Many writers would like to believe that the legacy of nineteenth century novel is the twentieth century film. Inherent in the structure of some of the Victorian and Edwardian novels is a crying need for a new art form, an anticipation to transcend the tedious, detailed monotonous novel writing. The film arrived as an answer and broke the tedium of all the present art forms. It not only borrowed heavily from drama and novel specifically but also suffused the existing art forms with its audiovisual splendour. Leo Tolstoy was fascinated with its swift change of scene and a unique blending of emotion and experience. Cinema created a new symphony of all the art forms and brought into play all the human senses. James Joyce in his excitement founded the first Cinema hall in Dublin. With the invention of a new art form, the novel could now deal with linguistic experiments, mythological accretion and psychological complexities. However writers like D. H. Lawrence and George Orwell felt that Cinema was an industrial art which not only homogenised popular culture but also eroded the novel in particular and the literary scene in general.

The film to begin with wished to break away from the established forms of drama and novel, and establish itself as a distinctive art form. Nevertheless the film could never completely shrug off its indebtedness to novel and drama. Hence it was inevitable that the debate over the similarities and differences between these art forms
debate over the similarities and differences between these art forms continued. The journey from the page to screen in the case of the novel, and from stage to celluloid in case of the drama needs to be retraced in the present context. The transformation process from the written word to the visual or from live performance to recorded or filmed performance is indeed a complex one. To unravel this process we need to examine the similarities and differences of these various modes of representations. This would later bring us to the question of, how differently is the reality represented by these art forms, how differently the meaning is constituted and conveyed to the reader and the viewer. However to begin the discussion we begin from the beginning i.e. the word- the basic unit of verbal language.

The fundamental difference that exists between the page and screen is while that the page uses 'words' only whereas the screen uses 'pictures' as well. According to the Semiotists the 'words' are arbitrary signs or "symbols" which are meaningless in themselves signifying only by conventional agreement. The 'pictures' in contrast, are generally thought of as natural signs or "icons" which represent things on the basis of some sort of inherent resemblance to them and give the illusion of being almost identical in what they signify. The page and the screen communicate through different languages-i.e. if a film can be considered a language at all. Language in the strict sense is essentially discursive, it has
permanent units of meaning which are combinable into larger units; it has fixed equivalencies that make definition and translation possible. The annotations of language are general, so that it requires non-verbal acts, like printing, looking or emphatic voice-inflexions to assign specific denotations to its terms. Film on the other hand has no such permanent vocabulary; it has no fixed grammar and its syntax it totally dependent on usage.¹

There exists a distance between the verbal and the visual between the linguistic system and the presentational one. Words and pictures are different classes of sign but they are also components of larger systems of signification that are, in turn, part of the entire complex of human communication, part of our total manner of making meaning. And the meaning is the key term here. The film can inform, explain, persuade and create a "text" called the movie. Film is thus the language of sounds along with the image- the film can convey meaning without the soundtrack but not always. As Roland Barthes suggested that the famous heroine Greta Garbo's face may indeed be an "icon". But even that highly expressive icon is unable, without the support of the words to communicate a message as precise as "I want to be alone". Humphrey Bogart's dangling cigarette, bemused expression, dinner jacket may hint at Rick Blaine's hard edged personality in the film *Casablanca* but his dialogue, "I stick my neck out for nobody" doesn't merely hint, it tells
2. Even silent films found it difficult to rely solely on the image and extensively used music and intertitles.

Theorists like Pudovkin in Russia have drawn parallels between language and pictures; thus, the word is equated with the shot, the phrase or sentence with the scene or sequence, grammar and syntax with editing and so forth. Though there is a degree of correspondence between fiction and film- the differences between them are greater. As André Levinson observed years ago that, "In the Cinema, one extracts the thought from the image and in literature the image from the thought". Moreover the dramatic impact and the powerful immediacy of a film is capable of arousing in the audience an immediate emotion. But the film also always happens in the present tense. Even when the past is projected in a flashback, it is unreeled in the here and now with the same immediacy as scenes set in the present. A rough correspondence exists between the structure of a novel and the structure of a film; for example, crosscutting can be used in both narrative forms. In a novel, `style' means the arrangement of words; in a movie "style" is almost wholly nonverbal.

