DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 330 CS 203 047

AUTHOR Aquino, John
TITLE Film in the Language Arts Class. Developments in Classroom Instruction.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 53p.
AVAILABLE FROM NEA Order Department, The Academic Building, Saw Mill Road, West Haven, Connecticut 06516 (Stock No. 1811-7-00, $2.50 paper, $5.00 cloth)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Film Criticism; *Films; Film Study; *Language Arts; *Literature Appreciation; Secondary Education; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

In this booklet, the author discusses the ways in which film may be used to extend and enrich the study of literature and explores the rhetoric of film--how it uses visual symbols, similes, and other metaphors to give depth to its content, and how it can broaden characterization and emphasize the symbolic and aesthetic highlights of setting in sequences that last only seconds. Topics of chapters are film and literature, films to extend or compare with works of literature, films as illustrations of literary techniques, and films instead of novels. A list of references, an annotated filmography, and a bibliography are included. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS CLASS

by John Aquino

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY NEA

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

ED130330

CS 203 047

DEVELOPMENTS IN CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

A National Education Association Publication

Film

IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS CLASS

Feature films, produced commercially for popular entertainment, have begun to prove their value in the classroom, particularly in the secondary language-arts curriculum. When compared with the novels, short stories, and plays from which their plots and characters are sometimes derived, they can throw valuable light on the works of literature that have inspired their producers. But even though there may be a relationship between a film and a work of literature, the film cannot be approached as a secondary or dependent art form. It is, in fact, an art form that may be as easy or difficult of access as any work of literature.

In this report in the *Developments in Classroom Instruction* series, John Aquino discusses the ways in which film may be used to extend and enrich the study of literature. In addition, he discusses the rhetoric of film—how it uses visual symbols, similes, and other metaphors to give depth to its content, how it can broaden characterization and emphasize the symbolic and esthetic highlights of setting in sequences that last only seconds. Using *Lord Jim* and *The Taming of the Shrew* as study models, and drawing many examples from other films, he shows how discussion may be used in the language arts class to relate reading and viewing. He also points out that film does allow the slow learner and the mentally handicapped student access to works of literature they would not ordinarily be able to read, at the same time that it can motivate the able learner to more effective critical reading of works of literature.

The report also includes an annotated list of films suitable for classroom use, as well as a bibliography. Mr. Aquino, managing editor of *The Music Educators' Journal,* has taught in the English department at The Catholic University of America. He has also published several articles on the theater and on George Bernard Shaw, and is the author of *Science Fiction as Literature*, also in this series.

Film

IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS CLASS

by John Aquino

nea
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 1977
National Education Association of the United States

Stock No. 1811-7-00

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Aquino, John.
Film in the language arts class.
(Developments in classroom instruction)
Bibliography: p.
1. Language arts. 2. Moving-pictures in education.
3. Moving-pictures and literature. I. Title. II. Series.
LB1576.A7 420'.7 76-43033
ISBN 0-8106-1811-7

CONTENTS

1. Film and Literature 7
2. Films to Extend or Compare with Works of Literature 11
3. Films as Illustrations of Literary Techniques 31
4. Films Instead of Novels? 41

References 44

Annotated Filmography 46

Bibliography 56

1. Film and Literature

The difference between film and literature is basic. Literature relies on the printed word, film on the visual image, usually in conjunction with the spoken word. This basic difference between the two media engenders other differences that ultimately affect the way they approach structure as well as the way their audiences respond to them.

Of the two, film, in its commercial form, is a medium of ever-increasing popularity. Feature film and its sister television, are currently the stuff of which an imaginary world of adventure and fantasy are made. Their effect is analogous to that of the novel in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when people crowded the docks in New York to find out—in the latest installment of Dickens—whether or not Little Nell was dead, and when Sherlock Holmes was thought to be an actual person. In the 1960's, James Bond films based on a best-selling series of adventure books became cult items and inspired a rash of imitations. They fueled the worldwide interest in espionage and spy-gadgetry. In the early 1970's, the film version of *The Godfather* engendered imitations and similar interest in the underworld and its violence.

In spite of their differences, there are many similarities between feature films and literature. Both are primarily concerned with telling stories. Literature served as an early influence on film so that terms such as *plot*, *irony*, *theme*, *climax*, *suspense*, and *characterization* are identifiable in both media. Dickens has been cited as an influence on American film pioneer D. W. Griffith[1] and Zola on Russian filmmaker Sergei Eisenstein.[2] Novels, short stories, and plays are frequently adapted for film.

The reverse is also true, that films influence literature. John Dos Passos employed filmscript techniques in *U.S.A.* and John Collier adapted Milton's *Paradise Lost* into a "screenplay of the mind." In *Jacob's Room* Virginia Woolf employed *montage*, a film device utilizing brief pictures or images juxtaposed.

There has been a recent trend to promote the study of screenplays (filmscripts) as literature. Douglas Garrett Winston writes that the claim that screenplays are literature is based on (a) the recent tendency to publish them, and (b) the proof of post-World War II cinema that films can not only entertain people but can enlighten them as well, with the "same subtleties and complexities that are to be found in any other art or literary form."[3]

To some critics, studying films as literature seems to require a new definition of literature. Robert Richardson cites the need for a climate in which everything written, including, of course, filmscripts, might be legitimately considered a part of literature.[4] Herbert Read writes that those who deny the connection between film and literature regard literature as "something polite and academic . . . If you ask me to give you the most distinctive quality of good writing, I would give it to you in one word: VISUAL."[5]

Another argument for studying films as literature is based on the fact that in the short history of the cinema, dramatic works have been written for film by such renowned figures in literature as H. G. Wells (*The Man Who Could Work Miracles*, 1935; *Things to Come*, 1936), F. Scott Fitzgerald (*Three Comrades*, 1938), Aldous Huxley

(*Pride and Prejudice*, 1940; *Jane Eyre*, 1943), Ernest Hemingway (*The Spanish Earth*, 1937), William Faulkner (*Roads to Glory*, 1936; *To Have and Have Not*, 1944; *The Big Sleep*, 1946), Jean Cocteau (*La Belle et La Bête*, 1947; *Orphée*, 1949; *La Testament d'Orphée*, 1960), Samuel Beckett (*Film*, 1965), Harold Pinter (*The Servant*, 1963; *The Pumpkin Eater*, 1964; *The Quiller Memorandum*, 1967; *The Go-Between*, 1970), and George Bernard Shaw (*Pygmalion*, 1938; *Major Barbara*, 1940; *Caesar and Cleopatra*, 1945).

But, however powerful the urge to study as works of literature the screenplays of favorite films or those written by literary figures, the basic difference between film and literature remains: film is composed of visual images presented in conjunction with the spoken word; literature relies on the printed word alone. It is never merely a matter of a screenplay being written for sequences of film frames. In addition, a screenplay suffers from the same deficiency as does a play script—it is complete only in performance. But a play is still a work of words; either it can be read aloud by a group such as students in a classroom or it can be assigned as silent reading to be followed by discussion. A screenplay, however, is only a blueprint for the finished blend of words and images that appears on the screen. A film properly does not exist outside of its projection onto a screen with a sound track accompanying the visual images. In short, a screenplay alone is an unfinished thing, unlikely and unfit for study as literature.

Although film is an entirely different medium from literature, and screenplays are not literature because they are unfinished in themselves,[6] the opinion that films have no place in a language arts curriculum, is not defensible. The similarities between film and literature noted earlier offer a firm basis for treating both forms in the classroom. Richardson argues that the visual literacy that is constantly being created and enlarged by films is an extension—or another version—of the verbal literacy that has been associated with literature since the Greeks.[7] Surely this parallel can be exploited. Also, novels, plays, even poems have been adapted to film. Now, while none of these film adaptations has been a duplication of the original, the comparisons between the two forms can be instructive to students. These premises allow us to explore at least three ways in which feature films can be used in a language arts curriculum:

- As extensions of or comparisons with specific works of literature
- As illustrations of literary techniques
- As substitutes for specific works of literature.

2. Films to Extend or Compare with Works of Literature

Since the beginning of the cinema, works of literature have been used as the basis for films. George Meilies adapted Jules Verne's *Trip to the Moon* to the screen in 1902. Before this in 1898, Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree and the cast of His Majesty's Theatre transferred some of their production of Shakespeare's *King John* to celluloid. In the 1920's, filmmakers on both sides of the Atlantic plundered the works of Dickens, Frank Norris, James Barrie, Tolstoy, Zola, Sabatini, and Robert Louis Stevenson. With the coming of sound in

1927, Hollywood began to rely on the comedies of Coward and Kaufman, while later filming spectacular versions of *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Anna Karenina*, *Great Expectations*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*. There have even been film versions of narrative poems, such as the 1955 film *Ulysses* (from the *Odyssey*) and the 1951 adaptation of Alfred Noyes's "The Highwayman."

The usual contention is that a film ruins or at least cannot do justice to the novel, short story, or play from which it is adapted. This contention is generally wrong in that it overlooks the basic difference between film and literature. A piece of fiction creates a world of words. A novelist manipulates words in creating characters, describing scenes and events, and provoking reader responses such as sympathy or dislike. Henry James in *The Aspern Papers*, for example, has a first-person narrator whose use of words leads the reader to doubt the accuracy of the narration. But such a use of words cannot be the focus of a film.

