There was a time when cinema was looked down upon as a low form of mechanical reproduction of reality. However, matters have changed over the years, with masters of the medium creating masterpieces on celluloid, thus helping to break prejudices and broaden the critical vision. Today cinema is a unique art with room to incorporate other art forms like music, dance, painting and literature.

The visual dimension of film has associations with painting; its dependence on movement links it with dance and its ability to produce kinetic and emotive effects equate it with music. As it involves the performance of artists and needs spectators, its relation to theatre is explicit. Above all, film as an art has close relation to literature in its use of plot, characters, setting, dialogue and imagery, its strategies of expression and its tendency to manipulate space and time.

As soon as the cinema began to see itself as a narrative entertainment, the idea of adapting a literary work for film received currency. According to Macfarlane, the reason for this tendency was “the lure of a pre-sold title, the expectation that respectability or popularity achieved in one medium might infect the work created in another” (7). Literary adaptations have pedagogical value—in teaching a nation about its classics and its literary heritage. For more than ninety years, the process of adaptation has attracted critical attention than any other film-related issues. Julie Sanders in Adaptation and Appropriation defines adaptation as a “specific process involving the transition from one genre to another: novels into film; drama into musical; dramatization of prose narratives and prose fiction; or the inverse movement of making drama into prose narrative” (9).
There is a long established tradition of film adaptations of literary sources from the very early years of cinema itself. The Italian and French filmmakers first adapted literary material into film. Jules Verne was one of the first writers to be adapted to screen. George Melies’ *A Trip to Moon* (1902) was based on Verne’s *From Earth to the Moon* (1865). Later he adapted Verne’s *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Sea*. D W Griffith, one of the pioneers of cinema based his films on poems, plays, short stories and novels. Griffith’s *Broken Blossoms* (1919) was based on Thomas Burke’s *The Chink and the Child* (1917) and *The Birth of the Nation* (1915) from Thomas Dixon’s bestseller, *The Clansmen* (1905). By 1910, adaptations of the established literary canon had become a marketing ploy by which producers and exhibitors could legitimize cinema going as a venue of ‘taste’ and thus attract the middle class to cinema. Literary adaptations gave film the respectable cachet of entertainment as art. In 1908, *Societe Film d’Art* was formed in France to translate prestigious literary works onto screen. Prominence was given to dramas and novels, notable of Hugo, Balzac and Dickens. In Italy, historical works like Bulwer Lytton’s *The Last Days of Pompeii* (1908) and Henrik Sienkiewicks’ *Quo Vadiz* (1912) were adapted as super spectacular movies. In 1911, Stephen Bush published a book on film called *The Moving Picture World*, in which he stated that the mission of motion picture itself was to introduce literary classics to the masses. However, most of the filmmakers did not share this idea. Though they were both supporters and detractors for adaptation, by the next two decades adapted films acquired a respectability and distinction, a tendency that has gone on to remain. It is also to be noted that the prestigious award winning films are often adaptations. In 1939, for instance, almost every
competing film for Academy Awards were adaptations, namely, *Wuthering Heights, The Wizard of Oz, Good Bye Mr. Chips*, and *Gone With The Wind*.

Though the history of adaptation is as old as films, there has always been a tendency to privilege written text over the visual text. Film theorist Robert Stam speaks of a certain logophilia, or “the valorization of the verbal”, and an often-corresponding iconophobia, an aversion for engraved images (*Literature and Film* 6). This involves a notion, perhaps derived from the physical nature of the film, that it is unable to transform the telling modus of the book successfully into the showing modus of the moving pictures, that the thoughts and the conceptual nature of the novel is simply not transformable into film action and dialogue. The main reason for skepticism is perhaps that the film is still the younger medium. Although it has been the dominant narrative medium for the past decades, it is still suffering from an inferiority complex towards the book, the dominant narrative medium of centuries before. Stam identifies iconophobia as another reason for hostility against film. It is “the deeply rooted cultural prejudice against visual arts is traceable not only to the Judaic-Muslim-Protestant prohibition of ‘graven images’ but also to the Platonic and Neoplatonic depreciation of the world of phenomenal appearance” (*Literature and Film* 5). A similar attitude was taken against the written word when it came to replace oral culture. For Plato’s teacher Socrates ‘writing’ corrupted the mind by substituting fixed and visible letters for memory. However, it can be seen that the written word and the book soon compensated for the reduction it imposed on oral culture. Another criticism against adaptation is the charge of parasitism. According to this view, adaptation is regarded as a parasite, which depends on literature for meaning. All these attitudes
spring from the notion that literature or the source text is superior to film adaptation. The historical anteriority and seniority of literature has led to the belief that it is original and that film adaptations are mere derivative.

Both film and literature are linguistic phenomena, being found on the basic concept of sign. Both use signifiers to connote a world of meanings, the signified. The word and the frame, the signifiers in literature and film respectively, are both visual as they are both perceived with the eye. When a word is read, it refers to or creates a mental image or concept that signifies meaning. When a frame is watched, the effect is immediate—here the image that signifies meaning is not mental but directly presented to the eye. Thus, it might be said that the filmmaker’s task is easier. It could also in one sense narrow the scope of the medium, if the signifier in the medium was too explicit to unravel the possibilities of the signified. However, it is argued that a cinematic frame can provide far more information than the more ambiguous word. A film speaks through its frames just as literature through words. Besides, in film each angle, each cut, could make multiple significations. Juxtaposing shots make them collide and it is from the collision that meaning is produced. The meaning produced through montage is further enriched by devices like music and acting. Verbal signs work conceptually whereas cinematic signs work directly, sensually and perpetually.