In his famous Preface to The Nigger of the Narcissus (1898), Joseph Conrad said:

"My task which am trying to achieve is, by the power of the written word to make you hear, to make you feel- it is, before all, to make you see".

While Conrad tried to make his readers "see" with the help of the written word, filmmaker D.W. Griffith echoed Conrad by declaring
that he wished his viewers to "see" in terms of pictures. While a film
director uses camera angles, shot sequences, his locales, images and
symbols to evolve a style like a literary artist similarly an author uses
words, paragraphs, image clusters, similes and metaphors to make
his readers see. However the process of "seeing" in both the mediums
is different and while a reader can take recourse to his imagination, a
viewer has it in concrete shape before him.

If we begin with a premise that both words and images are set of
signs which belong to systems which at certain levels resemble each
other than we will have to remember that each of these systems has
different codes i.e. the perceptual, the referential, and the symbolic.
According to Christian Metz what makes the study of the relation
between two separate sign systems possible is the fact that the “same
codes may reappear in more than one system”\(^5\). The verbal and the
visual can be seen as component parts of one global system of
meaning. Eisenstein who was aware of Cinema’s resemblance with
other arts, compares literature to the movies because it too, is an “art
of viewing”\(^6\). Eisenstein provides one of the earliest instances of a
relation between novel and Cinema in a famous essay entitled
"Dickens, Griffith and the Film Today". He demonstrates how
Griffith’s montage techniques are indebted to Dickens’ use of close-up
details, as in the opening pages of The Cricket and the Hearth. Thus
according to Eisenstein the montage technique is not unique to
Cinema but a fundamental technique of all art.
George Melies, one of the first filmmakers of the silent era, spoke of Cinema's capacity for combining all the arts in equal doses: dramatic art, drawing, painting, sculpture, architecture, and mechanics. The nineteenth century sensibility was however veering towards a powerful synthesis of all arts and trying to provide as if an 'extended mode of expression'. The modern novel of Joyce, Conrad and Lawrence were in fact pregnant with anticipations of a new art. Perhaps bored with the prevailing trend of an inflexibly omniscient, authoritative narrator, innovative novelists like Henry James and Joseph Conrad instead sought to lay bare the process of fiction by introducing a highly self conscious narrator in first person. Keith Cohen writes in *Film and Fiction* that as a result:

The emphasis shifted to showing how the events unfolded dramatically rather than recounting them, to conveying strictly complex experiences through a shifting narrative perspective: and to asking the reader to reconstruct into a cohesive whole what often came across as fragmented bits.

In the historical encounter between novel and Cinema when novel was losing its audience it started exploiting to its own advantage the techniques of fragmented vision and discontinuity peculiar to the movies. Almost all avant-garde movement since 1900, for eg; Cubism, surrealism and futurism resembled Cinema in their analytical, mechanical way of viewing the world. Jean Louis Baudry has explained in detail in his article, "The Apparatus" the manner in which both Marx and Freud took recourse to cinematic metaphors to explain some of their most fundamental doctrines. Ideology for Marx
is that which forces the subject to see social relations in a precisely inverted order—just as if one were looking through the aperture of a camera. On the other hand Freud's description of a subject's dream process is like viewing a film where the images are projected onto the "dream screen" of the sleeping subject. The images originate in the unconscious and so the subject is not aware of the manner of this projection.

Cinema was indeed a new art in several thousand years and was truly an 'invented art' unlike other arts. The intrinsic dependence of Cinema on recording editing and projection for its impact makes it a collective art, again a unique characteristic. Cinema as a medium can expand or compress time. It has the ability to break away from a simple, linear, temporally coherent narrative line. It can easily break up and rearrange ordinary temporal sequence with ease. The cinematic techniques of flashbacks and crosscutting can move a spectator through time at will and show number of events happening simultaneously which gives film narration a close affinity with modern Bergsonian ideas of time as something that can be manipulated.

