

Charles University in Prague
Faculty of Education

DIPLOMA THESIS

Ladislav Výmola

**Film adaptations of selected English
dystopian novels -
An analysis of chosen aspects of tight
and loose approaches to film adaptations
of novels**

Department of English Language and Literature

Supervisor: PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D.

2013

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D., for lending me his time, experience, expertise and encouragement as supervisor for this thesis.

Declaration

I hereby declare that this diploma thesis is the result of my own work and that I used only the sources cited.

Prague, 20 June 2013

Ladislav Výmola

Abstract

This thesis compares novels *The War of the Worlds* (1898) by Herbert George Wells, *Heart of Darkness* (1899) by Joseph Conrad, *Lord of the Flies* (1954) by William Golding and *A Clockwork Orange* (1962) by Anthony Burgess and their film adaptations. Two of these adaptations are conceived tightly and the other two loosely. The theoretical part of this thesis focuses on defining the terms “tight adaptation” and “loose adaptation”, on adaptation theories and on choosing the right criteria by which it will be possible to judge the suitability of techniques of adaptation in each case study. The practical part applies the chosen criteria on each adaptation and evaluates the success in transferring key themes and motifs from the model book into the movie version.

Key words: tight adaptation, loose adaptation, fidelity, movie version, novel version

Abstrakt

Tato práce srovnává knihy *Válka světů* (1898) spisovatele Herberta George Wellse, *Srdce temnoty* (1899) Josepha Conrada, *Pán much* (1954) Williama Goldinga a *Mechanický pomeranč* (1962) Anthonyho Burgesse a jejich filmová zpracování. Dvě z těchto adaptací jsou pojaty těsně a dvě volně. Teoretická část této práce se zabývá definicí pojmů „těsná“ a „volná“ adaptace, adaptačními teoriemi a výběrem kritérií, pomocí nichž bude možné hodnotit vhodnost použitých adaptačních technik v jednotlivých zpracováních. Praktická část aplikuje vybraná kritéria na jednotlivé adaptace a hodnotí zdařilost přenesení klíčových témat a motivů z knižní předlohy do filmové podoby.

Klíčová slova: těsná adaptace, volná adaptace, věrnost, filmová verze, knižní verze

Content

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. CHOICE OF ADAPTATIONS	5
3. THEORETICAL PART	9
3.1. Fidelity issue	9
3.2. Types of Adaptations	12
3.3. Different means of expression	15
3.4. Textual fidelity	19
3.4.1. Transfer or Adaptation: Barthes – McFarlane – terminology.....	19
3.4.2. Transfer.....	19
3.4.3. Adaptation.....	21
3.5. Spiritual fidelity	23
4. PRACTICAL PART	26
4.1. The War of the Worlds	26
4.1.1. Treatment of the main characters and cardinal functions.....	26
4.1.2. The treatment of chosen themes and motifs	32
4.1.3. Summary.....	35
4.2. Heart of Darkness / Apocalypse Now	37
4.2.1. Treatment of the main characters and cardinal functions.....	37
4.2.2. The treatment of chosen themes and motifs	46
4.2.3. Summary.....	47
4.3. Lord of the Flies	50
4.3.1. Treatment of the textual fidelity	50
4.3.2. Summary.....	58
4.4. A Clockwork Orange	60
4.4.1. Treatment of the textual fidelity	60
4.4.2. Summary.....	67
5. CONCLUSION	69
6. WORKS CITED	71

1. Introduction

After reading a good novel it has always been my habit to find out whether there is a film adaptation good enough to be compared with the original. I like to search for the differences between the original novel and the adaptation, wondering about the reasons that led the film-maker to the unique kind of expression. This was also my motivation for choosing this as the main topic of my thesis.

I thought a universal rule of making a good adaptation should not be hard to find and I wanted to apply this rule, judging each movie adaptation accordingly. However, considering the case studies from the source literature, it seemed that every transfer from novel to film was different. It should be, therefore, made clear in the very beginning that this thesis only focuses on some aspects of the transfer. It does not aim at universality but it tries to aim at objectivity, because in this field “most rigour is needed to offset the lure of mere subjectivism” (McFarlane 202).

“The relationship between a film and its precursor novel is a topic on which everyone feels free to comment while rarely evincing any concomitant need to explore the complex network of connections between the two texts (McFarlane 194). As far as McFarlane’s claim is concerned, I could serve as a textbook example because my opinions on the classification of film adaptations used to be really simple. I have always distinguished film adaptations that I called tight from those labelled as loose.

Tight adaptation was the one that incarnated my subjective vision of the world of the novel. Aleksander Jackiewicz says that the need to see the literary work is so natural that adaptations will keep coming into existence for as long as film exists, although they are often an act of barbarism (In Mravcová 8-9)¹. “Audience have continued to want to see what the books look like” (McFarlane 7). The process of reading creates in a reader an expectation so that he/she wants the characters to come to life. In this case, reader does not expect anything new but expansion or materialization of the novel. “They are interested in comparing their images with those created by the film-maker” (McFarlane 7). My own satisfaction with such spectacle stemmed from the fact that the film-maker had

¹ Quotations from Czech sources (or sources read in Czech) are put in my translation throughout the thesis

simply animated the original story. The cinema translated the more abstract to the less abstract. Words became pictures.

Loose adaptation did not agree with my reading of the novel. It would mostly take either the basic idea, the characters, some fragment of the plot or something else and use it in a different context or with a different storyline. It was possible to see the original elements of the novel in quite a different light. The notion that I did not find my conception of the novel usually resulted in one of two ways. On the one hand, I did not like the way the original story was treated, because it had been deprived of something that was subjectively important for me. The trouble is – as another film theorist, Christian Metz, says – the reader “will not always find his film, since what he has before him in the actual film is now somebody else’s phantasy” (In McFarlane 7). On the other hand, I sometimes found a delight in the way the movie treated the original elements. Although it was someone else’s view, it did not collide with mine. I discovered something that could even contribute to my further reading of the novel.

An interdisciplinary dialogue between literature and film is very important because of the film-maker’s chance to create another valuable piece of art that is able to stand independently from its source of inspiration. “The attribute of all true art, the highest and the lowest, is this – that it says more than it says, and takes you away from itself” (Leitch 19). True art wants to break free from the restraints of a form. Its goal is transcendental.

This thesis strives to prove that no type of adaptation – tight or loose – is predisposed to fail as far as making art and being appreciated is concerned. However, there is no guarantee that either type of adaptation is sure to succeed in this quest. The question of fidelity to the original text is very much discussed when it comes to adaptations. Sometimes it seems to be the only aspect of interest for the critics. “There are many kinds of relations which may exist between film and literature, and fidelity is only one – and rarely the most exciting” (McFarlane 11).

Besides the fidelity issue, in the theoretical part of this thesis I will try to separate and define certain criteria, according to which I will be able to judge the individual adaptations in the practical part. The four adaptations under examination should provide a wide range of evidence for the study.

Generally, the aim of this thesis is an assessment of four selected film adaptations according to a given framework and to the novels’ main themes and

motifs. I want to prove that the degree of fidelity should not be the key factor in judging the quality of adaptations and that there are factors that are more important than that of fidelity.

2. Choice of adaptations

As stated before, this thesis does not aim at universality. It just wants to be as objective as possible exploring deeply the limited amount of material. In this chapter I would like to justify my specific choice of novels and respective film adaptations. Each adaptation transfers the novel to the screen in slightly different manner. They exercise a broad range of adaptation techniques and should cover different points on the fidelity/quality scale.

The War of the Worlds is a science-fiction masterpiece written by H. G. Wells in 1898. It is considered one of the earliest novels dealing with an alien strike from outer space. The story of this novel takes place in England at the end of the 19th century. From an unnamed middle-class journalist we learn about the aliens coming from Mars in menacing battle machines, executing immense force and terror on powerless humankind. It seems that humans are going to be downgraded to the level of primitives subjugated to new extraterrestrial landlords. The dismal fate of the Earth seems inevitable but eventually the aliens are defeated by microorganisms spreading diseases. In its realism, the novel is concerned with the issue of morality. Humans, downgraded to the level of savages, are trying to survive at any cost and social or moral codes are pushed aside. The theme of the British imperialism is the next one to be considered. At the time of the novel's publication the British Empire was on the peak of its aggressive expansion. The approach of the Martians in the novel stems from the same imperialistic motivation and made the public consider the nature of imperialism from the victim's point of view. Another theme is the philosophy of Darwinism and evolution. Wells challenged the overvaluation of intelligence as the most important quality, suggesting that the development of brain capacity might surpass the development of the body to such extent that people would be left as only thinking entities. Wells also suggested that scientific discoveries as Darwinism should not be misused to justify acts like brutal imperialism or genocide. The novel has been adapted many times, but the most interesting is probably Orson Welles' radio broadcast in 1938 that caused such a panic people were leaving their homes in terror. "Though what the radio listeners heard was a portion of Orson Welles' adaptation of the well-known book, *War of the Worlds* by H. G. Wells, many of the listeners believed what they heard on the radio was real" (Rosenberg). Steven Spielberg's *War of*

the Worlds is the most recent film adaptation of this novel. It came out in 2005 and does not seem to represent faithful adaptations branch. At first sight, the plotline seems to be quite similar. In fact, the movie could be perceived as an updated version of the novel. Spielberg transferred the story from Victorian Britain to the present USA. However, the audience familiar with the book would miss the philosophical, political and social bias.

The next novel is *Heart of Darkness* by Joseph Conrad – nearly a psychoanalytic journey into the heart of the black continent - written in 1899. A steamboat captain, Marlow, tells a story about his way up the Congo river to rescue the ivory trader named Kurtz, whose methods have apparently become unsound. Deep in the jungle Kurtz has established his own ivory station charming the tribes of natives, who worship him like a fearsome god. Kurtz operates without any decency or restrains. Marlow is fascinated by the personality of Kurtz and gradually realizes the journey into the heart of Africa not only leads to Kurtz but it also leads to the basis of the human moral code, to the basis of humanity. Under the name of progress and philanthropy the European powers brutally exploit native African people. Kurtz is the final product of imperialism. In his masterpiece Conrad questions both moral issues of the imperialism and colonialism, and moral code of every human being thrown into extreme circumstances. Through his parable he depicts the strong temptation of European intellect to play god in the wild environment of savages. At the end of the journey only self-integrated being resists the temptation. This thesis will take a closer look at Francis Ford Coppola's *Apocalypse Now*, released in 1979. It is important to mention that this thesis is concerned with the director's cut version of the movie. This adaptation appears really loose in its fidelity. It moved the story from African Congo to the Vietnam War, replacing European colonialism by American war interventions. Kurtz is turned into a green beret gone mad and Marlow is captain Willard going up the river to "terminate" Kurtz's command. However, Coppola maintained the idea of the archetypal quest into the depths of human animalistic unconscious.

In 1954 William Golding wrote his *Lord of the Flies* – another horrifying allegoric story about the fragility of human moral code. In the middle of an unspecified nuclear war a group of young boys is marooned on a desert island. Without any grown-ups they strive to maintain order and stay reasonable while waiting for a rescue. However, they cannot resist the "call of the wild" and from

well-educated schoolboys they gradually descend to primitive blood-chasing animals. Golding's novel was written as an allegorical antithesis to the Victorian view of human nature. His inspiration was *The Coral Island* (1858), a novel by a Scottish author, R. M. Ballantyne, written at the height of the British Empire. Golding described the relationship between the two books, saying that "*The Coral Island* 'rotted to compost' in his mind, and in the compost 'a new myth put down roots'" (Kundu 219). In Ballantyne's novel the boys are "endlessly brave, resourceful and Christian, Golding's are frightened, anarchic and savage" (Gregor and Kinkead-Weekes). The main goal of Golding's allegory is to depict the evil within human nature and to disclose the fragility of civilization. His novel strives to prove that education and noble ideas cannot guarantee humanity. In the practical part of this thesis, the 1963 film version of Golding's novel, directed by Peter Brook, is going to be scrutinized. It is considered a faithful adaptation.

The last case of this study is a controversial novel by Anthony Burgess, *A Clockwork Orange*. His dystopian vision of a not very distant future was first published in 1962. Burgess juxtaposes the violence of an individual and the violence of the state. Alex, the main antihero, is an unscrupulous adolescent, a leader of a gang that indulges in brutal violence and sex. For all his negative features, he is very smart and has a delicate taste in music. Alex manages to escape responsibility until he is betrayed by his comrades and caught by the police. He is found guilty of murder and put into prison, where he plays innocent and finds a way to shorten his stay by undergoing a special treatment. The treatment is said to correct the prisoners so that they would not mean harm to society. Alex is brain-washed and made impotent to commit any crime. In fact, he is deprived of his right of choice between good and evil. Alex is then set free and wants to return to his old ways but is not able to do it anymore. On the contrary, he meets his former victims that now chase him and he cannot defend himself. One of his former victims forces him to attempt suicide. Alex then wakes up in the hospital, cured from the former treatment and goes back to his old ways. However, this time, he is stricken and calmed down by the oncoming adulthood revealing that the boyish violence and irresponsibility have to go. The key theme in the novel is the human right of free moral choice. The government tries to push through a treatment that deprives people of their choice to perform good or evil. "When a man cannot choose he ceases to be a man" (Burgess 67). The novel also

struggles with the topic of perverted aesthetic. Art that should cultivate human soul is, on the contrary, used to provoke images of violence and destruction. The novel is also known for its peculiar language and therefore it will be interesting to compare it with the movie version where language is not the main expressive device. Burgess owes the popularity of his novel hugely to Stanley Kubrick, whose film adaptation (1971) provoked so many controversial reactions, discussions and excitement, that its place among the best movies in the history of cinema is unmistakable. Kubrick did not use the final chapter of the book, in which Alex grows out of his old ways, as he (Kubrick) worked from the text that had been abridged by Burgess's US publisher (Morrison). However, this fact does not seem to collide with the previous chapters that are transferred quite faithfully.

The main intersecting point of the four novels is the moral issues. Each novel deals with the topic of morals and shows human characters under extreme circumstances. The task of the practical part of this thesis is to estimate to what extent the adaptations had the same impact on the audience with regard to the degree of fidelity.

3. THEORETICAL PART

3.1. Fidelity issue

The four films under analysis have been vaguely labeled as two tight, faithful, adaptations and two loose, unfaithful, adaptations. “Fidelity, it needs to be stressed, cannot profitably be used as an evaluative criterion; it can be no more than a descriptive term to designate loosely a certain kind of adaptation” (McFarlane 166). The problem with fidelity is that most film goers and film critics take it as the main (sometimes the only) criterion for their evaluation of the movie version. “At every level from newspaper reviews to longer essays in critical anthologies and journals, the adducing of fidelity to the original novel as a major criterion for judging the film adaptation is pervasive. No critical line is in greater need of re-examination – and devaluation” (McFarlane 8). In this thesis, I do not want only to judge the quality of individual movies, but I also want to estimate to what degree the film version succeeded in rendering the same kind of experience as a reader remembers from the book. It is obvious that only the audience familiar with the original novel is able to evaluate the degree and type of fidelity. The thesis wants to challenge the fidelity issue and that is why it is important to define what it means for the adaptation to be faithful or unfaithful. It also has to be specified what it is exactly the adaptation wants to be faithful to.

“The fact that one author finds ‘boringly faithful’ a film which another sees as having only ‘a tenuous relation’ to the original while yet another finds it ‘too faithful’ suggests that here is no clear consensus about what ‘faithful’ means in this discourse. Faithful to what” (McFarlane 165)? What should the adaptation be faithful to? We should at first distinguish adaptations that are faithful (tight) to the letter. In other words, they can be “read” the same way as we read the novel. In this case, it is possible to read the novel and simultaneously watch the film without much trouble. However, if the recipient wants to be precise, the relative polysemy of a written text and the relative definiteness of a picture need to be taken into account. “Fidelity criticism depends on a notion of the text as having and rendering up to the (intelligent) reader a single, correct ‘meaning’ which the film-maker has either adhered to or in some sense violated or tampered with” (McFarlane 8). What is important for the issue of fidelity is that one adaptation can only be faithful

to one of many possible connotations. Because of its different means of signification, the film seems to be too concrete to be able to adhere to such a level of abstraction as offered by the book. The viewer's dissatisfaction with the adaptation often stems from the fact that his/her impression of the novel does not always correspond with that of the film-maker. "Any given film version is able only to aim at reproducing the film-maker's reading of the original and to hope that it will coincide with that of many other readers/viewer" (McFarlane 9). And because the focus of a film-maker is also to make profit, the task to satisfy as many viewers as possible has made the quest for textual fidelity an act of fetishism. "The primary motive for fidelity in the most widely known adaptations is financial, not aesthetic" (Leitch 128). If the book is widely known and read, it is only reasonable to transfer "the thing" that is capable of charming readers into the film. Nevertheless, it does not always have to be the form that is so charming.