Films are generally divided into four major classes for practical and pedagogical purposes: (a) narrative film equated with fictional story telling (b) documentary film (non-fictional or factual), (c) experimental film (avant-garde) and (d) animation film. Like a novel, a narrative film is narrative fiction, controlled by a narrative voice, a teller (the camera lens) that lets us see what it
wishes. In addition, like a novel, a film is capable of leaping in time and space, a common feature of narrative fiction. The various components of cinematographic form, namely visual emphasis, shifting point of view, adventitiousness, lack of depth, montage, specialization of time and space, and the use of the ‘camera eye’ are amply illustrated in modern fiction.

After the advent of film, most of the writers of fiction were greatly influenced by the medium; the writings of most of the modern novelists of twentieth century were ‘cinematic’ as they were naturally excited by the discoveries of the cinema and attempted to borrow from, and even rival these in their own medium. Eisenstein provided one of the practical explorations into the relation between film and literature in an essay entitled ‘Dickens, Griffith and the Film Today’. His main point was the manner in which Griffith’s montage techniques are indebted to Dicken’s use of close-up detail in his novels. Griffith adapted Tennyson in *Enoch Arden* (1911), Browning in *Pippa Passes* and Jack London in *The Call of the Wild* (1908). In *The Cricket of the Hearth* (1909), he adapted Dickens who inspired him to use parallel editing, the close-ups montage and even dissolve, which gained the Griffith the title “Father of the Film Technique” (Boyum 3). William Faulkner and Ernest Hemingway can be considered the other two cinematic writers of the twentieth century. Practically, every resource of modern film—the close-up, the medium shot, the long shot, the moving camera, parallel editing, referential cross cutting, colour, and even sound recording can be seen in their work.

As a visual medium, film employs a multiplicity of techniques. Though present in the earlier writing, too, the emphasis on the visual gained a greater
impetus in the early years of the twentieth century, especially with Impressionistic writers like Virginia Woolf and James Joyce. The primary distinction between literature and cinema arises from the fact that the formal is a verbal medium, where as the latter is essentially visual. A good novelist writes scenes that are memorable, for his visual imagination and powers of description are directed by keen impulses to record fully and accurately a specific moment of perception. He uses verbal descriptions as a filmmaker uses the lens of his camera to select, to highlight, to distort, and to enhance—in short, to create a visualized world that is both recognizable and more vivid, intense, and dramatically charged than actuality. A good film director is likewise sensitive to the artistic use of camera and often creates unforgettable scenes in his films. The traffic is indeed two-way.

Story and plot are important features of fiction and film. The classification of narrative fiction was proposed by Gerard Genette in his seminal essay ‘Discours du recit (1972). Genette’s starting point is the term recit (narrative), which in French has three meanings: a statement, the content of the statement, and the action one performs when producing the statement. In his argument, Genette distinguishes between these three meanings of the word by giving each of them its special term: discourse (recit), story (histoire), and narration (narration). 1. Discourse is the spoken or written presentation of the events. Put in simple terms discourse is what we read, the text to which we have direct access. In discourse, the order of events is not necessarily chronological, people are presented through characterization, and the transmitted content is filtered through narrative voices and perspectives. 2. Story refers to the narrated events and conflicts in narrative fiction, abstracted from their disposition in the discourse and arranged
chronologically together with the fictional characters. Thus, story is what we usually understand by a summary of the action. 3. *Narration* refers to how a text is written and communicated. The process of writing, of which narration is a trace, carries with it a number of narrative devices and combinations, which all contribute to constituting discourse.

While Genette’s classification of narrative fiction owes a debt to the pioneers of this theory, Russian Formalists, who as early as around 1920s used the conceptual pair *fabula/syuzhet* in a way that pointed towards the distinction between story and discourse. *Fabula* is a paraphrasing summary of the action, and *syuzhet* on the other hand refers to the oral or written design of the story. Though Genette’s classification is based on narrative fiction, it can be seen that they are applicable to film as well. A film’s *syuzhet* may revise not merely the order of events in the *fabula*, but also their duration and frequency. Taking literary fiction as his object of study, Genette notes several possible permutations between narrative events on the one hand and the time given over to their representation on the other. At one extreme, narration may be greatly condensed by ellipsis or summary, passing over events entirely or reducing them to an outline; at the other it may be considerably expanded by description, when the text lingers over detail rather than immediately discharging its story telling duties. In between these opposing possibilities is a kind of normative narrating rhythm, neither too hectic nor too dilatory. Genette terms this a narrative’s ‘constant speed’ and measures against it any variants in the pace of story telling. The cinematic equivalent of Genette’s constant speed is a film made in real time, in which the duration of events corresponds exactly to their duration on screen. This strategy is generally
used to maximise tension within claustrophobic locations. The courtroom sequence in Sidney Lumet’s *Twelve Angry Men* (1957) and Alfred Hitchcock’s *Rope* (1948) are examples.

Point of view is an issue that concerns fiction and film. Problems relating to point of view have existed since the dawn of narration. In fiction, point of view determines the relationship between the narrative material and the narrator through whose eyes the events of the story are viewed. In other words, the ideas and incidents are sifted through the consciousness and the language of the storyteller, who may or may not be reliable guide for the reader. To put it somewhat simplistically, among the four basic types of point of view, (first person, omniscient, third person and objective), it is seen that the objective or impersonal mode is naturally superior to any other that allows for direct appearance by the author or his reliable spokesperson.

In cinema, point of view tends to be somewhat less rigorous than in fiction, giving the director the freedom to adjust his camera lens at will. The camera, like an eye, functions in a special way for special purpose, seeing what the spectator could see if he were present at the scene. Thus, it can be said that a novelist who strives for the appearance of objectivity is actually attempting an approximation of the camera’s view of things. Moreover, the director can focus his camera upon subjective details, rejecting the inessential. This view of shifting view points in the filmic mode shares several similarities with the way in which multiple points of views are handled in fiction, bringing the novel closer to cinematographic form. The fictional world is not directly represented to the reader; rather it is signified by the narrator’s words. Unlike fiction, film works by directly showing the fictional
world to the spectator. In his perspective account of the history of cinema, Louis Gianetti writes about the difference between novel and film:

In literature, the first person and the omniscient voice are mutually exclusive, for if a first person character tells us his own thoughts directly, he can’t also tell us—with certainty—the thoughts of others. But in movies, the combination of first person and omniscient narration is common. Each time the director moves his camera—either within a shot or between shots—we are offered a new point of view from which to evaluate the scene. He can easily cut from a subjective point of view shot (first person) to a variety of objective shots. He can concentrate on a single reaction (close up) or the simultaneous reactions of social characters (long shot) (370-71).