Anthropologists have demonstrated that primitive tribes and babies shown a motion picture for the first time are literally unable to see it, unable to synthesize the lights and shadows on the screen. A certain degree of cultural training is required which enables us to see a movie. The language of Cinema tends to be iconic and the language of
literature tends to be symbolic. However image and word, both media involve perception and cognition, and also the process of decoding. More than merely perceiving a cinematic image, we link that perception to prior perceptions to previously gained knowledge and experience. While reading, we ourselves perform the act of visualisation but in watching a visual directly in a film, we still construct a mental image and match it with our prior structure of image to reach a "perception". So whether it's word or picture, we must inevitably construct a mental image of what we have "perceived". While watching a film we constantly translate the visual in front of us. If we see a character in the first scene in the narrative and then do not see him for the next few scenes, we are constantly trying to place him with the main narrative until he reappears again on the screen. When we see a small figure on the screen gaining in height as he walks towards the camera we immediately know that he is not expanding in size but coming closer.

The word and the image can elicit similar association of ideas-"bright lights" both as a word and as image will throw up associations of festivities, happiness etc. Hence like words in literature, images in Cinema are capable of carrying both denotations and connotations, they not only signify entities other than themselves in the literal sense but also have a way of calling up feelings surrounding them. However while Gerald Barrett and Virginia Woolf, argue that film has much lesser connotative capacity than verbal language. Theorists like
Christian Metz contend that "cinematographic" image is much richer in connotative possibility than the word, in fact much richer than in denotation. The image in combination with the word and music becomes more connotative.

Ingmar Bergman the famous Swedish filmmaker and theorist identified yet another root difference between the two media. According to him, Cinema addresses the feelings more immediately, directly and powerfully than the intellect. However in films made by the French New Wave film director Jean-Luc-Godard in his use of Brechtian devices (the actors directly addressing the spectator to break the dramatic illusion) compel us to think about what we are seeing and the intellect is equally at play along with emotions.

Another similarity between cinematic and literary language lies in their mode of construction in the manner in which they tend to arrange their signs. Film may choose to communicate various 'messages' simultaneously, while literature has no such capability. Film has no grammar and so no predetermined rules for its construction. But film like verbal language frequently opts to order its signs in some logical sequence in order to make meaning. Joy Gould Boyum illustrates this by describing the following scene from Alfred Hitchcock's *Psycho* (1960):

In *Psycho*’s famous shower scene, for example, where some fifty two separate shots make for some forty five seconds of the film, we see (among other things) the head and bare shoulders of a woman, a shower head spraying water straight at the camera, shower head and woman's head together, a figure vaguely perceived through a shower curtain coming through a door, a
huge knife, the shower curtain being ripped open, the woman's face contorted in pain; blood streaming down the drain, the woman herself sliding down the shower wall and on to the floor. Never once do we see the knife enter the woman's body. But the images or signs themselves, the order in which they have been presented, and the implicit relationship between them all force us to the conclusion that she has been stabbed.9

We are frequently reminded that in film it is impossible to say: "Happy families are all alike, every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way" (Anna Karenina) or "It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife," (Pride and Prejudice). But Boyum argues that film can make these statements either through voice-over, or written intertitles like in silent movies. Moreover literature does not always operate in the realm of abstract generalisations. It also aspires to the concreteness of the film.

Besides being a storytelling art, both film and literature are fundamentally representational art unlike music, dance and architecture. To use Siegfried Kracauer's phrase, the basic function of the camera is "to redeem reality", to recreate and reflect the world out there. André Bazin points out that film achieved what painting struggled to realise in its 2000-year-old history. Film however veered towards the imaginative aspect of literature, through fictional representation of reality rather than the real world. Film and literature both are temporal art i.e. both require time to reveal itself. The static visual forms like painting and photography are not capable of narrative but may have narrative elements. Narrative requires sequential development of events presented over a period of time. In
Renaissance frescoes of Sistine Chapel for instance all the narrative elements though in a sequence, is given to us all at once in one large canvass.