There would seem to be less difference between feature films and drama, since films imitate human action in a manner similar to drama. But, unlike film, drama requires actors to react to and play against immediate audience response· dramas are created to rely on audience acceptance of theatrical make-believe. More importantly, dramas often utilize the stagecraft at a theater's disposal in a way that does not transfer to films. For example, in the stage musical *Fiddler on the Roof* other characters "freeze" while Tevye, within a spotlight, talks to God or to himself. In the film version (1971), the director Norman Jewison used a variation on this effect: he distanced the other actors from Tevye and had Tevye photographed in closeup with the other actors seen over his shoulder. The film effect lacked the immediacy and fluidity of the stage effect. And, although soliloquies are a standard device of the theater, Tevye's soliloquizing seemed forced on the screen. The play *Death of a Salesman* by Arthur Miller utilized the technique of an actor walking from the present in one room to the past in another. This same technique was used in the film (1951) where it seemed clumsy, since film is capable of shifting an individual from present to past and back again merely by a change of image.

In short, no matter how hard it tries, a film cannot exactly represent the piece of fiction or the play from which it is taken, because it is not that novel or short story or play. The most that can be expected of a film adaptation of a work of literature is that it be relatively faithful to the original and still be a good film. The film *Frankenstein* (1931) greatly alters the structure and characterization of Mary Shelley's original. But it is the memory of the film characterization and not that of the novel that is associated with the name Frankenstein. In adapting the novel, the scenarist took speech away from the monster, streamlined the plot, removed Victorian conventions, and gave the story a happy ending. But the film maintains Dr. Frankenstein's motivation, the theme of tampering with life and death, and creates in the monster a mute grotesque that is convincingly the victim of an experiment that transgresses the limits of science.

The question remains, can a film version of a literary work be helpful to students learning about that work? To continue the example of *Frankenstein*, if the novel is read and discussed by students, then, as a coda to the discussion of the novel, the film can be shown. The film *Frankenstein*, while not strictly faithful to the novel, retains much of the plot, the theme, and many of the central characters. The teacher can help the class examine the differences between the novel and film. Questions can be asked, such as "What changes are made in the film adaptation? Do these changes help or hurt the final effect of the film? Do they blunt the point of the original? Does the film make the point in a different way?" At the very least, the showing of the film allows the students to *visualize* what they have read.

Of course, some films are so different from the original work that there is no point in showing the film in connection with a classroom discussion of the work. The teacher should be able to decide whether there is enough of the original in the film for it to be helpful in such a discussion.

Film and Fiction

The tempting question of whether film or fiction as a genre communicates better is not necessarily relevant to the study of either form. Given the plot of Stevenson's "The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," which is preferable, the film versions or the original story? The Stevenson story is epistulary and episodic. The first major film version, starring John Barrymore in 1922, reorganized the story into a straight narrative, provided two love interests (the good woman Dr. Jekyll is to marry and the saloon entertainer Mr. Hyde fancies), and emphasized the transformations of Dr. Jekyll into Mr. Hyde. Later American film versions have maintained these deviations from the original and extended them to protracted final chase sequences in which Mr. Hyde is caught and killed, and to detailed transformations from Dr. Jekyll to Mr. Hyde, utilizing makeup and special effects. But, going back to the original story, it seems in some ways more horrifying if such transformations are left largely to the reader's imagination, as in the Stevenson work. Also, the original epistulary, and consequently, episodic structure creates a suspense in itself as the reader learns bit by bit who Mr. Hyde is, a suspense that is lacking in the films.

Elder Olson notes that fiction affects the imagination of a reader while drama affects the sensations of an audience.[1] Fiction can describe both a character's thoughts and actions with words; drama and film display primarily external behaviors, even when they attempt to put thought into speech.

Film can visualize immediately many things that printed fiction must describe in such a way that the reader is forced to take time to form a complete impression. One wonders whether any prose description of a character's vertigo could match Alfred Hitchcock's distorted-vision effect employing a trackout combined with a forward zoom in *Vertigo* (1958). We can both see and see-through the ghosts in the various film versions of Dickens' *A Christmas Carol*. We can *see* the frantic battle the old man wages with the great fish in the film of *The Old Man and the Sea* (1958). The flying carpet in *The Thief of Bagdad* (1941) does indeed fly. In the film version of H. G. Wells' *The Time Machine* (1960), we do not need to rely on being told that the Time Traveler saw great changes as he traveled from 1895 to the 1960's and beyond, because we see the changing fashions, the ever-expanding cities, the variations in transportation, the wars, the destruction, and people growing older.

Often the visualization of what must be described in fiction when fiction is adapted for films leads to the omission of dialogue and transition pages in favor of a succession of images. In Dickens' *David Copperfield*, David meets Mr. Murdstone in chapter two; David and Peggoty visit Peggoty's brother for two weeks in chapter three while David's mother marries Mr. Murdstone; and in chapter four, after David cannot satisfy Murdstone and his sister that he knows his lessons, he is savagely beaten by Murdstone. In the 1970 film version (released to TV in the U.S.A.), the same basic action is accomplished in this fashion:

David meets Mr. Murdstone who is already married to David's mother:

> CLOSE ON: Murdstone, who has now moved Davy back, and is bending down and pinching the lobe of the little boy's ear.

> MURDSTONE: Davy and I will get on well enough—won't we, Davy? *He laughs quietly and menacingly.*
>
> INT: LIVING ROOM—CLARA COPPERFIELD MURDSTONE HOUSE—DAY CLOSE ON: Davy's Mother, distraught, her eyes on the room overhead, the sounds of a cane thudding down repeatedly and Davy's cries coming down to us.[2]

The film compresses and visualizes David's relationship with Mr. Murdstone. The dialogue and action of chapters three and four are omitted. The film transcends time limitations, cuts out circumstances and causes, and goes right to the end result. Such compression of events would probably also occur if the novel were adapted into a drama. The purpose of such compression in both film and drama is to strive for points of high action, climax, and plot development. But film goes a step further than drama in that it can jump sequential time and connect images logically related.

Since film is a blending of spoken words and visual images, extensive dialogue and transitional sequences of words are uncinematic and hence may appear very awkward in film. What must be remembered about film is that it can accomplish a great deal with a short series of images. There are three shots in John Ford's *The Searchers* (1956) that tell a little story in themselves. Clayton, a burly frontiersman, sits at a table drinking coffee. He sees through an open door a woman stroking the Army uniform of her husband's brother. He quickly averts his eyes. These three shots tell the audience about the woman's love for her husband's brother, show that Clayton knows about it, and, by his averting his eyes, tell us worlds about Clayton—the brusque man's uncharacteristic modesty, his discretion in the immediate situation, even his chivalry, since we sense that he will tell no one about it.

This scene from *The Searchers* also provides an example of how film establishes characters—quickly and concisely, taking full advantage of looks and gestures. In *The Russians Are Coming! The Russians Are Coming!* (1967), the Russian submarine commander (whose lines are spoken entirely in Russian) is stodgy, very military, and humorless. At the film's end, the New England townspeople come to the aid of the beached Russian submarine and give it safe escort to open waters. A little girl waves at the submarine commander. The camera goes into a closeup of the commander's face. He looks both ways to make sure no one is watching him. Then he smiles and gives a quick, little wave of his hand. With this one brief incident, the film suggests a gentle man beneath an ultra-military shell. The character of Mike, Brett's British lover, is well established in Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* by dialogue and prose descriptions. The film version (1957) uses different methods. A key scene in the film's characterization of Mike occurs at the end of the film. Brett has left. Jake is checking in on Mike who is sitting on the bed in his room. The dialogue in the film is derived from the following passage narrated in the novel by Jake:

> I went in and sat down. The room was unstable unless I looked at some fixed point.
>
> "Brett, you know. She looked for you to say good-bye. They went on the seven o'clock train."
>
> "Did they?"
>
> "Bad thing to do," Mike said. "She shouldn't have done it."
>
> "No."
>
> "Have a drink. Wait while I ring for some beer."
>
> "I'm drunk," I said. "I'm going in and lie down."
>
> "Are you blind? I was blind myself."
>
> "Yes," I said. "I'm blind."
>
> "Well, bung-o," Mike said. "Get some sleep, old Jake."[3]

In the film, Mike's lines are delivered heartily, perhaps overheartily. Mike is sitting on the edge of the bed. The scene is photographed mostly from an overhead angle so that Mike seems small and isolated and the disheveled bed prominent. "Bung-o!" Mike says heartily and raises his glass. "Bung-o," Jake acknowledges softly, and he leaves. As soon as the door closes, the camera closes in on Mike's face. The smile fades. Tears seem about to well in his eyes.

In the adaptation of fiction to film, then, film can visualize prose descriptions, can visualize and sometimes compress the action of a piece of fiction, and can suggest action and characterization by images, sometimes without dialogue. A limitation in film is that, unlike fiction, it deals primarily with external behavior. A voiceover on a film's soundtrack to tell a character's thoughts cannot be used continually. Even nightmare sequences such as the final scenes in *Dead of Night* (1946) work with visual shock effects and seldom delve into a character's psyche. Related to film's concentration on external behavior is its inability, because of its very visibility, to leave any visual thing to the imagination of the viewer. Ambiguity in fiction is often lost in the translation to film. Henry James' *The Turn of the Screw* leaves it unclear whether the ghosts are genuine apparitions or figments of the housekeeper's or the governess's imagination. The screenplay by William Archibald and Truman Capote, for the 1961 film version entitled *The Innocents*, by having the ghosts heard and predominantly seen only by the governess, makes it appear that they are figments of her imagination and thus presents a limited interpretation of the James story.

But the opposite can also be true, that film does not always effectively visualize what words can describe. In Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, the hound is described as "a hound from hell," and, when it finally emerges on the moors, so startles the usually implacable Sherlock Holmes that it gets past both him and Dr. Watson. A frantic chase ensues. The hound leaps upon its prey, Sir Henry, and is just about to slash his jugular vein when Holmes and Watson arrive and have to empty both their revolvers to kill the great beast. In none of the many film versions of the novel has this effect been even approximated. This is because filmmakers have lacked "a hound from hell." In the 1959 version, the chase is eliminated completely and the hound attacks Sir Henry in the ruins of a Roman grotto—one wonders if the chase was eliminated so that the hound's rather small size would not be emphasized. In the 1972 made-for-TV film with Stewart Granger as Holmes, the hound is not even shot; instead, Holmes strangles a rather emaciated-looking dog on the moors. Conan Doyle was able to achieve with words what filmmakers could not do with visualized atmosphere and special effects.

