

Chapter :2

Adaptation :Negotiating Film and Originality

With the issue of negotiation between film and the original text in adaptation, there is a need to understand the whole process of film making, the process of adaptation and before all of that the history behind the magic that we call as cinema. Apart from this the other side of the coin also should be explored, ie. Literature, its usual characteristics, its importance and its place in human history. Without paying enough attention on both the aspects of literature and film, it will not be possible to have enough input on the various areas of the process of adaptation. Here through this study it is intended to show the relationship between literature and film- when they come together in the process of adaptation. This relationship will be judged on many levels. It will move through the alley of comparison and contrast. This sort of analysis is essential in examining the outcome of an adaptation . A goal is set here to explore the relationship between the film adaptation and the original text by considering various factors influencing the whole process .

Literature:

To define literature is not at all an easy task. The most available definitions of literature are broad and vague. But any definition of literature can change with the passage of time. This change is the only certainty of literature. This change occurs in literature with its enormous possibilities. Literature sucks up these possibilities to create meaning out of it. Literature generates ideas through its different genre. Whether it is prose , poetry, novel, drama, fiction or essays, the only dilemma it encounters is that, it can not be static to any idea. One idea which is not considered as worthy to be commented on, at one point of time, can be considered as an idea of excellence at another period of time. Holding on to this dynamic nature of literature, it can be claimed that it is an art form , which may be written or spoken¹. Literature inserts literary value to any

written or oral text. Literary texts in its written form could be circulated for reading only after the invention of the printing press. Gutenberg and its printing press revolutionized the way literature is read today. With the effort of Gutenberg, literature in written form could be circulated for reading. It was because of the technology of printing that literary texts could be captured in pages. Many copies of the same book could be published. These copies could be sold. Because of this commercialization of literature question of copyright and authorship developed. This development helped in the patent of one particular book and its idea with its author. Now literary text is armored with the shield of copyright. Any reproduction of the literary text now will be in need of permission and thus will be judged on the value of fidelity to the original text. This particular development authenticated a piece of work as an original product of a creator. This tag of originality is the ground on which adaptation will be judged in later years.

The tag of originality speeded in every shade of literature be it story, novel, drama, poems, fictions , essays and so on. In all these wings of literature it is evident that literature is a one man production produced for many. In short literature is meant to be read. Without readers the meaning of a literary text will not be decoded. Thus literature incorporates its aesthetic elements, values, philosophies, and arguments to be decoded by its readers. This is the reason why the growth of literature is followed by the growth of readership. The growth in readership helped written literature to grow and to spread its wing. Along with this growth of readership, literature became the essence of human life. It has even controlled human imagination from many generations. This hold, on human imagination helped literature to induce the habit of reading in general public. While oral literature made a connection between the speaker and the listener, written texts of all times tried to establish a relation between the writer and the reader. Often it has served the purpose of erasing the difficulties of passing the leisure time. Literature and reading became synonymous as reading literature became a ritual for many. As time passes by, literature and its impact on human race became more prominent. In different languages, regional literature developed. Variation in language brought variation in style and in

content. This variation in style and content can also be understood as the impact of time. Writers have changed their style and content of writing according to the need of the time. With the need of the time new ideas usually enter within the boundary of literature, creating newer possibilities. Thereby literature is defined in different terms by different thinkers and philosophers. Literature has gone through various ages grasping various social and cultural inputs in it. This is the reason why literature is often looked at as the replica of the society. Here the idea of mimesis comes closer to literature. Beyond this Aristotelian concept of literature, its meaning and its content shuffled with neo classicism, romanticism, naturalism, and with many other developments. Moving ahead in time it appears that literature is also seen as an expression of human psyche. Even Avant-garde movements influenced literature a lot creating new horizons for it. In twenty first century literature has landed in the postmodern era where it serves the role of exploiting the human condition in a total chaos, where integrity and solidarity is destroyed by the alarming effect of terrorism and nature's fury.

Film and its history:

We live in such an age when our generation has moved far ahead from text based information and entertainment to image based information and entertainment. This movement forward to the image based entertainment began with the advent of photography and then the discovery of television. The hunger to capture the world within a camera and more precisely in a photograph never stopped. The development went on with newer discoveries in science. This hunger to move forward can be felt in the words and anxiety of Joseph Nicephore Niepce who “produced the first black and white photograph at Chalon- Sur- Saone in 1827-using an 8 hour exposure on pewter coated with bitumen and silver salts. Yet in 1816 he wrote: *“I need to arrive at some way of fixing the colour that is what is concerning me at the moment and it is the thing which is the most difficult. Without that it would not be worth anything.”* For the photographic pioneers the black and white picture was always a staging post on the road to colour.”²

It is not only the shift from the black and white still photography to the color photographs that captured human imagination, rather it is the hunger to develop moving picture which pushed human civilization to the new era of entertainment and art. The development of moving images owes a lot to Eadweard Muybridge. Muybridge is known for his revolutionary finding in photographic studies in motion. His pioneering work *The Horse in Motion* which came up in 1878 exposed that camera can capture motion. Muybridge was commissioned by Leland Stanford to capture the moment when a horse gallop and become fully airborne. As he was a still photographer, he came up with the idea of placing 12 cameras one after another connected with a single cord. When the horse sped by he pulled the connected string to capture twelve photos at a time. This technique gave him beautiful shots of a galloping horse, proving the inability of human eye to capture movement. Motion picture developed years after this trial of Muybridge with 12 frames. The development of motion picture saw the use of 16 to 18 frames per second till the period when 24 frames per second came up as the actual speed that could provide the image of actual movement that now we are accustomed to. *Time 100 Photos* includes Muybridge's *The Horse in Motion*, and in its introductory write up it highlights "Muybridge's stop –motion technique was an early form of animation that helped pave the way for the motion – picture industry, born short decade later."³ This sort of development and discoveries are equipped with the strength for a great shift in human history. It guaranteed a leap from the text based entertainment to the image based entertainment. This shift from the text based to the image based entertainment had great impact on visual stimuli which ultimately reshaped our perception and then knowledge. It is all because the visual images act fast on our brain than the mental image created in the process of reading. This is the reason why with the newer development of technology, 'cinema' with its moving image became the main instrument of visual entertainment and even instruction.

Cinema is the most popular form of diversion which accompanies glory and delight. With the advent of cinema and its technology, the construction of 'picture palaces' began, specially in Britain. In India cinema got its glorious beginning with revolutionaries like Dadasaheb Phalke⁴. From this seed of evolution in Indian cinema, nurtured by Phalke, there began the journey of those who opted the silver screen to reach out to the larger audience. This thought to reach out to the larger audience through the moving images of cinema was possible because cinema offers a cultural perspective. Film is that medium of mass communication which can really satisfy our mind and soul. Witnessing the influence of cinema on the mind of the people it can be claimed that cinema is one of the most dominant kind of all arts. This is the reason why we cannot avoid this truth that there is a dominance of movies in our lives.