Like all other narratives, film and literature both have two time frames at work, the time taken for narration and the time of the story itself. Hence both forms are capable of ellipsis. In films, while a montage of several scenes in rapid succession shows passage of time, a fade-in and fade-out of darkness and light or trees flowering and bare trees also shows passage of a day or a season respectively. Both forms are also capable of stopping time, for example long descriptive passages, philosophical reflections stop the flow of time in a novel whereas freeze frames or a long take can stop time in a film. Similarly within a given time frame both the forms can depict parallel action. The film form has syntax like language and can be learnt through exposure. While cut or fade modifies time, similarly camera angle, close-up, long shot, top angle and pan modifies space and all these together determine meaning.

The film has however a unique advantage over novel i.e. two separate tracks one for the image and the other for the sound. It has thus the capability of non-synchronous sound and image. For example the image of a man walking down a lonely street can be patched up with soundtracks of a romantic melody, to a suspense music or to a music evoking horror, (the stock repertoire of these soundtracks can be easily recognised by a regular viewer) and the impact would be
different each time. Similarly dialogues and voice-overs on the sound track may or may not match the image on the screen hence constituting varied and diverse meanings. Film may have borrowed from literature but have also contributed to written texts. Critics now detect postcinematic effects in many novels.

In the recent discussions relating to the film and novel following questions are usually raised:

1. Objective viewpoint. (Phenomenology, avoidance of interiority etc).
2. Subjective viewpoint. (First person narration, memory, hallucination, imagination).
3. Transitions (scene linking, superimposition, fondus or dissolved).
4. Chronology (flashbacks, flash forwards, real versus filmed time, absence of film "tenses")
5. Problems of film versus literary "language" (analogies of syntax, punctuation, metaphors semantics)
6. Cinematic versus novelistic "universe" (question of time space).
8. Verbal versus Visual description (analysis possible or impossible).
10. The "double register"(image and sound) in film versus the single register in novel.
Virginia Woolf in her essay on Cinema ("The Cinema",1926) argued that, although Cinema had in its grasp innumerable symbols for emotions that have so far failed to find expression but there are areas which are accessible to words and to words alone. George Bluestone in a similar vein assented in his seminal treatise *Novels into films* (1957) that the rendition of mental states, memory, dream, imagination cannot be adequately represented by films. But Stanley Kubrick explains in his essay "Words and Movies", his preference for adapting novels concentrating on a character's inner life by saying that, “it is easier to invent external action which will be”, and here he borrows T.S. Eliot's term- an "objective correlative of the books psychological content".

Similarly Sergei Eisenstein had sought out James Joyce, whose *Ulysses* he greatly admired, to learn from Joyce's use of 'interior monologues' to record the stream of consciousness technique. Eisenstein believed that film even more forcefully than literature, could make such mental processes accessible, and wished to film *Ulysses*. When Joseph Strick adapted that novel more than thirty years later in 1966, his chief device for depicting inner thoughts was the voice-over (a term for the use of an off-screen voice heard "over" the scene we are seeing; the voice may be that of a narrator, or that of a character). Laurence Olivier's *Hamlet* (1948) presents a number of soliloquies in this way, and Robert Bresson uses a voice-over to give
us the journal entries of the protagonist in the *Diary of a Country Priest* (1950).

But of course films can also use visual as well as verbal correlatives for mental states. Ingmar Bergman's *Wild Strawberries* (1957) makes extensive use of the voice-over, but we see the flashbacks and silent dreams of its protagonist, Isak Burg. The visual world of Wiene's *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (1919) seems entirely controlled by the intensely subjective mental perspective of its ambiguously disturbed hero. The French film director Luis Bunuel's *Un Chien Andalou* (1928) is once again a subjective vision of a surreal world

A verbal language is made of a limited number of phonetic sounds, insignificant in themselves, but which are assembled in a number of significant units –words for instance, and are capable of generating a potentially infinite number of utterances. Thus a language can be broken down into minimal significant units which in turn can be broken down into minimal phonetic units. This double breaking down or articulation is what A. Martinet has called the *double articulation* of language. This characteristic of language is absent in film language and it is not possible to divide a film into minimal elements comparable to a word, still less to a phoneme (the minimal phonetic unit). Words in language can have arbitrary meanings but a film shot, which is not constituted of elements like words, can be hardly ever arbitrary and always equivalent to a concrete image.
Christian Metz tries to answer what is film language in his book *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. According to Metz film or Cinema before being a language is a means of expression. Metz says in *Film Language*:

> There is expression when a meaning is somehow immanent to a thing is directly released from it, and merges with its very form.  