Another problem with film's ability to visualize is that, in showing everything, film's approach to what it shows is generally objective. It is true that films often include subjective shots, and entire films have been made from one character's point of view (*Lady in the Lake*, 1946) and even several points of view (four in *Rashomon*, 1952; American version—*The Outrage*, 1964). But, as a rule, films are objective in what they show.[4] Short generalized statements, such as those in the novels of Henry James and Jane Austen, which begin a novel and appear periodically to orient the reader to events, are not transferable to film. The first sentence of James' *Portrait of a Lady*,

> Under certain circumstances there are few hours in life more agreeable than the hour dedicated to the ceremony known as afternoon tea. . .

is not filmable. A voiceover narration of these words is unlikely to help, since the story is not being told by anyone in particular (just an omniscient narrator). And even if the line were voiced-over to start the film, lacking the orientation the words give to the situations in the novel, the film would soon become objective in what it showed.

Even so obvious a narrator point-of-view as that used in *Tom Jones* is uncinematic. Its continual interruptions would break the flow of a film. But the narration, which has a convivial, ironic tone and openly manipulates the action, which requests of the reader, "let us behave to one another like fellow-travellers in a stage coach who have passed several days in the company of each other," is the structuring element of the novel and would seem essential for an adaptation.

Yet, once it is admitted that film cannot achieve short generalized statements or duplicate a novel's center of consciousness, it becomes apparent that film can achieve some measure of success on its own terms. In adapting *Tom Jones* to film (1963), the director Tom Richardson and the scenarist John Osborne approximate much that the narrator in the novel accomplishes. They do use a voiceover narrator, but sparingly, just to sequence the events. However, on occasion, Tom winks at the audience; he asks the audience if the landlady took his money. Mrs. Waters shrugs at the audience when she is told that Tom with whom she has spent the night is her son, and she comes forward and explains to the audience what Squire Allworthy is telling the others. All of these effects approximate the original narrator's tone and manipulation of events. They make it clear that this is only a film, just as the narrator made it clear that the original was only a novel. The film *Tom Jones* is a good example of adapting a novel's special devices to film techniques.

Any film adaption of a work of fiction is open to criticism from purists. The criticism is certainly justified for adaptation of fictions that compress events and oversimplify characters to suit a two-hour running time and to match the supposed intelligence level of the audience. Faulkner's system of relationships in *The Sound and the Fury* proved too complicated and uncommercial for Hollywood, so it was changed for the 1959 film. The older Quentin (Caddy's brother) is eliminated; Jason is no longer Caddy's brother but the son of Father Compson's second wife by her previous marriage. There is, then, no blood relationship between Jason and the younger Quentin (Caddy's daughter), so a love relationship is acceptable. Jason's character is softened. Quentin does not run away with the carnival showman, as she does in the novel, but returns to Jason. It was inevitable that the film would not have the quadruple point-of-view structure of the original novel. But the changes also result in the loss of a) half the book through the elimination of the older Quentin (Caddy's brother), b) the shift in time sequences, c) the sadism of Jason, d) the incestuous feelings Jason has for the girl Quentin, and e) the eventual sense of poetic justice when Jason cannot find Quentin and the money she has taken.

A number of the problems related to over-simplification have come from filmmakers' reluctance or inability to deal with anything but the conventional. After all, Hollywood gave a happy ending to Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* (1932) and turned the Ghost of Christmas Past into a beautiful girl in the 1938 version of *A Christmas Carol*. But, in defense of filmmakers, it should be said that some of the problems in the transfer of a story to film have to do with the nature of the film medium itself. Alfred Hitchcock notes that a film bears a closer similarity to a short story than to a novel or a play, because a short story sustains one idea that culminates when the action has reached the highest point of the dramatic curve.[5] Following this line of reasoning, not only will a novel have to be translated into cinematic terms, but it will also inevitably, be compressed when it is translated into film.

LESSON MODEL: Comparison of Film and Novel:

Lord Jim

In 1965, Joseph Conrad's novel, *Lord Jim*, was brought to the screen. It was written, directed, and produced by Richard Brooks, a writer and director of both entertainment films and adaptations of literary classics and popular dramas.[6]

Procedure:

A. Reading of Novel

B. Class discussion of novel

Sample discussion questions:

Structure:	How is the story told? Who is the narrator? Is there more than one? What is the nature of the language used in the narration? Does it affect the way the reader responds?
	How does the way in which the story is told affect the time sequence of the novel?

Who is the hero of the novel—Jim or Marlow?

What is the story about?

Characterization: How are the characterizations of Jim and Marlow established—by their speeches, by descriptions of actions; all at once, or little by little?

Who is Jim? What does he dream about? What is his problem?

Why does Marlow take an interest in Jim?

Compare Jim and Gentleman Brown.

C. Viewing of film

D. Class comparison of film and novel

Sample discussion questions:

How is the film's story told? How is it different from the novel? What other changes does the different treatment bring about? In time sequence? In the number of characters? In the action? In the characterization? In the way language is used?

Who is the hero of the film?

Who is Jim in the film? What does he dream about? What is his problem?

What is the film story about?

Background for the Lesson: Analysis of Film and Novel

The first major difference apparent between the novel and the film is that of organization. *Lord Jim* is a novel of complex structure. It begins with an omniscient narrator telling the early history of Jim up until Jim's testimony at the inquiry (Chapter 4). The remainder of the book is told by Marlow, who meets Jim during the inquiry. Marlow tells part of the story at a dinner party and the rest in a letter to another guest at the dinner party. The book, then, becomes a combination of Marlow's reminiscences of Jim, and the reminiscences of Jim, Jewel, and the French officer who boarded the *Patna* after the crew had deserted, as told to and recounted by Marlow. Hence, it combines several different points of view. The time sequence also shifts back and forth. Marlow remembers Brierly's appearance at the inquiry, mentions Brierly's suicide a short time later and a mate's account of it, and then remembers his last conversation with Brierly which occurred during the inquiry. Similarly, Marlow's recounting of the Gentleman Brown episodes shifts back and forth, from Brown's speaking of Jim on his deathbed to Brown's remembrance of his encounter with Jim years before. Time seems to stand still for three chapters (7,8,9) with Jim on the deck of the *Patna*, as if holding as long as possible this very important moment in Jim's life.

Much of the book is taken up with Marlow's descriptions of the inquiry and its participants and Jim's conversations with Marlow. Jim has difficulty expressing the burden he bears (that of having deserted the *Patna*), but it soon becomes clear:

> " 'I had jumped. . .' He checked himself, averted his gaze. . . 'It seems,' he added.
>
> "His clear blue eyes turned to me with a piteous stare, and looking at him standing before me, dumfounded and hurt, I was oppressed by a sad sense of resigned wisdom, mingled with the amused and profound pity of an old man helpless before a childish disaster.
>
> " 'Looks like it,' I muttered.[7]
>
> ° ° ° °
>
> " '. . . I had jumped—hadn't I?' he asked, dismayed. 'That's what I had to live down. The story didn't matter.' . . . He clasped his hands for an instant, glanced right and left into the gloom: 'It was like cheating the dead,' he stammered.
>
> " 'And there were no dead,' I said. . . .
>
> " 'And that did not matter,' he said, as stubbornly as you please."
>
> (Chapter 12)

Eventually Jim finds forgiveness and contentment as Lord or Tuan Jim in Patusan: " 'Look at these houses; there's not one where I am not trusted.' " (Chapter 24). Eventually, the possible loss of this trust leads him to sacrifice himself.

Soon, it becomes not only Jim's story, but Marlow's as well. Marlow's story is of his search for information about Jim, his growth of understanding, and his inexplicable interest in Jim:

> "It seemed to me I was being made to comprehend the Inconceivable—and I know of nothing to compare with the discomfort of such a sensation. I was made to look at the convention that lurks in all truth and on the essential sincerity of falsehood. . . .My fault of course. One has no business really to get interested. It's a weakness of mine."
>
> (Chapter 8)

Marlow's comment about Jim, that "he was one of us," (Chapter 5) refers both to Jim's British upbringing and to the kinship Marlow finds with Jim. Both men seem to wrestle with the strengths and weaknesses of humanity. Gentleman Brown, the pirate, also compares himself with Jim (Chapter 40).

The film eliminates the character of Marlow altogether. The events of the novel are restructured and related in the film in strict chronological order. It is easy to see why this structure was used. It is the conventional method of film storytelling. It is possible, of course, to imagine a film of the novel *Lord Jim* maintaining the structure of the original and still being cinematic. The landmark film *Citizen Kane* (1941) told a story of a man's efforts to find the truth about a recently dead millionaire by interviewing the man's friends and associates, thus producing several points of view in the same film. *Catch-22* (1970), from the Joseph Heller novel, attempted to recapture the novel's tricks with time.

The omission of Marlow and the restructuring of the sequence of events have many repercussions. It is no longer Marlow's story as well as Jim's. Jim's soul-searching as expressed to Marlow, Marlow's interest in Jim's story, and his accumulating of the details of Jim's story are gone. The other points of view are missing. The film's approach to its subject matter is objective. The role of narrator is no longer shared by Marlow and an omniscient narrator, but is taken over by Jim's first captain, a character created for the film.

Marlow's function as Jim's confessor is taken over in the film by Stein. The French captain's opinions are not told to Marlow three years after the inquiry but are incorporated into the inquiry. The shipwreck and inquiry, as well as Jim's wanderings, are compressed in the film in favor of more extensive coverage of other aspects of the book.