In fiction, the distinction between the narrator and the reader is clear—it is as though the reader was listening to a friend telling a story. In film, however, the viewer identifies himself with the lens, and thus tends to fuse with the narrator.

Film and literature often contain references back and references forward, so that the order of telling does not correspond to the order of happening. Sometimes the story will ‘flash back’ to relate an event which happened in the past or the narrative may ‘flash forward’ to narrate, or refer to, or anticipate an event which happens later. Gerald Genette, in his book *Narrative Discourse* names the flashback as ‘analepsis’ *(an* after *+ lepse / to take on)* and flash forward as ‘prolepsis’ *(pro* before *+ lepse / to take on)*. Griffith, during the era of silent filmmaking employed the method of analepsis in his *Intolerance*. Orson Welles in
his *Citizen Kane* (1941) made use of the possibilities of analepsis to perfection. The flashback is by now a familiar piece of film’s story telling grammar. However, the structurally opposite device of prolepsis is used less often and remains potentially disorienting. Whereas the flashback evokes the routine workings of memory, prolepsis has connotations of odd mental processes like prophecy and premonition. Prolepsis is employed in Chris Marker’s short science fiction film *La Jetee* (1962) and in Alan Resnais’ *La Guerre est finie* (1968).

Fiction relates especially to one of the senses—the eye. From the reader’s spectator’s point of view, fiction and film provide two distinct kinds of experiences, essentially the private experience of an individual. Fiction excites the imagination of the reader, encouraging him to reflect on what he reads. A film on the other hand, is a multisensory experience, most often enjoyed in the company of others. Hence responses of a spectator to a film may be immediate and spontaneous, often conditioned by the responses of other viewers. The two forms are equally capable of summarizing—literature does it with a studied choice of words in which meaning is condensed, while film compresses meaning into sensory experiences. Film can summarize events extending over years into a matter of few moments through a montage of several scenes.

Ever since Edwin S. Porter made the first story telling film, *The Great Train Robbery* in 1903, critical opinion has maintained that the film is essentially a form of literature. This, however, need not exactly be so. While film and literature both aim to express concrete situations involving the development of a plot and the exposition of the character and environment, the medium through which they seek to accomplish these ends are entirely different. Film depicts
concrete situations involving plot development and characterization, setting and environment, emotional reactions and philosophic attitudes and concepts, by means of a series of plastic images—visual representations projected upon a screen in a darkened room before an audience. It is seen and heard by its audience and secures its characteristic form and rhythm by the purely filmic process of editing. The medium of literature however makes use of words for all its purposes. The novelist originally creates words or sentences in order to achieve maximum literary power to stir the thoughts and emotions of the readers. In spite of such basic differences of form and style, filmmakers naturally turned to literature, especially novels and drama, for the essential ingredient on which their narration is based, namely, the story.

Visual arts in film depends primarily on two things—composition and mise-en-scene, that is, on how objects and people inside a frame are brought together into a mutual relation, and on the texture of details in which such mutual relations are foregrounded. Originally, the French term mise-en-scene literally meant ‘to place on stage’ and referred to the arrangement of all visual elements in a theatre production. In a film it is used as an umbrella term for the various elements that constitute the frame, including camera distance, camera angles, lenses, lighting as well as the positioning of persons and objects in relation to each other. Similarly, in fiction, visual sense is expressed through the writer’s combination of shapes and tonal values of objects, peoples and events and movement of things. While the objective of the film is an artful arrangement of elements in a succession of scenes, which enable us to see the most with least difficulty and deepest feeling, the aim of the fiction writer is to evoke the
conditions to build in the subject an attempt to render, in the words of Henry James “the look of things, the look that conveys their meanings, to catch the colour, the relief, the expression, the surface, the substance of the human spectacle he depicts on the written page” (173)

Though literature and film have many features in common, the technical property of the latter makes it necessary for the critic to find a new methodology to evaluate it. Traditional film criticism employed the critical tools of literature to evaluate a film, especially an adapted film. In order to reveal how the film translates the literary text to screen, the *mise-en-scene* analysis of the film has been very essential. Comparison of the summaries of the narrative contents of fiction and film were inadequate to study how the adaptation was made possible. However, it is, in fact, the specific character of the filmic medium that makes it distinct from all other art forms. Unfortunately, much of the discourse on film is weakened by insensitivity towards the material properties of films. Thorough understanding about the elements of mise-en-scene is necessary for analyzing a film in general and adapted film in particular. Those contents of a film’s visual field that are considered to exist prior to and independent of the camera’s activity are called pro-filmic elements of mise-en-scene. They are the attributes of setting, props, costume, lighting and acting which cinema shares with forms of staged spectacle such as theatre, opera and dance.

The setting or the place where the events are happening are not merely backdrops to the action, but are perceived as a signifier of authenticity. At the most basic level, locations serve in narrative cinema to reinforce the plausibility of particular kinds of story. Cinematic settings vary in scale from interplanetary
distances of science fiction films to claustrophobic rooms and dungeons in a
gothic horror film. The setting of the film anticipates the kind of story that follows.
The setting of a film like *A Fist Full of Dollars (1964)* emphasizes the rough and
rough life of the central characters while the two-dimensional set in *The Cabinet of
Dr. Caligari* (1919), with the expressionist lighting suggests danger and paranoia.
The setting helps to specify the geographical co-ordinates, socio-economic status
and occupation of the film protagonists or even symbolize their psychological
conditions. For example, when the vampiric protagonist in F W Murnau’s
*Nosferatu* (1922) is seen in one shot standing behind the latticed window of an
apartment block, it not only reveals his living conditions but, more profoundly,
something about his sense of estrangement within the society.