The second focus of this thesis are the loose or unfaithful adaptations. These adaptations do not try to be faithful to the original text but to the spirit of the novel. "There will often be a distinction between being faithful to the letter, an approach which the more sophisticated writer may suggest is no way to ensure a successful adaptation, and to the spirit or essence of the work" (McFarlane 9). The spirit or essence of the novel is not mere reading and perceiving the story. There is some deeper message that emerges from the story but would not necessarily emerge from the direct transfer. The film-makers are aware of the limits of the film medium so they seek to find ways in which to retain the same deeper structure but, sometimes, at the expense of changes. Therefore, these adaptations do collide with the textual fidelity. "Central to literary film rivalries, fidelity to the spirit of a text is typically accompanied by an insistence on the necessity of infidelity to its letter or form" (Elliott 139). More interestingly, the adaptation in its seeking for the means of expression sometimes goes outside the lines that the novel has established and reaches an artistic goal other than that of the novel. The viewer familiar with the original novel then has the chance to go back to the novel and read it in quite a different light. "Adaptations are condemned as unfaithful because critics read only one way – from novel to film – and find that the film has made changes. But if one reads in both directions – from novel to film and then from film back to novel – one often finds the alleged infidelities clearly in the text" (Elliott 157).

The question of fidelity is rather a complicated one and that my original distinction between tight and loose should be particularized, for the sake of this study, as textual and spiritual fidelity. These two terms are not the actual names for adaptation types. They serve as the two opposite poles of one scale. The type of an adaptation, with regard to fidelity, is placed somewhere between these two poles. In other words the adaptation is, to some extent, a mixture of a textual and a spiritual fidelity. One of the aims of this thesis is to justify the spiritual fidelity that is often condemned as unfaithful. "The faithful adaptation can certainly be intelligent and attractive, but is not necessarily to be preferred to the film which sees the original as the raw material to be reworked" (McFarlane 11). In the next chapter, the thesis examines different approaches to adaptations.

3.2. Types of Adaptations

Quite a few authors have focused on the categorization of adaptations and the purpose of this chapter is to list the most influential ones. "Some writers have proposed strategies which seek to categorize adaptations so that fidelity to the original loses some of its privileged position" (McFarlane 10).

Geoffrey Wagner distinguishes three main types of adaptation: transposition, analogy and commentary (In Helmanová 134). Transposition means plainly to bring the novel to the screen. This kind of adaptation can be watched as the receiver goes through the pages of the respective novel, not noticing any differences. Commentary stands for an adaptation where the original material is changed to some extent by author's deliberate intention. Analogy is a major departure from the literary text, resulting in completely different piece of art.

Michael Klein and Gillian Parker introduced a very similar three-member model of adaptation: fidelity to the main thrust of the narrative; keeping the basic structure of the narrative while the actual text is interpreted or deconstructed; taking an original novel as a raw material, as a starting point for the creation of different art form (In Helmanová 134).

Dudley Andrew also recognizes three main approaches to literary material: borrowing, transformation and intersecting (In Helmanová 134). Borrowing can be applied to anything. A film-maker may borrow an idea, a character, a topic, a chosen scene. Transformation means that the literary source undergoes a change caused by the character of the film medium. Transformation is, however, aimed at reproducing the main features of the original novel. "The film can be faithful either to the text or to the spirit" (Helmanová 135). This approach is very important for this thesis because it is concerned with these two types of fidelity. What Andrew calls intersecting is a film's view of the literary source or its reflection. "The original has a life of its own in the film" (Helmanová 135).

Brian McFarlane distinguishes between transferable elements of the novel and those elements that need adaptation strategies. His approach is adopted in this thesis and will be discussed in greater detail later on in this thesis.

Kamilla Elliott classifies "six mostly unofficial concepts of adaptation that split form from content in various ways to account for the process of adaptation" (Elliott 134). She compares the form and content distinction to that of body and soul. In

the psychic concept of adaptation the soul has to abandon the body to create an independent entity. "An adaptation has to leave behind the literary corpse" (Elliott 139). The ventriloquist concept of adaptation seems to be the opposite of the psychic one. It empties out the body/form and fills it with a new filmic spirits. However, these new spirits are not completely new because they are present in the form as a potentiality. The genetic concept of adaptation claims there is some "deep narrative structure akin to genetic structure, awaiting ... a manifesting substance in much the same way the genetic material awaits manifesting substance in the cells and tissues of the body" (Elliott 150). Genetic material – the deep structure – is able to take another form. This approach overlaps with McFarlane's concept of deep narrative elements directly transferable to the new medium. The de(re)composing concept of adaptation takes some elements from the original, decomposes them and the recomposes the results creating something new. The new thing could be, for instance, a character's unfulfilled desires or disappointed hopes. In a way it can serve as a means to fulfill a film-maker's wishful thinking. The incarnational concept of adaptation is simply the word made flesh. As film historian Jim Hitt says: "We long to see the physical reality of a cherished novel or sort story, to see the ethereal become solid, touchable" (In Elliott 165). The last type, according to Elliot, is the trumping concept of adaptation. This kind of adaptation seeks to correct the mistakes of the source novel. "The adapting film claims to have represented the signified better" (Elliott 174). It could be seen as an act of literary criticism. Sometimes the film-maker might use this concept to update the literary source so that it is understandable for contemporary audience.

Thomas Leitch presents more strategies creating a logical progression from a faithful adaptation to an allusion. Celebrations are an umbrella term for adaptations that celebrate the power of its original (Leitch 96). They include curatorial adaptations, replications, homage and heritage adaptations. These kinds of adaptations favour the novel over the film. Pictorial realizations, in contrast, celebrate the cinema's ability to render things that words can say only indirectly. They are an umbrella term for liberations and literalizations. Liberations claim to free the material of a literary source from its repressions or decorum. For example, in contemporary film adaptations of Victorian novels the recipient feels the liberation from the prudishness of 19th century. Literalizations are equal to Elliot's

incarnational concept, the word made flesh. Next umbrella term and “by far the most common approach to adaptation is adjustment” (Leitch 98). The source text is rendered more suitable for the cinematic adaptation. It includes variety of strategies. Compression by means of elision and omission shortens the long novel to be more suitable for filming. Expansion is the opposite tendency used when working with short stories. Correction resembles Elliott’s trumping concept. It corrects the flaws of the source novel. It could also mean offering happy end instead of the gloomy one. Updating is used “to transpose the settings of a canonical classic to the present in order to show its universality ...” (Leitch 100). The last adjustment type is superimposition. It is the situation when something has to be done with the source material because of a reason imposed on the process. It can be, for example, the constrained budget of the film-maker. Another type of adaptation strategy, according to Leitch, is so called neoclassical imitation. It takes the original story and communicates it by its own artistic choice. Leitch offers an example of relocating Shakespeare’s story to a time and place that are both historically specific and contrary to fact – a 1930s fascist England (103). Revisions seek to transform their source beyond adjustment. They resemble Elliott’s psychic concept, but they aim at altering the spirit as well. Colonization is an approach that resembles Elliott’s ventriloquist concept. It sees the original as an empty box to be filled with new meanings. Next, adaptation that displays the problems involved in producing a text is called (meta)commentary or deconstruction. Leitch also says that parody and pastiche are forms of adaptation but they are difficult to classify and locate on the continuum from adaptation to allusion (116). Last category according to Leitch is that of allusion.

“Very general nature of all these categorizations shows that adaptations can be classified only vaguely, with the respect to the most universal features of them” (Helmanová 136). Nevertheless, at the end of each section of the practical part of his thesis, some of the suggested strategies might prove useful in classifying the respective type of adaptation. After the examination based on the same framework they should be more susceptible to classification.

3.3. Different means of expression

Both a novel and a film feature different means of expression. A pioneering figure in this field, George Bluestone, claims that “between the percept of the visual image and the concept of the mental image lies root difference between the two media” (In McFarlane 4). The concept of written sign is richer in possible meaning than the relatively stable and precise visual image. On the other side, “[i]t is nowadays a common thing to read that this or that novelist had borrowed certain devices from the cinema, and it is generally true enough” (Cranskshaw 180). From the late nineteenth century writers have been breaking with the traditional representational novels. The ways in which they started to express their thoughts resembled the new kind of media – cinematography. “We learn to read the ostensibly unmediated visual language of later nineteenth-century novel in a way that anticipates the viewer’s experience of film which necessarily presents those physical surfaces” (McFarlane 5). From this point of view, it could seem as if the comparison between the means of expression of both novel and film should gradually lose its importance because the two media are now too close to each other that they can overlap. However, this chapter attempts to show that it still plays a relevant role. Bluestone was definitely right claiming the difference between the two signifying systems.

“The verbal sign, with its low iconicity and high symbolic function, works conceptually, whereas the cinematic sign, with its high iconicity and uncertain symbolic function, works directly, sensuously, perceptually” (McFarlane 27). In an adaptation a film-maker has to find a respective visual representation of verbal signs but there is a big chance his representation will not be satisfactory for the readers of the source novel. “We very well know that the film expresses itself by its own language and that what is written could be visually and compositionally expressed by thousand kinds of ways” (Pudovkin, “*Film, Scénár*” 17). The concrete adaptation leaves only limited scope for the imagination that simply cannot be compared with that of a novel. However, it proves important to examine whether the adaptation leaves any space for the recipient’s imagination. An important aspect of the high iconicity of the film is the film-maker’s occasional need for mitigated visualization of what is suggested by the novel. “The writer does not have to put any limits: in the literary piece, where words have aesthetic

function, even the most brutal scenes are perceived as an artistic image” (Strusková 171). However, in the film there ought to be a distinction between the pointless depictions of brutality and purposeful artistic expression.

McFarlane states that the novel is linear whereas the film is spatial (27). It means that from a novel a reader learns things linearly one by one as he/she goes through the lines. In a film, however, at one point a viewer can learn many things simultaneously. What a writer describes on several pages could be expressed by one look at the screen. The word by word reading of a novel cannot be compared to the frame by frame watching of a film. “The frame is never registered as a discrete entity in the way the word is” (McFarlane 27). What is more, the film provides information of sensual complexity. “The novel draws on wholly verbal sign system, the film variously, and sometimes simultaneously, on visual, aural, and verbal signifiers” (McFarlane 26).

There is a difference between the writer’s power over readers and the film-maker’s limited power over viewers. The writer has absolute control of what the reader knows and over the order in which the reader gets to know information. “Films are too more or less narrated by their authors but we see and hear more than the author might have planned” (Monaco 42). In a way, the viewer has a certain freedom to pick from the scene in the film a different detail than the film-maker wanted him/her to fasten on. “Words are always the same on the page but the picture on the screen keeps changing according to the direction of our attention. The film, in this sense, represents much richer experience” (Monaco 43). Nevertheless, the recipient’s sense of the author’s idiosyncrasy is suppressed in the film. This aspect is very much connected with the film adaptation of literary works because the recipient familiar with the source novel feels a loss of the authorial voice. “The film’s story does not have to be told because it is presented” (McFarlane 29).

The next aspect to be mentioned is the specific language codes. “One of the prominent privileges of the novel is its capacity for manipulation with the words” (Monaco 44). The cinema does not have a language as such (not as a major means of expression), but it certainly has a system of conventions or codes very similar to those of language. These conventions are generally understood by the viewers who are familiar with the ascribed meaning of the codes. “When we witness a film, we share with the film’s maker a basic assumption that we know the

codes” (McFarlane 29). By using these codes in an innovative way a certain space for the recipient’s imagination can be opened. By this space for the recipient’s imagination the film-maker contributes to the artistic value of the adaptation. At this point, also the film-maker’s imagination and his/her knowing ways to surpass the limits of the medium should be mentioned. “Novel and film can share the same story, the same ‘raw materials’, but they are distinguished by means of different plot strategies which alter sequence, highlight different emphases, which – in a word – defamiliarize the story. In this respect, of course, the use of two separate systems of signification will also play a crucial distinguishing role” (McFarlane 23). McFarlane distinguishes the language codes by which he means the actual text or speeches, the visual codes through which recipients do not merely see but also interpret, the non-linguistic sound codes which include both musical and other aural codes and cultural codes which describes the specific culture of the specific time and space (29).

Monaco indicates that film works in the real time and therefore is limited (41). When reading a novel the reader has the opportunity to stop and reflect. The reader can go back and forward just by turning a page. There is a freedom to postpone further reading in order to do some research on the subject matter. The point is that a film goes on regardless of the possibility that the recipient is missing important clues, and that is why the expressive matter appearing on the screen has to be clear enough. The film is also limited by space. “In the transfer from book to film the details disappear almost without an exception” (Monaco 42).

To sum up, stemming from the difference between the two signifying systems, many things should be kept in mind in order to judge the film that, from its nature, has to remain an independent medium with its own means of expression and conventions. The film adaptation should transfer meanings, not words. When watching an adaptation one cannot seek for equivalents on the level of words but on the level of broader semantic units, e.g. characters, settings, time relations, atmosphere, etc. “Film enriches the recipient’s experience by adding anthropological qualities” (Mravcová 10). In other words, the medium of a film closely resembles live experience. However, the film leaves limited space for the imaginative work of the recipient. In the film the story is presented, not told by the personality of the author. Nevertheless, the loss of the author is also the loss of the controller of the recipient’s focus. Both systems of expression have their

specific codes and conventions but they influence each other a lot. "Film and literature have the permanent tendency to both merge together and split" (Casetti 74). The recipient should be familiar with these codes in order to judge a film adaptation objectively.

3.4. Textual fidelity

3.4.1. Transfer or Adaptation: Barthes – McFarlane – terminology

The focus of this chapter is, on the one hand, to find those elements of the novel's text that can be directly transferred to a film medium and, on the other hand, those elements that can not. It is, therefore, concerned mainly with the textual fidelity. Roland Barthes's early work, *Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives* (1966), did not deal with the cinema but for the film theorist, Brian McFarlane, it provided a fruitful source of terminology that should prove useful also for this thesis. Structuralist approach tried to grasp and systematize objectively distinguishable elements of a text regardless of their interpretation which is subjective. "It refuses the 'obvious' meaning of the story and seeks instead to isolate certain 'deep' structures within it, which are not apparent on the surface" (Eagleton 83). Literature is not the only medium able to render these structures. "The structuralist method implicitly questioned literature's claim to be a unique form of discourse" (Eagleton 93). These deep structures can be found in whichever medium. Therefore, structuralism provides a systematic framework for an equal juxtaposition of novel and film. McFarlane uses the term "transfer" for everything that can be almost directly transferred into film. The other term, "adaptation", is the process when the film-maker has to look for filmic equivalents for the novel elements (13).

3.4.2. Transfer

"Transfer is feasible for the things connected with the narrative, not bound to one semiotic system. That is why they can be directly transferred into film" (Helmanová 135). The most apparent feature literature and film have in common is their capacity of narrating a story. "The narrative potential of film medium is such that it did not make its closest bond with painting or drama but with a novel" (Monaco 41). Narrative is central for both novel and film. It seems to be woven into the deep structure of the text and that is why it is not fixed on the type of medium. As Levi-Strauss would put it, narratives bear even the worst translation just as myths do (In Mravcová 136). Narrative can be treated objectively and it is the chief transferable element. "Narrative seems to me to offer the best and most obvious starting-point

for comparative study” (McFarlane 202). Narrative means the basic story-line populated by major and minor characters (their functions), events gradually influencing the unfolding story. The terminology of Roland Barthes, elaborated by Brian McFarlane, distinguishes the distributional (functions proper) and integrational (indices) functions of the narrative. The former refer to actions and events – they are the horizontal axis of the story so they unfold linearly and they are also the main transferable elements of the novel. The integrational functions refer to the vertical axis of the story. They denote psychology of the characters, atmosphere, representation of place, etc. They function in a pervasive rather than linear way.

The most translatable distributional functions are further subdivided into the “risky moments of the narrative” called cardinal functions, and catalysers. The cardinal functions will be the basic category to be observed in the practical part of this thesis. They are the main points of the narrative, “opening up the alternatives of consequence to the development of the story” (McFarlane 13). They are referred to as “risky moments” because the reader or viewer recognizes there is more than one possible consequence of the given moment in the story. The risky moment could be imagined as the source from which the possibilities are stretched out. Only one of them is eventually fulfilled and connected with another risky moment, etc. If linked together these moments form the bare bones of the narrative on chronological and logical basis. These functions should be relatively easy to maintain in the film version of the novel and the film-maker focused on a faithful adaptation should try to preserve them in his work. In any case, it is the film-maker’s choice to withdraw from the original plot. “He can, of course, put his own stamp on the work by omitting or reordering those narrative elements which are transferable or by inventing new ones of his own” (McFarlane 26). The catalysers are supportive and complementary to the cardinal functions. Their point is to root the action performed by cardinal functions (e.g. laying the table for the meal – which gives rise to cardinal function). They are not as “risky” as the cardinal functions and do not contribute to the current of the storyline. Nevertheless, McFarlane claims that both cardinal functions and catalysers are directly transferable from one medium to another because they are independent of language (14).