Since Marlow's search for details about Jim and Marlow's growth of understanding are gone, the film is entirely Jim's story. And Jim's story, told in chronological fashion, is an adventure story. This is what the film *Lord Jim* becomes. Unfortunately, the standards it follows for adventure films are commonplace—the story of Jim who, in order to expiate his guilt of the *Patna*, wanders around the colorful islands performing brave and noble deeds. Jim is given an adversary, the General, who is perhaps derived from Sherif Ali in the novel. The General is a slobbering, sadistic warlord who tortures Jim gleefully. Jim blows up the General by tossing a burning barrel of gunpowder at him. He blows up Brown and Cornelius by shoving the gold coins they are after into a cannon and firing it at them. (In the novel, Brown dies in bed many years after the action involving Jim.) Jewel is not Cornelius' daughter, but becomes someone called simply "the Girl", who has her blouse ripped open by the General. Rather than the complex personification of evil that he is in the book, Gentleman Brown is a rather harmless fanatic whose motivation is misplaced religious conviction. Even things that are taken from the book exist in isolation. For example, Stein's collecting butterflies, which is retained in the film, is meaningless without his reminiscence to Marlow of his lost youth and lost dreams.

Brooks' simplifications of the original occasionally lead to travesty. Conrad mentions Jim's daydreams. Brooks uses a split screen to show Jim daydreaming of his being on a desert island with a beautiful native girl and his rescuing his captain from pirates. There is no indication in the novel that Conrad was referring to such comicbook-style daydreams. In the film, Captain Brierly is a shrill spokesman for British honor who accuses Jim of having betrayed his kind. Brierly is later reported a suicide. In the novel, Marlow describes Brierly as a man who seemed "consummately bored by the honour thrust upon him. . . .One of those lucky fellows who knew nothing of indecision, much less of self-distrust." Of his suicide, Marlow comments, "No wonder Jim's case bored him," noting how deep his own guilt must have been. The film retains the character of Brierly but misses the point of his role in the novel. The film's Brierly is a stereotype who kills himself out of patriotic hysteria. The novel's Brierly parallels Jim, since both characters experience private guilt.

We note, then, that a major character has been omitted, the novel's complex structure redesigned, and the story offered up as an adventure story. Some of the film's treatments of the book's characters and ideas cause both to be travesties of the originals. Not only is the film unfaithful to the Conrad novel, but it is not even a very good film.

What in the film *Lord Jim* could be of value to students studying the novel? At the very least, by comparing the film's structure to that of the book, a student might better understand what Conrad was doing with structure, with time, with point of view, in order to make a statement about human life and individual responsibility. There *is* an adventure story element in the novel, but the film chooses to emphasize only that element. Some of the film's changes from the original are for better dramatic effect: Jim and the ship's crew come into port in a lifeboat with their story all prepared and are greeted by the sight of the *Patna* still afloat. The shipwreck sequence in the film captures the intensity of the storm, as the waves persistently knock Jim down and hurl him around, not allowing him time to think, thereby providing an explanation of why Jim abandoned ship.

Some of Brooks' settings are also effective. At times they are even more effective dramatically than the novel's descriptions. In the novel, Jim and Gentleman Brown have their meeting on land. In the film, these two men, alike and yet not alike, meet alone on a crude, wooden ferry, surrounded by fog.

Film and Drama

A film and a play both imitate human actions before an audience. Both deal in external rather than internal behavior. Beyond that, there has been continual debate as to how close the two media are. There is such a thing as the "filmed play," a filmic record of a stage performance, such as Richard Burton's *Hamlet* (1964) or Laurence Olivier's *Othello* (1965). These are not strictly films. A play becomes a true film, however, once the imitated action no longer exists on a stage but within the frame of verisimilitude possible in film and subject to cinematic techniques.

The term typically associated with film adaptations of dramas is *opening up*. Plays are confined within a proscenium arch. Their imitation of human action is limited by what can be shown on stage. This limitation has long been acknowledged. Shakespeare has the Chorus in *Henry V* address the problem:

> O for a Muse of Fire that would ascend
> The brightest heaven of invention,
> A kingdom for a stage, princes to act,
> And monarchs to behold the swelling scene!
> Then should the warlike Harry, like himself,
> Assume the port of Mars, and at his heels
> (Leash'd in, like hounds) should famine, sword, and fire
> Crouch for employment. But pardon, gentles all,

The flat unraised spirits that hath dar'd
On this unworthy scaffold to bring forth
So great an object. Can this cockpit hold
The vasty fields of France? Or may we cram
Within this wooden O the very casques
That did affright the air at Agincourt?
(*Henry V*, I, 1–15)

Film provides such a Muse of Fire for drama. Laurence Olivier's film version of Henry V (1945) begins with the Chorus' invocation and two scenes set at Shakespeare's Globe Theatre. The play is then opened up. The battle of Agincourt is shown on an open plain in all its ferocity and glory.

The method of opening up plays for films is a testament to the earlier noted ability of film to visualize. Action that is described on stage can be shown on film. The Ascot Races and Embassy Ball are only referred to in Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*. In the film version (1938), in scenes supplied by Shaw himself, these events are shown. Opening up not only has to do with supplying scenes described on stage but also with extending the action for film. The duels in the films *Romeo and Juliet* (1936) and *Hamlet* (1948) are much more extravagant than they could ever be on stage. The same is true of the fight scenes in *The Great White Hope* (1971), the battle and mob scenes in *Julius Caesar* (1953) and the pageantry in *Camelot* (1967). With this visualization comes some compression of dialogue and the omission of scenes in the original play which the visualization renders unnecessary.

Sometimes the opening up of a play is done to an accepted formula. Alfred Hitchcock describes the process:

> Let's say that in the play one of the characters arrives in a cab. In the film they will show the arrival of the cab, the person getting out and paying the driver, coming up the stairs, knocking at the door and then coming into the room, and this serves to introduce the long scene that takes place in the room. Sometimes, if a stage character has mentioned something about a trip, the film will show the journey in a flashback.[8]

Plays may be opened up too much, as in the film of *The Front Page* (1974) where chases and other scenes not suggested in the original play were added to the text merely for the sake of taking the action out of the play's original one-set location. Plays may also be opened up too little. The film of Jean Kerr's *Mary, Mary* (1963) contains three brief additional scenes; otherwise, the action remains confined to the living room set of the original play.

Opening up a play for films can change the play's orientation and structure to the point where the film is an entirely new expression, bearing only passing resemblance to the original play. Arthur Miller's *A View From the Bridge* was an attempt at modern tragedy, complete with a chorus in the person of a lawyer who makes reference to ancient Greece. In brief, the play concerns a longshoreman whose *tragic flaw* is a subconscious desire for his niece. In Sidney Lumet's film version (1963), the chorus function of the lawyer is eliminated. A less theatrical approach is employed, and New York dockyard locations are utilized. Consequently, the conscious parallels to classic tragedy are lost and the film becomes the story of a single man who works at the docks, and who has an unfortunate desire that results in his death.

Blatant theatrical effects do not transfer well to film. In the play *Edward, My Son*, the main character talks to the audience, justifying his actions. This was retained in the film version (1949). In the theater, the effect was that of one person talking to a live audience. In the film, the effect is that of a man-on-film talking to a live audience. The film was considered forced and stagy. In the film of Robert Bolt's *A Man for All Seasons* (1966), the character of the Common Man, who spoke directly to the audience and assumed several parts in the play, was not used. Instead, the play was filmed as straight historical drama, emphasizing pageantry, and taking advantage of on-location filming of British castles and fields. Bernard Shaw's *Saint Joan* was completely restructured in the Otto Preminger film (1957) to render it more cinematic. The original is a chronicle play which culminates in a fantasy scene in which all the major characters reappear in a dream. The film begins with the dream; the characters appear magically and begin to describe their part in the story, which then continues in a series of flashbacks.

It should become apparent that even though film and drama are similar in their basic intent, a film adaptation of a drama as a rule renders the play an entirely different entity. The difference is sometimes more startling than are film adaptations of novels, mainly because a film and a novel are so dissimilar to begin with. A play can be filmed several times and each film can be completely different from every other, depending on how the play is opened up and on the interpretation the film gives to the play's lines and actions. Orson Welles' film of *Macbeth* (1948) is quite a free adaptation. Lines are cut and new characters added. The witches' opening lines are spoken on the soundtrack while their hands are seen molding a clay figure of a man and placing a crown on the figure's head. Macduff's killing of Macbeth is symbolized by the hacking off of the statue's head. The emphasis in this film is on the barbaric and primeval, on darkness, fog, and craggy heaths. George Schaeffer's *Macbeth* (1960), originally filmed for TV's Hallmark Hall of Fame and later released to theaters, has no touch at all of the barbaric or of primeval influences. The witches are quite obviously fortune tellers rather than actual witches, and the story becomes one not of predestination and the supernatural, but of the inherently evil nature of humankind. There are elements of the barbaric and supernatural in Shakespeare's play. The Welles' version concentrates on these and extends them. The Schaeffer version ignores them. Two completely different films of the same play result.

LESSON MODEL: Comparison of Film and Play:

The Taming of the Shrew

In 1966, the Italian director Franco Zefferelli produced and directed an English-language film version of William Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew.*[9]

Procedure:

A. Reading of play

B. Class discussion of play

Sample discussion questions:

What is the play about? What is Petruchio's goal? How does he achieve it?

Is the play serious or funny? What makes the play a comedy?

How is the play structured? Is the Christopher Sly framework necessary?

What is *stichomythia*? Where does it occur in the play?