Films are also dependent on ‘props’ as a device for conveying meaning. In
another sense, props are definers of genre, particularly weapons in action movies;
garlic, cross and stakes in vampire movies etc. Props can also become unique
signifiers of meaning in a particular film. While all scenes are constructed around
a number of props, by use of close-up, and dialogue, our attention can be drawn to
particular objects. An example can be drawn from Alfred Hitchcock’s *Strangers
on a Train* (1951), where the protagonist handles a cigarette lighter decorated with
crossed tennis rackets to the psychotic villain. The crossed rackets signify a
number of ‘crossings’ of various characters and events against one another. The
lighter remains itself as an important icon throughout the movie, which decides the
direction of the plot.

Costume is a variant of the prop, which is tightly linked to the characters.
The characters are identified on the basis of the costume. Particular items and
combinations of clothing index national identity, class allegiance, sub-group affiliation, gender position, emotional and psychological status, and so on. Subtle changes in the costume of a single character can be used to signify change of status, attitude and even passing of time. Costume can also be used to signify mismatches. Costumes bring a series of expectations which are then subverted by the action. The presentation of robbers in the costume of police is an oft repeated plot device.

Light and shade can be used to direct our attention to a particular part of the frame. This is most usually done by the movement of characters through a variously lit set. Sometimes lighting can be used as a characteristic of the style of a whole film or over a number of scenes. There are two basic lighting schemas in films: high key and low key. High key describes an even diffusion of lighting across a shot, resulting in low contrast between brighter and darker areas and quite full detailing of any portions that are still shaded. In low-key lighting, on the other hand, there is much higher contrast between bright and dark, with less penetrable areas of shadow. If these two lighting types are treated in semiotic fashion as signifiers, then particular meanings might be attached to each of them. High key lighting design tends to evoke a sense of clarity and optimism, while low-key lighting may induce feelings of moral ambiguity, anxiety and even terror.

The performance of actors is another important element among the mise-en-scene. The on-screen facial expression, gesture, positioning, movement and speech of the performers constitute acting. As with costume there is a strong coded element in the facial expressions and body positions held by performers. These codes, broadly referred to as ‘body language’ are part of every day life. The
presentation of characters by actors using body language is a key element in the creation of a ‘performance’. Body movements can also be used to express both change of emotion and change of time. In *Citizen Kane* (1941) the decline of Kane can be identified from the animated young man to the lumbering figure who smashes up his second wife’s room when she threatens to leave him. While early films were often dependent on the kind of exaggerated body movements that in the theatre were recognizable from the upper gallery, but with the development of close-ups, meaning can often be expressed by the slightest movement. Finally, the performer and particularly the ‘star’ brings to the film a meaning derived merely from their presence. Stars will bring in with them a level of expectation and implied meaning from their previous films.

Next to the pro filmic elements of *mise-en-scene*, the next important feature of film is cinematography. Camera acts as an objective third person narrator and also as subjective viewpoints of individual characters. The position of the camera, angle, and movements contribute to the meaning of the film. Within the capacities of focus, the camera is able to move anywhere from the extreme close up to the use of wide screen shots limited to pairs of eyes. Extreme long shot is used to establish the geographical setting and is widely used in Westerns. The medium long shot generally frames the subject from below the knee upwards; the medium shot from the waist up; the medium close up from roughly chest height; while the close-up isolates the head and perhaps neck. The close-up has a particular place in the development of film, enabling the viewer to read the minute reactions and expressions of the character. The thoughts and feelings of the character can be effectively conveyed through close-ups. Camera is nearest in the extreme close up,
which is most frequently used to break up the unity of the face by showing only particular features such as eyes or mouth. The degree of elevation of the camera’s positioning adds the signification process. With respect to camera angle three basic options are available: high angle, straight-on angle and low angle. If the straight-on angle appears to be neutral and devoid of emphasis, the other two angles have often been correlated with specific meanings. Conventional accounts suggest that the high angle shot is taken to diminish the power of its subject, and the low angle, conversely, to enhance it. The movement of the camera is another important function in film. Panning and tilting of camera appear to reproduce eye movements and are motivated by the action that is occurring. Shots can also be developed to reproduce the movements of the characters within the set, using rails, hence the tracking shot, or in a more liberated way using a hand held or a Steady-Cam camera, walking action. Movements above ground level, with the camera rising or descending on a mechanically operated mount of variable length—are known as crane shot. All these give a strong sense of identity and place.

Colour performs a number of functions in films. It serves as a marker of historical and geographical authentication, and even helps in genre classification. The emphasis on colour adds to the symbolic and thematic potentials of films. In the film, Edward Scissorhands (1990), the primary colours used for the suburb’s houses communicate optimism and well being; yet an excess in their brightness, coupled with the fact that no darker or mixed hues are visible anywhere, alerts the spectator to a critique of suburban blandness and conformity. Even after the advent of color filming, some directors used black and white photography to increase the effect of the theme and symbolism of the film. Robert Wise’s
Haunting (1963) and Stephen Spielberg’s Schindler’s List (1993) are instances in point. The period films produced by Hammer Studios used Technicolor to get theatrical effect to the films.