The integrational functions are further subdivided into indices proper and informants. Indices proper are related to elements such as character or atmosphere and are therefore hardly amenable to direct transfer. However, the informants are “pure data with immediate signification” (McFarlane 14). They are easy to transfer because they introduce concepts as names, ages and professions of characters, details of physical settings, etc. In other words, they represent ready-made material for the transfer. They share some features with catalysers.

An important fact is that the distributional functions constitute the formal content of the story. This content is abstract and independent of the medium, and that is why it should be easily transferable. On the other side, the integrational functions breathe life into this content. “They help to embed this formal content into realized world, giving specificity to its abstraction” (McFarlane 15). Yet, in the real world the particular realization is also the matter of concrete medium, that is why the direct transfer is more complicated. It is possible when treating the ready-made material (e.g. names) but on the level of atmosphere and psychology the direct transfer seems dependent on the medium. What is needed here is a respective equivalent based on the means of expression.

3.4.3. Adaptation

The necessity of adaptation strategies for the integrational functions has been already mentioned. Among them, especially indices proper need a treatment of a film-maker. “Of course, the inner life of man is accessible even for the film, but film gets to it by a difficult associative way” (Strusková 170).

These concepts are tightly connected with the next important element of the novel – the kind of narration. Whereas a narrative is not restricted by the medium, kinds of narration are so specific to the written language they are difficult to sustain in the film.

Three of the case studies in this thesis exercise the first-person narration approach in which the whole narrative is filtered through the mind of one character. One way of the cinematic treatment of this problem is a very peculiar point-of-view succession of shots. Yet, this subjective cinema has the status of curiosity and is not performed in any of our case adaptations. Another way of dealing with the first-person narration is the oral narration or voice-over. In this case a recipient actually hears the voice of the character presenting parts of the

storyline. "It cannot be more than intermittent as distinct from the continuing nature of the novelistic first-person narration" (McFarlane 16). Stemming from the fact that everything the character's voice says is immediately made flesh on the screen, the experience of everything being filtered through the character's consciousness loses its privilege. "One now sees everything that camera sees, not just what impressed itself on the hero-narrator's imaginative responsiveness" (McFarlane 16). In the novel the character who narrates the story does not have to necessarily be involved in the particular event (he/she just comments on events not involving himself/herself), whereas in the voice-over film it is very often the case.

This thesis is also aimed at one novel employing the omniscient kind of narration. It means the events, characters and the story are presented by a narrator, apparently knowing and seeing everything that happens in the world of the novel. The narrator also has the access to the minds of characters. Characters present themselves via direct speeches but the context of the speech is again introduced by the omniscient narrator. In the cinematic practice the camera may see everything the omniscient eye sees but cannot comment on, cannot add any philosophical bias or describe the inner life of protagonists. However, thanks to its sensual complexity, the film medium features devices that enable the film-maker to displace the verbally created reality even though sometimes only in the symbolic way of codes and conventions (music, angles of camera, positioning of characters, gestures, details, off-screen and on-screen space). "We also hear a great deal about the art of montage or cutting, that art which obviates monotony, heightens suspense, and shows a given subject from various angles of vision, which strengthens the film by enriching its texture, which affords freely the brilliant delight of contrast and which brings into the space of a few moments of time a significant juxtaposition of aspects and scenes" (Cranshaw 180). These devices, unfortunately, can never displace extensive inner monologues of characters presented in the novel. This is where the advantage of the previously mentioned voice-over could be seen.

In a way, all films are omniscient because "the viewer is aware of a level of objectivity in what is shown, which may include what the protagonist sees but cannot help including a great deal else as well" (McFarlane 18). It is far more difficult for a film-maker than for a writer to make a recipient focus on the specific

subject in the screen because the recipient cannot help perceiving the picture as a whole. Nevertheless, the visual omniscience of a film cannot compete with the descriptiveness of a book, because the book describes more than just a visual side of its reality.

Even though one shot of the camera could show a lot more than a few pages in the book, the omniscient or the first-person narrator of the novel are subjectively perceived as knowing more than one gets from the cinematic narration. It is connected with the past tense used in novels. In the film the viewer does not know that much in advance as a film is perceived rather as the present tense experience.

There are essentially two basic elements, narrative and narration, to be shifted from the novel to the film as far as the textual side of the novel is concerned. Narrative is independent of the semiotic system because it exists at the deep level of whatever medium and it is therefore easy to transfer. Narration represents “the whole expressive apparatus that governs the presentation – and reception of the narrative” (McFarlane 20). It is more or less bound to the means of expression of the particular medium. In the practical part of this study all transferable elements will be localized and distinguished from those that need an adapting process of the new semiotic system. It will be exercised to what extent the film transfers all the easily transferable elements and, second, to what extent the film provides a cinematic equivalence for the elements specific to a novel.

3.5. Spiritual fidelity

An interdisciplinary scholar, Christopher Orr, adduces that “[a] good adaptation must be faithful to the spirit of its literary source” (In Elliott 136). Spiritual fidelity is not concerned with the text but rather with the content inside it. Inevitably, the objectivism of the structuralist approach has to be abandoned for the sake of an interpretation which is subjective.

The objectively found elements/structures of the text are to be interpreted and juxtaposed with those of the film not only in terms of the textual fidelity but also in terms of the spiritual fidelity. This will be possible if there is a meaning

ascribed to those elements. It should be mentioned that even those “objectively found elements” are to some extent localized subjectively.

The next thing that has to be treated is the historical context of the novel and its possible actualization/updating in the film. “Adapting a literary source did not prevent film-makers from introducing contemporary social problems” (Leitch 31). By the actualization the film-maker highlights the timelessness of the novel’s ideas and makes them relevant for the contemporary recipient.

“The spirit of a text is commonly equated with the spirit or personality of the author” (Elliott 136). The author’s idiosyncrasy that is contained within the novel is another spiritual element that the film-maker might want to capture. For instance, when reading *Heart of Darkness* the reader somehow feels that Conrad really wrote from his own experience. This spirit may include the author’s intention, imagination or style. Algernon Swinburne would say that the novel is what it is because the author was what he was (In Elliott 137). “The spirit of the text passes from author to novel to reader-filmmaker to film to viewer” (Elliott 137). In other words, by the act of adhering to the authorial spirit the film-maker does not have to deny his/her own idiosyncrasy. The outcome is, in a way, a collective work of both the author of the original and the film-director.

The most important feature that interconnects all previously mentioned ones is the film’s agreement with the novel’s main themes and motifs. The film-maker has more options to choose from. First, he/she can maintain and support the theme of the precursor novel. Second, he/she can twist the focus and introduce a new theme. Third, he/she can maintain the original theme and add some new one. The last option is the most interesting. In this case a new artistic value is created on the basis of a literary subject. It is transformed by means of a different aesthetic code. Therefore, there is an opportunity to see the new cinematographic work as an act of interpretation that multiplies the field of meanings (Mravcová 6). “This is how one distinctive value becomes an impulse for the birth of a new value – and this is perhaps the most important outcome of the dialogue between art forms and cultural epochs” (Mravcová 18). The value added is something that allows the recipient, who is familiar with the source novel, to get more from its meanings. Helmanová says that the recipient aims at establishing a unity that is neither just a book nor just a film; and the perception heads towards a synthesis that exists only in the recipient’s mind and nowhere else; therefore the final product is a virtual

piece of work (143). This could be seen as taking the idea of the previous paragraph one level further, because this virtual piece of work is basically a mixture of the book, the film and, additionally, the recipient's individual consciousness.

Fidelity to the literary source is the main issue of many film critics, but this thesis aims at its confrontation with quality and artistic value. The relationship between fidelity and quality will be the point closing each particular analysis.

4. PRACTICAL PART

4.1. The War of the Worlds

Spielberg's treatment of the novel's elements is very specific and, to some extent, unusual. The procedure of this case study will be to localize transferable elements from the novel and confront them with their assumed counterparts in the movie. The main transferable elements are represented by the major characters and the cardinal functions. The cardinal functions stand for the succession of the important events of the story as they appear one by one. These elements of the narrative are not dependent on the medium and, therefore, are susceptible to direct transfer (if the film-maker wants to). In the next section of the analysis the contribution to the main themes and motifs of both the novel and the movie will be discussed. The case study will finish with a summary.

4.1.1. Treatment of the main characters and cardinal functions

There is a difference in the usage of the main characters and their functions in the novel and in the movie. The main character and also the narrator in the novel is a respected man with scientific education and knowledge, a philosopher interested in the issue of morality. In order to show other locations where the narrator is not present, in several chapters the narrator tells the story of his brother, who is also very reasonable and logically thinking. It seems that these two men do not have a counterpart in the movie as far as their inner attributes are concerned. Nevertheless, they both have to undergo a journey under disastrous circumstances which connects them with the character of Ray from Spielberg's adaptation. Compared to the narrator in the novel, Ray is not a reliable character. He is an ordinary worker, neither respected nor educated. He is, in fact, an anti-hero who acts like a child at the beginning of the movie. As the movie unfolds Ray's character changes from a careless man to a responsible hero-like father. In the novel the personality of the narrator does not change. The changes take place in the narrator's opinions and beliefs. The contemplative nature of the narrator in the novel allows him to comment on and discuss serious questions about human morality, British imperialism, natural selection or religion.

The artilleryman in the novel represents the military. On the one hand, he seems rational and organized but, on the other hand, he ends up as a drunkard and a devoted gambler capable of playing games instead of taking his responsibility. With his eloquence and fighting spirit he acts like a demagogue who is capable of charming the desperate narrator. He introduces the point of view of a bankrupted soldier who wants to take the opportunity of being a leader of a revolting movement. The artilleryman seems to have two counterparts in the movie. The first one is Ray's adolescent son, Robbie, who would like to join the army and fight the aliens but he does not realize his decisions are imprudent and immature. With his apparent reason and organization the artilleryman also resembles the man who offers Ray a shelter in the movie. His name is Ogilvy (without any purpose, he shares the same name as a minor character from the beginning of the novel). Like in the novel, the superficial nature of this character is revealed shortly also in the movie. The man from the movie also turns to be a demagogue, cruel enough to sacrifice others to save his own life.

The character of the curate in the novel represents the religion. After watching the destruction of the symbols of his faith he proves only a feeble burden to the narrator. By descending to primitive instincts the curate demonstrates the hypocrisy of the church. The novel suggests that the religion is not practical in earthly matters unless it is coactive with the common sense. The curate's movie counterpart is to be found, again, in the character of Ogilvy. However, the only resemblance lies in the cause of their insanity and their eventual fight with the main character. In the movie the fight scene is, from Ray's point of view, a matter of protecting one's relatives, whereas the novel features a symbolical fight between religion and common sense.

The character of Ray's daughter, Rachel, does not have a counterpart in the novel. She functions as Ray's motivation or stimulus to go on and prove to be a good father. In this motivational aspect she resembles the narrator's wife from the novel. She may also stand for both women from the precursor novel that the narrator's brother has to take care of. On the one hand, she acts almost hysterically at any contact with danger but, on the other hand, she is sometimes capable of very reasonable decisions and proves courage. Rachel adds a sentimental and kitschy flavour to the movie. It seems that her major function is to cry and weep, to want her dad to sing her a lullaby, etc.

As far as the aliens are concerned, Spielberg's tripods are powerful and menacing as suggested by the book, but the actual creatures are quite different. While in the novel they can barely move and are impotent without their machines, in the movie version they do not seem to be affected by any handicap. Spielberg does not follow Wells's concerns about evolution. The novel suggests that the Martians are but brains entering different bodies, but there is nothing like that in the movie. The aliens are not called "the Martians" in the movie since nowadays people know there is no life on Mars.

Characters constitute a crucial part of the narrative and especially in *The War of the Worlds* the representatives of common sense, science, military or religion are irreplaceable. They represent different levels of the social ladder and are important for creating the context for looking on the impact of the disastrous situation from different angles. Even though all important characters are somehow preserved in the movie they often function only as black-and-white shortcuts. Essentially, by omitting or recreating the novel's main characters the movie does not create the sufficient context for adhering to many important themes and motifs suggested by the novel. Instead, Spielberg chose to trace family relationships and by doing so contributed to the shallowness of the movie version.

As for the cardinal functions, both the novel's and the film's plotlines could be vaguely described as a very eventful and revealing journeys in order to escape a disaster. The main character undergoes a journey maintaining his reason against all the madness he sees around. He also seems to be privileged to glimpse things that stay hidden for the others. "For that moment I touched an emotion beyond the common range of men ..." (Wells 403). To be more concrete, it should prove appropriate to contrast the two plotlines of both journeys in more detail.

Spielberg changed the concept of the aliens falling to the Earth in cylinders. Instead, it is suggested that the fighting machines were buried deep underground millions of years before. It is also suggested that the lightning bolts that hit the ground bring the machines alive. This concept may seem even scarier than the original one. It makes the aliens' plans more elaborated. It is a breath of fresh air into the genre of alien-invasion movies. On the other side, the movie is deprived of the original excitement and suspense caused by the unknown object fallen from the sky and its slow evolvement from the harmless creature almost incapable of motion to the menacing fighting machine. There is no space for the image of the

alarmed army, the psychology of the crowd or the disastrous communication attempt. The issue of colonialism is better suggested by the cylinders falling one by one as in the novel.

The reactions of the narrator in the novel and Ray in the movie are similar. They try to go and protect themselves and their relatives. They make a first moral flaw by taking the vehicle from a person who is not aware of the danger. Only the narrator in the novel makes an attempt to return the vehicle. This attempt serves as the context for the narrator's departure with his wife. On his way back to his town he sees the fighting machine for the first time. He also encounters the artilleryman and the curate successively. The narrator has the opportunity to see the growing panic as the aliens move ahead through the impotent soldiers or citizens. He also happens to watch the destruction of one fighting machine by the artillery. The three characters in the movie do not encounter any important person in the middle section of the movie. They arrive at the house of Ray's ex-wife and spend the night in the basement. It creates the context for developing the family relationships, but the inner psychology of the crowd suggested by the book cannot be treated. The narrator in the novel is capable of self-reflection. He comments on his losing common sense when being part of the big crowd. Since he encounters people from different social groups he is able to comment on the nature of individuals as well as the crowd as a mass. These various subtleties eventually draw the big picture of all kinds of men descending to brutes.

The new event in the movie is the wreckage of the Boeing 737 and the news-reporter informing about the origin of the aliens and their advancement all over the world. This is probably another movie shortcut in order to show that the aliens are really powerful and merciless. In the movie the aliens attack all over the world, whereas in the novel their attack is focused on England. In the novel there is a stronger notion of the colonizing empire being colonized. In the novel the narrator describes more forms of the alien attack and more weapons and machines to show the versatility and organization of the aliens. The aliens in the novel destroy the symbols of human culture purposefully, leaving humans to descend into savagery. The novel, again, represents the aliens' growing power over the human empire better. Moreover, everything is described in almost scientific detail, which supports the reliability of the novel.

In the middle section of the movie the three characters undergo the same exodus as the narrator's brother in the novel. They also see dead bodies in the river and they are robbed of their vehicle by the excited crowd. They also happen to have a gun to protect themselves like the narrator's brother in the novel. They manage to get on a ferry as well, but the turn of events is different from the novel. In the novel many people cannot get on the board because the boats are already overcrowded by people. In the movie, they cannot get on the ferry because there are cars on board. It is, therefore, suggested that nowadays the expensive cars (or things as such) are felt more valuable than human lives. In the movie there is a disastrous scene of the ferry being turned over by the alien fighting machine but there is no warship showing bravery as in the novel. In the novel there is a sign of hope for the humankind. It shows many times that the aliens are not invulnerable and can be defeated by human power. People are welded together by seeing the tripod destroyed by the warship. The movie is rather pessimistic in this respect. Spielberg's tripods have special protecting shield that makes human weapons impotent. Therefore, in the movie there is almost no chance that the aliens could be eliminated by human power or bravery. The only chance is to wait for a miracle.