The first public exhibition of moving picture in Britain in 1896, was the beginning of major cultural revolution. This paved the way for mature cinema in Britain. Holding the hand of British International pictures and Gourmont British Pictures Corporation, British film industry shined against the American film industry. The formation of British Board of Film Sensor (BBFC) in 1912 marked the growing involvement of government in film industry, which worked to be the watchdog and controlled the projection of movies which are not considered to be appropriate for screening. Early British cinema saw its possibilities in adaptation of classical stories. Among many others *Henry vii*, *Oliver Twist*, *Lorna Doone* etc. were the popular ones. These adaptations were done to win over the audience, who were habituated with reading literature and for whom these were the familiar subjects. Though many developments occurred in British cinema still it could never surpass the influence of American influence on cinema. American films acted as cultural melting point but there were few issues of Language, dialect and specific cultural interest which helped to give separate identity to British film industry.⁵

The success of *Screen*, the journal devoted to film studies can be considered to be the major cultural landmark of twentieth century. After this, the publication of *The Film*

Teacher, edited by Derek J. Davies stressed on the development of serious studies on films. This journal *The Film Teacher* later became the *Society for Education in Film and Television* (SEFT) under the editorship of Ray Wills. Thereby the role played by *Screen* in promotion of serious study on films can never be overlooked. It provided genuine platform for film studies when the need of such study was not even felt. After SEFT dismantled, University of Glasgow functioned as the centre for *Screen*, later its publication was handled by Oxford University Press. Till today *Screen* is a platform of film studies and it is controlled by an international editorial advisory board.

Narrowing down the enlarged history of cinema to India and its films, attention must be shifted to India's film factories in Mumbai, Chennai, Kolkata, Bangalore and Hyderabad, where largest numbers of films are produced every year. Here also some controlling factors work, some of them are representing the film industry and some of them are managing the relation between state and industry, which can be enlisted as the various state film chambers of commerce, the film federation of India, the various film development corporations and the trade unions led by the Indian Motion Pictures producers association etc. All these institutions in one way or the other have tried to restore the history of films in India in a total political basis but in reality many of the silent films produced in India could never be restored, many of the archives are prepared with the help of partially available material and even partial knowledge. Still in India cinema has very special role to play. This is the reason why Ashish Rajadhyksha has stated, "if today we accept that far from being straightforward move towards nationalism, secularism and democracy, India's history represents an extraordinary chequered growth with its own share of conflicts and compromises, at least one reason for it would be the evidence provided by Indian cinema."⁶ He has added, "When the cinema apparatus came into India, it was technology and mode of cultural manufacture and distribution without direct historical precedent in the country. On the other hand, from the earliest features of Phalke's work and ever since then, film presented its most critical value as being neo – traditional cultural form *per excellence*, a gadget that

worked at its best in suturing cultural difference and producing an easily consumable homogeneity for an increasingly undifferentiated mass audience.”⁷ Cinema in India has travelled a lot to reach up to that stage where now it stands. Here also from the time of silent movies, cultural perspective of cinema is often served with the creative freedom of directors to present a concrete as well as an imaginary vision. In the post modern era directors usually concentrate on the instable relationship of the viewer and the viewed object, reader and the text, even the past and the present.⁸ Specifically in adaptations , the directors ability to depart from the limitations of a given text, force viewers to accept the visual production with new thought and new meaning.

Analyzing a film is much different from like reading a novel. Watching a film and reading a book can give us different kind of experience altogether. A book of literature generates pleasure- when it is read, but the case with film is different. In films, entertainment is the result of collaborative effort of many including the director, actor, editor, producer, cinematographer, choreographers, technicians and sound designer and many more. Andrew Dix has elaborated the collaborative art of film with the following words, “In general however, cinema is an extrovert rather than solipsistic art. As Michael Ondaatje puts it in his book of dialogues with Walter Murch:’ a film set resembles a bee hive , or daily life in Louis xiv’s court- every kind of society is witnessed in action and it seems every trade is busy at work.’ ”⁹ In short, analyzing a film requires to take a careful look at the setting, plot, characters, dialogue, symbols, metaphors, techniques etc., as well as those factors that have an influence on the film, such as the theoretical ,cultural, historical, and political context in which the film is created. Analysis of a film keeping in mind all its essential parts can only be possible with the technical aspect of it. Thus few of the important technical and theoretical elements of film are highlighted below. Technical involvement of camera, light, soundtrack, special effects are the lifeline of a film, without which neither the story, nor the plot can get its due. Therefore a brief analysis on the theories and techniques of film are underlined below.

Montage:

Montage is the technique in which a series of shots are placed one after another to create the impression of a particular time and place. Talking about ‘*Montage*’ in his famous essay *Word and Image*, Sergie Eisenstein has said, “the role set itself by every work of art, *the need for connected and sequential exposition of the theme, the material, the plot, the action*, the movement within the film sequence and within the film drama as whole. Aside from the *excitement* of story, or even its logic or continuity, the simple matter of telling *connected story* has often been lost in the works of some outstanding film, masters, working in various types of films. What we need, of course, is not so much individual criticism of those masters, but primarily an organized effort to recover the montage culture that so many have lost. This is all the more necessary since our films are faced with the task of presenting not only narrative that is *logically connected*, but one that contains a *maximum of emotion and stimulating power*.¹⁰ According to Sergei Eisenstein “montage is just as indispensable component feature of film productions as any other element of film effectiveness”.¹¹ He again commented that the Montage is the essential need of “every work of art, the need for connected and sequential exposition of the theme, the material, the plot, the action, the movement within the film sequence and within the film drama as a whole.”¹² Asha Kuthari Choudhury writes, “the word is derived from the French : ‘putting together’. It is a film editing technique that employs special effects, rapid editing, and music; condensing the narrative space and time to present ‘tight’ effects. Related techniques in visual culture are the forms of collage and the photomontage that were in great vogue in modernist art.”¹³

Mise-en-scene :

Whatever the camera catches during the making of a film, whether it is the cinematography, plot, the character, props, lighting, the setting including the sound, can be termed as *Mise en scene*. It is the complete presentation of a film with which a film can communicate with its viewers. It is an expression which is used to describe the visual

theme of theatre or film. This expression could never be defined clearly by anyone thereby it is the grand undefined term of film studies.

