written word. It merely flattened everything out onto a screen for the viewer to see. The books with it's meticulous descriptions wonderful schemes of plot offered a lot more to the reader. It provided the reader with the space to imagine as one wished and accordingly delve deeper into the meanings implied. There was certainly more room for absorbing elements and a lot was left to the reader's own interpretation. The critics also argued that unlike books, the films left no room for one to probe deeper into the text. It had many shortcomings. Not everything written in the book could be filmed. In such circumstances, the filmmaker would make a film with wae resources that were available at hand and this in turn was a drawback. The filmmaker provided a ready-to-view version of the text thus not allowing the viewers' to rely on thier own imagination. It was like saying that the viewer was at the mercy of the filmmaker and had to swallow the bite offered to him without protesting of mentioning if he preferred it. The film could never delve deeper into what the book had to offer, lest it
would miss the point. All that a film could be was a poor rendition of the book. The 'visualisation' of the book ruined the subtelties of the written word. The debate over the fidelity to the source has been going on etver since the first work of adaptation was created. But with time as the approaches to understand literature broadened, a new spectrum to understanding literature sprang up. It advocated that there could be more than one ways in which a text could be read and interpreted. The reader response theory places the reader in the centre and states that it is the reader who is important not the text. Thus if we looked at the filmmakers as readers of the literature they adapt on screen, we may justify that the film adaptations are their readings and interpretations of the source. This attitude of dehierarchising has found a lot of ground in the last few years. The critics and scholars alike are now more focussed on discussing intertextuality than the initial debate of fidelity to the source. The stress is now laid on understanding a film based on a text as an artistic creative work and that it is an ongoing process where the synthesis of two mediums goes on to transcend the boundaries of a single medium and the final product is a new text altogether that has it's roots in many texts and media at the same time yet it is strongly on it's own. The work of adaptation is seen as a field of various intertextual networks.

As a scholar who sees films based on literary texts, it is of undue importance that one must not simply seek to find an honest depiction of the book on screen. The task is to understand that the film is an independent, coherent and an artistic creation of its own
which may carry its own meaning, different from the source text altogether. A sense of open mindedness to accept a fresh new perspective on the text is vital, in order to understand that adaptation is not just an artistic process and but also an act. The filmmaker is a reader in his own right and the film is how he received the literature. If we were to adapt this outlook, then an adaptation is an original creative piece of work even though it is adapted!

Most of the times, adaptations are well awaited and then looked down upon. Why does this happen? Well, everyone who has loved reading a book and have entered the enthralling world of the human mind where there exist new realms of imagination would always love the magic of the book or the written word. They eagerly await its cinematic adaptation in order to view it onscreen; its places, characters, events come to life but often, the adapted version is very different from the original book and this leaves the readers dissatisfied. While in some cases when the film is a faithful copy of the original, it is criticised for 'going by the book' way too much.

'The Old Man and The Sea' the film by Anthony Duress is an absolute faithful version of the book by Ernest Hemingway. So much so that we can actually read out paragraphs from the book word by word as we watch the film and the characters in it speak them out. But then, there is a totally altered rendition of The Metamorphosis by Carlos Atanes, the experimental Spanish filmmaker which leaves the viewer in cerebral chaos. Both the films are works of adaptations based on literary classics but
poles apart. The filmmakers have made the films in the light of their own elucidation of the books. With this in mind, one cannot help but be perplexed by the continuous debate on whether it is appropriate to identify adaptations as literature on screen. Well, if it is on screen, is it still literature? lurks the question. And so does the looming question of differentiating the literature on screen with literature in films.

The ubiquitous works of narrative adaptations in the present-day culture, notwithstanding the critical condemnation has generally been to disparage the works of adaptation and treat them secondary to the "original". Somehow the way we think has been so conditioned that the work that originates first appeals as the only original work. Succeeding works that may heavily or loosely rely or adapt the first work are always seen in the shadow of their precursor. In spite of the fact that the newer works might be minefields oozing creativity, we most of the times tend to identify them as copies. Adaptation studies is attracting a lot of attention worldwide. It is not as though that the process of adaptation is a new process. It is in fact as old as time itself. Aeschylus and Goethe and de Ponte all retold the same old stories in new forms. Shakespeare too staged the plays that he wrote on paper. To remember the words of Walter Benjamin here, "story telling is always the art of repeating stories" rings truer when one commences on the task of studying adaptations.

In literary criticism it is not uncommon to mingle the terms form and meaning for with each other. Infact, the two are seen as going hand-in-hand with each other
always. When it comes to film criticism, most often the safe go-to area is the themes. It is very common to thematically criticise a film but rarely ever is the form or the medium spoken about. This is a sad but a true fact. Many films find their base or roots in literature. This poses a problem when the critic tries to understand and evaluate the film on the basis of the novel it borrows elements from. The concern is that the film as a medium is altogether different and thus it requires different analytical tools to be understood or analysed. The tool that foremost comes to mind when talking of films that are adaptations is that of 'time and space'. An interesting thing to comprehend here is that when looking at a narrative film, one has to consider the screen time as well as the diegetic time. The same would apply to space in the film. The screen space that is the actual image of the space where the narrative takes place and the diegetic space which is the mental space within the narrative space made up of the viewer's imagination.

A keen observation of fiction and films simultaneously leads one to realise that there is a vast difference in the subtle elements that cause the forms of the two to differ. To expand this point let us take a look at the techniques of the narrative in both. While in the works of fiction, the narrator is almost always present. Often we come to know what the characters feel and think not through their own dialogues but through the active narration. Whereas in the films many times the narrator altogether disappears. The film one may go as far as to say has the advantage of visual tools that help it
showcase images on screen that directly stimulate the perceptions of the viewers. This is definitely something a book cannot achieve at least not with the former’s intensity! Honestly, a film has tremendous effect on our sensory perceptions that is direct as compared to books. On the other hand, the major drawback of this audio-visual medium is the time constraint it has to face.

While reading the works of fiction and their adaptations, one have come across changes in the films where the filmmaker perhaps wanted to shadow a particular theme and bring out another one which was rather understated in the novel. Sometimes, the filmmaker brings out the traits in a character that are otherwise hidden to the reader’s mind while reading the novel. And yet at times, the filmmaker goes a step ahead and even pursues the problems he sees unsolved in the written work and tries to decipher them in his rendition of the source. In this sense, a film too has to be read not just viewed. Bluestone, one of the first scholars of adaptation works in films and literature said that ‘a filmmaker is not a mere translator but an established author’ (Bluestone)

In the preliminary chapter 'The Limits of the Novel and the Limits of the Film' in his canonical work 'Novel Into Films', George Bluestone quite straightforwardly draws a similarity between the lines of Conrad in his work Nigger of the Narcissus and the words of D.W.Griffith. Both are upon the same task of making us (the readers and viewers) see. He states that the novelist and the director both have common
intentions. Both are creative artists and both want a receptive audience since they want 'to make us see' their respective arts whether visually through the eye or imaginatively through the mind is left upon us to ponder. Thus states Bluestone that the difference between the two media lies in the perception of the visual and the concept of mental image.

While he laments on the way novels and their filmed adaptations are accepted by the audiences, he states that novel is viewed as the norm and film as it's peril and the extent of deviation, one enjoys in the adapted work varies directly to the 'respect' one has for the original. True to this understanding a concern that rises is that very few grasp that the motives of a novel and a film are aesthetically different. Both are categorically different and serve unique and different purposes.
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