The three characters, having survived the massacre of the overturned ferry, see the people being caught by the fighting machines. Then, they see human clothes falling from the sky. There is no such scene in the novel. It is a suggestive image of humans being deprived of something that actually makes them humanlike. "Spielberg indirectly points at experience that humankind remembers. The refugees remind of Jewish transports" (Spáčilová, *"Válka Světů"*). Spáčilová evidently points to the scene of the exodus or the scene with the burning train. The notion of a systematic genocide is introduced both in the novel and in the movie.

Robbie's eventual departure from his relatives in order to see the fight and Ray's decision to let him go and stay with his daughter could symbolize Robbie's maturity. Family issues are present throughout the movie and in the movie only. There is a sign of the war-fever and wanting to see the fight, resembling the narrator's excitement when going back to return the borrowed cart. "I wanted to be in at the death" (Wells 266). The fighting spirit of Robbie stands for the mood of the Americans after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

The movie scene in the basement is a counterpart of the scene from the novel in which the narrator and the curate are trapped in a deserted house close to

the landing point of a fallen cylinder. In the novel the opportunity to watch the Martians from the closest possible point of view creates the context for the contemplative passage in which the narrator thinks about natural selection, evolution and alien advanced technologies. The movie version shows the aliens closely, but without any commentary. They search the house seemingly only because Spielberg wanted to show them in the movie. In the movie this basement is where Ray encounters Ogilvy and has to face their escalating conflict. Ogilvy's speech and fighting spirit substitute the deep contemplative speech of the artilleryman from the novel. In the novel the soldier speaks about the human nature and meditates about the plans of the aliens from the survivor's point of view. He also introduces an alternative way of life of the surviving resistance. In the movie the character of Ogilvy partially represents these thoughts, but it is only another shortcut not comparable with the novel. The fight of the two men in which Ray kills mad Ogilvy proves Ray's parental qualities. Almost all the important topics suggested by the novel are suppressed by the struggle to protect one's relatives. Moreover, in the film there are no consequences of the murder which contributes to the shallow psychology of the characters. The narrator in the novel is haunted by guilty conscience and remorse even though he does not directly kill the curate. He eventually stands his own inner trial before his conscience and God.

A completely new episode in the movie in which Rachel is caught by the fighting machine and Ray rescues her causing the inner explosion and collision of the machine seems without a purpose except for the news that the machines are, after all, vulnerable. The sensation of defeated humankind after Ray's ascent from the basement closely resembles the narrator's coming out from the deserted house under the Martian's foot. Everything is covered with the red weed and the land seems like an unknown planet.

In the end of the movie, the alien fighting machines are shown to be struck by an unknown phenomenon which makes them lose their shield and they become vulnerable. The movie displays the actual killing of the alien tripod by the terrestrial weapons. In the novel the narrator comes to desolated London and finds the dying tripod howling desperately. He slowly realizes that the domination of the Martians is over and he thanks God. He comments on the nature of the alien's decline and wonders about the human birthright of the earth. The novel suggests the contrast

between the advanced technologies of the Martians and the smallest and the simplest organisms that eventually killed them. The usage of the terrestrial weapons in the movie reduces the intensity of this contrast.

Eventually, in the movie, Ray and Rachel are reunited with Robbie. Robbie calls Ray father for the first time. The resolution supports the family issue. In the last chapters of the novel, the narrator reunites, too, with his relatives, but he also comments on the development of science and contemplates the future of humankind. The novel suggests that people learned a lesson about their vanity. The movie concludes with the reunited family and the philosophical bias is left as a backdrop.

Spielberg maintained the most important cardinal functions, transferring them into the movie version. Sometimes they are altered, merged with one another or presented in different order. In Spielberg's adaptation the cardinal functions often do not use their full potential. They fail to create the proper context for introducing important themes and motifs. Instead, these important issues are only indirectly suggested and used as a backdrop for the development of family relationships. On the other hand, some scenes were newly invented. They often seem to be introduced rather for the sake of showing off the visual skilfulness of Spielberg's team and they seldom create the context for any important message.

4.1.2. The treatment of chosen themes and motifs

This thesis focuses on the theme of morality. In the case of *The War of the Worlds* it seems to be coloured and supported by the issue of colonialism and imperialism.

By the merciless conquerors from the outer space Wells reflected the British Empire on the peak of its expansion. Wells criticizes the self-centred complacency of the imperialistic power from the point of view of the natives, the colonized nations that do not know what to expect from the invaders. The philosophy of Darwinism and natural selection was used by the colonizers to justify the atrocious genocides upon the wild nations. "And we men, the creatures who inhabit this earth, must be to them at least as alien and lowly as are the monkeys and lemurs to us" (Wells 215). Like the colonizing nations the alien surpass the humankind in technologies and intelligence. They test their flying vehicle while people learn how to ride a bicycle. Wells suggests that the seemingly meritorious enlightenment and education practiced upon the wild nations cannot justify the real horrors and

suffering of natives. “Are we such apostles of mercy as to complain if the Martians warred in the same spirit” (Wells 216)?

The wild natives may consider the invaders harmless at first sight. People in the novel firstly consider the aliens harmless creatures scared to death in their pit. Similar to the colonizing powers, the aliens are harmless without their vehicles and machines. Humans’ interpretation of the invaders’ behaviour is suggested to resemble the animal’s interpretations of human deeds. The carelessness of the aliens fighting without any provocation could be seen as an unscrupulous children’s play. “He had swept it out of existence, as it seemed, without any provocation, as a boy might crush an ant-hill, in the mere wantonness of power” (Wells 441). The narrator of the novel realizes the change of perspective. “I felt ... a sense of dethronement, a persuasion that I was no longer a master, but an animal among the animals, under the Martian heel” (Wells 403). As the wild people had their troubles to keep their peculiar customs under the colonizers’ feet, the dethroned people have their troubles to maintain humanity and not to descent to the level of brutes. The curate asks “who are these Martians” and the narrator answers “who are we” (Wells 301). The question of the contemplative narrator really makes the reader think.

Spielberg moved the story a hundred years further from the original into the present America. The issue of imperialism and colonialism is still a topical one, but now the colonizing empire is not Britain. “Spielberg’s *The War of the Worlds* comes out at the time when America is criticized for its imperialistic attitudes” (Adamovič). Spielberg seems to be reflecting the imperialistic behavior of America as a global super-power. “Spielberg’s version draws inspiration from the current ‘scourge of men’ – terrorism” (Křivánková). Many scenes of panic under the alien attack are said to commemorate the terrorist attacks upon the United States on September 11, 2001. Nevertheless, Spielberg reflects this issue only indirectly, and so the important issue might come out unnoticed.

The narrator in the novel is a scientist interested in human moral code. As the story unfolds he sees, on many occasions, that humanity is only skin-deep. It is mostly connected with the psychology of a scared crowd. “There was some booing from those more thoughtless and excitable souls to whom a crowd is always an occasion for noise and horse-play” (Wells 244). Even before the attack the on-lookers act like lemmings. The situation gets worse as the aliens get out of

the pit and start killing people. "They must have bolted as blindly as a flock of sheep" (Wells 246). As the narrator has to run along with the crowd he realizes he loses his common sense. He seems to be losing it every time he is a part of the crowd. Gradually and systematically, all the comfort and signs of human culture are destroyed by aliens. Powerless people are paralyzed and confused. The bigger the disorder is the lower the human scruples are. The police lose effectiveness. People are dangerous even to each other. "[R]evolvers were fired, people stabbed, and the policemen ... were breaking the heads of the people they were called out to protect" (Wells 331). Empty shops and houses are being plundered.

"A great bank of dust ... made everything within twenty feet of the ground grey and indistinct ..." (Wells 339). Symbolically, the dust may be an allusion to the Bible, foreshadowing of a bad future of the crowd. It makes the people in the crowd indistinct so they lose their individual identities. The Chief Justice dying in the crowd could be another symbol of demoralization.

Both the narrator and his brother maintain their reason and morality against the crowd. However, there are points in the story where there seems to be only "the last touch of humanity" allowing them to think twice. The narrator's brother orders the lady to point the gun at the horse instead of the man. The narrator himself decides not to actually kill the curate. "With one last touch of humanity I turned the blade back and struck him with the butt" (Wells 396). The narrator asks the reader not to judge him too harshly because under the pressure of the circumstances even those who know what is good and bad might take a decision against their moral code. In the very end the narrator symbolically finds (on his writing-table) his paper on the probable development of Moral Ideas. The conclusion is left up to the reader.

As far as the moral issues are concerned, the impact of the movie on the recipient is quite similar. To certain extent the movie reproduces the panic, confusion and demoralization of the crowd. It even keeps the symbolical dust, because the people are turned straight into dust by the touch of the heat-ray. On his coming home Ray is all covered with the dust which symbolizes his being a part of the crowd. On many occasions the question of morality or humanity is pushed aside for the sake of the parental issue. Ray does not much think about the humanity when he kills the man in the basement. He evidently thinks about his

daughter instead. The movie lacks the narrator/authorial commentaries and inner thoughts. It maintains the issue of morality but it certainly does not have the philosophical depth.

4.1.3. Summary

It should be obvious from the treatment of the characters and the cardinal functions that the major adaptation twist lies in the spiritual side of fidelity. The major theme in the movie is that of a family. Spielberg adjusted the story to his custom, the family issue, which is similar to what he did in his other movies (Křivánková). Spielberg focused on the struggling to survive of a father and his children, and the gradual development of their relationships. He took the original story as a raw material to create a different art form. It resembles Dudley Andrew's adaptation process called transformation. The movie reproduces the main features of the original story, at least as far as the textual fidelity is concerned. The problem is that in the movie the alien strike and the disastrous circumstances are used only as a backdrop, whereas the novel uses the cardinal functions more symbolically and purposefully. According to Thomas Leitch, the movie exercises an updated pictorial realization and also the colonizing concept of adaptation. It sees the original as an empty box to be filled with the new topics. It proves it can afford to display things the novel could only suggest. Spielberg definitely did not have a budgetary limitation. He also managed to update the story to show its universality. For example, the scenes of the falling clothes and the burning train suggesting the Jewish transports could be considered an important value added.

Concerning the framework introduced by Brian McFarlane's, the transferable elements are, to some extent, kept in the movie. The movie is lacking the spiritual fidelity mostly due to the absence of the first person narration. This narration used in the novel evokes the voice of Wells himself. The narrator shares with Wells the scientific background, features deep scientific knowledge and has opinions concerning imperialism, morals, natural selection, etc. The narrator suggests the story took place a few years before. He switches between the past simple tense and the present simple tense. The past tense is used in order to tell the story that took place in the past, whereas the present tense is used for the sake of describing facts that were not known at the time of the story. The very beginning and the very ending of the movie are accompanied by the voice-over. These are

the only places in the film where the recipient feels the authorial spirit of Wells. The passages are taken almost directly from the novel. “The makers of ‘authoritative’ editions and adaptations frequently invoke authorial spirit to authorize their work” (Elliott 141). Spielberg definitely gains the authority in the beginning of the story, but he loses it immediately when he starts narrating the story of Ray and his children. Both parts accompanied by the voice-over give the impression of Spielberg’s faint attempt to point out a message that was not properly presented by the actual story itself. McFarlane asks how closely the film provides an experience equivalent to the reading of the novel (168). The novel reads as a dialogue between the reader and the author. There are many philosophical questions to be answered by the reader. The movie can only suggest the philosophical bias but it does so only indirectly and as a backdrop.

Overall, this adaptation is faithful in its symbolism. It is a journey and a struggle to survive and it has a revealing character. Both main characters learn their lessons. The main character of the novel alters his philosophic opinions, whereas the movie’s main character changes personally. The movie manages to transfer the transferable, but it does not succeed in finding the equivalents for those elements that are less susceptible to a direct transfer. In other words, it does not to create the proper context for many topics treated by the novel. The disproportion stems, largely, from the absence of the narrator’s/authorial voice. The movie is, therefore, not faithful in the spiritual way. Spielberg wanted to pay homage to Orson Welles and his radio broadcast that caused national panic in 1938 (Spáčilová, “*Král Vypravěčů*”). The director succeeded in preserving the panic, the terror and public confusion; he added the point of view of America’s everyman, but his departure from H.G. Wells’s original themes and motifs leads to the movie’s shallowness and its poor artistic value. As far as the innovativeness and originality are concerned, in most cases the movie tends not to display any innovations, not even in the usage of the codes specific to its medium.

4.2. Heart of Darkness / Apocalypse Now

Francis Ford Coppola adjusted the original storyline to adhere to his individual vision of Conrad's tale. The differences between the novel and the movie are such that a direct comparison of the corresponding scenes would be almost impossible. The analytical part of this case study will, therefore, deal with larger segments rather than individual scenes. Also, the treatment of characters will not be separated from the analysis of the narrative.

4.2.1. Treatment of the main characters and cardinal functions

The novel employs the frame story where the actual narrator is a member of a group of listeners to which Marlow narrates his story. It allows the narrator to cast doubt on Marlow's truthfulness. "Marlow compares London's past to that of Africa's dark present..." (Delbanco 31). The comparison is more vivid when told to fellow sailors, Londoners who are, possibly, unaware of the revealing impact of Marlow's story. "...the meaning of an episode was not inside like a kernel but outside..." (Conrad 4). The frame also serves to set the atmosphere and foreshadow the nature of the story. The very beginning of the movie is accompanied by the song *The End* by The Doors. It shows a napalm strike upon the jungle, images of helicopters and the sound of their rotors mixing with the sound of a ventilator in a hotel room, waking up Willard who waits for a new mission. The text of the song and Willard's dream followed by his alcohol rapture set the atmosphere for a dark and absurd story. It also introduces Willard's inner voice as a vehicle for presenting the narrative. "...Willard is the eyes and ears through which we comprehend this war, and through whose sensibilities the war is going to be filtered" (In Delorme 36). Coppola makes use of cinematographic codes in an original way. He combines an ecstatic music, actual sounds of the jungle and Willard's alcohol rapture. He juxtaposes these images with those from the very end of the movie. In his alcohol trance Willard breaks the mirror and, symbolically, loses the illusions he had about himself. In a documentary that chronicles the shooting of the movie (*Hearts of Darkness: A Filmmaker's Apocalypse*) Coppola reveals: "I imagined that this guy did things that nobody had ever seen ... he must have the Kurtzian other side in him." There is no story within the story in the movie but the "general sense of claustrophobia, oppression and atrociousness" is

present in the movie (Cheshire). Coppola achieves to introduce the motif of the duality of human nature.

There is a difference between Marlow's and Willard's backgrounds and motivations for the journey. In the novel Marlow announces he has always wanted to be a steamboat captain and was curious to explore "the blank space" of central Africa. Willard's story is also a recollection of events. However, Willard takes his mission as a punishment for his sins. This dissimilarity does not influence the initial impression of conspiracy that is present in both versions. Whereas in the novel the conspiracy is linked with the nature of colonialism itself, the tension in the movie stems from the mystery of Willard's mission. He is to find and assassinate colonel Kurtz, an American who is reported to have gone insane. Willard knows from the beginning that "it is going to be hairy". He himself wonders what it is about Kurtz's insanity that is so special, when compared to other insanities of warfare, that the army wants him dead. The movie is more straightforward than the novel in its insinuating the enigmatic nature of the journey. Contrastingly, Kurtz in the novel is reported to be the best agent so Marlow looks forward to meeting him and only indirectly anticipates troubles. Contrary to the standards of cinematography, Coppola has Willard look straight at the camera for the purpose of inviting the audience to ponder. This technique raises the impression that the viewers are a substitute for the group of listeners on the boat.

Both versions display the polished appearance and cultured behaviour of the chief officers (in the movie) or agents (in the novel) contrasted with the wretched and twisted images of the reality. The movie shows the refined food being served while a classical piano piece is being played. During this comforting atmosphere Willard is assigned his mission. Willard's superiors talk about "the temptation to play god" and the duality of human nature, so they show awareness of the fact that out there "...the changes take place inside..." (Conrad 12).