As ‘word’ in literature, the basic unit of signification in films is ‘shot’, that is an unbroken sequence of film recorded by one camera. Film conveys meaning by juxtaposing one shot with another. Considering the opening shots of Chaplin’s Modern Times (1936), Somdatta Mandal explains how two, different shots combine together to produce an idea:

In the first shot, we see a flock of sheep being driven through the gate of a sheep pen. Manifestly, this shot means virtually nothing by itself. If we examine shot two, we see a mob of workers emerging from a subway exit on their way to work. This also means little by itself. If, however, we examine these shots in their proper ideological relationship, they yield the apparent meaning: workers under modern industrial conditions are driven to work like a flock of sheep. (19)

While most of the characteristics of the film shot are related to codes developed in still photography, the joining of strips of film is specific to cinema. The film employs various bridging devices like the ‘cut’, ‘wipe’ ‘dissolve’, ‘fade’, etc. In dissolve, the incoming image appears superimposed on the outgoing one and gradually replaces it, whereas in wipe, a line traveling either horizontally or vertically across the screen pushes away one image to clear a space for the next. Fade is a slower manoeuvre during which the screen either becomes progressively darker so that an image disappears (fade out) or progressively lighter so that a new
image emerges (fade in). Such devices enable a range of expressive effects. A dissolve between shots may evoke a briefer time lapse than a fade or suggest a closer merging of two characters or spaces than would a cut from one to the other.

The final element in constructing ‘image’ of a film is the soundtrack. Sound as an integral part of a film only developed after 1927. Unlike other innovations like colour and wide screen, sound, once introduced, became a universal format in a very short period of time. Sound can be used to reinforce the continuity of action. While the image is fragmented by the cuts from one shot to another which we ‘know’ can hide temporal ellipsis, a character not shown crossing a room for instance, an unbroken sound track signifies a continuity of time. Sound also has a continuity role in establishing links across the scenes. Orson Welles used sound to bridge between sequences. In Citizen Kane, Welles uses Thatcher’s Merry Christmas as a bridge between Kane’s boyhood and adulthood. Sound can also be used to direct us into the past through the use of the voice-over. Primarily music is used to inform the audience of appropriate emotional response or, having established a response, to enhance it. The emotional pull of music and its high level of connotative meaning allow these processes to operate almost subliminally. While the impact of the Psycho shower scene can be attributed to the rapid cutting, it can equally be attributed to Bernard Hermann’s background score. Music also plays a role of ‘confirming’ the emotional response of the spectator, seemingly leading to a particular way of seeing a sequence. Music can also be used to identify character, locations and time.

Analyzing the mise-en-scene elements of films reveal that the process of constructing and extracting meaning out of a film is complicated. The specificity
of the medium is evident from the analysis of the film. This indicates that a discussion on film should be made based on a critical method of its own. This is applicable in the case of analyzing the process of adaptation from literature to film. Traditional criticism of film adaptation based on the criteria of fidelity to the source text, thus becomes incapable to evaluate the quality of the adaptation.

Adaptation is a process by which an art work in one medium is transposed into another another medium. Julie Sanders in her book *Adaptation and Appropriation* elaborates adaptation as “a specific process involving the transition from one genre to another: novels into film; drama into musical; the dramatization of prose narrative and prose fiction; or the inverse movement of making drama into prose narrative” (19). Adapting a literary work into film has always attracted the film makers from the very early days of cinema itself. It is in fact a process of translating the literary text into a visual text. In “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation” Roman Jakobson distinguishes three kinds of translation: intralingual (or rewording), interlingual (or translation proper), and intersemiotic translation (or transmutation). Intralingual translation or rewording involves “the interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language” whereas interlingual translation is “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language”. The third category, intersemiotic translation or transmutation is “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of non verbal sign systems” (114). In Roman Jakobson’s classification, intersemiotic translation or transmutation incorporates adaptation of literary works into film. Jakobson specifically mentions cinema as one of the intersemiotic options for translating the untranslatable and writes that only creative transposition is possible. Jakobson’s
The concept of “intersemiotic transposition from one system of signs into another, eg. From verbal art into music, dance, cinema or painting” (118) allows us to consider film adaptations within the realm of intertextuality as intersemiotic translation of words into film images.

The objective of a study of translation resembles the research in the field of film adaptation on several points. Similar to the theoretical approaches in Translation Studies, studies in film adaptation have urged a reconsideration of notions such as ‘fidelity’ and ‘the original’ and to acknowledge the effects of the social, cultural and historical elements that are involved in the process of reformation. The translation of a verbal text to the medium of film can be said to be an imitation, creative transposition, or an appropriation. All these words are synonyms for translation. Translation and adaptation are both the process of transposing a text, rearranging it and reconstituting it in order for it to fit into a new medium. The theory of translation presents an analogous premise to the problem of analyzing adaptations of literary works into film. Despite the obvious differences between a mode that involves the transfer of a text into another language and one that involves the transfer into another medium, the two can in many ways be seen as comparable processes.

In his essay “The Task of the Translator,” Walter Benjamin writes that the translator should allow “his language to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue ... he must expand and deepen his language by means of the foreign language” (81). A good translation, he maintains, frees “pure language” from its imprisonment in a given artistic creation, returning it to the “concealed and fragmentary” force which that creation is symbolizing (79). He means that
translation does not aim to recapture what is embedded in the original, but to free it to be symbolized in another language. Thus, in order for the spectator to engage with a film translation/adaptation, the novel has to be freed from its literary language so as to take new life in the new language of film. The film ought not to lose the opportunity to free itself of its literary complexity by means original to itself.

Another important aspect of Benjamin's essay is his idea that translation constitutes part of a work's “afterlife” since it enables new meanings to be discovered in the original as language changes in accordance with historical reception. Benjamin writes that “translation issues from the original--not so much from its life as from its afterlife,” writes Benjamin (71). The work of the translator is not just replicating a text as closely as possible, but also to reveal it as a living organism, and to release hidden meanings that can only be brought out through reworking in another language. As many theorists have observed, each generation retranslates, rewrites, and at times, rediscovers an infinite variety of meanings embedded in the original. Because of the speed with which language changes and the natural changes in the cultural reception, works of literature need to be re-translated periodically.