Film is an unique art form because by its means of expression it is also capable of organising itself into a sequence of being a language. Metz makes an interesting point when he says that the technique of Montage resulted from the desire to make the film language a language system, something like a verbal language. The famous Russian film director Kuleshov's experiments showed that succession of images creates narrativity and because the film tells a story, it is a language, and not vice-versa. A film language is invented and established through usage and; may; vary while verbal language has fixed grammatical rules.

According to Christian Metz, film lacks three basic characteristics of the verbal language. If language is a system of signs used for intercommunication – film language contradicts all three. It is neither a system with an established vocabulary or grammar or syntax, for a means of intercommunication. It is rather a means of expression where the spectator is not necessarily inactive or passive but simply cannot communicate back. Moreover Cinema does not use signs, it uses images which operate as signs within the whole
film. Cinema shows pictures and pictures are not there as signs, that is something standing for something else, they bear in themselves what they signify. The picture of a chair, as it were, bears the absent chair. If the picture signifies the chair, then the sign and the signified cannot be distinguished. Jean Mitry identifies three steps of signification in film, which Gaston Roberge further explicates, with the help of an example from the Eisenstein classic *The Battleship Potemkin* (1925).

1. Image is perceived identified and recognised: The famous pince-nez of Dr. Smirnov in the mutiny sequence of TBP- A close up of the pince-nez.

2. This is the pince-nez of Dr. Smirnoff who has just been thrown overboard. The meaning of the image is arrived at from the clues given by the narrative in which it appears.

3. An added meaning is arrived at by relating the image in its sequence with other sequences. The pince-nez hanging precariously and ridiculously in the air. It is about to be thrown overboard. Jean Mitry in his seminal work *Aesthetic* points out that, the film production of a great novel is made by reducing the novel to the novella. There are two reasons for this the ninety minute format cannot accommodate the duration required for the unfolding of the characters and secondly the film script somehow always unveils a character through a rigorous line up of events.
The adaptation of a novel to film Mitry argues, rests on an assumption that there exists a content which can be transferred -transformed-from one form of expression into another. But a change of form results in another content. In short, in adaptations according to Mitry, you do not express the same thing differently, you express a different thing. In novel things shape progressively, but in Cinema they; are given all at once. When a character like Joan of Arc appears on the scene, she is fully there. Gaston Roberge in his book, The Subject of Cinema says that:

"The space of the novel is conceptual but its duration established with words, is experienced, thus lending its authenticity to the space. In the Cinema the duration is established with sets, events and the reality of space is experienced. That is why Mitry says, "A novel is a narrative that organises itself into a world; a film is a world that organises itself into a narrative.""

The association of film and theatre has given the film several of its masterpieces, for eg: Lawrence Olivier's Hamlet (1948) and Akira Kurosawa's The Throne of Blood (1957) an adaptation of Macbeth. If the film was a legacy of the nineteenth century novel and almost displaced it from its prime position, theater too had a similar fate. If not based on a popular novel, a film in the early days would be predominantly based on popular theater tradition of the time. Alfred Hitchcock had a contemptuous phrase for film adaptations of stage plays, he called them "photographs of people talking". The Russian filmmaker Dziga Vertov and theorist condemned theatricality in film. He felt that if a film is merely based on a script and acting,
then it is merely a theatrical performance. Underlying in all these assertions was an assumption that a film is so much less or so much more than drama.

The relation between the two dramatic arts is in many ways is antithetical and antagonist i.e. if we begin by saying that the theatre is verbal and Cinema is visual then in the same context we may add that while theatre is live, the film is recorded. If theatre is indoors and stage a film besides being all that, is also open air. Theatre is entirely performance, a live performance of actors and all the props of lights, décor and customers while a film is all that and photography plus movement. The two forms accommodate different acting and narrative styles, produce different ambience and appeal to a different kind of audience. Theatre even if brought out in the streets from fancy auditoriums continues to be elitist while the film is both democratic and yet more private and solitary form. While a film can be replayed at the flick of a button but a drama needs money, time and place for a re-run and yet may not be able to reproduce the same impact. Moreover unlike a film, it cannot be relocated anywhere, i.e. it cannot travel everywhere.