C. Viewing of film

D. Class comparison of film and play

Some discussion questions:

In the film what has been omitted from the play? Why?

What has been added to the film? Why?

How are the play's *stichomythia* scenes treated in the film?

What is the film about? What is Petruchio's goal? How does he achieve it? Does he really achieve it? Why?

Background for the Lesson: Analysis of Film and Play

Shakespeare's play, supposedly one of his earliest (ca. 1593–94), is a farce about a young blade named Petruchio who is out to marry for wealth, and how he "tames" Katherina, the shrewish daughter of Baptista, a rich gentleman of Padua. The play has a framework in the story of Christopher Sly, a drunker tinker who, as a prank, is dressed in rich clothing by a lord. Sly awakens to find servants who convince him that he is indeed a lord. Sly watches players perform a play, "The Taming of the Shrew." There has been some critical debate concerning the Christopher Sly sequence, since after awhile Sly disappears from the action altogether. Consequently, the framework is one-sided, and the critical debate concerns the genuineness and necessity of those Sly sequences.

The Taming of the Shrew is distinguished by the extreme, male-chauvinistic methods that Petruchio uses to tame Katherina. He is drunk at their wedding, he drags her from the wedding reception early, he starves her, and he mentally tortures her into admitting that day is night and night is day if he so wills it. The play is also characterized by *stichomythia*, a term used for the exchange of short speeches:

KATH: Asses are made to bear, and so are you.
PET: Women are made to bear, and so are you.
KATH: No such jade as you, if me you mean.
PET: Alas, good Kate, I will not burthen thee,
For, knowing thee to be but young and light.
KATH: Too light for such a swain as you to catch,
And yet as heavy as my weight should be.
(II, i, 199–205)

The Zefferelli film avoids the problems with the Sly sequences by simply eliminating them. The film begins with Lucentio's entry into the city. It cuts out most of the scenes between Bianca, Katherina's sister, and Lucentio, and focuses on Petruchio and Katherina. The lines in the remaining sections are more or less intact, though they are given interpretations not always evident in or consistent with the original text, but showing, rather, a striving for either comic or cinematic effects. For instance, Petruchio's speech,

Why came I hither but to that intent?
Think you a little din can daunt mine ears?
Have I not in my time heard lions roar? . . .
(I, ii, 198–200)

is delivered in the film as he, Gremio, Hortensio, and Vincentio march to Baptista's house. Meanwhile, however, Katherina is beating Bianca. Act I, scene two has been blended with Act II, scene one. Petruchio's grand speech, therefore, is interrupted by both Katherina's and Bianca's screams, causing the men—even Petruchio with his bold words—to back off in fear.

An even greater instance of changing the interpretation of lines by visual effect is the stichomythia scene between Petruchio and Katherina (II, ii). The thought seems to have been that such staccato dialogue is uncinematic. Therefore, while many of the lines have been retained, the battle of words gives way to an actual battle as Petruchio pursues Katherina through various rooms in Baptista's house, across the roof, through the roof. He even declaims lines while swinging on a trapeze.

Another important interpretation that the film supplies to the original text is a watering down of the attitude towards women as subservients. The reading of Katherina's lines and closeups of her face indicate that she is letting Petruchio think that he has the complete upper hand. At the end, Petruchio heartily proclaims his victory to the people at the banquet, only to turn around and find that Katherina is no longer beside him. He must fight his way through a roomful of women in order to pursue her.

The film also strives to extend and fill in the action of the original play. Petruchio's entrance into Padua for the wedding in gaudy and ill-fitting clothes is turned into a parade. The wedding, with Petruchio's bad behavior, only described in the play (II, i, 149–183), is shown in the film, along with additional details supplied by the screenwriters: Petruchio cannot find the ring, tries to drink the wine from the cruets, knocks the priest down, and blots out the "not" of Katherina's "I will not" by kissing her.

The film *Taming of the Shrew* has adapted the original play in the usual manner—omitting material unnecessary to the development of the story; providing certain interpretations to the actions, and opening-up the play. The filmmakers have not been unusually violent to the text and have been true to the farcical, boisterous spirit of the original. While students should be kept aware of the differences between the play and the film, they can have a useful discussion of the play from viewing the film, because the film is a fairly faithful rendering of the play.

3. Films as Illustrations of Literary Techniques

As we have seen, films can be used to supplement the teaching of specific works of literature. In addition, films, or segments of films, can be useful in explaining literary techniques in a language arts curriculum.

There is no denying that films and literature are inherently different; that films rely on visual images and spoken dialogue, literature on the printed word. *Irony* and *metaphor* as executed in film and literature, because of the basic differences between the two media, are not the same in both. Still, since film is a visual as well as audible medium, it can illustrate irony and other literary concepts and techniques to students. As an instructional tool, films are preserved in a permanent and constant form; they are easily available for rent or through theater and television showings. Also, the showing of a film, even though it serves an instructional end, is likely to receive a good reception from the class.

The selection of films or parts of films for instructional purposes should depend both on the teacher's knowledge and on the availability of particular films. Following are discussions and suggestions for using feature films to illustrate various literary devices: point of view, metaphor, personification, irony, symbol, and imagery.[1] The definitions of these terms are taken from standard dictionaries of literary terms. That some of the films selected to illustrate literary devices may show or suggest violence is a reflection both on the type of feature films that have been produced recently and on the type of dramatic action that evokes irony and symbol in film.

Point of View

The concept of point of view is one of the most important in the study of literature. It is essential that students grow to realize that all writing, from classic works of literature to current nonfiction books and magazine articles, have an orientation that is designed to shape reader reaction. This orientation is most often described as a certain point of view. M. H. Abrams defines point of view as follows:

> Point of view signifies the way a story gets told. . . . the perspective or perspectives established by an author through which the reader is presented with the characters, actions, setting, and events which constitute the narrative in a work of fiction.[2]

Abrams lists as types of point of view, third person omniscient and its variations, and first-person narration.

Point of view in films is analogous to point of view in literature. It is conveyed by the different angles of vision—by what is shown and how it is shown. Consequently, while point of view in literature is more subtle and varied than in films, a film can serve as a good introduction to the concept.

For example, in first-person narration in fiction, the point of view is usually limited by what the speaker has experienced. In film, the single-character point of view is often expressed with a subjective camera. The point of view of a film that is generally objective will occasionally change to include a subjective shot of a fist or pie coming towards the camera, or to a single character's view of an action or situation. At the end of Alfred Hitchcock's *Spellbound* (1945), for example, the point of view changes abruptly to a subjective shot: the screen's foreground is filled with the villain's gun which follows the heroine as she goes to call the police. The gun follows her but does not go off. She leaves, the gun slowly turns towards the camera and goes off, signifying the villain's suicide. The action in the first twenty minutes of *Dark Passage* (1947) is seen from the main character's point of view, all shot with a subjective camera, as he escapes from prison and seeks a plastic surgeon to change his face (into that of Humphrey Bogart). All but three minutes of Robert Montgomery's *Lady in the Lake* (1947) is shot with a subjective camera and shown from the main character's point of view. This approximates the first person narration of the detective novel that was the film's source. The audience, then, learns the mystery of the lady in the lake at the same time that the detective, Philip Marlowe, does. The audience sees what he sees and knows what he knows. These and other films can show students just what is meant by first person point of view, because the audience is shown certain situations from particular angles as one character experiences them.

The subjective camera is not the only way film can establish a single-character point of view. Alfred Hitchcock's *Rear Window* (1954) is framed around a photographer (incapacitated by a broken leg) and his observation through binoculars of the apartment complex across the way. He sees bits and pieces of the lives of many people and, little by little, piles up evidence of a murder in one of the apartments. Though not entirely subjective in the visual presentation, the film evidences a first person point of view. In this way the film follows the method of narration in the short story from which it was adapted.

As a rule, the objective approach of films is analogous to the third person omniscient narration in literature. The audience is treated as a third person watching the events of the story. But in films, there is still a structuring element that selects what is shown, just as the choice of particular words shapes the effects in third person omniscient narration in literature. Alfred Hitchcock's *Psycho* (1960) is very stark, very realistically filmed. It rigidly adheres to two-character shots so that the audience becomes a third person watching the events. But the director includes selected shots of the supposed murderer, the young man's mother, and her voice is heard. Different shots would have revealed the surprise ending: the mother a mummified corpse, the murderer the young man with a split personality who from time to time assumes the character of his mother.

Two examples for class use of what is meant by point of view are film treatments of the same basic story, that of the sinking of the *Titanic* in 1912. Both films were taken from popular books. In the film *Titanic* (1953), women and children are shown to the lifeboats first. There are individual acts of heroism by passengers and crew. The captain goes down with his ship, and the people on the sinking ship sing "Nearer My God to Thee" as the ship's band plays. In *Night to Remember* (1958), some acts of heroism are shown, and the band does play, but most of the people do not hear the band, since they are clawing one another to retain a footing on those parts of the ship still above water. Those who jump overboard either die of heart failure in the icy water or are sucked under.

The difference between these two films is not so much one of truth as of point of view. *Titanic* is very selective in what it shows and highlights. It emphasizes the heroic. *Night to Remember* has a wider angle of vision. It strives to be objective and to show the whole picture, both the heroism and the callousness that result from panic.

Another good example of point of view for class use is presented in *Gambit* (1966), a comedy-suspense film about an art theft. In the first half of the picture, the hero imagines how perfectly the theft will go. This first half, though not shot from a subjective point of view, shows the exploit as the protagonist imagines it will be, and consequently, represents his point of view. The second half shows the actual robbery in which everything goes wrong, in comic contrast to the first half. This second half represents the objective point of view typical of films.