In this regard Antonin Artaud's emphasis on the term *mise-en-scene* can be useful to a large extent. Though Artaud used the term for theatre but it is equally meaningful for films. According to him *mise en scene* can be considered as the language of cinema. Antonin Artaud said that theater should not subordinate itself to speech "one might wonder whether the theater by any chance possesses its own language, whether it is entirely fanciful to consider it as an independent and autonomous art, of the same rank as music, painting, dance, etc....one finds in any case that this language, if it exists, is necessarily identified with *mise en scene*."¹⁴ All the things that are "put in the scene": the setting, the decor, the lighting, the costumes, the performance etc. Narrative films often manipulate the elements of *mise-en-scene*, such as decor, costume, and acting to intensify or undermine the ostensible significance of a particular scene. A Glossary of Literary Terms explains "the French *mise-en-scene* (placing on stage) is sometimes used in English as another synonym for "setting"; it is more useful, however, to apply the term more broadly, as the French do, to signify a director's overall conception, staging and directing of a theatrical performance."¹⁵

But when we talk about film and the use of *mise-en-scene*, it appears to be a much involved element so Andrew Dix argues, "Mise-en-scene interpretation can be overdeveloped until it becomes an end in itself, producing a rather static, pictorial attitude towards cinema. It risks abstracting the work the film spectator does with eye from other possible programmes of inquiry."¹⁶

Scopic regime:

The French film theorist Christian Metz coined the term *Scopic regime*. In *The Imaginary Signifier* Metz used the term for the first time. The idea of Scopic Regime reflects this idea that the act of seeing is not innate rather it is constructed culturally. The

gendered way of seeing can also be regarded as scopic regime. This idea of scopic regime refers back to the idea of gaze. This idea of scopic regime is often used against the notion that vision is universal. This concept focuses on the idea that there are specific ways of seeing which are manifestations of culture.

Diegesis:

It can be explained as the presentation of the internal world created by the story which is felt and even enacted by the actors in a cinema. It is the narrative part of the film. Within this narrative part every part of the story. In a film the camera chooses the place where to see and which are the areas where the views should give their emphasis. This can be done by editing, which force viewers to jump from one scene to another as if viewers are given instructions by someone in which way to go. This narrative process of cinema is termed as diegesis. Here both the seen and unseen part of the story is told with special narrative techniques. The scene where the character imagines and his thought is projected through voice over is called non diegetic. These non diegetic elements are against those which are diegetic.

Auteur:

The term auteur was coined after the advent of the theory called The Auteur Theory. Auteur theory says that a film usually reflects its directors personal creative vision .This theory came alive in the writings of film critics like Andre Bazin , Alexandre Astruc and Andrew Sarris. The beginning of Auteur theory can be traced back to the critics association with the French journal *Cahiers du Cinema*. Andrew Sarris tried to explain a filmmaker's or director's opus through the term Auteur. He tried to find out distinctive feature of a director's work, where an impression of the director's personality can be found. After the advent of this theory, the term auteur became popular. Here auteur is a filmmaker whose style and control over the production of a film can give it his personal touch. Auteur is considered as the major creative force of a film. Auteur refers

to those directors who express their artistic vision in the medium of film. In the differing works of these directors there are some similarities. An auteur may be born from a layered system of abilities. A technique, a personal style, and an interior meaning help to formulate an auteur.

Though the term auteur is still in use, but Auteur theory was criticized by many. When some argued that production of a cinema is a collaborative effort, others claimed that cinema imbibes a lot from society so it takes its ideology from there too. Critics like Jenet Staiger argue that auteur theory is nothing but a 'reading strategy'. She comes up with the idea of 'authorship –as- site –of –discourse-approach' and emphasizes that in the narrative an author works with 'repetitive citation of a performative statement of 'authoring choices''.¹⁷ With such remarks she has tried to reuse the concept of auteur through the term author.

Camera :

Without the use of camera no one can think of films. Camera is the most essential element of a film making process. Within a film the text moves because of the camera. Camera can be considered as those eyes through which audiences watch a film. In any movie whether it is an adaptation or not camera makes all the difference, it makes all the choices. In a way it decides what is to be seen, how much to be seen, where to look and when. Dziga Vertov has rightly claimed, "use of camera as a camera eye more perfect than the human eyes for exploring the chaos of visual phenomena filling the universe..... we cannot improve our eyes but we can always improve the camera."¹⁸

"Film offers a variety of focused and sustained camera angles. It expands or contracts our experience by virtue of the absence of the space-time continuum. Shots in separate spaces are edited together. Different times can be sliced, joined or rearranged. The environment – the viewing filter of a dark and a quite room – enhances the experience."¹⁹

Camera Angle:

Camera angle refers to the position of the camera in relation to the subject. The position of the camera can be high, low or in the exact level with the subject.

Camera work :

Camera work refers to the overall work of the camera in the making of the film. It includes technicalities like shot distance, focus, movement, camera angle, big close up, Bridging shot, crane shot, deep focus and so on.

Bridging Shot:

Bridging shot is that kind of shot which can be used to connect two scenes which are far from each other both in time and place. With such shots viewers are provided with a compact scene that has bridged the gap of time and place.

Cinematographer:

The director of photography is known as the cinematographer. A cinematographer is the chief over the camera crew and he is responsible for making artistic and technical decisions related to images and photography. Cinematography can be understood as the science and the art of motion picture photography. A cinematographer is the soul of a film, without his presence moving images will lose their direction.

Editor:

The person who is responsible for putting the filmed footage together is known as an editor. His work is to compile the complete footage of the film so that the film can get its final shape. It is because of the task of the editor that viewers get to see a narrative in

its linearity within a particular time frame. Without editing it will not be possible to put different scenes together. It is an essential part of the film making process.

Focus:

Focus connotes the particular way a photograph is taken. Here effects are achieved by adjusting the camera lens. Focus may be of two types: deep focus and shallow focus. Deep focus can cover the entire picture within the frame but shallow focus will bring a concentrated point on the particular area of interest leaving the left out area blurred.