In her book, *Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as Analysis* (1997), Marilyn Gaddis Rose calls translation a form of literary criticism and argues that those points where the translation seems to “miss” important aspects of the original are not defects so much as opportunities to find new levels of richness in it that were not visible previously (7). For Rose, these “failings” of the translator are one of the most important resources in interpreting a literary work.
She posits an “interliminal text,” a boundary in which other potential translations can be inferred, using the rendering of a given word or phrase as a starting point (7). The interliminal space between original and translation offers readers a place to criticize both, and to rewrite the original; in this sense translation provides a collaborative experience that goes beyond that of the two initial texts. Like translation, adapting a literary text into another medium such as film also involves the process of comprehension and reformulation. And the process of translating elements from the source text into a new form and inquiring into the “interliminal space” between text and image will allow us to gain insights just as original and provocative as critical interpretation.

Though many attempts have been enacted to undermine the prejudices about the superiority and originality of the source text, the adaptation criticism tended to revolve around the yardstick of fidelity. The structuralist and post structuralist theoretical developments subverted many of these notions and thus had an impact on the discourse of adaptation. The structuralist semiotics of the 1960s and 1970s treated all signifying practices as shared sign systems productive of ‘texts’ worthy of the same scrutiny as literary texts, thus abolishing the hierarchy between novel and film. The intertextuality theory of Julia Kristeva and transtextuality theory of Gerard Genette, similarly stressed the endless permutation of sexualities rather than fidelity of a later text to an earlier model. Roland Barthes’ provocative leveling of the hierarchy between literary criticism and literature offered an opportunity to view adaptation as a form of criticism or reading of the literary text. The fundamental concept of intertextuality is that no text is original and unique-in-itself; rather it is a tissue of inevitable, and to an
extent unwitting, references to and quotations from other texts. Intertextuality sees
every text as related to other texts.

In 1960s, Julia Kristeva coined the term intertextuality by introducing
Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of ‘Dialogism’. Kristeva’s coinage of ‘intertextuality’
represents an attempt to synthesize Ferdinand de Saussure’s ‘structuralist
semiotics’ with Bakhtin’s ‘dialogism’. The concept of dialogism was derived from
the critical procedures of the Soviet critic Mikhail Bakhtin was another landmark
in the evolution of the notion of intertextuality. To Bakhtin a literary work is not a
‘text’ of which meaning is produced by the play of impersonal linguistic or
economical or cultural forces but a site for the dialogic interaction of multiple
voices, or modes of discourse. A person’s speech does not express a ready-made
individuality; instead, his or her character emerges in the course of the dialogue
and is composed of languages from diverse social contexts. That is utterances or
‘dialogic’ foregrounds class, ideological and other conflicts, divisions and
hierarchies within society. Graham Allen writes: “Dialogism is not literally the
dialogues between characters within a novel. Every character in the dialogic novel
has a specific, in some sense, unique personality. This ‘personality’ involves that
character’s world-view, typical mode of speech, ideological and social positioning,
all of which are expressed through the character’s words” (23).

Kristeva incorporated Bakhtinian dialogism into her mode of semiotics. In
“Word, Dialogue, Novel” Kristeva is concerned with the manner in which a text is
constructed out of already existent discourses. She affirms that the author does not
create their texts from their own original mind, but rather compiles them from pre-
existent texts. Kristeva explains that “a text is constructed as a mosaic of
quotations; a text is the absorption and transformation of another” (66). In this way, a text is a permutation of texts, an intertextuality in the space of a given text in which several utterances taken from other texts intersect one another. In his essay, “Theory of the Text”, Roland Barthes stresses that a text has “signifying practices, productivity, significance, phenotext and genotext, intertextuality” (36). Barthes emphasizes the semiological system of texts, suggesting that “all signifying practices can engender text: the practice of painting pictures, musical practice, filmic practice, etc. The works, in certain cases, themselves prepare the subversion of the genres, of the homogeneous classes to which they have been assigned” (41). Thus, according to Barthes and Kristeva, no text can be read outside its relations to other, already extant texts. Neither the text nor its reader can escape this intertextual web of relationships that causes the reader to have certain expectations about both the content and the form of the works she is reading. These relationships may take many forms, including parody, pastiche, allusion, imitation.

Robert Stam, Robert Burgoyne, and Sandy Flitterman-Lewis opine that for Kristeva, as for Bakhtin, every text forms a “mosaic of citations,” a palimpsest of traces, where other texts may be read. However the concept of intertextuality is not reducible to matters of “influence” by one writer on another, or by one film-maker on another, or with “sources” of a text in the old philological sense (New Vocabularies 204). Later, Kristeva used the term ‘transposition’ instead of intertextuality. Following Freud’s argument that dreams tend to function through ‘condensation’ and ‘displacement’, in her mode of semiotics Kristeva viewed that condensation and displacement are the two operations in semiotic process. In
condensation, one sign collects into itself a host of meanings or signifiers. In
displacement a sign from another area of signification stands for the real content.
In *Revolution in Poetic Language*, Kristeva styles intertextuality as the third
operation within semiotic process. By using the term ‘transposition’,
textuality is understood as the passage from one sign system to another.

In *Palimpsestes* (1982), building on Bakhtin and Kristeva, Gerard Genette
proposed a more inclusive term, ‘transtextuality’, to refer to all that which puts
one text in relation with other texts. Genette posits five types of transtextual
relations. The first is ‘intertextuality’, which he defines as “a relationship of co-
presence between two texts or among several texts” and as “the actual presence of
one text within another” (Genette 1-2). Genette’s second kind of transtextuality is
paratextuality where “the paratext marks those elements which lie on the threshold
of the text and which help to direct and control the reception of a text by its
readers” (Allen 103). They include titles, prefaces, epigraphs, dedications,
illustrations etc. The paratext is constituted by all the accessory messages and
commentaries which come to surround the text and which at times become
virtually indistinguishable from it.