Willard is taken to the camp of lieutenant colonel Kilgore from which he is supposed to be escorted with his boat to the mouth of the river. This whole episode could be seen as a substitute for that part of the novel in which Marlow finds his wrecked steamer and prepares to set off for the voyage. In this part, both the novel and the movie present various manifestations of the main character's astonishment about the true state of affairs. As far as the issue of the colonialism is concerned, the novel discloses "the philanthropic pretence of the whole

concern” (Conrad 28). Marlow describes the stations as inhabited devastation, where greedy company agents try to gain a higher status within the company, plotting against one another, killing the time by pointless tasks. They make the poor natives do a devastating work just for the mere purpose of work. The natives are referred to as savages, enemies, criminals, etc. Marlow also learns that the position and the reputation of Kurtz are regarded with envy. In the movie, Willard skims through the materials mapping Kurtz’s impressive career and his desire to confront Kurtz grows. In the camp of Kilgore he observes the reckless behaviour of stultified soldiers. Kilgore risks the lives of his troop and fights the Viet Cong-filled village for the sake of gaining a good place for surfing. It seems like a boyish game when they perform the air strike accompanied by Wagner’s *The Ride of Valkyries* blasting from the loudspeakers fastened to the helicopters. In this section there are images symbolizing the absurdities happening during the war, for instance, the image of a cow being picked up by a helicopter followed with the image of a battlefield Catholic mass, or the spectacle of a soldier surfing on a wave caused by napalm bombing. Even in these seemingly dissimilar sections it is possible to find motifs common to both the novel and the movie. There is a sense of confusion, disorder and demoralization. There is a strong racist overtone connected with the natives. In the movie, the Vietnamese are called “fucking savages”. The atrocities are performed under the delusion of helping or cultivating the natives. Kilgore’s unit may represent the group of pilgrims from the novel killing time by pointless actions. There is, also, the story about a man who committed suicide on his way home. It serves to foreshadow the possible impact of the affairs up the river on the main character. Both in the novel and in the movie the main characters are getting excited about the prospect of meeting Kurtz, even though Kurtz is yet only a voice to them.

The next section recounts the way up the river. In the novel Marlow compares the journey to travelling back in history. This aspect is also indirectly suggested in the movie when Willard and Chef (a member of the crew) get out of the boat to find a mango tree in the jungle. Amid mammoth trees and dense vegetation, they are frightened by a tiger which leads to an insane gunfire in the direction of the jungle. The image of an insane firing at the jungle is also taken from the novel. Willard suggests the wilderness is a perilous place to go, but he also realizes that Kurtz got off the boat and disappeared from the reach of the

army, just like Kurtz in the novel who turned his back on the company. The more Willard reads about Kurtz the more he admires him. In the novel, Marlow and his crew encounter some wild villages administered by the company agents. Marlow says the white men are like under a spell, that the black natives with their shouts and frenzy either curse them or pray to them. He describes these scenes as an incomprehensible frenzy. In the movie, Willard and his crew encounter camps alongside the river, which they describe as bizarre spectacles in the middle of the war. The section with the playboy bunnies, rock and roll band and the Vietnamese people peeping through the fence serves as an insight into how the American culture got infiltrated even into the Vietnam War. Willard comments on the American soldiers' morale and contrasts it with that of Viet Cong ("Charlie didn't get much USO..."), agreeing with Kurtz's pamphlet suggesting that army needs fewer men, but better and committed. This resembles the same message the company agents get from Kurtz in the novel. It indicates that the wilderness with the natives will always defeat the European colonizers unless they start taking things seriously. Similarly, in the movie Willard suggests the reason why the US Army was doomed to lose the Vietnam War. "Charlie had only two ways home, death or victory." Willard's crew seems to be, too, affected by the bizarre circumstances and the soldiers gradually go down with the nerves.

Apart from *Heart of Darkness*, Coppola's next source of inspiration was Homer's *Odyssey*. "His directorial concept should be an allegory about war and ancient *Odyssey* by Homer proved appropriate source of inspiration that was approached as a study of solitary insanity" (Slanina 14). Like Odysseus, Willard stays focused on his mission resisting all temptations. He is kept busy reading the dossier about Kurtz, realizing Kurtz started his own war against everybody. He begins to understand why the army wants Kurtz dead. Willard also gets to know he is not the first soldier to be sent to assassinate Kurtz, and that his predecessor became one of Kurtz's private army. Like in the novel, the boat is decaying and the crew starts acting strangely as if bewitched by the circumstances. The Vietnamese sampan massacre in the movie serves as another example of racism and questioning the value of human life during warfare. The closer Willard gets to Kurtz the more bizarre the spectacle is. It seems the war has started living its own life and the headquarters lost their grasp. The boat is attacked from the shore and Clean (the youngest member of the crew and the symbol of naivety) is shot dead.

It is not clear whether there are enemies attacking. Everything foreshadows Willard's getting close to something horrific.

The movie part involving the French plantation puts together some important motifs from the novel. Since the voyage up the river is also the journey from civilisation to barbarism, the French plantation could stand for the last bastion of civilization on the way to Kurtz. Civilization could be, too, symbolized by the scene of the burial. Clean is the last one to be properly buried in the ground. In *Hearts of Darkness: A Filmmaker's Apocalypse*, Coppola said he wanted the progress up the river to look like going back in history. The plantation stands for what remained from the colonization of French Indochina. The colonists were "trying to keep themselves convinced that it was still 1950". For Coppola, this section serves as the first stop on the journey backwards in the history of Vietnam. The whole part is immersed in fog so that it is not clear whether it is a dream or reality. It serves to cast even more confusion on Willard, adding to his growing persuasion that the war is but a delusion. America is said to be fighting "for the biggest nothing in history". There is also the character of the widow that Willard spends the night with. She could be seen as a counterpart of the black savage woman presented in the novel. She is a sensuous, dreamy element that has, reportedly, nothing to do among the atrocities. In the movie she says "[t]here are two of you ... one that kills and one that loves", pointing to the duality of human nature.

The next section of the movie also features several important parts of the novel. Like in the novel, there is a thick white fog so the crew cannot see anything. Weird shrieking sounds are coming from the jungle but the crew cannot tell the direction due to the fog. There is a sense of claustrophobia and escalating suspense. Eventually the boat is attacked by harmless arrows so it seems the natives just want to scare them off. The crew fire pointlessly in various directions. Chief, the helmsman, is hit by a spear. In the movie the helmsman, with his last strength, makes an attempt to pull Willard onto the spearhead. The attempt could symbolize the hatred that Chief felt for Willard because he saw Willard as the cause of all troubles and wasted lives. It can, too, stand for the evil side of Chief that was eventually woken up by the circumstances. In the novel the death of the helmsman serves as a vehicle for opening the monologue about Kurtz, his intended and his pamphlet. Marlow confesses he misses the helmsman but he talks about him as if he was just a tool for him which adds to the racist tone of the

novel. In both versions the corpse of the helmsman is given to the current. In the movie it contrasts with the burial of Clean and, thus, symbolizes the further moving from the signs of civilization.

In the movie Willard confides the goal of his mission to the remaining members of the crew. They reluctantly agree to help him, but Chef does not want to get off the boat as if the jungle was dangerous itself. As they proceed along the river they see dead bodies, burning buildings and altars with candles on the shore. It suggests getting closer to something sacred, ritualistic. In the novel Marlow mentions unspeakable rites performed in the name of Kurtz (Conrad 63). "What Marlow most wanted of Kurtz was the chance to have a talk" (Delbanco 35). In the movie Willard's desire to confront Kurtz is said to be much stronger than fear as the approaching to Kurtz has double nature. It mixes European physical horror with Eastern Zen emptiness (Vágner). On the one hand, the character of Lance behaves strangely, entranced by the surroundings, engrossed in practising tai chi, his face painted as though he was a member of some wild tribe. Lance represents those who cannot resist the temptation of the vast wilderness. The image of the boat going up the dark river is mingled with the image of an idol statue which can symbolizes the godlike status Kurtz has gained. It can also symbolize an almost mythical experience that is to come. On the other hand, the horrors of Kurtz's madness are visible only to those who resist the primal temptation, Willard and Chef.

The last part of the novel describes the encounter with Kurtz at his station. In the movie, there are natives in little boats letting Willard's crew pass by and then closing the way behind them. This symbol reminds of the jungle closing its door behind Marlow's steamboat in the novel. Both versions suggest a journey from which there is no coming back. Like Marlow's crew in the novel, Willard's crew is met by Kurtz's disciple. In the movie, he is turned into the photojournalist. His words about Kurtz are taken almost directly from the novel. "You don't talk with that man – you listen to him" (Conrad 67). "He enlarged my mind" (Conrad 69). Like in the novel, it is shown in the movie that this place is the heart of all horrors, that it is the final stop on the voyage back in history, to the forgotten depths of human soul. In the novel, Marlow is horrified by the heads on the stakes. In the movie, the crew sees dead bodies everywhere, there are severed heads lying on the stairs to the temple of Kurtz, the people there are said to be Kurtz's children.

The natives and even American soldiers inhabiting the camp look as if under some spell. The photojournalist tells them not to judge Kurtz. He also speaks about Kurtz's forgetting himself among the natives as suggested by the novel. In the novel, there is the image of a woman that is told to be the soul of the wilderness. She contrasts sharply with the savagery at Kurtz's station. In the movie, the image of a woman has already been used in the French plantation section. What is contrasting in Coppola's version is the presence of savage children. The turn of events in the movie is very different from that of the novel. In the novel Kurtz is presented as an animated image of death. However, he is strong enough to escape from the boat. Marlow takes his chance to deal with the shadow-figure of Kurtz alone and their encounter in the jungle creates a context for their philosophical struggle. "No eloquence could have been so withering to one's belief in mankind as his final burst of sincerity" (Conrad 86). Coppola's Willard, having commissioned Chef to call the air strike if he does not return, is caught by natives and brought to Kurtz. Kurtz's shadowy character is displayed only in dim lighting which indirectly suggests his untouchable status and creates a distance between him and chained Willard. During the night Kurtz approaches Willard and throws Chef's severed head into his lap. At this point Kurtz's face is painted which signifies his god-like status (or a savage during a ritual). This scene symbolizes Kurtz's awareness of Willard's intentions and his unlimited power over Willard. Willard realizes there is no way to circumvent Kurtz.

Coppola uses the character of the photojournalist to articulate Marlow's thoughts about Kurtz from the novel. As the photojournalist talks to imprisoned Willard he says that Kurtz is clear in his thoughts but his soul has gone insane. After some time of imprisonment Kurtz gives Willard the freedom of the compound. Kurtz reads an article from a magazine. "...It openly points at how the American public was deceived at the time of the Vietnamese conflict" (Matějka). This resembles the way the European public was deceived during the period of colonialism. Willard recovers and becomes one of Kurtz's listeners. Kurtz reads poetry aloud. Coppola has him read *The Hollow Men* by T.S. Eliot, suggesting Kurtz's opinion about military intelligence. In the novel the agents of the company are said to be empty inside on many occasions. "Perhaps there was nothing within him" (Conrad 25). "Men who come out here should have no entrails" (Conrad 25). "It echoed loudly within him because he was hollow at the core" (Conrad 75). It

indirectly suggests the nature of the character of Kurtz himself. By using this piece of poetry Coppola brings a new artistic value that interconnects his movie, Eliot's poetry and Conrad's novel. The character of the photojournalist escapes citing the ending of Eliot's novel.

Willard listens to Kurtz for days trying to make up his mind whether to kill Kurtz. Kurtz says that Willard can kill him but he has no right to judge him. The same thing is suggested in the novel. It is also suggested in both versions that the experience from within the jungle cannot be communicated to those who have never been there. Kurtz in the movie talks about prehistoric instincts, the impotency of the US army compared to the devotion of Viet Cong, killing without judgement. He also gives Willard a mission that can be compared to the one Marlow is indirectly given by Kurtz in the novel. In the movie Kurtz wants Willard to tell Kurtz's son about his father. In the novel Marlow is supposed to meet Kurtz's intended for the same purpose. Kurtz's speeches are accompanied with the image of the idol statue that symbolizes his magnificence. Kurtz also indirectly suggests that he himself should be killed.

In the novel, Kurtz's dies on the boat whispering his last words that conclude his whole experience. "The horror, the horror" (Conrad 90). In the movie, Willard realizes that Kurtz wants him to take away the pain. He paints his head the same way as Kurtz did before so, in a way, he becomes the animal ready to kill without judgement. The disguise also symbolizes Willard's identifying himself with Kurtz. He enters Kurtz's chamber and attacks him with the machete. The scene is interwoven with that of natives slaughtering a buffalo as a tribute during a festival dedicated, possibly, to Kurtz. Kurtz is slaughtered like a cow. The nature of his death resonates with the message on tape from the part of the movie where Willard received his orders. "But we must kill them, we must incinerate them, pig after pig, cow after cow, village after village, army after army ..." Like in the novel, "Kurtz is hoisted by his own petard" (Cheshire). There are images that have been already used at the very beginning of the movie. Also the music by The Doors is the same. It suggests the impression of closing the circle of Willard's experience where Willard wins as a moral leveller. Kurtz's last words are the same as in the novel. Willard then finds Kurtz's pamphlet. As he browses through the typewritten pages he chances upon a page where the handwritten message stands out. "Drop the bomb exterminate them all." It resonates with the inscription in Kurtz's

pamphlet in the novel. "Exterminate all the brutes" (Conrad 63). Willard takes the volume and goes out from the chamber. The natives stare at him as if he was their new dictator. It is clear that Willard has the opportunity to become a new Kurtz. Eventually, Willard drops his weapon and everybody does likewise. He takes Lance, the last member of his crew, by the hand and leads him to the boat. The whole Kurtz's village sees them go. They sail away, not calling the air strike. There is the image of the idol statue, the flight of a helicopter and Willard's painted face. The last words of Kurtz echo. The movie version suggests, again, the duality of human nature and the attraction of playing god. It is clear that Willard chose to resist the temptation. He was capable of undergoing the journey into Kurtz's soul (as well as into his own), but he remained resistant to the self-destructing temptation. Lance, on the other side, symbolized weakness and poor self-integrity.

There is a final part in the novel that has no counterpart in the movie. Marlow comments on the corruption of the company agents. He talks about his life after the Congo experience and how he managed to keep the true story of Kurtz for himself. He describes the encounter with Kurtz's devoted fiancée and the horror of not telling her the actual truth. The novel closes with the silent listeners waiting for the ebb on the Thames. Even though the movie lacks the final passage of the novel it does not lack the invitation for the audience to meditate about its meaning and impact. Marlow leaves his listeners deep in thoughts the same way Coppola leaves his audience.

As far as the characters are concerned, Marlow and Kurtz have their obvious counterparts in the movie. Coppola adjusted the two characters so that they agreed with the war circumstances. For all, he managed to transfer their functions as suggested by Conrad's novel. Coppola even added some characters to depict different manifestations of the impact of warfare on different personalities. To summarize the cardinal function, both the novel and the movie are divided into three parts. The first part includes the preparations for the voyage, the second part describes the actual voyage and the third part depicts the final destination, the actual heart of darkness. Although the inner sections of these parts are treated differently due to the different contexts (colonialism/war), Coppola managed to find appropriate equivalents for these sections and, therefore, rendered the same effect as suggested by Conrad's novel.

4.2.2. The treatment of chosen themes and motifs

Both *Heart of Darkness* and *Apocalypse Now* are concerned with human moral code. It seems that colonialism or warfare serve as two different contexts for the common theme, the question of the duality of human soul. “Conrad used *Heart of Darkness* as a vehicle for his exploration of human mores – morals and ethics” (Cheshire). Coppola’s movie is, too, rather a philosophical parable than a war movie. The war is but a concrete hell on earth serving the purpose of disclosing the nature of evil. Neither version has a clear storyline. “It’s in that context that *Apocalypse Now* should be judged: as a disaster movie, an apocalypse movie, delivering scenes of catastrophic action one after another, with no coherent plot” (Delorme 32). Both the novel and the movie try to present a succession of images depicting various symptoms of the descent to the primitive instincts inherent in every human being. They resemble impressionist painting. “We saw life did not narrate but made impressions on our brains” (Delbanco 130).

It is shown in both versions that human features considered virtuous are relative and can be easily used to make the world a better place or living hell. The merciful pretext of education, help and progress might be transformed into exploitation of the wild and credulous nations. In other words, knowledge and education can be misused in the circumstances with guaranteed impunity. Kurtz has made himself a godlike figure judged by no one, not even himself. In the movie Kurtz says that it is the judgement that defeats us eventually. Both Marlow and Willard are moral levellers who realize that conscience is the only judge in the circumstances without external control. “Conrad, judging by his villains, seems to have been oppressed by the sense of evil, and evil to him was an irresponsible force wandering at large in an ordered and respectable society. There is nothing to be done with it at all. It is a perpetual menace, and the only armour against it is a perfect integrity on the part of every member within the gates” (Cranskshaw 25). It is the self-integrity that is needed to resist the temptation to play god. Marlow and Willard are fascinated by the character of Kurtz. As the story unfolds they gradually identify with Kurtz as he represents the dark side that is inherently present in every human soul. Both Marlow and Willard are the only ones who truly understand Kurtz. They know that Kurtz is not to be judged. “Conrad was not intent on describing Kurtz nor in revealing his precise mentality, but in rendering

the sinister fatality of his environment” (Cranskshaw 134). In both versions Kurtz is the product of the circumstances (colonialism/war) brought to extreme, with no moral restraint. Their endings suggest that “the heaven do not fall for such a trifle” (Conrad 100). What changes are the points of view of Marlow in the novel and Willard in the movie, but there is no impact on the ideas of imperialism or militarism. These ideas remain the same as they used to be because no one is ever to find out the truth without the actual experience in the heart of darkness. Coppola criticizes the hypocrisy of American militarism the same way Conrad criticized the pretence of colonialism. *Apocalypse Now* shows that the issue of the public being deceived was still relevant at the time of Vietnam War. At the time of colonialism public opinions were formed by media and Coppola shows it was the same case with American public during the Vietnam conflict. “There's nothing that I detest more than the stench of lies.”