Sound:

The audio, the recorded track of the film is known as the sound track. It includes songs, music, the sound effects, voices from other sources of sound like television and radio. The role of sound in films is immense. Sound plays different roles in a film. At one point of time it can play a direct narrative role on the other it can play a subliminal narrative role. Through its direct narrative role sound gets a direct story telling role. Sound or music is incorporated in the script itself to tell the untold aspect of the narrative. Sound may also play a subliminal role where its effect cannot be realized by the audiences directly. It works on the audience unconsciously. In such a case sound is taken as an integral part of the total viewing experience. Audiences cannot separate sound from the moving images of the film. Despite the fact that these sounds are deliberately constructed to instruct the audiences how to feel. Sound has to play grammatical role too. Sound moves with the grammatical structure of the film. If point of view of the director is changed but the scene remains to be the same, then sound plays a crucial role to connect the scene with the difference, came in the point of view in the narration. So “sound provides a form of continuity or connective tissue for films.”²⁰

Flashback:

Flash is again a technical aspect of the process of filmmaking. With this technique the director can easily retrieve the incidents and actions from of the past . In the film the director cannot use narration just like a writer, but here he can use this technique to feature an episode from the past. Flashback is a technique through which the sequence of time and its realization is maintained. The change in time is often managed through Flashbacks. Incidents and happenings of the past is visually presented with the help of this technique.

Close up:

It is a special shot where only some of the feature of the subject comes to the fore front in the lens of the camera. It is usually the facial feature and facial expressions which are caught through such technicalities of camera. Close ups are essential in highlighting emotion and sentiment of characters. It also attracts the attention of the audiences to something that the camera has focused on. In films close-ups can speak beyond words. Referring to some of Hitchcock's films and his use of close ups Seymour Chatman writes in the essay What Novels can do that Films Can't(And Vice Versa),“Close –ups that come immediately to mind seem introduced for plot unraveling, for hermeneutic purposes. Think of Hitchkok's famous close –ups: the villain's amputated little finger in The Thirty –Nine Steps; the poisoned coffee cup in Notorious; Jenet Leigh's horribly open eye in the bloody shower in Psycho. For all their capacity to arrest our attention , these close-ups in no way invite aesthetic contemplation ; on the contrary , they function as extremely powerful components in the structure of the suspense. They present in the most dramatic fashion, that abiding narrative hermeneutic question: “ My God” , they cry out , ‘what next?’.”²¹ So close up shots are more intimate in nature. The effect of such a shot is that audience start losing their visual grip on the character's surrounding. Focus is shifted to the detailed image foregrounded on screen. In the case of extreme close up the

focus of the camera brings up the emotional intensity of characters and the impact of the scene.

Establishing shot:

As explained by Ernest Lindgren in his *The Art of the film* , an establishing shot is “ A long shot introduces at the beginning of a scene to establish the interrelation ship of details to be shown subsequently in near shots.” ²²When these shots occur at the very beginning of a film, it provides details. It is descriptive in nature, as till that point characters are not introduced properly. With the help of such shots details of a place or an event is captured to form the base to start up the narrative. Following such establishing shots, the director of a film starts narrating events that will follow.

Fade in:

In this technique a scene gradually come out from acute blackness.

Fade out:

In this technique a scene or an image gradually disappears from the screen and dissolve in an acute black background.

The above mentioned and explained terms are few, among many such technical terms. The above mentioned terms reflect the functional and the technical aspects of the film making process. Therefore an attempt has been made to draw some light on these technicalities of film making process. This brief understanding on these terms, is really very essential for the complete understanding of the process of film making. Without an understanding of terms like *Mise en scene*, *Montage*, *Diegesis* , it would be difficult to explore the world of cinema . Specifically in dealing with adaptation, where a literary work is adapted in a film , these terms would be of great help. Comparison and contrast

of literature with its adapted version will be easier with the idea of the terms mentioned above.

Adaptation:

Literary adaptation is the adaption of literary texts to another medium, which may vary from theater to video games. In the case of literature into film, it may range from short stories to novels. In the article *Adaptation : from Novel to Film* added in Masterpiece²³, *film in the classroom* section it is highlighted that “ John Harrington , in his book *Film And / Is Art* estimated that a third of all films ever made have been adapted from novels and if it include drama or short stories , that estimate might well be 65 percent or more . Nearly all of the works of classic literature students study in high school have been adapted for film – some many times and in multiple languages , settings or formats.”²⁴ Within such a range of adaptations , it is often seen that there is an inclination to compare and contrast a literary text with the film when an adaptation is to be analysed. There is always a search for the better one when film and a literary text is compared. Faithfulness of the film to the original work is often tested in such comparisons. Regardless of the difference in the medium, films and literary texts are compared and validated in terms of fidelity. The question of fidelity occurs as the text that has been taken for adaptation is tasted in time and sustained. Its quality is ensured through its acceptance by its readers. When this tested story is adapted into a film , critics search for the appropriation of the original text in the film. Malgorzata Marciniak explains “Critics could not forgive what was seen as the major fault of adaptation : the impoverishment of the book’s content due to necessary omissions in the plot and the inability of the filmmakers to read out and represent the deeper meaning of the text.”²⁵ It is believed that a good adaptation usually holds tight with the content and the spirit of the book. Whether the spirit of the text is captured in the film or not, adaptation needs to go through necessary alterations. With all its alterations, it is expected from a filmmaker to represent the deeper meaning of the text. But what if a particular text carries multiple meanings. With the new approach of Reader’s Response Theory, meaning of a text gets

different shades with every reading of it. With such an approach meaning of a text becomes dynamic. According to this theory there can not be a single meaning of a given text. So a literary text may have many interpretations. With this instable meaning the film's fidelity to the original text can not be tested. Thus after many years of given importance on the question of infidelity to the text, critics now try to regard adaptation as a case of 'intertextuality'. Adaptation is now considered as an art form, which revolves round the endless process where one text leads to another with no definite point of origin. Here adaptation can be explained as an interpretation. It is a specific reading of a literary text. Such reading generates a movement from the static and the fixed meaning of a particular text. So referring to Bakhtin's work Julia Kristeva writes: "His work represents one of that movement's most remarkable accomplishment, as well as one of the most powerful attempts to transcend its limitation."²⁶ Transcending the limits is an act which has paved the road for the 'movement' pointed out by Kristeva. Kristeva's reading of Bakhtin can be useful in understanding adaptation where literary texts move into the film crossing the limits of medium and form. Kristeva's arguments can be appropriated in the attempt to uncover adaptation and its properties. Properties of the literary text enters into a different structure, and this entry is registered in its 'relation or opposition' to the structure from which it is adapted. Thus Kristeva writes "the only way a writer can participate in history is by transgressing this abstraction through a process of reading –writing; that is, through the practice of a signifying structure in relation or opposition to another structure. History and morality are written and read within the infrastructure of texts."²⁷ In the light of Kristeva's argument adaptation can also be regarded as a creation that includes the history and the morality of the time in which it is created, while transcending the history and the morality of the text adapted in it. It is like participating in history. As history and morality can be read in a text, thus it can also be transmitted to another medium while adapting the text to its next level. This transmission of texts and its impact can be related to the term Intertextuality. Thus Toril Moi in her introduction to Kristeva's *Word, Dialogue and Novel* has said "Kristeva's insistence on the importance of the speaking subject as the principal object for linguistic analysis

would seem to have its root in her own reading of Bakhtin's 'dialogism' as an open-ended play between the text of the subject and the text of the addressee, an analysis which also gives rise to the Kristevan concept of 'intertextuality'.²⁹ This open ended play between the text of the subject and the text of the addressee as propagated by Bakhtin with the use of the term *Dialogism*³⁰ is somehow relevant to Kristeva's concept of *intertextuality*, where texts move from one medium to the other. In adaptation too there is a play between the text taken out from the literary source and the text of the film. The dialogue between these two texts is essentially the necessity of adaptation. With such a dialogue between the text of the film and that of the book, *intertextuality* appears to be an instrument for understanding the essence of adaptation of a literary text into a film.