Even the audience prepare themselves differently while watching the two art forms. They are alert in a theatre but lounge in a Cinema prepared to be overwhelmed. A text in a drama can be infinitely reinterpreted while in a film it seems finalistic. With the coming of talkies in 1930’s in Hollywood the influx of theatre artists
to the film industry began. The film now burdened with a sound track needed artists to deliver the lines properly. Besides the theatre artists the dramatists themselves contributed to the films by; writing screenplays. Brecht, Beckett, Shaw and Pinter made impacting contributions. The difficulties arose when the plays were adapted for films, film had clearly more possibilities for time, space and point of view than theatre. If one wishes to ventilate the play in the film i.e. to take it out from its static interior setting one runs the risk of diluting the intensity of the play which depends precisely on a closed spatial unity provided by a stage. The outdoor visuals may at times not only appear contrived but may also impede the flow of the narrative.

The performance meant for stage hugely differs from the performance meant for the screen. While on stage the range of actor's voice, his large movements are central to the performance, on the screen a twitch of an eyebrow, facial expressions convey meaning more effectively. In the theatre, performance is directed to the audience, where as in a film the camera is the sole audience. In a play the actor can merely improvise and not redo his act but a screen actor can redo his enactment a number of times till he achieves the desired perfection. However this may be a disadvantage too for it breaks the actor's continuity. To complete a film he has to maintain the same intensity over a long period of time. Many famous stage actors in Hollywood could not make an
impact on screen because the switchover to underplayed acting effected their style. In comparison in Indian film industry it is the stage actors who dominate the screen which may be because films in India heavily depend on dramatic elements and give a greater emphasis to dialogues in the screenplay.

The point-of-view is a major area of departure between the theatre and the film. A theatrical performance is one that is viewed from a fixed vantage point in the theatre, it can have theatric equivalents of dissolves and masking but basically it is a long shot or a medium shot of continuous enactment. A film on the other hand can fragment this experience into close-up detail, alternating angles and increasing variety of viewpoints. However in order to overcome the limitation of a fixed distance between the audience and the stage, innovative methods like a revolving stage, dividing the stage into two sets and create crosscutting with the helps of lights on one or the other have been introduced time and again successfully. These techniques have ironically tried to approximate the cinematic characteristics and hence have been ‘cinematifying’ the theatre.

A latest technique in theatre has been to move the audience platform close to the stage and take them around the stage and hence play around with the concept of ‘point of view’ in the theatre. Unlike the visual zooming in or rushing in towards the viewer in a Cinema, in this case the viewer bodily moves closer to the spectacle and gets a three dimensional view of the enactment. The enactment
instead of being tied down within an auditorium takes place in the open air sets and hence once again not only visually but also physically transports the viewer to the tangible, real world. The viewer gets to see live action sequences, as if watching a rehearsed shooting sequence for a film, without the gloss of laboratory work or the print. The theatre with these techniques not only carves a niche for itself but by borrowing from the Cinema acquires an entirely new flavour and texture very different from its traditional form.

In 1934, Sergei Eisenstein and Les Kuleshov had carried out similar experiments in drawing up plans for a rehearsal hall in which to train film actors. This building plan was an attempt to overcome the heritage of theater. The main stage was a rotating one flanked by two other stages. The spectators' stage was also a rotating disc, which would turn the spectators to the acting area at the proper moment. The building was to have walls, which would open to reveal the landscape outside. The main stage was connected to the auditorium with a bridge, so that actor could walk up to the audience to provide a 'close-up'. A conveyer belt was also provided so that the actor could run in place or merely 'pan' past the audience. Eisenstein thus remained convinced that the Cinema or theater was a spectacle calculated for a spectator and he attempted to capture Cinema on stage.