Metaphor

Metaphor is defined as "a figure of speech in which a comparison is made between two objects by identifying one with the other."[3]

Douglas Garrett Winston notes that film is often criticized for its absence of metaphor because words cannot serve as the mediating factor.[4] But, in addition to containing metaphors that might occur in dialogue, film can achieve metaphoric effects by juxtaposing or blending images. In *Strike* (1924), Sergei Eisenstein dissolves from the image of a man whose tongue and teeth protrude to a shot of a dog. In *Hallelujah, I'm a Bum!* (1933), a shot of singing bums is followed by a row of singing crows. In *The Lady from Shanghai* (1946), a couple deep in a scheme full of illicit love and a faked murder meet in an aquarium, silhouetted against tanks of squids, octopuses, and grouper fish.

Metaphor in films also occurs when an object is photographed to look like something else. In Orson Welles' *The Magnificent Ambersons* (1942), young George, a callow young man, comes back to the empty Amberson mansion and prays beside the white sheeted bed where his mother has died. The bed looks like an altar. In Hitchcock's *To Catch a Thief* (1955), the shiny shingles of a roof on which police pursue a jewel thief take on the appearance of a giant chess board.

Personification

Personification is "a figure of speech, a species of metaphor, that attributes to inanimate or abstract things the qualities of a person."[5]

Personification is so easily presented in the film medium that films are an excellent tool for illustrating this literary technique. Personification of inanimate or non-human things occurs in *The*

Wizard of Oz (1939) when trees are shown in active resentment against Dorothy and the Scarecrow who are picking fruit off their branches. But when the Scarecrow speaks disparagingly of the quality of their fruit, the trees throw the fruit at him, giving him exactly what he wants. In *One Touch of Venus* (1947), a statue of the goddess Venus comes to life when a store clerk kisses it. In less classical fare, in *The Road to Yukon* (1945), a fish speaks to Bob Hope. In a later scene a bear walks through a bedroom in the middle of the night, then turns towards the camera and complains: "A fish they let talk. Me, I don't get a single line!"

Personification of abstract things is illustrated in the final scene of *The Joker Is Wild* (1957). The singer-comedian Joe E. Lewis confronts himself, or at least his super-ego, in reflections in store windows. In William Saroyan's *The Human Comedy* (1943), the narrator/ghost of the family's father is not only an illustration of the afterlife but also of the ideal moral qualities of a model family during World War II.

Irony

Dramatic irony occurs when the audience of a play is aware of plot elements of which one or more characters are unaware.[6] Film versions of plays that exhibit dramatic irony can, of course, preserve those moments for eventual classroom use. In the 1968 film of *Oedipus Rex*, Oedipus mocks Tiresias' blindness and threatens the murderer of King Laius with justice. Both mockery and threat eventually turn back on Oedipus. But film, primarily because of its generally objective quality, is prone to suggest that more cosmic brand of dramatic irony known as the irony of fate.

> The phrase "irony of fate" figuratively assigns to fate the role of an ironic will that mocks men's plans . . .[7]

Irony of fate can serve to teach what is meant by the word *ironic*.

In a film entitled *They Wouldn't Believe Me* (1947), a young man is unjustly accused of murder, and the evidence against him is overwhelming. Just as the foreman of the jury is about to announce the verdict, the man panics, tries to escape, and is shot and killed by the police. For the record, the foreman reads the verdict: "Not guilty." That is irony at its most obvious.

In Orson Welles' *Touch of Evil* (1958), a police chief finds evidence for murder against a Mexican youth. It is later revealed that the chief had planted the evidence to get a conviction. The chief is later found out and killed in a gunbattle, but before he dies the youth confesses: he had been guilty all along. In *The Sand Pebbles* (1966), irony is a major theme, because an American gunboat risks an international incident to rescue the missionaries who do not particularly want to be rescued.

In *The Americanization of Emily* (1964), the hero of the hour, the first man on the beach at Normandy, is shown to be not only not dead, as has been reported, but also a coward. Still, for publicity's sake, his statue is ironically displayed as an inspiration for others. What is quite possibly the most cosmic irony of all occurs in *The Planet of the Apes* (1968). An astronaut, wishing to escape the mad, fatalistic frenzy the earth is turning on itself, goes to a planet located in the future. He discovers that it is inhabited by human-like apes. He finally escapes from the apes and finds, in the closing shot, that he has never left home. He sees on the beach the shattered hulk of the Statue of Liberty.

Symbol

A symbol in literature is "the use of expression which represents or recalls certain ideas. A short, concrete symbol is found to be a convenient substitute for ideas, particularly abstractions."[8]

Film, which deals principally with visual images, can be expected to have a good supply of symbols. Symbols in films achieve the same purpose as symbols in literature, but they do so visually rather than in writing. *The Manchurian Candidate* (1962) is a film that deals with a communist assassination plot. A scene at a party begins with a shot of caviar molded in the shape of the American flag. A guest takes a cheese knife and cuts into the flag, symbolizing the traitorous act which is to be the film's subject. In Hitchcock's *Saboteur* (1942), the hero fights with the Nazi villain on the top of the Statue of Liberty which serves, of course, as a symbol of freedom. The villain falls, the hero grabs his arm, and slowly, thread by thread, the villain's coat sleeve comes apart; symbolically, his life hangs by a thread. Hitchcock repeats the Statue of Liberty symbol in *North by Northwest* (1959), where foreign spies pursue the hero and heroine over the presidents' faces on Mount Rushmore.

Things that are common, everyday symbols can take on greater symbolic meaning in films. In *High Noon* (1952), a town is beset by gunfighters who are intent on killing the sheriff. The sheriff will not run, but no one in the town will help him, except his Quaker wife. He wins the fight, and as he leaves the town with his wife, he tosses the badge in the dirt. Throughout the film he has worn the badge as a sign of his office but at the end the badge takes on new meaning. It stands for law and order, which he has fought to uphold and for his individual courage and triumph in upholding them. The badge in the dust stands for his contempt, not of the law, but of the town that would not support him.

Symbols in films can be complex. For example, in *The Bridge on the River Kwai* (1957), the bridge represents three progressive ideas: first, it is a symbol of British POW resistance to the Japanese; second, it is a symbol of personal and national pride as the British POWs decide to help the Japanese build the bridge; third, it is a symbol of enemy construction that has to be destroyed by British forces. Frederico Fellini's *La Strada* (1955) uses the road of the title as a multifold symbol. The protagonists are travelling performers; the road reflects their way of life. The road also is a symbol of a journey, not only through life, but a journey of the soul. As the protagonists develop, they travel either to their spiritual fulfillment or to their ultimate despair.

Some film symbols are very simple. Fellini's *Amarcord* (1973) begins in spring with puff-balls blowing about the Italian town. The film traces the young protagonist's life through the winter when his mother dies, and ends with a wedding in the spring where puff-balls blow again. The puff-balls symbolize spring, new life, new hope. In John Ford's *The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance* (1962), a woman places a cactus rose on the coffin of Doniphon, a man of the Old West. The rose is a symbol for the man who, like the rose, was rough and wild and free.

Imagery

> (Imagery is) The presentation of an object or idea by referring to something else with which it becomes associated in the writer's imagination, or the expression of ideas by means of images or mental pictures. . . . It is an invariable quality of the true poetic mind to see things in new ways, to turn them to shapes and to find new relationships of abstract and concrete.[9]

Imagery as a concept in literature is difficult to relate to film since film, by its nature, consistently deals with visual images. However, examination of the above definition of imagery, especially its references to the poetic mind and its expression of things in new ways, suggests that extended images in films could prove of use in a classroom situation to illustrate not only what is meant by imagery but what constitutes poetic expression.

For example, in an early scene in John Ford's *Prisoner of Shark*

Island (1936), President Lincoln is assassinated. His head falls forward, and this image dissolves so that a very thin curtain seems to descend over Lincoln's head. This scene evokes an allusion to the theatrical setting of the Lincoln assassination (Ford's Theater), and at the same time it suggests a veil of history separating Lincoln from us. As then-Secretary of State Stanton said at the time of Lincoln's death, "Now he belongs to the ages."

In Alfred Hitchcock's *The Wrong Man* (1957), a man is falsely accused of a crime. The wrong man loses his job and his wife goes insane. Driven to despair, he finally prays before his mother's statue of the Madonna. As the man prays, Hitchcock superimposes on his face the figure of a man walking toward the camera. This man's face then takes the place of the face of the wrong man on the screen. The second man is the one who really committed the crime, the person the wrong man has been mistaken for. The criminal is caught and the wrong man is vindicated and freed. Hitchcock has effected a "new," even poetic way of suggesting divine intervention.

In *Beau Brummel* (1924), the title character, played by John Barrymore, is a dashing dandy who offends the king and spends his last days in poverty. In the final scene, he dies, a shriveled old man. From his corpse rises the superimposed form of his young self. This suggests an afterlife and a continuance of the essence of Beau Brummel: beauty and gallantry. A similar effect occurs in John Huston's *Moulin Rouge* (1953) when the dwarf artist Toulouse-Lautrec dies. Through his eyes, the room becomes filled with the transparent figures of can-can dancers and others from the Moulin Rouge, many of whom have long been dead, dancing to the strains of Offenbach.

After a while, such examples become a purely subjective matter. But any selection should be oriented towards a definition of imagery and poetic expression.

LESSON MODEL: Symbols

Procedure:

A. Hold a classroom discussion to teach the classic definitions of a *symbol*, showing how to apply a general definition to what the student has specifically read and viewed.