Conrad in his novel sharply distinguished between the natives and the colonists, between the wilderness and civilization. In both versions the civilization-stained whites promote the old local rituals to savage-like organized slaughtering (Štaudová). In the novel the primordial instincts lurking in the wilderness are said to echo within the civilized men. In the movie the closer Willard gets to Kurtz the thinner the line between the savagery and civilization becomes. This thin line is finally broken in Kurtz's compound where there is almost no difference between the savages and the soldiers. This gradual transformation is best visible on the character of Lance who changes from an alert young soldier to a stoned druggie who masks his face in camouflage and assimilates into the primitive lifestyle of the natives at Kurtz's compound.

Almost all themes and motifs colouring the main topic of the fragility of human moral code have their counterparts in the movie. However, they are often introduced by different means of expression.

4.2.3. Summary

The treatment of the characters and the cardinal functions in the movie is very different from that of the novel. However, Coppola managed to adjust them to serve his own vision. All major themes are kept and the same oppressive atmosphere is introduced. In an interview with John Milius, Coppola said that *Heart of Darkness* was his bible during the making of the movie. He wanted to

make *Heart of Darkness* transferred into the Vietnam War. He used the mythical journey as an allegory, trying to explore the duality of human nature during a war time. "Offer Coppola something real and he'll bring out the mythical in it" (Delorme 35).

Concerning the type of the adaptation, it seems that *Apocalypse Now* resembles Geoffrey Wagner's process called analogy. The movie represents a major departure from the novel as far as the textual fidelity is concerned. Nevertheless, as long as the meaning of Conrad's stories is not to be found inside the actual text, the textual fidelity should not be the most important evaluation criterion. "For in a novel of the kind which Conrad wrote the main interest is not in the physical facts of the affair but in its atmosphere and in the effect of those facts on the minds and hearts ..." (Cranskshaw 172). It also resembles Dudley Andrew's transformation, because the source text really undergoes a change, but the main features (river, boat, the voyage, etc.) of the original text are maintained in the movie. Following the terminology of Thomas Leitch, the movie features updated neoclassical imitation. It shows that Conrad's themes and motifs were still relevant at the time of the Vietnam Conflict and, possibly, were going to be relevant afterwards. These themes and motifs are communicated by Coppola's own artistic choice but Coppola remains faithful to Conrad's spirit. "Contemporary novelists may borrow from the cinema, but the cinema in its best manifestation might just as well have borrowed from Conrad" (Cranskshaw 181).

Following McFarlane's framework, *Apocalypse Now* manages to change the transferable elements so that they match the context of the Vietnam War. It also succeeds in finding the equivalents for those elements that are less susceptible to a direct transfer, hugely employing the peculiar codes of cinematography. It maybe unfaithful to the textual side of the precursor novel but it is faithful enough to the spiritual side of it. The movie depicts a symbolic journey the same way as *Heart of Darkness*. The voice-over narration of the main character is a perfect equivalent of the first person narration used in the novel. Willard's point of view and his commentaries on various aspects of war are equal substitutes for Marlow's commentaries on colonialism. The high subjectivity introduced in the novel is adequately presented by the subjectivity of the main character in the movie. The camera eye resembles the narrator's eye used in the novel. The experience of watching the movie is very similar to that of reading the novel. Coppola even

brought the philosophical ending of his story a level further by introducing T.S. Eliot's poetry and, thus, interconnecting more individual pieces of art. The recipient gets another source of inspiration that might help him/her to reconcile the moral enigma of Coppola's movie. The movie works on many different levels, it does not offer a "black-and-white picture" and it leaves a sufficient space for a recipient's imagination. *Apocalypse Now* offers an interesting alternative to the reading of *Heart of Darkness*. Coppola's interpretation serves as an interdisciplinary dialogue that might be useful for a further reading of the novel. Even though it can never replace the original, it is an independent and valuable piece of art that can stand separately from its source of inspiration.

4.3. Lord of the Flies

Faithful adaptation naturally does not feature many departures from the original novel in terms of the succession of events and the usage of main characters. Logically, there is no need to focus on cardinal functions themselves, unless there are changes in the movie. It should be advisable to scrutinize the vertical axis of the story which does not contribute to the evolution of the story itself but deals with the portrayal of individual characters, their psychology, atmosphere, representation of place, etc. Such treatment of the textual fidelity will, most importantly, deal with the indices proper of the text. Additionally, it should focus on catalysers which help to root the individual cardinal functions so they contribute, mostly, to the logic of the succession of events.

There is no need to separate the treatment of themes and motifs into a specific section since it is incorporated already in the following textual analysis.

4.3.1. Treatment of the textual fidelity

In the very beginning, the movie displays an interesting montage of pictures and music which does not have its counterpart in the novel. There are pictures of a school environment and classrooms accompanied by the sound of a (school) bell, a teacher's voice declaiming a geometric axiom, another voice speaking Latin. The sequence ends with a picture of school-boys' choir accompanied by *Kyrie Eleison* chant. This succession of pictures and sounds gives the impression of school organization, education, order and Christianity. Right away it is contrasted with the next montage which shows the weapons of mass destruction, warplanes in the London sky and "evacuation" direction on the blackboard. It is accompanied by percussive sounds resembling a tribal drumming. The next picture shows a map of the Pacific Ocean and the following sequence displays a plane being attacked and falling down. The purpose of this section is obviously to cast light on how the boys happened to end up on the island. It highlights the collision between school order and savage nuclear war so it foreshadows the main dilemma of the whole story. At the beginning of the novel Piggy keeps bringing up the topic of atomic bomb and all the adults being dead. This is only suggested in the movie where the boys do not talk about such matters so the recipient has to make do with the introductory montage.

The first cardinal function common to both versions is represented by the two boys meeting in the jungle. In the novel, Ralph says that his father, who serves in the navy, taught him to swim, while Piggy mentions his deceased father. It seems there is the theme of social difference between Ralph and Piggy. In the movie Ralph does not ask Piggy about his father. There is a sharp contrast between Ralph's and Piggy's characters in the novel. Piggy realizes the danger and keeps reminding of the adult world, he suggests constructive actions. The naive Ralph acts childishly and relishes the magic of the absence of adults. In the movie version there is almost no difference depicted between them. Only in the novel, the fruit from the island gives Piggy diarrhoea so it is suggested that the island is not such a paradise it seems to be.

The next cardinal function is finding the conch. In the novel, it is made clear that it is Piggy who wants to pick it up from the water for the sake of calling other survivors. He is, also, the one who suggests blowing it. There is no such distinction in the movie and the finding and blowing the conch seem like a children's play without any sophisticated purpose.

At the first assembly, Brook's version comes up with the boys' choir not only marching as suggested by the novel. They even sing a variation of *Kyrie Eleison* unusually accompanied by a military march music, adding a dark tone to Jack's group. Only in the novel, it is explicitly mentioned that intelligent actions take place only because of Piggy (Golding 30). Also, the conflict between Jack and Piggy is depicted better when Jack arrogantly disagrees with the vote. In the novel Jack's slamming the knife into a tree trunk is connected with the character of Simon and foreshadows Simon's fate.

The three boys go to explore the island. In the novel, there are some sayings resembling school environment. "...Increase the swing of the pendulum ... and bear against that point of furthest balance ..." (Golding 37). The boys proudly enjoy the feeling of domination over the island. "This belongs to us" (Golding 38). There is the atmosphere of friendship and shared experience. In the movie, they hardly talk to each other so the atmosphere is indifferent. Only in the novel, when the three boys chance upon a bush, Simon pronounces the buds candles. By doing so he, again, foreshadows his fate. In the movie, Simon just smells a flower which is afterwards smashed by Jack. In Golding's version, the scene with the pig is that of "madness of extreme terror" (40). There is the suspense where the still

persisting contrast between the savagery and civilization within the boys could be found. Brook's treatment of this scene gives the impression of a fairytale where boys find an adorable piggy. Jack draws his knife almost reluctantly. Even the music suggests a comforting atmosphere. The movie lacks contrasts, does not feature the catalysers to give a rise to the character's motivations. The movie also lacks the elaborated depiction of characters.

There is the second assembly. Only Golding's Jack interrupts Ralph by suggesting the importance of the army. Brook's Jack only agrees with Ralph, pronouncing English patriotism. Again, Brook does not develop the growing conflict between Ralph and Jack. Only in the novel, Piggy still reminds others of the importance of the conch. The meaning of the order-establishing conch and its connection with Piggy is not sufficiently put across in the movie. There is no space for the distinction between Ralph's naive character and Piggy's adult-like features. Brook's Ralph appears to be nearly as reasonable as Piggy. Golding's Ralph comforts the boys by naive promises of fun and rescue, while adult-like Piggy is said to have "a martyred expression of a parent" (Golding 50). In the novel, the notion of the beast creates a context for the distinction between older boys and the younger ones. It is suggested that imagination is something ungraspable for Ralph. For creating this tension Brook uses only the music backdrop.

The bonfire on the mountain is treated differently both in the novel and in the movie. The movie displays only lighting the fire using Piggy's spectacles and Jack's decision that his choir is to be responsible for keeping the fire. The novel gives a context for the growing distinction between the characters. Piggy as an adult-like character points out the importance of the conch, he suggests building shelters and he blames everyone for acting senselessly setting the island on fire. He even proves responsibility and suggests looking after the smaller boys. It is suggested that Piggy, though reasonable and responsible, has no word within the crowd. He is always scorned or intimidated by Jack or even Ralph who wants Jack's rapport. It is important that Ralph goes for his reputation, supporting Jack's behaviour rather than that of Piggy. Simon, though a member of Jack's choir, sympathizes with Piggy. Piggy announces they have lost one of the youngest boys and the impact of the fact silences the crowd at last. Only the novel depicts the irresponsibility of the children's play and its horrible outcome.

The third chapter of the novel does not contain any cardinal function. It means it does not push the story further. It may be the reason why Brook's version does not offer any counterpart for it. However, the novel elaborates the evolution of the conflict between Jack and Ralph and serves as a catalyser. It sets the background for the escalation of the collision. Jack is led by his "compulsion to track down and kill" (Golding 65). He describes that there is something fascinating in the jungle. His behaviour displeases Ralph who, with Simon's help, tries to build shelters with no help of the other boys who just play. They have an argument. Jack symbolizes hunting and killing while Ralph stands for the image of home and a chance of being rescued. The morale of the group goes down and the promises pronounced during the meetings are never fulfilled. Also, the character of Simon as a prophet is developed by this chapter.

The next chapter features the cardinal function of letting the fire out. The movie displays the boys' innocent games on the beach, helping each other building shelters, choir guards keeping the fire. It shows Jack in the jungle learning to hunt while Simon plays tenderly with a lizard. These scenes might be seen as counterparts for the novel's catalysers from the previous chapter, but they give the impression of shortcuts. Golding darkens the image of the beach idyll by various manifestations of will to power among the boys of all ages. "Henry was bit of the leader this afternoon" (Golding 75). "Maurice followed, laughing, and added to the destruction" (Golding 76). "He became absorbed ... exercising control over living things" (Golding 77). "Johnny was left in triumphant possession of the castles" (Golding 77). There are hints of the boys slowly breaking the bounds of taboo things. "Maurice still felt the unease of wrong-doing" (Golding 76). "Here, invisible yet strong, was the taboo of the old life" (Golding 78). "Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness" (Golding 80). Piggy is said to be considered an outsider because of his features that might easily resemble the features of adults. Even Ralph does not sympathize with him fully. These important indices are not presented in Brook's version. The movie presents only cardinal functions: the boys missing the hope of rescue because of no signal smoke, the argument between the two leaders, Piggy's broken glasses, Simon's and Ralph's sympathies for Piggy, the renewed bonfire, feasting, the children's play and Ralph's calling an assembly. Again, the movie does not display any equivalents for the development

of characters or their inner thoughts. “[T]hey had outwitted a living thing, imposed their will upon it, taken away its life like a long satisfying drink” (Golding 88).

Before the next assembly, Golding shows Ralph walking on the beach, changing his perspective. It serves as a catalyser. Ralph muses about signs of civilization, common sense and true values. He realizes Piggy’s importance. At the beginning of the meeting Ralph lists the examples of breaking the rules (coco-nut shells, lavatory, shelters), and then he moves on to the topic of the signal smoke. In the movie, this section starts with the topic of the signal smoke straightaway. Neither does it create a proper atmosphere nor does it display the changes in Ralph’s mind. The course of the discussion in the movie is different from that in the novel. Brook rejects the important monologues during which holding of the conch is still relevant and the boys seem organised. Percival stands for the mood of all the “littluns” sharing the same fears and cries, while in the movie he is alone. The important speech of Piggy is, also, omitted. “What are we? Humans? Or animals? Or savages” (Golding 113)? Brook does not highlight that it is always Jack who scorns everything important and does not respect the rules. There are no catalysers for the collision between rational and irrational, causing the break-up of the discussion. Only in the novel Simon is said to be “a whiteness in a gloom”, which underlines his prophetic function. Golding lets the whole discussion start at twilight so that the growing darkness supports the collapsing order. Only in the novel, Piggy anticipates the nature of Jack’s future leadership. “If you don’t blow, we’ll soon be animals anyway” (Golding 115). Piggy also suggests that it is only people that may be feared. The adult word is mentioned with a sigh in both version, but in the movie it is only Piggy’s sigh. Ralph’s growing affection for Piggy is not properly supported in Brook’s version. It seems, again, that the movie just strives to keep the actions but does not support the inner psychology and motivation of characters, which is so important for the actual impact of the story.

The next cardinal function is the trip to the other side of the island in order to find the beast. Brook does not respect the motif of the darkness playing tricks with the boys’ minds. Only in the novel the former act of calling for something adult is symbolically answered by the “beast from air”. Therefore, the apparition of the dead parachutist seems quite illogical in the movie. During the meeting before the trip only Golding’s version stresses the growing affinity of Ralph and Piggy against Jack. In the movie, Simon just mentions his doubts about there being any beast.

His remark comes from nowhere, whereas in the novel there is the passage dealing with his motivation and his inner thoughts. Again, the movie lacks catalysers. In the novel the discrepancy between Ralph and Jack grows as they are alone on the rock. Ralph talks about the fire while Jack is excited about the rock and foreshadows Piggy's death. In the movie Ralph smiles at Jack as they are alone on the rock and there is almost friendship between them. The distinction between Ralph's common reason and the groupthink of the boys is communicated only in the novel. In the movie there is a new passage where Piggy explains the etymology of a town's name to the "littluns". This passage is rather humorous and does not match with the atmosphere.

The following contemplative chapter is not presented in the movie, again. Ralph contrasts the beauty of the forlorn nature with the dirtiness of the boys. He also dreams about civilization. The prophetic function of Simon is further developed. "You'll get back to where you came from" (Golding 137).

The passage showing that even Ralph has a taste for hunting is not presented in the movie. Most importantly, it shows how the children's play turns into a bloody, primordial ritual. "Ralph too was fighting to get near, to get a handful of that brown, vulnerable flesh. The desire to squeeze and hurt was overmastering" (Golding 142). The game in its degree of savagery contrasts with the previous one presented in the novel. The movie features only the first game and does not offer this more brutal counterpart.

The next cardinal function common to both versions is the scene where the boys catch the sight of the dead parachutist. The approaching night and growing darkness are not stressed enough in the movie. Darkness is an important symbol in the novel and it is always connected with the boys' fears. Only in Golding's version, the collision between Ralph and Jack is actually pronounced. "Why do you hate me" (Golding 146)? The movie does not offer any substitute for Ralph's inner conflict between rational (Ralph's conscience, the voice of Piggy) and irrational (pride, vanity).

There is the assembly where Jack renounces the membership of Ralph's group. However, it is shown only in the novel that this time it is Jack who blows the conch, twisting Ralph's remark about the "hunters" in rather populist manner. The movie lacks Ralph's important notions about the nature of darkness and the impossibility to make a fire on the mountain. Therefore, the decision to make fire

on the beach, common to both versions, does not have proper catalysers in the movie.