However, in the present context a new identity for the theatre will inevitably change the existing equation between the theatre and
Cinema. Susan Sontag writes in her essay "Film and theatre" that movies are regarded as advance from theatrical stasis to cinematic fluidity. An emancipation from theatrical formality (spectator of a play fixed in his seat worth unchanging angle of distance or point-of-view), theatrical acting (gestures stylized and exaggerated) and finally from theatrical furnishings which distance the audience further, are certain obvious characteristics of Cinema according to Susan Sontag. Cinema according to her is both a medium and an art which could be either passive as a recording instrument or highly selective as a discerning camera eye. Cinema with its paradox of being able to "redeem reality" (in Siegfried Kracauer's term) with the help of artifice led theorists to label it sometimes as a story-telling art and sometimes as vehicle of "optical poetry and dynamic light architecture".

One of the fundamental irreconcilable differences between theatre and Cinema is the continuous use of space. Cinema uses space discontinuously through editing and camera shots. The challenge in films is thus to anchor and join the discontinuity and provide a sequence and syntax to the numerous disjunction's. In theatre while the actors are either 'on' stage or 'off' stage but in Cinema the actors present in a scene are actually absent when viewed. Theatre on the other hand does not have the facilities for the strictly controlled repetition of images, or juxtaposition and overlapping of
word and images. Bela Balázs highlighted three basic principles of theatre which the film violated and added a wholly new principle\textsuperscript{14}:

1. In a single scene of the film the distance between the spectator and the filmed character may vary.
2. Camera angles provide multiple perspectives and point-of-views in a single scene, unlike in a theatre.
3. A single shot may be divided into numerous shots.
4. Montage or assembly of shots, arranging various camera angle shots (close-ups and long shots etc.) creates a wholly new aesthetic effect entirely absent in theatre.

Unlike Bela Balázs, André Bazin in his seminal treatise \textit{What is Cinema} \textsuperscript{15} had argued that drama is the soul of both theatre and Cinema. Cinema while adapting a play should be able to absorb theatrical drama and use its techniques to serve the theatre. Christian Metz however would call the drama in Cinema as a non-cinematographic code, which can be easily integrated with the cinematographic codes. Bazin felt that the main distinction between theatre and Cinema was that actor in theatre and his dramatic space was the most important aspect but in a film it was only the décor, which was predominant and could do without actors. Jean Mitry expanded on Bazin’s theory of relation between theatre and Cinema and increased the scope of the debate. He identified the following areas of difference\textsuperscript{16}:

1. In the theatre the dialogue determines the understanding of the drama. In the Cinema words are consequence of the action to which image provides verifiability.
In the theatre the décor is a frame for the actor, in the Cinema the actor is intimately linked to the real world.

Theatre dialogues cannot be transposed to film because it expresses everything whereas in a film the visuals render the dialogue insignificant.

In film the image plays the role of the word.

The spectator assists a play, which is a representation and watches a play, which is a presentation.

In the early days of Cinema there was a growing fear that the camera eye had opened up a world of possibility which the stage could never dream and hence would become obsolete. Hence the borrowing began, stimulated by the cinematic technique of the “iris-in”, stage lighting took to singling out a lone player or some segment of the scene, masking out the rest of the stage. Rotating sets tried to approximate the instantaneous displacement of the camera eye. The main aim of adapting cinematic devices for the stage was to approximate the Cinema's absolute control over the audience's attention. Cinematifying the theatre has recently led to a thesis propounded by the Cinema enthusiasts, that all barriers between all arts should be removed and a synthesis of all arts achieved. Conversely however dramatists like Wagner, Marinetti, Artaud and John Cage feel that theatre is that total art which could achieve the summation of painting, sculpting photography, architecture, composing, dance and film. Both Cinema and theatre
are at crossroads aiming to be the domain for a synthesis of all arts and hence invoking ideas for futurist aesthetics.
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13. Ibid. p. 362., Theo Van Doesburg in his essay, “Film as Pure Form”, 1929 while defining the film form predicted that, “films will realise, Bach’s dream of finding an optical equivalent for the temporal structure of a musical composition”.