Again, adaptation can be understood in terms of pleasure. Linda Hudson's *Theory of Adaptation* concentrates on this aspect of adaptation where pleasure is the only bridge between the book and the film and here the source of pleasure is the combination of the known and the unknown. When the known story of the book is repeated in the adaptation then an unknown desire rises up to verify its familiarity and difference with the original written words. This is the reason why Hudson claims, "the appeal of adaptations lies in their mixture of repetition and difference, of familiarity and novelty".³¹ Adaptation creates the possibility of revisiting the well known world of the book, and the possibility to re reach to the world which they imagined and loved while reading. Here it can be easily understood why J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* and its adaptations are a craze for the readers as well as the film lovers. Therefore it is to be said that adaptation brings interpersonal artistic communication between a filmmaker and a reader. Here the filmic experience comes in front of the private reading experience of the book. Apart from this, adaptation generates interest with the bodily presence of actors who with spoken words provide the human touch to the conceptual world of the written text. This human presence in filmic version of literature makes it appealing and closer to the human world. Anger, jealousy, sentiment, happiness, laughter etc all sorts of human emotions come alive in a film, while these emotions are restricted in the black ink of the pages of a

book, which serves as the source of the adaptation. It is ultimately the human presence in the well known stories that matters. This human presence generates a kind of enthusiasm to watch the film first and then to be judgmental on issues like fidelity. Thus Marciniak writes in her article *The Appeal of Literature To Film Adaptation* “An adaptation as interpretation does not have to capture all the nuances of the book’s complexity, but it has to remain a work of art, an independent, coherent and convincing creation with its own subtleties of meanings. In other words, it has to remain faithful to the internal logic created by the new vision of the adapted work. Even if the film makers’ reading of a given text clashes with our reading, we are willing to forgive all the alterations when they spring from a well thought – out scheme and can lend persuasive new sense to the text.”³² Thus the aesthetic superiority of printed words over films fades out with newer ideologies, where film is accepted as a specific art form which work with different methodological aspects. The visual images produced in a film differs from the mental images created by a reader in the process of reading, so films are essentially different from a book and for this reason comparison can not be regarded as vital. Despite this fact comparisons are made. Beyond these comparisons, film occupies a separate place where, through adaptation, content from literature come close to film. In this movement, contents from literature gets affected. Andre Bazin thus claims in his essay *Adaptation, or the Cinema as Digest*, “A novel is a unique syntheses whose molecular equilibrium is automatically affected when you tamper with its form. Essentially, no detail of the narrative can be considered secondary, all syntactic characteristics, then are in fact expression of the psychological, moral, or metaphysical content of the work.”³³ He adds on to say “I grant that the protagonists and events of a novel achieve their aesthetic existence only through the form that expresses them and that somehow brings them to life in our minds”³⁴. Cinema is therefore a medium or a form in which events and characters from a novel come alive. They are provided with an esthetic existence. Such an existence is created with the moving images on screen in a human form. These human forms are dragged out of the descriptions given in the literary text. The well developed characters are pulled out from written pages to ‘bring them into play’. So Andre Bazin

claims “ the cinema borrows from fiction a certain number of well thought, well – rounded or well- developed characters, all of whom have been polishedit adopts them and brings them into play , according to the talents of the screen writer and the director , the characters are integrated as much as possible into their new aesthetic context.”³⁵Whatever may be the form, whether it is novel , drama or short story, the story line and its narrative structure acts differently on readers when we read them in pages. The same story , when it is projected in a medium like film, its appeal differs in many ways. In written pages , often a narrator directs the meaning of what a reader will read, but in the case of a film technical aspects like *voice over* is used to give the viewer a particular direction of viewing the film . When one particular incident is explained in novel , it may take narration of many pages but in the film it may occur just as a brief scene.

If we really try to differentiate between literature and film then it must be said that in a written story or novel or a drama , characters are presented through the narration , knowledge about the characters and situations usually come to the readers by what is said about them. But in a movie, characters are revealed through what they do. It is all because film provides visual images, that directly effects perception but in case of reading words can simply provide mental image. When one particular writer writes a literary text, films are produced with collaborative effort of a team. Apart from all these one film is restricted within the shots which are edited and ultimately shown on the screen but the freedom with story in written pages can allow its reader to imagine and to re-interpret the text. Those who advocate the superiority of literature over films argues that visualization destroys the internal world of the literary work .It is thus believed that the freedom of imagination can only come out with the response of the reader, while he reads words from the pages of the book. Such aspects of freedom of imagination can only alienate literary texts from film as a medium. But despite of these differences literary texts are adapted into films for a long time. This is the reason why many theorist have concentrated on the term adaptation and its relation to literary texts . In *The well Worn*

Muse Adaptation in Film History and Theory , Referring to *A Day in the Country* by Jean Renoir, Dudley Andrew has argued that “ the tale ‘A Country Excursion’ bears a transcendent relation to any and all films which adapt it, for it is itself an artistic sign with a given shape and value if not a given meaning .A new artistic sign will then feature this original sign as either its signified or its referent”³⁶. Dudley Andrew writes “ no filmmaker responds immediately to reality itself, or to his own inner vision . Every representational film adapts a prior conception. Indeed the very term ‘representation’ suggests the existence of a model . Adaptation delimits representation by insisting on the cultural status of the model, on its existence in the mode of the text or the already textualized.”³⁷ According to Andrew there are three modes of relation between a film and a text , borrowing, intersection and fidelity of transformation . After pointing out these three modes of relation, that are generally accepted by thinkers, Andrew says that there is a need to shift our attention to “ the system by which film involves us in fictions and the history of that system are ultimately the questions we face even when starting with the simple observation of an equivalent tale told by novel and film.”³⁸ For the question should be asked in a different way to enquire “How does adaptation serve the cinema?”because “ the choices of the mode of adaptation and of prototypes suggest a great deal about filmmakers’ aspiration and sense of the role of cinema from decade to decade .”³⁹ This is the reason why there is a need “to study films themselves as acts of discourse. We need to be sensitive to that discourse and to the forces that motivate it.”⁴⁰ Thus for Andrews the relation between the film and the literary text in adaptation has moved ahead of the much asked questions on the fidelity . He wants to drag the attention of critics to the study of the film as a discourse.