At this point the courses of both versions split in order to juxtapose the behaviour of Ralph's group, Jack's hunters and that of solitary Simon. The movie, again, shows just the succession of events without important indices, for instance, the senselessness of the hunters, killing a sow instead of a piglet. The sow is a symbol of an adult that later (in the form of a head on a stick) speaks to Simon in a teacher's voice. The whole passage where the actual "Lord of the Flies" talks to Simon, revealing the nature of the whole disaster, foreshadowing Simon's fate, is absent from the movie. When Ralph's group is ambushed by the hunters, Brook does not offer any equivalent for Jack's breaking the bonds of shame and self-consciousness, turning himself into a chief among the savages. Brook does not work with the platform or the conch as the symbols of order. The further development, where Ralph is tempted by the image of playing hunters and, therefore, cannot remember the main purpose of the fire burning, is not presented in the movie. The function of Piggy as the wise mentor of Ralph is missing, too. The outcome of the meeting over the conch serves as an important catalyser for the next course of affairs and without it the movie lacks logic.

Simon finds the corpse of the parachutist while Ralph's group joins Jack's feast on the other side of the island. As Simon approaches the crowd of boys they attack and kill him, mistaking him for the beast. In the movie, the parts where Simon takes the decision to inform the others about the real nature of the beast and his noticing that there is a smoke on the other side of the island are missing. Therefore, Simon's decision to approach the crowding boys on the other side of the island lacks logic. Also, the recipient is not offered any reason why Ralph and Piggy let the fire out and join Jack's feast. Only in the novel, the crowd teases Piggy and makes fun of him which creates a context for Ralph's reuniting with the crowd. It is the same case with Piggy being the one who brings the notion of a rescue to Ralph's mind. Brook does not familiarize the viewer with the reason for the ritualistic dancing, which later serves as a justification of Simon's death. His movie does not even show why Ralph and Piggy eventually participate in the ritual leading to the murder of Simon.

In the next part, the denial of a collective crime is being displayed and Piggy's glasses are stolen. Nevertheless, only the novel depicts Ralph's admitting,

for the first time, that the boys should be afraid of themselves; his losing common sense, not being able to connect the fire with the rescue; his dreams of civilization. Only in the novel, the boys mention the conch and the fire so the remaining signs of civilization are remembered. The movie section depicting Jack's denial of the murder misses the catalysers foreshadowing Piggy's death and Roger's (Piggy's assassinator) growing fascination with irresponsible authority. It also lacks the insinuation of Jack's increasing blood thirst.

The decision to go and try to get Piggy's spectacles back is presented in both versions, but the movie misses the speech about the importance of fire and the wish for better appearance as signs of civilization. Again, the purpose of the fire vanishing from Ralph's mind is absent from the movie along with Piggy's concerns about adults' opinions, pronouncing for the first time the murder of Simon. It is visible only in the novel that the disorder and the lack of rationality of adult world have profound impact on Ralph. Brook offers an equivalent for turning away from civilization by showing a few boys fully naked. Both versions depict the hopeless communication attempt, rendering the same impression, but the breaking of the conch is not explicit enough in the movie. The part where Jack intimidates Ralph till the point where Jack deliberately throws the spear stands for the next catalyser that is absent from Brook's version.

The final hunt for Ralph ending with the arrival of a naval officer stands for the last cardinal function. Most importantly, the movie lacks the equivalents for Ralph's inner thoughts so there is no depiction of his feeling like a hunted animal, remembering Piggy, Simon and the conch, hoping that the hunters are not such savages to be able to kill him. Only in the novel, Ralph tries to fight back so he actually turns into a hunted beast, hurting some boys. He has a stick sharpened at both ends (though he does not know the meaning of it) to defend himself. He gets the stick from the remnants of the Lord of the Flies. The spoiled character of Roger is depicted only in novel. Ralph realizes the senselessness of the hunters setting the whole island on fire. The movie ends with Ralph's encountering the naval officer, Percival's forgetting his name and everyone's crying. It does not display the Officer's joking before learning the actual truth, Ralph's confessing his leadership contrasted with the silence of Jack, or the important conclusion of Ralph. "...Ralph wept for the end of innocence, the darkness of man's heart, and

the fall through the air of the true, wise friend called Piggy” (Golding 248). In the very end Golding also discloses his original source of inspiration, *The Coral Island*.

Because of the allegorical nature of the story it is not really difficult for the film-maker to maintain the cardinal functions, the succession of events, or the main characters. What proves difficult is preserving the atmosphere, the psychology of individual characters, their motivation and the logic thanks to which the whole narrative moves faster and faster towards the inescapable climax. The indices helping to develop characters, objects or places and their symbolic functions are rarely kept in the movie. Many significant features of the novel are displayed only as shortcuts and this fact adds to the shallowness of the movie. The movie also lacks many significant catalysers so there are scenes that appear almost senseless, without a reason or without a purpose.

4.3.2. Summary

The movie can be classified, agreeing with Geoffrey Wagner together with Michael Klein and Gillian Parker, as a transposition that is faithful to the main thrust of the narrative. Kamilla Elliott would probably label it as an incarnational concept where the word is made flesh. Concerning the terminology of Thomas Leitch, the movie is a celebration, but, most importantly, there was a superimposition during the shooting. ”When Brook made the film, he deliberately tried to duplicate the conditions depicted in the novel as much as was feasible. He also opted for an entirely non-professional cast, with impressively convincing results. Though performances are far from flawless, the more technically polished efforts of drama school pupils might have undermined Golding's key theme” (Brooke). Brook’s movie could be regarded as an attempt to employ the Stanislavski Method of acting. “Stanislavski required the actor to live in his/her role as if in real life ...” (Pudovkin, “*Stanislavského metoda*” 14). Nevertheless, the depiction of Golding’s work in all its depth proves inaccessible for this kind of approach.

According to McFarlane’s framework, the textual fidelity is mostly exercised only in terms of cardinal functions, which proves not sufficient for a faithful adaptation. Many catalysers, which should be also susceptible to direct transfer, are missing from the movie. The movie lacks an intellectual depth because it is not able to offer cinematographic equivalents for indices proper, and, most importantly, for the omniscient kind of narration. As the evil is inside the boys, the

depictions of the inner lives of individual characters are crucial for the novel, but there are no cinematic counterparts for them in the movie. Also Golding's rich language which allows him to comment on the contrasts between the pure nature and the atrocities of the boys, the world of adults, etc. has no counterpart in the movie. However, there are some elements that could work in the movie's favour. In the very beginning, the movie employs the peculiar codes of cinematography displaying the montage of pictures and music. Also the tune of *Kyrie Eleison*, gradually changing from the symbol of Christian purity to the symbol of the savage hunters, serves as another example of interesting usage of cinematic codes. The usage of this tune when displaying the image of Simon's dead corpse is an advisable way of showing his prophetic holiness, but the nature of his character is fully revealed only in the novel (by indices and catalysers), so the viewer of the movie who is not familiar with the novel would not understand the image.

As far as the spiritual fidelity is concerned, it is obvious that the movie tries to communicate the same themes and motives as suggested by the novel. Nevertheless, the experience of watching the movie is far from the pleasure of reading the novel. The movie barely shows signs of originality or innovation, it gives an impression of an unfinished work that cannot stand separately from its source of inspiration. It is very superficial in its meaning and as such is of a poor artistic value.

4.4. A Clockwork Orange

Kubrick wanted his movie to be faithful to Burgess. “I’d say that my intention with *A Clockwork Orange* was to be faithful to the novel ...” (In Priestley). Appropriately to the faithful adaptation, Kubrick maintains the main cardinal function along with the characters as suggested by the novel. Therefore, this case study will comment on the cardinal functions only when there are significant differences. The main focus of the scrutiny will be, again, indices proper and catalysers. The novel is divided into three parts so the case study will proceed accordingly.

4.4.1. Treatment of the textual fidelity

In the first scene, the four boys sit in the Korova Milkbar thinking what to do with the evening. Kubrick immerses his audience in nadsat by means of Alex’s inner voice from the beginning. Nadsat is a special language Burgess invented for the novel. It is said to mean “teen” (Burgess 24). Kubrick uses one long shot of the camera, showing the interior of the Korova Milkbar. There are white statues of naked women and tables in the shape of naked women in bizarre positions. The clothes of the boys in the movie are different from those suggested in the novel. The piece of music Kubrick chose for this introductory scene combined with the move from the Gregorian chorale *Dies Irae* is a nice example of using the peculiar codes of cinematography. Kubrick does not use Alex’s description of the time and place. The recipient gets to know anything about the fashion, media, or Alex’s opinions on contemporary music and the way of life of young people.

From all the manifestations of “ultra-violence” presented in the novel Kubrick leaves out the scene with a man going from the library and the shop robbery. Nevertheless, by the omission of these scenes Kubrick also omits Alex’s speech about the decaying mass culture and the shortage of police. Most importantly, the movie lacks Alex’s opinion about the character of Dim. Alex looks down on Dim for his bad manners, lack of intellect and culture. This creates the context for the escalation of the conflict between Alex and Dim. During the scene of the scuffle with the gang of Billyboy, Kubrick nicely takes over the novel’s suggestion of the dancing-fighting. “... left two three, right two three – and carve left cheeky and right cheeky ...” (Burgess 17). Kubrick has the scene take place in a theatre, accompanied by a piece of classical waltz music. Kubrick, again, does not show

the catalysers for the conflict between Dim and Alex. Another innovation is used by Kubrick during the surprise visit in the cottage named Home. His version shows futuristic interior of the house but, most interestingly, Alex sings *Singin' in the Rain* while beating and raping the couple. Nevertheless, Kubrick rejects the most important feature of this scene. Only in the novel Alex mentions his strong admiration for writers and reads a few sentences from *A Clockwork Orange*, a pamphlet directed against the attempt to impose law and condition upon a man. It foreshadows the nature of the unfolding story and it is an important catalyser for the political struggle that is to come.

Back in the Korova Milkbar the conflict between Alex and Dim reaches its peak. In the movie version it seems to stem only from the incident with the lady singing the classical piece, whereas in the novel the proper catalysers have been used throughout the first part. The novel communicates that it is Alex himself, and not the lady, that Dim does wrong to (Burgess 26). In the movie, the conflict exists only between Alex and Dim, whereas in the novel, Georgie also takes part in the argument and, thus, points out that every member of the group is involved in the conflict. It is, again, a significant catalyser and an impulse for the change in Alex's behaviour.

In the novel, Alex goes home and listens to three pieces of classical music, musing about violet sex, causing him orgasm. In the movie, he listens only to Beethoven's *Ninth*, provoking the same images in his mind. In fact, the montage used in this section of the movie is very impressive and it exemplifies Kubrick's sense for detail and rhythm. In the movie version, Alex has as a pet, a snake, which was definitely used in order to show Alex's intelligence and wickedness at the same time, if taken as a Biblical allusion.

The whole passage concerning Alex's dream, foreshadowing the upcoming quarrel within his gang, is omitted in the movie. What is also omitted is Alex's commentary on the evil side of humans, provoked by the visit of Mr. Deltoid and his opinions about the civilizing function of art. In other words, the intellectual development of Alex's character is not properly depicted in the movie which adds to shallowness of the character.

In the novel, the section concerning the rape of the two girls picked up from the music store serves as another manifestation of Alex's wicked ways. It is underlined by the young age of the girls. Alex is disgusted by their behaviour and

manners, but he has them eat and drink till they are too drunk to feel anything. In the movie, the scene does not look like a rape at all. The girls are older and aware of the situation. However, Kubrick works effectively, combining classical music with the speeded up love-making scene, cushioning the obscenity. The movie shows that Alex fully enjoys his sexuality but it does not depict the criminal nature of the act.

There is no mention of the dream of Alex's father in the movie. It has a synergic effect in connection with the former dream of Alex, insinuating the development of affairs. Therefore, Alex's discussion with the other members of the gang lacks its important catalysers in the movie. The fight scene in the movie is, very suggestively, accompanied by music, being the cause of Alex's quick decision. However, it is depicted as unfair and unexpected from the point of view of the surprised members of Alex's gang. In the novel, Alex explicitly asks for the fight. Evidently, Alex is not as black-and-white as suggested by Kubrick's depiction.

The movie scene where Alex is caught by the police lacks Alex's description of the town and his admiring of the pieces of art in the old lady's house. However, Kubrick's treatment of the fight between Alex and the old lady is more than satisfactory. It is, again, depicted as a dance-fight accompanied with classical music. There is a bust of Beethoven in the hands of the old lady as a symbol of old values and traditions, and there is Alex holding a statue of a big penis, symbolizing youth, animal instincts, etc. The symbolic nature of the fight in the movie is an impressive invention of Kubrick.

The movie's depiction of the interrogation at the police station is, again, deprived of indices. It lacks Alex's inner feelings, the night in the cell, his dream and the notion about his age.

Kubrick's version depicts Alex's entrance check-up in the jail. It seems to have no purpose, except for the notion of Alex's full name and the cruelty of the prison conditions. The movie version also leaves out Alex remembering the old times and his getting to know about Georgie's death. The fact that Alex cunningly helps the prison curate is common to both versions, but in the movie, Alex does not operate the stereo so there is no catalyser for the treatment of music in this section. Indeed, Kubrick's version offers music only as a backdrop for Alex's twisted

fantasies caused by reading the Bible. What is more, the chosen music is not by Beethoven so it is, evidently, not a part of Alex's imagination. In the novel, it is clearly stated that the music helps Alex understand the Bible in his wicked way, and that it is actually the music that keeps him going. Kubrick's prison curate is entirely good, introducing the difficult question of the free moral choice, but in the novel, he is not such a black-and-white character. Apart from his undeniable function of being the one who fights for the free moral choice, he looks forward to his promotion, informing the governor about hidden happenings in the prison. He also hypocritically renounces his responsibility for Alex undergoing the Ludovico's treatment. By doing so, the Biblical allusion to Pontius Pilate suggests itself.

The scene in the prison cell, where history repeats and Alex is, again, betrayed by his "mates", is omitted in the movie. The catalyser for his getting out of the prison is not presented, nor is the dream that foreshadows the nature of his treatment. In both versions the minister of interior has the same speech. "Cram criminals together and see what happens. You get concentrate criminality, crime in the midst of punishment" (Burgess 73). It seems that in the movie this statement has no real reason, missing the catalyser of the dead man in the cell. Alex's gaining the attention of the minister is also different in both versions. In the novel, his remark about not being "the common criminal" stands for his disagreement with being counted among the social class of filthy criminals, whereas in the movie, it is obvious that his remark stands for Alex's volunteering for the treatment. Therefore, Kubrick's version gives the impression of Alex having control of the affairs, while Burgess's conception shows a stroke of fate causing the succession of events. The inevitability of fate is significant for the novel since it refers to the last redemptive chapter.

The cardinal function of the Ludovico's treatment itself is depicted in both versions, but the movie version lacks some important indices and catalysers. Only in the novel, the evil nature of the experiment is foreshadowed by all the staff's behaviour when Alex tries to make fun of the procedures. Only in the novel, Alex expresses his doubts and suspicions about the nature of the technique. It is depicted how Alex is tricked by the doctors, showing his attempts to guess the cause of his response to violence till the point where there is no cause to be found. There are also various manifestations foreshadowing the evil side of the treatment and the cruelty of people, for example, the strange behaviour of the discharge

officer, Alex's nightmare, the vain escape attempts, etc. Alex comments on his torturers. "They must have been more callously and filthy than any prestoopnick in the Staja itself" (Burgess 84). Also the fact that Dr. Brodsky is not interested in music and has not thought over the consequences of its usage is properly treated only in the novel. Burgess's version is also far more philosophical. After Alex screams that he is cured, Dr. Brodsky claims it is just a heresy of an age of reason (Burgess 92). This is a significant statement, questioning the possibility of the right decision between good and evil. It implies that the focus of the new method is really to erase any other options than good to choose from. Dr. Brodsky also utters that there is a dual nature in everything, so he shows his awareness of the risks. "The sweetest and most heavenly of activities partake in some measure of violence ..." (Burgess 91). This claim resonates significantly with Alex's oncoming experience. Apparently, Burgess tries to be really precise and thorough in its disclosing the wicked nature of the experiment, while Kubrick leaves many things up to the viewer. Only in the novel, Alex's discovery of not being able to perform violence is shown before the passing-out day. It is an important catalyser for the stage performance where Alex knows that he has to be quick in his violent act in order to overtake the pain and sickness. However, this catalyser proves not necessary in the movie since Kubrick's version treats the stage performance differently. In the movie the inner fight between Alex's intentions and Alex's fears is depicted rather vaguely. The farcical outcome of his trying to overcome the sickness is portrayed only in the novel, together with his inner speech where he discloses the change in his way of thinking. Only in Burgess's version, Alex expresses his fear of becoming a clockwork orange, which silences the audience. The audience seems aware of the pamphlet under the same title, so the approaching political struggle has the right catalysers. Alex is reminded of the fact that it was, paradoxically, his own choice to undergo the treatment. This assertion is also maintained in the movie but it is used in a different place where the paradoxical character may come out unnoticed.