B. Sample readings might include:
Hawthorne's "Young Goodman Brown"
Conrad's "The Secret Sharer"
James Joyce's "The Dead"
Selections from Melville's *Moby Dick*

C. Sample films or film clips might include:
The Bridge on the River Kwai
Saboteur
High Noon
La Strada

D. Follow-up discussion of symbols in selected story and film
Sample discussion questions:

- What symbols do we find in (short story) and (film)?
- What are the differences in presentation of the symbols in (short story) and (film)? (Select a limited number of symbols from each to allow for full discussion.)
- How can everyday objects or events be made symbolic in a film? (Choose examples from the film the class has viewed.)
- Compare a complex symbol in a work of literature with that in a film. (Examples may come from outside reading and viewing.)
- How can the same symbol be presented in both forms? How do the presentations differ? How are they the same?

4. Films Instead of Novels?

The preceding two chapters have examined (1) films as extensions or comparisons for works of literature, and (2) films as illustrations of literary devices. But there is still another way that films can be used in a language arts curriculum, a way that requires that the focus of instruction no longer be the literary work but rather the film itself.

Richardson was quoted earlier with his claim that film represents an extension of the verbal literacy that started with the Ancient Greeks.[1] There is a growing tendency today to stress that reading should not be defined solely in relation to print media. Film has been seen as a way to develop good habits of perception, analysis, judgment, and selection of visual data.[2] Courses in visual literacy have been developed,[3] and manuals are available.[4]

The previous chapters have described some affinities and the extreme differences between film and literature. As we have seen, film can visualize what literature describes in words only. Consequently, film can be seen as an extension of literature. Much has been made of the fact that both the novelist Joseph Conrad and the filmmaker D. W. Griffith claimed basically the same thing: that their purpose was to make people *see*.

In the educational process, literature and language instruction are included in the curriculum to teach young people how to read with comprehension, to accelerate mental activity and curiosity, to open up not only worlds of previously written words but also worlds of imagination, new thought, and experience. Film, as an extension of literature, can serve the same educational purpose. Film has its own language, its own view of things. In its focus on external behavior, film can present to students what can be shown and felt, rather than what must be reconstructed from reading. In a language arts curriculum, film can be said to have just as much place as literature.

Taking this idea to the extreme, some have advocated the use of film in place of literature. There is something to be said for this idea. There are some students who are slow to read and some who will never read well. It is a harsh curriculum that deprives slow learners, the educationally disadvantaged, and the mentally handicapped from instruction that can accelerate thinking and curiosity and that can open up new experiences to them. Films are designed as entertainment. They are *meant* to be enjoyed. If at the same time they can instruct, then it is folly to ignore the possibility of their usefulness. As far as specific works of literature are concerned, students who may not be able to read the works themselves can at least, through film adaptations of these works, know of Captain Ahab, the Scarlet Letter, Scrooge. They can have heard "But soft, what light through yonder window breaks?" They can learn of Sancho Panza, the pit and the pendulum, and other characters and ideas from literature they will hear referred to again and again in the course of their lives. Film adaptations may provide an incentive to students to read an original work. But even if students do not become readers, they can know something of what gives literature its unique quality. If printed words cannot stir their imaginations, then films, with their rich virtuosity of visual effects, might. So there *can* be justification for substituting film for literature.

There is a danger, though, in teaching film in place of literature. The fact that film is a popular form and does not require reading assignments could make it seem to many students preferable to literature. Poor adaptations of literature can distort a student's view of the original work. It is hoped that the first two chapters of this report have shown that even successful film adaptations of literature are, because of the natures of the two media, inherently different. Richard Lester's version of *The Three Musketeers* (1974), for example, though faithful to the spirit of the original, streamlines the plot and interpolates slapstick effects, not in the original book, in order to duplicate the book's zestful spirit. Students should not be led to think that in the Dumas book, the musketeers are rescued by their servant dressed as a bear.

The continual use of films in place of literature ultimately defeats the purpose of language arts which is a development of the value and use of languages both as tool and as art. To be sure, visual language is important, especially as it concerns a student's development. But slavish utilization of film in the classroom for *all* students in *all* cases, because film is easy and popular, soon leaves the students right where they were before their formal education began—unable to read these works of literature and probably anything else similarly complex. It is surrender without a fight.

Film can be substituted for literature in some cases. Film has a place in language arts instruction along with literature. But temperance and wisdom must be used in curriculum planning because, as we have stated throughout this report, film is not literature and literature is not film. Use of either requires an understanding of both.

References

Chapter One—Film and Literature

1. Robert Richardson, *Literature and Film* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1969), p. 17.
2. Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Essays and a Lecture*, Jay Leyda, ed. (New York: Praeger, 1970), pp. 79–80.
3. Douglas Garrett Winston, *Screenplay as Literature* (London, Tantivy Press, 1973), pp. 14–15.
4. Richardson, p. 15.
5. Herbert Read, *A Coat of Many Colours* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1945), pp. 230–231.
6. It is ironic that one might be more justified in referring to unproduced screenplays, such as Dylan Thomas' *The Doctor and the Devils* and Bernard Shaw's *Saint Joan*, as literature because with these unrealized films one is dealing only with the printed word.
7. Richardson, p. 13.

Chapter Two—Films to Extend or Compare with Works of Literature

1. Elder Olson, *Tragedy and the Theory of Drama* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1961), p. 13.
2. George Curry, *Copperfield '70* (Screenplay by Jack Pulman and Frederick Brogger) (New York: Ballantine, 1970), p. 119.
3. Ernest Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises*, 1927 (rpt., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), pp. 223–4.
4. Alfred Hitchcock received great criticism for his 1950 film *Stage Fright* in which he used as the crux of the plot a suspected murderer's testimony, shown in flashbacks, that he did not commit the murder; after his friends try to prove him innocent, the film ends with the man having been guilty all the time—the flashbacks were a lie. This was thought by some to be unthinkable in a medium where all images are the truth.
5. François Truffaut, *Hitchcock* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967), p. 50.
6. Brooks has had long experience as a Hollywood scriptwriter, spinning out such entertainments as *Brute Force* with Burt Lancaster (1947) and *Key Largo* with Humphrey Bogart (1948). Brooks turned to direction in the early 1950's and wrote and directed two more Bogart vehicles: *Deadline U.S.A.* (1951) and *Battle Circus* (1954). He later began to specialize in film adaptations of classic fiction and popular plays: *The Last Time I Saw Paris* (from Scott Fitzgerald's "Babylon Revisited," 1954); *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1958); *The Brothers Karamazov* (1958); *Elmer Gantry* (1960); *Sweet Bird of Youth* (1961); and *In Cold Blood* (1966). The cast for *Lord Jim* included Peter O'Toole as Jim, James Mason as Gentleman Brown, Daliah Lavi, Curt Jurgens, Akim Tamiroff, Eli Wallach, Paul Lukas, and Jack Hawkins.
7. Joseph Conrad, *Lord Jim* (New York: Dell, 1961), Chapter 9, pp. 116.

All further references to this book will appear in the text and refer to this edition.

8. Truffaut, *Hitchcock*, p. 156.
9. *Shrew* was Zefferelli's first film after extensive stage experience. He achieved some notoriety by having his stage Hamlet declaim, "To be or not to be—What the hell!" In 1968, after *Shrew*, Zefferelli directed a film version of *Romeo and Juliet*, which featured young actors in the title roles. The cast of *Taming of the Shrew* included Richard Burton as Petruchio, Elizabeth Taylor as Katherina, Michael Horden as Baptista, Cyril Cusack, Alan Webb, and Victor Spinetti.

Chapter Three—Films as Illustrations of Literary Techniques

1. H. L. Yelland, S. C. J. Jones, K. S. W. Easton, *Handbook of Literary Terms*, (New York: Citadel, 1966), p. 196.
2. M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1957), p. 133.
3. *Handbook of Literary Terms*, p. 116.
4. Winston, p. 59.
5. *Handbook of Literary Terms*, p. 145.
6. Joseph, T. Shipley, ed. *Dictionary of World Literature* (Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1968), p. 234.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Handbook of Literary Terms*, p. 201.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 94–95.

Chapter Four—Films Instead of Novels?

1. Frederick Goldman and Linda R. Burnett, *Need Johnny Read? Practical Methods to Enrich Humanities Courses Using Films and Film Study* (Dayton, Ohio: Pflaum/Standard, 1971).
2. Ted Johnson, *Using Film in the Classroom*, 1971; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, November 1971. ERIC Document ED 085 759.
3. Ralph J. Amelio, *Film in the Classroom: Why Use It, How to Use It* (Dayton, Ohio: Pflaum/Standard, 1971).
4. David R. Anderson and Gary Wilburn, *Visualize; Instructor and Student Manuals* (Two Volumes) (Dayton, Ohio: Pflaum/Standard, 1971).

Annotated Filmography

This annotated filmography consists of two sections: the film adaptations of prose fiction and dramas, respectively. The list is not intended to be comprehensive but rather represents a sample of film adaptations of works often taught in elementary and secondary language arts curricula and particularly appropriate for classroom use. Care has been taken not to discuss film adaptations already dealt with in the text of this report. The works of some authors have been extensively filmed (e.g., Shakespeare, Dickens). In this listing, the name of the film's director follows D, and the names of the cast follow C.

A. *Film Adaptations of Fiction*

The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. 1938. D: Richard Thrope. C: Mickey Rooney, Walter Connolly, William Frawley, Rex Ingram, Lynne Carver.

The casting of Mickey Rooney as Huck Finn makes this version of the Mark Twain novel seem juvenile and casual. Twain's use of Southern dialects is not apparent, and the ending, the "taming" of Huck Finn, is conventional and not in keeping with the original. The novel was filmed again in 1960, directed by Michael Curtiz, with Eddie Hodges as Huck, and again in 1974 in a musical version made by Readers' Digest. Parallel to this is the film history of Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer,* which was filmed in 1938 by David O. Selznick who the next year would produce *Gone With The Wind.* This version contained an Injun Joe cave sequence which was considered too horrifying at the time and which had to be toned down. The novel was produced as a musical by Readers' Digest in 1974.