In *What Novels can Do That Films Can't* , Seymour Chatman writes on different aspects of narrative to uncover the relation between films and novels. He has observed that different ideas on narratology developed during the development of Russian Formalism and French Structuralism. During this time linguistic and cinema theory developed hand in hand. Linguistics is the basis of semiotics, a ‘study of all meaning

systems , not only natural languages ', can be linked to cinema studies too where the 'work of Christian Mertz is also semiotically based. Chatman argues , "narrative is a kind of text organization and the organization , that schema, needs to be actualized; in written words, as in stories and novels; in spoken words combined with the movements of actors imitating characters against sets which imitate places, as in plays and films; in drawings; in comic strips; in dance movements as in narrative ballet and in mime."⁴¹

In Chatman's analysis it appears that in narrative there can be a double time structure. In any narrative medium whether it is a novel or a film , there is a particular time sequence. It is the time sequence of plot , where events develop. This time sequence is the 'story time' .On the other hand there is again a 'discourse –time', where a writer or a director presents these events of the story time. Thus chat man argues " in theory at least any narrative can be actualized by any medium which can communicate the two time orders."⁴² In this sense Chatman is very much clear in his argument that there is every possibility of actualizing a narrative style into the other if the creator can get hold of the 'two time order'. In this process of actualization differences and variations will definitely arise, but keeping aside these differences the film maker concentrates on the possibilities of adapting a narrative in its time frame. So, it is pointed out that "close study of film and novel version of the same narrative reveals with great clarity the peculiar powers of the two media. Once we grasp those peculiarities, the reasons for the differences in form ,content , and impact of the two versions strikingly emerge."⁴³ Here he is very much clear in his thought that different features of a narrative can be chosen for comparison but then also, they will be narratives told in a time frame. So in his discussion he has chosen two distinctive features of narrative: description and point of view, to enquire the process of adaptation within the dual time frame of narrative.

In essays like "*Rematerialising Adaptation theory*" Kyle Meikle opines , " of all the figurative tropes operating in adaptation today, one of the most prevalent is that of film adapters " using the source as raw material" . When source texts are compared with raw materials , he is compelled to say that the only task adapters seems to be doing is

preserving stories in the medium of films. With references from the works of George Bluestone , Brian McFarlane , Thomas Leitch ; Kyle Meikle forms the ground to state that ‘ Adapters stock and Store Stories’’. Kyle’s take in this essay is to spill out the Simone Murray’s argument proposed in the essay “Materializing Adaptation Theory”⁴⁴ . Simone Murray described adaptation studies as a material phenomenon in which a system work with an interlinked cord between interests and actors. In this regard Balaz’s name come to the fore as he also carries a materialistic attitude in his arguments. For him a novel should be considered as a potential raw material to be transformed at will by the writer of the screenplay. Along with a materialistic attitude he sees the film adaptation as an entirely new artistic form. Thus Balaz gives complete license to the filmmaker to extract what he considers useful and to discard what is not for the cinematic medium.

All the above discussed theoretical aspects of adaptation seems to be pointing out to a single truth, that adaptation and change in the original text is somehow intertwined. There is always a negotiation between the literary text and its cinematic version. Despite of many complications involved in this negotiation between the literary text and the film , adaptations are frequently attempted. It is observed that a single text is adapted at many times. It is interesting to see that at many times a single text influence many film makers to adapt. In the history of cinematic adaptation such cases are not rare. It appears like a single text is interpreted through different point of view. These interpretations of the same text by different directors add new meanings to it. Thus multiple meanings of the same text evolve through these cinematic renditions. These evolved meanings of the old text are often treated with a kind of modern sensibility. The term modern is associated with the new and polished sensibility that arrives with time. This new sensibility, with which the old story is treated, is the effect of the difference in time. This new sensibility asks for changes and alterations in the film. At times it is seen that some of the literary adaptations carry heavy alterations. Despite these alterations, some of the films are accepted as great adaptations. For Example Akira Kurosawa’s Throne of Blood with all its alterations of setting, timeframe, the particularities of plot, and language is considered

as one of the best adaptations of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. In Bollywood , Bishal Bharadwaj's adaptations of Shakespeare's dramas are well appreciated. In his adaptation of *Macbeth* (Maqbool), *Othello* (Onkara), and *Hamlet* (Hayder), Bharadwaj ,played a lot with the content of the original text . Much alterations are made in all these films . In spite of the alterations, these films are commercially successful and critically acclaimed. Likewise, Bapsi Sidhwa's *Ice Candy Man* was adapted by Deepa Mehta . The adaptation was titled as 1947: Earth. This film was appreciated by critics but was not a commercial success but after its release the book was reprinted with the new title 1947: A Fractured Nation. Such adaptations make it clear that Cinema is a different art and audiences play a crucial role in it. There is enough possibility that an adaptation which has captured the theme and the ideas of the original novel is rejected by its audience. On the other hand an adaptation which has captured few of the ideas of the source text, a great work of art, is well accepted by its viewers. It is therefore a fact that quality of adaptation varies, but what remains static is the unique attribute of the film as well as the literary text.

Selecting a story:

For a great film there is a need of a great script. But in all great stories there may not be the necessary resource for the creation of cinema. So, a film maker must be very critical in selecting stories for the film he or she intends to make. Because of this inability to select appropriate scripts for films , it is often seen that film makers take help of literature. Therefore whenever anyone talks about script, literature easily comes closer to film. Though filmmakers usually try to rely on great literature of all time but success of film mostly rely on those stories that can be told in the language of cinema. This is the reason why Hemingway's novel *The Old Man and the Sea* and Tolstoy's *War and Peace* could not be made into great films. On the other hand *Island* and *Goldfish* are those stories which are the base of great films of all times. *Widen Brooks* is one of the famous novel of Thomas Mann , the great Nobel Prize winner writer was adapted into film having the same name where the director has showcased the exact picture of the contemporary society, its ups and downs, its differences, and its rise and fall .

Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment* became the story and inspiration for many filmmakers. Lksness's *Independent People* is a popular novel, and the film which is based on the story of this popular novel is similarly popular. Ibsen's *Dolls House* is one of his post popular novels. After its first publication in 1879 this novel became a huge success but its film version was a failure. Stories of great novels often fails in its film version, still exceptions are there. Famous writer director Orson Wels's *Macbeth* is a success. Homer's *Iliad* is adapted into films in different language of this world. In Hollywood itself many movies are made based on different part of this epic. *The Trojan Horse*, *Helen of Troy* are few of those where the makers could not even wipe out the essence of the main story.

The director of a film, select the story of the film depending on the innate literary quality of that story. At times he may overlook the story line for giving emphasis on the theatrical element of the story. In such cases to attain the cinematic excellence, the quality of literature get distorted. Whatever may be the base of selecting the story for a film , the artistic representation of literature into film will be possible only when , the filmmaker will trust on the language of cinema and its grimmer, accompanied by the imagination and technical aspect of it , while making the story alive with its minute details . It is true that art gets changed with the change of its medium. Literature and film, are two separate medium and two separate art form. This is the reason why it is not completely possible to adapt literature completely and without change. Few characteristic differences of film making process and the process of writing literature creates the gap between these two mediums of art. This is the reason why there occurs some problem in transcending elements one to the other. That is why adaption of literature into film is a controversial issue. In the last few decades the influence of postmodernist elements and the influence of literary criticism of literature have influenced the process of filmmaking too. Thereby these new critical aspects of literature have some way or the other have taken literature closer to cinema.

In adaptation a director can stick quite close to the original text while creating highly literal reproduction of the original text or he can create totally different version of the original text. It depends on the creator to decide on his own capacity whether to reproduce the original text or to create it with his own artistic vision. His decision makes all the difference. Though there may be a difference between the two possibilities still the whole process of adaptation needs a single unifying whole where a written text becomes a source for an audiovisual production. In his essay *Film (Adaptation) as Translation Some Methodological Proposals* Patrick Cattrysse explains, “ Even film adaptation of famous literary texts generally do not limit themselves to adapting the literary source lone . The story of such book may have guided the film adaptation on the narratological level, but other aspects such as directing, staging, acting setting, costume, lighting, photography, pictorial representation , music etc may well have been governed by other models and conventions which did not originate in the literary text and did not serve as translation of any of its elements. As a result film adaptation had better be studied as a set of discursive practices and by its general historical context.”⁴⁵

Cinematic adaptation have always come across the question of infidelity to its source . The literary source place a challenge in front of its adapted film version –which ultimately ask for a replica of the text itself. As the literary sources act as the storehouse of stories , characters, and of those emotions which can easily connect to the general public , it becomes a believable and acceptable script for a filmmaker. Literary sources become a kind of resource for film makers. These literary resources are full of possibilities. For a filmmaker literary texts are resourceful, as it can provide a hope of acceptance from the public. Apart from all these, literary texts chosen for adaptation can connect the film to the rich literary heritage . All these possibilities attract filmmakers to revisit literary sources time and again. Filmmakers remain in continuous need of a story for their film and in this case they get easily attracted to literature. They find their refuge in literature. This refuge is provided to the filmmakers with challenges. The challenge originates in the clash of two distinct art forms. The clash begins when a film adaptation

is considered inferior than the original text. It is seen as a secondary product. Critics usually cannot really judge the prime fault of the filmmakers, their view fluctuate between the filmmakers interference in the content of the book, making necessary change in it and their inability in transcending the deeper meaning of the text to the screen. Alterations in the sacred entity of written pages challenge the traditional verdict that the book is better than the film. Therefore, it is very much difficult to select one over the other. It is because of this dilemma the true nature of adaptation is to be decoded. In the process of decoding adaptation, there can be a look on those aspects where literature negotiates with film. Understanding this negotiation requires to have a concentrated idea on the changes that takes place in the process of adaptation of a book into film. The negotiating aspect of adaption is revealed in the steps involved in it. Adaptation runs through the following negotiations. These negotiations are essentially the part of the adaptation process. The negotiation between the literary text and a film is presented through the following table:

ADAPTED	ADDED	EXCLUDED
Events and details from the book which are changed for the movie.	Events and details projected in the film that are not in the book	Events and details from the book which are not included in the movie.

If the above mentioned steps of adaptation are true then there is a need to know why these additions and exclusions are attempted. Some of the reasons for such alterations are outlined below.

- when a literary text is adapted to another medium there may be changes as change will be the demand of a totally new medium where it is adapted.

- Both these mediums have their own techniques and tools. For example in literature the writer may introduce new chapter for taking its readers to the past through narratives but in film the same thing is done through techniques like flashback, crosscut and dissolve.
- At times film makers make changes in the original story to emphasize in some special traits of a character.
- A director can select one episode from the literary text over the other, to focus on a specific aspect of the narrative.
- Sometimes new theme to be introduced by the director of the film asks for a change in the original source.
- Time is an important aspect over here. The distance between the time when the literature was written and the time when the film is produced demands change.
- To satisfy the need of the contemporary viewers, change in the original work is required.
- When thought of the character narrated by the writer is transformed into dialogues, change occurs.
- The desire to make the story interesting and appealing to the contemporary audience, create the need of change.
- Place is another important aspect which create the demand of change. When a Story set in Europe is adapted in Asia the setting must be different, thus change is a demand of situation here.
- Cultural perspective remains to be one of the elements of change between film and the original literature.

These changes occur during the course of adaptation. These changes originating from the adaptation process, makes it a very complex task. These complexities are evaluated by Patrick Cattrysse in the article *Film Adaptation as translation: Some methodological proposals* .While writing on the complexities of adaptation Patrick Cattrysse takes up an example of a detective story and highlights :

Various norms seem to install themselves in conflicting situation where the one tries to overrule the other instead of cooperating with it . For example, it is clear that the adaptation process cannot be reduced to simplification. Many modifications produce an effect which , far from simplification , is sometimes rather complicating. Thus , one (more or less) common dramatic practice consists in adding scenes where antagonists(e.g.,the criminal and the detective) are brought together in the same , or in an adjoining place. This probably explains why , in contradistinction to films based on detective stories , where numerous scenes where the police features are deleted, criminal films presented from the point of view of the criminal add scenes of this kind. These situations heightened the risk of discovering the culprits and ending the stories prematurely. Therefore, apparently , an overall norm of suspense serves to explain why, in certain cases , the norm of simplification has been overruled and the literary scene underwent *narrative complexification* in the film.⁴⁶