Kubrick's visualization of the third part of the novel starts when Alex comes home. It does not depict Alex's embarrassing encounters with journalists, proving his impotence to defend, nor does it show his reading the boastful articles in Government Newspapers, suggesting a new vision of the world without crime. It

does not contain the first manifestation of Ludovico's treatment, when the lewdness of people in the restaurant makes Alex feel sick. The novel insinuates a gradual disclosure of the terrible consequences of the Ludovico's treatment.

In the part of the movie where Alex comes home, Kubrick depicts his inner feelings suggested in the novel, by having Alex perform the action of raising his hand against the lodger. It is even more suggestive, showing that the lodger is disgusted by Alex being sick because of his treatment. In the movie Alex also learns that his snake died. It can be guessed that the death of the snake symbolizes Alex's impotence to behave devilishly.

Only in Burgess's version, Alex goes to his formerly known places, the music store and Korova Milkbar. In the music store Alex, again, realizes that he is not able to get angry for fear of the sickness. He also becomes aware of the fact that all emotional music makes him feel bad. There is no such thing in the movie, because, obviously, Kubrick wanted to focus only on Beethoven's *Ninth*. In the Korova Milkbar, Alex hallucinates about God and his angels, telling him that he has to try again. This is, possibly, a catalyser referring to the nature of the last chapter of the novel. Alex decides to commit suicide in both versions but Kubrick uses only indirect ways of a cinematic code to suggest it. Strangely enough, in Kubrick's version, Alex does not feel any sickness thinking about the suicide. The scene in the library where Alex encounters his former victim is replaced in the movie by an encounter with his former victim, the homeless. However, the library scene is a significant one, because it shows Alex deprived of the opportunity to enjoy literature. Even reading the Holy Bible makes him feel terrible, because the duality of good and evil participates in everything.

The part taking place in the writer's house is treated differently in both versions. The novel seems to be more philosophical, reintroducing the pamphlet, *A Clockwork Orange*, and its notion of people being turned into machines by the government that decides for them what should be considered good or wrong. The pamphlet contains the notion of a natural growth as a catalyser for the last chapter of the novel. Mr. Alexander and his colleagues want to fight for liberty but, at the same time, treat Alex like a thing in a cage that can be used. Only in the novel, Mr. Alexander reiterates the thoughts uttered formerly in the novel by the prison curate. He also says explicitly that Alex has been deprived of the pleasures of music, literature, love, etc. The act of depriving people of their right to sin is

pronounced an ungodly act itself. In Burgess's version, Alex listens to Mr. Alexander and his colleagues and even takes part in the conversation, showing that he is not as unaware of their intentions and their wicked plotting as suggested by the movie. The way in which Mr. Alexander gets to know the real identity of Alex is different in both versions but both of them have their own charms. In the novel, it is the language that rings the bell, whereas in the movie it is the song, *Singin' in the Rain*. Only Kubrick depicts the pleasure that Mr. Alexander feels when Alex is being tortured by Beethoven's *Ninth*. He even looks like a bust of Beethoven himself. There are more differences between the two versions in this part of the story, but they do not convey any significant meanings, for instance, the fact that Mr. Alexander is bound to a wheelchair in Kubrick's version.

The last scene of the movie where Alex wakes up in the hospital lacks Alex's awareness of the selfishness of the political struggle, capable of using him as a scapegoat. The novel depicts the representatives of both political parties trying to have Alex as a potent weapon on their side. However, only Kubrick's version shows the minister of interior openly admitting that the public verdict is the most important instrument in the politics even though it is very easily influenced by media. It is possible only in the movie because there is the catalyser of Alex and the minister being alone (without any journalist) in the hospital ward.

In the last, redemptive chapter of the novel, Alex is shown growing out of his old ways and his animalistic youth has to give way to oncoming adulthood. Alex comments on the course of life. He describes the youth stage as an inevitable struggle that can be compared to a clockwork toy, not being able to avoid bouncing into obstacles. The last chapter adds a new philosophical level to the whole meaning of Burgess's novel. It summarizes all the catalysers referring to the nature of youth in the novel. To give a few examples, "...it is apparent that you, my dear boy, with ... the headlessness of youth ..." (Burgess 72); "...they were really – you and me and him and kiss-my-sharries – more like a natural growth like a fruit" (Burgess 124). The last chapter gives hope and the notion of moral progress as a natural part of everyone's life. On the other side, the fact that Kubrick's version does not adhere to this chapter gives Kubrick an excuse for not using some catalysers in his movie. For instance, there is no need to respect the specific fashion of Alex's gang because there is no oncoming change; Alex could be more black-and-white character because the moral growth is not a significant theme of

the movie, etc. However, by omitting the last chapter Kubrick highlighted the comfortlessness of his vision. Burgess himself blamed Kubrick for supporting the violence, twisting Burgess's intended message of the novel. "[A] vindication of free will had become an exaltation of the urge to sin" (In Duncan 136).

Kubrick maintains almost all cardinal functions and all important characters. The development of the movie lacks many important catalysers and indices. However, Kubrick successfully creates his own ways of creating the context for his own artistic expression. His thematic focus is different and more straightforward than that of Burgess, so he reasonably adjusts the indices and catalysers to correspond with his aim (the snake, *Singin' in the Rain*, etc.).

4.4.2. Summary

Very similarly to the previous case study, *A Clockwork Orange* exercises fidelity to the main thrust of narrative (Michael Klein and Gillian Parker) so it could be labelled as a transposition adaptation, introduced by Wagner. It also represents the incarnational concept by Kamilla Elliott, which is equal to the literalization concept by Thomas Leitch. However, if the omission of the last chapter is taken as a deliberate act, purposefully changing the meaning of the story, it should be suggested that Kubrick used Elliott's trumping concept, corresponding with Leitch's correction.

According to McFarlane's approach, as far as the textual fidelity is concerned, the movie adheres to cardinal functions and characters. It lacks some important catalysers but Kubrick sensibly creates his own ones, more suitable for his artistic purpose. Therefore, the succession of events in the movie (mostly) does not lack logic. Kubrick also offers cinematic equivalents for the elements of the text that are generally less susceptible for a direct transfer, namely the indices proper and the type of narration. As for the indices proper, Alex in the novel manifests fine taste in fashion, music, literature and art in general. Kubrick works reasonably with pieces of art (costumes, music, sculptures, furniture, etc.) in order to adhere to this fine taste. Especially the first part of the movie is very rich in displaying extraordinary collages of fine art. Also, Kubrick's sense of the representation of place is more than satisfying. On the other side, the psychology of the characters is depicted too black-and-white and, sometimes, the movie gives the impression of an allegorical

story without inner evolution of characters. Nevertheless, Kubrick's version does not need to depict the inner evolution because of its omission of the last chapter. Regarding the type of narration, Kubrick makes use of various montage techniques, camera angles and even the hand camera to support the subjective experience of the main character. Also the voice-over helps to establish the subjective view. The nadsat talks are taken directly from the novel. However, due to the chiefly visual character of the film medium that cannot afford extensive inner monologues, the recipient cannot fully enjoy the suggestive language experiment for which the novel is so special.

Regarding the spiritual fidelity, one of the main points to be seen both in the film and the novel is that evil which is chosen is nonetheless superior to good which is not. Kubrick's treatment still seems far less elaborated and superficial. In Kubrick's version, the consequences of losing the moral choice are restricted to the violence and one concrete piece of music. Hypothetically, according to Kubrick's version, it would be possible for Alex, to move from the county (in order to escape his own past) and live a normal life without violence and Beethoven's *Ninth*. The novel, contrastingly, suggests that the duality of good and evil is inherent in everything human (love, art, religion, etc.) and, therefore, it is not even thinkable to live without it. It is not possible to erase the evil from the world whatsoever. Without the duality and the right of the free moral choice there would be no sense in anything. The philosophical impact of the movie cannot be even compared to that of the novel.

To sum up, regardless the shallow philosophical bias, the movie has shown it deserves the place among the treasures of the world's cinematography, but, in my opinion, mainly because of its visual quality and shocking suggestiveness.

5. Conclusion

This thesis tried to find out such elements in a novel that movie adaptation should try to be faithful to, in order to be considered a quality piece of art as such. It was important to differentiate between the two basic approaches to the problem of fidelity, the textual fidelity and the spiritual fidelity.

As far as the textual fidelity is concerned, a framework by Brian McFarlane, using the structuralist terminology adopted from the work of Roland Barthes, was applied for the sake of distinguishing certain categories of a novel's actual text that could be traced also in the movie version. On the one hand, some of these categories proved relatively easily accessible to a direct transfer because they were not dependent on the medium of expression. On the other hand, there were categories that appeared less predisposed to be transferred onto the screen since they were bound to the written medium and, therefore, their treatment asked for various adaptation strategies utilizing ways of expression peculiar for cinematography.

To be able to transcend the formal side of a novel and focus more on the treatment of the spiritual fidelity, chiefly the themes and motifs, the structuralist approach had to be abandoned. It was important to realize that the textual side of a novel served as a vehicle for drawing a reader's attention to a message, which was as important as, or even more important than, the text itself.

The practical part of this thesis, hopefully, demonstrated that the textual fidelity and the spiritual fidelity are two sides of the same coin, but, most importantly, it showed that the spiritual side of fidelity was chiefly connected with those categories of the textual fidelity that were less susceptible to the direct transfer. To be less abstract, the indices proper and the kind of narration contributed mostly to the spiritual side of fidelity.

The two examples of tight adaptation in this thesis tended to maintain the thrust of the precursor narratives by keeping the major cardinal functions and characters. Nevertheless, Peter Brook's *Lord of the Flies* failed in depicting the changes in the psychology of the characters. His movie did not offer equivalents for the indices proper and the style of narration, so the outcome was a simple-minded allegory. Stanley Kubrick's *A Clockwork Orange* kept the transferable elements and, fortunately, offered a few examples of cinematic equivalents for the

style of narration and indices proper. These equivalents in terms of the voice-over, music, locations, work with the camera, etc. proved potent enough to guarantee the artistic quality of the movie.

The remaining two case studies featured a rather loose treatment of the succession of events and main characters of the precursor novel. They took the source text as a raw material to be reworked. Steven Spielberg's *The War of the Worlds* was, above all, a science fiction, disaster movie. It regarded the depiction of the devastating alien attack from the novel as its main challenge. It adjusted the cardinal functions and characters to a new narrative, and changed the spiritual side of fidelity, resulting in a polished piece of filmic work, totally lacking the spiritual depth of the source novel. Francis Ford Coppola's approach proved the best of the four case studies. He wanted his movie to adhere mainly to the spiritual side of Conrad's novel, adjusting the thrust of the narrative in order to be relevant to the contemporary problems, proving the universality of Conrad's message. He even diverted the attention from the source novel by the name of his movie. For all, the outcome of his work was an outstanding, independent piece of art that conveyed the same deeper message as suggested by Joseph Conrad, and an interesting alternative to the reading of *Heart of Darkness*.

It seems that tight adaptations should focus more on the categories of the textual fidelity that are less susceptible to direct transfer in order to be considered faithful and quality at the same time. Loose adaptations do not have to treat the textual fidelity so accurately. They seem to have the advantage of creating their own cardinal functions and characters so they can seek for their own ways of expression in order to adhere to the spiritual side of fidelity.

In my opinion, the duality of textual and spiritual fidelity resembles that of the form and the content. The best result is to create a great form with a great content. However, if I had to choose between the form and the content I would go for the content. Similarly, as far as movie adaptations are concerned, I would prefer the spiritual fidelity to the textual because, for me, the impact of the spirit is more permanent than the impact of the text.

6. Works Cited

- A Clockwork Orange*. Dir. Stanley Kubrick. Warner Bros, 1971.
- Adamovič, Ivan. "Ve Válce Světů se Dobře Tuží Rodinná Pouta." *Hospodářské Noviny* 29 Jun. 2005.
- Apocalypse Now*. Dir. Francis Ford Coppola. Zoetrope Studios, 1979.
- Brooke, Michael. "Lord of the Flies (1963)." *Screenonline*. 10 June 2013.
<<http://www.screenonline.org.uk/film/id/555873/index.html>>.
- Burgess, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange*. London: Penguin, 1996.
- Casetti, Francesco. *Filmové Teorie 1945 - 1990*. Praha: Nakladatelství akademie muzických umění, 2008.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. London: Harper Press, 2010.
- Cranskshaw, Edward. *Joseph Conrad*. London: The Macmillan Press LTD, 1976.
- Delbanco, Nicholas. *Group Portrait*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1982.
- Delorme, Stéphane. *Francis Ford Coppola*. Paris: Cahiers du cinema, 2010.
- Duncan, Paul. *Stanley Kubrick the Complete Films*. Cologne: Taschen, 2003.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Úvod do Literární Teorie*. Prague: Plus, 2010.
- Elliott, Kamilla. *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Golding, William. *Lord of the Flies*. London: Faber and Faber, 1962.
- Gregor, Ian, and Mark Kinkead-Weekes. Introduction. *Lord of the Flies*. By William Golding. 1954. 1st ed. London: Farber and Farber, 1962.
- Hearts of Darkness: A Filmmaker's Apokalypse*. Dir. Fax Bahr. American Zoetrope, 1991.
- Helmanová, Alicja. "Tvořivá Zrada. Filmové Adaptace Literárních Děel." *Tvořivé Zrady: Současné Polské Myšlení o Filmu a Audiovizuální Kultuře*. Ed. Petr Mareš. Prague: Národní filmový archiv, 2005. 133-144.
- Cheshire, Gerard. Life&Times. *Heart of Darkness*. By Joseph Conrad. 1899. 1st ed. London: Harper Press, 2010.
- Křivánková, Darina. "Válka Světů Je Protipól E.T." *Lidové Noviny* 28 Jun. 2005.
- Kundu, Rama. *New Perspectives on British Authors: From William Shakespeare to Graham Greene*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2006.

- Leitch, Thomas M. *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents: From Gone With the Wind to The Passion of the Christ*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Lord of the Flies*. Dir. Peter Brook. Janus Films, 1963.
- Matějka, Ivan. "Coppola se Vrátil k Příběhu Apokalypsy." *Hospodářské Noviny* 22 Jul. 2003.
- McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Monaco, James. *Jak Číst Film*. Praha: Albatros, 2004.
- Morrison, Blake. Introduction. *A Clockwork Orange*. By Anthony Burgess. 1962. 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1996.
- Mravcová, Marie. *Literatura Ve Filmu*. Praha: Melantrich, 1990.
- Priestley, Breton. "Of Clockwork Apples and Oranges: Burgess and Kubrick (2002)." *www.brentonpriestley.com* 2002. 5 August 2009 <http://www.brentonpriestley.com/writing/clockwork_orange.htm>.
- Pudovkin, Vsevolod. *Film, Scénár, Réžia, Herec*. Bratislava: Tatran, 1982.
- . *Stanislavského metoda ve filmu*. Praha: Československý Státní Film, 1952.
- Rosenberg, Jennifer. "War of the Worlds Radio Broadcast Causes Panic." *About.com*. 13 April 2013. <<http://history1900s.about.com/od/1930s/a/warofworlds.htm>>.
- Slanina, Ondřej. *Slavná Světová Filmová Klasika*. Praha: Charon Media, 2011.
- Spáčilová, Mirka. "Král Vypravěčů Rozpoutává Válku Světů." *Mladá Fronta Dnes* 25 Jun. 2005.
- Spáčilová, Mirka. "Válka Světů Nedovolí Vydechnout." *Mladá Fronta Dnes* 29 Jun. 2005.
- Strusková Eva. *Mezi Literaturou a Filmem*. Praha: Československý filmový ústav, 1988.
- Štaudová, Lucie. "Apokalyptická Vize Lidské Šílenosti." *Denní Telegraph* 20 Feb. 1996: page 13, col. 3.
- Vágner, Ivan. "Tři Hodiny Šílenství ve Vietnamské Džungli." *Lidové Noviny* 13 Feb. 1996.
- War of the Worlds*. Dir. Steven Spielberg. DreamWorks Pictures, 2005.
- Wells, Herbert George. *The invisible man: The War of the Worlds ; A dream of Armageddon*. London: Fisher Unwin, 1924.