Genette’s third type of transtextuality is ‘metatextuality’. He says: “It unites
a given text to another, of which it speaks without necessarily citing it (without
summoning it), infact sometimes even without naming it” (Genette 4) It is the
critical relation between one text and another, whether the commented text is
explicitly cited or only silently evoked. ‘Architextuality’, the fourth category of
transtextuality, has to do with “the reader’s expectations, and thus their reception
of a work” (5). Some novels signpost their architextual relation to certain genres,
sub-genres or conventions by including a sub title as in Anne Radcliffe’s Gothic novel, *The Mysteries of Udolpho: A Romance*. ‘Hypertextuality’, according to Genette, is any relationship uniting a text B (which Genette calls ‘hypertext’) to an earlier text A (hypotext). What Genette terms as hypotext is what is termed by most critics today as ‘intertext’, which is “a text which can be definitely located as a major source of signification for a text” (Allen 108). Thus it can be said that Homer’s *Odyssey* is a hypotext in James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, which is the hypertext. In this thesis the term ‘intertext’ is preferred to denote the relationship between source text and target text.

Since its appearance in poststructuralist theoretical circle, intertextuality has been adopted and explored by theorists like Roland Barthes, Michael Riffaterre, Claude Levi-Strauss and Umberto Eco. Barthes announced ‘the death of the author’ and ‘the birth of the reader’, declaring that a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination. Thus, Barthes problematised the status of ‘authorship’.

Michael Riffaterre saw intertextuality as the reader's perception of the relations between a text and all the other texts that have preceded or followed it. The anthropologist Lévi-Strauss foregrounded conceptual necessity of the intertext in the analysis of Native American myths. He found that a particular myth could be comprehended only in relation to a vast system of other myths, social practices and cultural codes. Eco spoke of intertextual frames or the diverse frames of reference invoked in the reader, which authorize and orient interpretation.

As far as a critic of film adaptation is concerned, the notion of intertextuality is used to find out the intertextual elements in the source text and
the filmic text, thereby proving false the insistence of fidelity. Moreover, they use the intertextual sub theories like Kristeva’s ‘transposition’ and Genette’s ‘hypertextuality’ to study filmic adaptation from the source text.

Brian Mcfarlane in his book *Novel to Film* notes that adaptation is “replacing one illusion of reality for another” (21). He looks into how one illusion replaces another and what elements come into play to shape the end result of adaptation. Mcfarlane’s method for analyzing film adaptation is drawn from Roland Barthes’ *Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives* (1966). In this book Barthes distinguishes two main groups of narrative functions; *distributional* and *integrational* functions. Though Barthes does not concern himself with cinema in this discussion, the discussion is valuable in sorting out what maybe transferred (from novel/drama to film) from that which may only be adapted. Barthes names the distributional function as Functions Proper and integrational functions as Indices. Distributional functions or functions proper are those which are related to a narrative’s actions and events, and are often easier to transfer than integrational functions, which are the psychological information of the characters, data regarding their identity, the atmosphere and representations of place. The functions proper are again subdivided to include cardinal functions and catalysers. Cardinal functions, he says, “are the ‘hinge points of narrative: that is the actions they refer to open up alternatives of consequence to the development of the story…The linking of cardinal functions provides the irreducible bare bones of the narrative ( Mcfarlane 13-14).

Based on Roland Barthes’ classification Mcfarlane divided the elements that make up a novel into two distinct categories which he calls *transfer* and
adaptation proper. ‘Transfer’ is concerned with those elements that can be taken almost directly from the novel and transferred into film, while ‘adaptation proper’ is concerned with the elements which need to be reinterpreted for the film. Several strategies are considered for considering the idea of transfer, namely, the story/plot distinction, the cardinal functions in the source text, the character functions, and the psychological patterns. While ‘story’ is simply the basic succession of events—the raw material—the plot is the way in which the ‘story’ is creatively reformed. The novel and the film may share the same story but the strategies are different. Cardinal functions are those narrative actions which make up the story and the part played by the characters in the plot is termed as character functions. Certain universal aspects of human human experience which can be transferred irrespective of cultural boundaries are termed under psychological patterns.

Adaptation proper are those elements which cannot be transferred directly and needs to be re-interpreted. By re-interpreting these elements the film maker can make the film quite distinct. Literary text makes use of a verbal sign system while the film draws on visual, aural and verbal signifiers. The film-maker has to choose visual suggestions from the literary text in order to represent the key verbal signs. The visual representation of the film maker determines one’s reading of the film text. As film is a medium which stresses spatiality rather than linearity of literature, in transferring the adaptation proper, the film makers control of the mise-en-scene gains importance. Mcfarlane refers to that extra cinematic codes like (a) “language codes” (accent or tones of voice) (b) “visual codes” (reading between the visuals) (c) “non-linguistic sound codes” (musical and other aural codes) and (d) “cultural codes” (29) (regarding people and their life at particular
times and places) also determine the signification in a film. So while evaluating a film, codes specific to the medium should be employed. Thus, in order to determine the merit of an adapted film, mise-en-scene analysis becomes necessary. The excellence of an adapted film lies in how effectively the film maker transmute the ‘transfer’ and ‘adaptation proper’ into visuals.

Julie Sanders uses the word ‘appropriation’ to distinguish the kind adaptations which transpose the source culture to a different culture. An appropriation uses the general characters, plot, and themes of the source text, but shifts both language and setting into a new context. These films often suggest the same universality of theme and have the task of creating verbal, visual, and/or aural analogies that bridge two cultures. Some of the impacts of the adaptation depends upon the audience’s awareness of its relationship with the source texts. In anticipation of this most formal adaptations carry the same title as their source text. For appropriations this is not necessary. Sanders observes: “An adaptation signals a relationship with an informing source text...On the other hand, appropriation frequently affects a more decisive journey away from the informing source into a wholly new cultural product and domain” (26).