Therefore, literary adaptation is a huge agenda which carry different layers of complexity. Film adaptation in specific is complex enough. In film adaptation it is not only the whole filming process which come into the purview of critical analysis but also the essence of the transcreation part where the narrative of a book finds its place in a totally different medium. Patrick has rightly said that modifications can bring those effects which are far from simplifications. Simplification of the story comes along with the complex technical aspect of the film. While dealing with such complex process, that has to struggle against too many issues and mainly of fidelity to the original source, the creator or the director of a film must have patience, talent and an acute interest in literature. Literature as a source of inspiration often provides the director a chance to deal within a comfortable zone. A chosen subject taken from literature represents considerably less risk, as the story is already accepted by a larger reading public. This favorable aspect of adaptation attracts many directors around the world. This attraction has chased many

in Indian film industry too. If we talk about the film industry in Bengal, Satyajit Ray is the figure who can be called as the champion in adaptation. His recognition as master filmmaker to the whole world began with the adaptation of Bibhutibhusan Bandopadhyay's *Pather Panchali*(1956). For his venture in the adaptation of Bibhutibhusan's novel, the unsung story of the film history of India comes to the international attention. Till today Ray is considered to be a dominant figure in Indian cinema. In India adaptation as a particular form of art got new meaning with him. His journey with adaptation simply began with Apu Trilogy which continued with *Charulata*, *Goopy Gyne Bagha Bayne*, *Teen Kanya* and many more. His interest in adaptation is carried forward by Rituparno Ghosh. Ghosh acquired the similar kind of creative and artistic temperament as that of Satyajit Ray. From the beginning of his career as a filmmaker till his last days he tried to deal with the basic idea of film, while controlling the over all supervision of the whole process of film making in the same fashion of his inspirer, Satyajit Ray. For film directors like Rituparno Ghosh adaptation is the chance to rethink on the possibility of bringing literature closer to the medium of film. Following the footprint of Satyajit Ray, Ghosh has also managed to bring his own interest and love of literature in the beautiful and magical world of cinema. Thereby a detailed analysis of his special touch in literary adaptation is required. So, it is intended to explore Ghosh's experimentation with literary adaptations in the following chapter of this study.

Notes:

1. Spoken Literature or oral literature is a term which refer to that kind of literature which is circulated in domain of spoken words. This includes, folk stories, songs, myths, spells, legends, ballads, riddles, life stories and so on.
2. Adrian Bailey & Adrian Holloway. "The Search for colour." *The book of colour photography*. New York: E Bury Press, 1999 . 18. Print.
3. Eadweard Muybridge. *The Horse in Motion*. 1878:100 photos. retrieved from Time.com
4. Dadasaheb Phalke is known as the father of Indian Cinema. He was a director, screen writer, and even a producer. *Raja Harishchandra, Lanka Dahan, Kaliya Mardan, Gangavataran* are some of his films.
5. Bibhash Choudhury. *English Social And Cultural History*. Eastern Economy Edition, Gauhati: PHI. 2005.
6. Ashish Rajadhyaksha & Paul William. Introduction. *Encyclopaedia of Indian Cinema*. By Ashish Rajadhyaksha. New York: oxford University Press. 1999. Print.
7. Rajadhyaksha.
8. Andrew Sanders. *The Short Oxford history of English Literature*. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. Print.
9. Andrew Dix. *Beginning Film Studies*. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2010. 140. Print.
10. Sergei Eisenstein. *The Film Sense*. Trans. Jay Leyda. New York: Meridian Books , 1957. 34. Print.
11. Eisenstein.
12. Eisenstein.
13. Asha Kuthari Chaudhuri ed. *Ideas Of The Stage, Selection From Drama Theory*. Guwahati : GU Press. 2010. 93. Print.
14. Antonin Artaud. *Oriental and occidental theatre* .Ed, Dr. Binny Deka. Guwahati: Bookland, 2013. Print.

15. M.H. Abrams, Geoffrey Galt Harphem. *The Glossary of Literary Terms*. Eleventh Edition. Delhi: Cengage Learning, 2015. Print.
16. Andrew Dix 38
17. Janet Staiger . ‘ Authorship approaches’ *In Authorship and Film*, ed. David A Gerstner. London and New York: Routledge , 2003.51. Print.
18. Dennis Lim. “Machine age Poet, Born in Revolution, Stifled under Stalin , Dziga Vertov Films at Museum of Modern Art”. *The New York Times*. April,8,2011. Web
19. John Dean “Adapting history and literature into movies”. *American Studies Journal*. Dec14 2016, 5:17 PM, Web.
20. “The Role of Sound” retrieved from FilmSound.Org. Feb,20.1999. Web. http://filmsound.org/articles/roles_of_sound.htm
21. Seymour Chatman. “What Novels Can Do That Films Can’t (And Vice Versa) *CriticalInquiry*” *OnNarrative*(Autumn)7.1(1980):121140. JSTOR. web. Accessed on 13/01/2010 10:48.
22. Ernest Lindgren .*The Art of the Film*. New York: Reed Books, 2011. Print.
23. Masterpiece
24. *Adaptation : from Novel to film* , *Film in the classroom : Masterpiece* , PBS. Org. 15-21
25. Malgorzata Marciniak. “ TheAppeal of Literature to Film Adaptations.” *Lingua Ac Communitas* 17 (2007): 59
26. Julia Kristeva. “ Word , Dialogue and Novel” *The Kristeva Reader* . ed. Toril Moi. Columbia University press , New York . 1986 . 35
27. Kristeva 36.
28. Toril Moi, ed. *The Kristeva Reader* Columbia University press , New York . 1986 . Print.
29. Kristeva 35.

30. Bakhtin developed the concept of Dialogism. Dialogism recognizes the multiplicity of perspectives. In this study the term has been used to correlate Kristeva's theoretical ideas on intertextuality.
31. *Linda Hutcheon: A Theory of adaptation, New York: 2006. P86.*
32. Marciniak 61.
33. Andre Bazin. "Adaptation or the cinema Digest." In *Film Adaptation* . ed. James Naremore. Rutgers University Press, 2000.19-27.
34. Bazin
35. Bazin
36. Dudley Andrew . "The Well –Worn Muse: Adaptation in Film History and Theory". *Narrative Strategies* .Western Illinois University 1980. 9. Print.
37. Andrew 9.
38. Andrew 9.
39. Andrew14.
40. Andrew17.
41. Chatman 121-122.
42. Chatman 122.
43. Chatman 123.
44. Kyle Meikle . "Rematerializing Adaptation Theory." *Literature / Film Quarterly* 41.3 (2013): 174-183.
45. Patrick Cattrysse . "Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals" . *Target International journal of Translation studies* . 4:1 1992 .62.Print.
46. Cattrysse 57.