Though the appropriation are not tied to the source text by an acknowledgement, a juxtaposition of the source text against the appropriated text widens the possibility of its reading. West Side Story (1961) is a modern day adaptation of Romeo and Juliet in the back ground of racial conflicts between two rival gangs in the New York City in 1950s. The protagonists in the film, Tony and Maria are clearly modern reworkings of Shakespeare’s ‘star-crossed’ lovers in a 1950s New York context. Though West Side Story can stand independently, the
awareness of the film’s intertextuality deepens and enriches the reading. This is an example of appropriation where the source text is embedded within the film text. In such works the real interest lies not in the source texts, but in the new text. The practice of displacing the setting is commonly applied to Shakespeare’s plays both on stage and screen in order to preserve the effect of their poetry, while suggesting a more contemporary relevance. For example, the 1995 version of Richard III, directed by Richard Locraine, and adapted by Locraine and Ian McKellen, situates the play in the 1930’s. Baz Luhrmann’s William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet (1996) is another case to point. The scene has been moved to a sultry urban center in the present day where contemporary youth are immersed in a world of violence, sex, and drugs. The modern setting had already been suggested by West Side Story, but Luhrmann’s vision also utilizes the visual language of the youth by shooting and editing the film in the disorienting fast-paced style of MTV, and incorporating a corresponding soundtrack. Michael Almereyda’s Hamlet (2000) tries to imitate Luhrmann’s success. It places the melancholy Danish prince as an aspiring filmmaker in New York City, trying to stop the uncle who has usurped control of his father’s Denmark Corporation.

Brian Mcfarlane’s methodology is useful in analyzing an appropriation. When choosing a text for appropriation, ‘transfer’ and ‘adaptation proper’ are considered. The cardinal functions, character functions, and the psychological patterns of the source text, which comes under the consideration of transfer, are carefully transmuted. As appropriations transpose the cultural setting of the source text, the elements of the transfer are appropriated suitably to the target culture. The psychological patterns which reveal certain universal human experiences are
usually transferred directly to screen. Once the elements of transfer are appropriated, aspects of adaptation proper are transferred. The mise-en-scene and the extra cinematic codes specific to the target culture are employed. Akira Kurosawa’s appropriations employ styles of Noh Theatre, a quite, stylized Japanese dramatic dance form. Kurosowa’s adaptations of Shakesperean texts like *Macbeth*, *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, as *Throne of Blood* (1957) *The Bad Sleep Well* (1960) and *Ran* (1985) are examples of appropriation. Though these films do not acknowledge their intertextual relationship with the source texts, the awareness about the embedded text widens the scope of reading the films. The films offer an opportunity to compare and contrast how the film maker bridges the distance between the two cultural settings. Often, the appropriated films transfer the universal issues directly while the culturally specific issues are appropriated according to the target setting. Francis Ford Coppola’s adaptation of Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* as *Apocalypse Now* (1979) is another instance.

The advent of post modernism in the critical and cultural studies in the early 1980s carried with it new expressions and perceptions upon relations between the original and the copy, and the present and past. It did so in response to the newer reproductive media and information technologies and to trends in film and TV which seemed to feed off repeats and remakes. Both tendencies undermined the concept of the original and therefore had clear implications for the study of adaptations.

The postmodern condition transformed the process of film adaptation with the triumph of the “new culture of the image or simulacrum” (Roberts 123). The postmodern emphasis on retrospection and pastiche in art and rejection of the
insistence on originality has also reshaped the process of adaptation. As adaptation is characterized by an engagement with and reproduction of earlier texts, it is ideally suited to be regarded as a pastiche where various intertexts merge together. “Pastiche is a sort of copying or appropriation of the forms and styles of other literature. It has a strong family resemblance to parody, where a satirist writes a version of a well-known work in order to make some point” (Roberts 125).

Many recent adaptations engage in postmodern retrospection through their use of pastiche, mixing and matching past styles and genres in order to modernize, reinvent, or deconstruct their source texts. Quentin Tarantino’s *Pulp Fiction* (1996) is an example of a post modern pastiche where it recreates the stylistic patterns of the 1950s. Andrew Leman’s *The Call of Cthulhu* (2005), an adaptation of H.P Lovecraft’s story (1926) of same name into a silent film that pretends to be made in 1926 is another example of a post modern pastiche. In case of these films, the new technology is employed to create a previous text in a retrospective manner. In this sense, film adaptations can be regarded as post modern pastiche as it employs multiple texts to create its system of signification.

Considering literature versus film debate with a special focus on the problems of adaptation, one can only accept the fact that as long as popular novels or literary masterpieces continue to be adapted to the screen, such problems will persist and some critics will continue to harp on the sanctity of the literary text. It might be appropriate to quote Joy Gould Boyum:

In assessing an adaptation, we are never really comparing book with the film, but an interpretation with an interpretation—the novel that
we our selves have recreated in our imaginations, out of which we have constructed our own individualized ‘movie’ and the novel on which the film maker has worked a parallel transformation. For just as we are readers, so implicitly is the filmmaker offering us, through his work, his perceptions, his visions, his particular insight into his source. An adaptation is always, whatever else it may be, an interpretation (61-62).

Theories proposed by Roman Jakobson, Walter Benjamin and Marilyn Gaddis Rose enable us to evaluate adaptations as intersemiotic translations. The difference between the source text and adapted text offers a space to criticize both and to view adaptations as critical interpretation by the adaptor. Similarly, the post-structuralist notions of intertextuality as proposed by Kristeva, Barthes and Genette liberates adaptation studies from the traditional criteria like fidelity and originality. The concept of pastiche which gained significance in the postmodernist discourse, where the text is a mixture of a variety of texts, also supports this argument. Uncovering the layers of the pastiche or rather intertexts in the source texts and filmic texts demolish all arguments for the superiority of the literary text and thereby neutralize fidelity criterion. Brian Mcfarlane’s technique of close scrutiny provided a methodology based on narratology to analyze adaptations. All these approaches liberate and open up the possibilities of evaluating film adaptations. The source text acts as a ground from which the adaptors vision takes off. What the audience perceives is not the novelist’s vision, but the film maker’s interpretation of the novelist’s vision. Thus, adaptation of any work of art from one medium to another is always a personal interpretation.