Alice in Wonderland. 1933. D: Norman Z. McLeod. C: Charlotte Henry, Richard Arlen, Gary Cooper, W. C. Fields, Edward Everett Horton, Baby LeRoy, Mae Marsh, Edna May Oliver, Jack Oakie, Cary Grant.

This film contains elements of both Lewis Carroll's *Alice* and his *Through the Looking Glass.* Most of the actors are unrecognizable in various makeups and masks. Sometimes stagy, this film was innovative in special effects which may seem dated now. Later versions are a 1950 British film directed by Dallas Bower which combined puppets and live action; the Walt Disney cartoon version; and a 1972 British film starring Peter Sellers, Dennis Price, Ralph Richardson, and an all-star cast.

Billy Budd. 1962. D: Peter Ustinov. C: Peter Ustinov, Robert Ryan, Terence Stamp, Melvyn Douglas, John Neville.

This is an adaptation of both the Melville novel and the Louis O. Coxe and Robert Chapman stage version. As such, it is highly dramatic and often quite talky. The camera-work is stiff, limited to close-ups of characters talking or reaction shots of characters listening to others talk. One can also question the casting of Ustinov as Captain Vere, though opinions may vary according to one's acquaintance with his long list of comic performances. However, the story of the Christ-like Billy Budd and its ironies remains intact.

The Great Gatsby. 1974. D: Jack Clayton. C: Robert Redford, Mia Farrow, Bruce Dern, Howard Da Silva.

This film follows the plot of the F. Scott Fitzgerald novel closely, but it lacks conviction. The charleston is danced at Gatsby's party as if it were being performed on Broadway; the parties become improbably lavish feasts. Robert Redford lacks the inward, brooding quality of a Gatsby. There is some attempt to make the novel more contemporary: Gatsby and Daisy clearly become lovers; Fitzgerald's ironic image of Gatsby's corpse floating in his expensive swimming pool is replaced by a shot of the pool filled with blood.

Hemingway's Adventures of a Young Man. 1962. D: Martin Ritt. C: Richard Beymer, Diane Baker, Paul Newman, Eli Wallach, Arthur Kennedy, Ricardo Montalban, Dan Dailey, Susan Strasberg, Fred Clark, Corinne Calvet.

This is at once an oversimplified and sentimental compendium of the Hemingway stories woven around the character of young Nick Adams. And yet, it is an interesting film because of its production and cast, and the inherent interest of the stories. As an introduction to or dramatization of the stories, it is appropriate for class use. Richard Beymer is not a happy choice for Nick, but Newman as the Battler, Montalban as an Italian officer, and Kennedy as Nick's father are all most convincing.

Jane Eyre. 1944. D: Robert Stevenson. C: Joan Fontaine, Orson Welles, Margaret O'Brien, Peggy Ann Garner, John Sutton, Henry Daniel.

This is a faithful, atmospheric version of the Brontë novel of the orphan girl who becomes governess in the household of the mysterious Mr. Rochester. The film sentimentalizes and pretties up some of the elements of the original. And yet the film is still most effective in the more gothic sequences, especially those that trade on visual impressions: Rochester's displaying of his first wife, Jane's first glimpse of Rochester, Rochester's brooding and blind wandering through the ruins of his estate. Welles, Fontaine, and Daniel as the schoolmaster are quite good. Aldous Huxley collaborated on the screenplay.

The Letter. 1940. D: William Wyler. C: Bette Davis, Herbert Marshall, James Stevenson, Frieda Inescort, Gale Sondergaard.

The Somerset Maugham short story was basically about Mr. Joyce, a lawyer for Leslie Crosbie who has shot a man she says attacked her. But Mr. Joyce has to retrieve an incriminating note the woman sent to the dead man. He does so with distaste but out of sympathy for the husband and, perhaps, some love for her. Her husband finds out, but she goes blithely on. The film retains Mr. Joyce's discomfort and his relationship with the woman and is most effective in his (Stephenson's) scenes. But the film becomes Leslie Crosbie's story. The story begins after the shooting, but the film shows the shooting at the start and ends with a poetically just, tacked-on ending of Leslie being killed by the dead man's Chinese wife.

Lost Moment. 1947. D: Martin Gabel. C: Robert Cummings, Susan Hayward, Agnes Morehead, Joan Lorring, Eduardo Cianelli.

The film is a very romanticized version of Henry James' *The Aspern Papers*, in which a man seeks the lost love letters of a famous writer from an old lady and her daughter—even at the cost of romancing the daughter. Valuable for class discussion only for its beginning scenes with their gothic overtones or perhaps for contrast with the original. The film has the young man turn romantic hero and rescue the daughter from a fire that destroys both the letters and the old lady.

Moby Dick. 1956. D: John Huston. C: Gregory Peck, Richard Basehart, Leo Genn, Harry Andrews, Orson Welles.

This is a very literal and literate version of the Melville novel about Captain Ahab's pursuit of the great white whale. The action has been streamlined and characters omitted, but largely the film strives to duplicate Melville on film—New England town life; the activity aboard the *Pequod;* the mystic brooding sea filmed in muted colors. This exactitude, along with the casting of Gregory Peck as Ahab, may account for some dullness in the middle portion of the film. Peck is visually impressive as Ahab and tries very hard, but he lacks the resonance of voice and depth of interpretation of Basehart (Ishmael), Genn (Starbuck) and Welles (Father Maple). An interesting comparison is John Barrymore's *Moby Dick* (1930). Though the plot has been desecrated (Ahab returns home alive to his fiance), Barrymore's playing of Ahab is much truer to Melville than Peck's.

O. Henry's Full House. 1952. D: Henry Hathaway, Howard Hawks, Henry King, Henry Koster, Jean Negulesco. C: Fred Allen, Anne Baxter, Charles Laughton, Marilyn Monroe, Gregory Ratoff, Jeanne Crain, Oscar Levant, Jean Peters, Richard Widmark, Farley Granger.

Five O. Henry stories, "The Clarion Call," "The Last Leaf," "Ransom of Red Chief," "Gift of the Magi," "The Cop and the Anthem" are included in this film. All are faithful dramatizations, well cast and well produced. This film supports the claim that short stories are most easily adapted to films.

The Old Man and the Sea. 1958. D: John Sturges. C: Spencer Tracy, Felipe Pazos, Harry Bellaver.

This straightforward version of the Hemingway novella is a simple tale of an old man's epic encounter with a big fish. The story was thought to be unfilmable. This adaptation uses much of the third person narration of the novella on the soundtrack. Little of the original action has been omitted and the only major interpolations are flashbacks to the old man's arm wrestling victory. The battle with the big fish is graphically presented. As a detailed rendering of the novella it is appropriate for classroom use, though as a film it presents some problems—an inevitable static quality at times, and the use of Spencer Tracy as both the old fisherman and the off-screen narrator.

Oliver Twist. 1948. D: David Lean. C: Alec Guiness, Robert Newton, John Howard Davies, Kay Walsh, Francis L. Sullivan, Anthony Newley, Henry Stephenson.

This film captures the atmosphere and logically extends the action of the Dickens novel about the young orphan Oliver Twist's experiences in the workhouse, with a gang of thieves, and with a murderer. An illustration of the added scenes is the opening showing Oliver's mother stumbling towards the workhouse, her pathetic figure silhouetted against the sky—a scene suggested by though not included in the novel and in keeping with the Victorian melodrama of both the novel and film. In addition, the director seems to have cast the exact doubles of the Dickens characters: Robert Newton as the loathsome Bill Sikes, Guiness as Fagin, Sullivan as the portly beadle Bumble. An historical side-note that should be known by the teacher, if only to inspire group discussions, is that Guiness' characterization of Fagin was criticized on release as implicitly anti-Semitic.

The Picture of Dorian Gray. 1945. D: Albert Lewin. C: George Sanders, Hurd Hatfield, Donna Reed, Angela Lansbury, Peter Lawford.

This film is a lavish and generally effective version of the Wilde novel about the young man whose portrait shows the signs of age and sin while he remains youthful. Changes in the original are mostly for better dramatic effect (e.g., Dorian learns of Sybil's brother's death immediately rather than being told about it casually the next day). Hatfield and Sanders are both well cast as Dorian and Sir Henry and there is a rich, voiceover narration by Sir Cedric Hardwicke. One change, however, might be seen as a distortion of the original since it gives the story a happy ending. In the novel, Dorian stabs the portrait, experiences the wound himself, and is found dead by his servants; he is found old and shrivelled while the portrait likeness is young. In the film, Dorian says, "God forgive me," three times before he dies and then the portrait changes—giving the impression that his soul has been saved. There has been no preparation for this change and it is discordant with the rest of the film and the Wilde novel. Also, the portrait with all of Dorian's sins is painted in an expressionistic style that mitigates its horrific impact.

Pride and Prejudice. 1940. D: Robert Z. Leonard. C: Laurence Olivier, Greer Garson, Edna May Oliver, Edmund Gwenn, Karen Morley, Ann Rutherford.

George Bluestone argues in *Novels into Films* that the film transfers the irony, conflicts, and contradictions of the novel to film and supplies period details lacking in Jane Austen's sparse descriptions. Aldous Huxley and Hunt Stromberg wrote the script. This is a polished, well-produced film.

Shane. 1953. D: George Stevens. C: Alan Ladd, Jean Arthur, Van Heflin, Brandon de Wilde, Jack Palance.

The film follows very closely the Van Tilden novel of a stranger in the midst of a homesteader-rancher feud and adds breathtakingly beautiful location work and two explosive fight scenes. What is lost in the visualization and extension of the novel's action is some of the mystery and brooding quality of the Shane character. Instead, in the performances of Alan Ladd as Shane and Jack Palance as Wilson, there is a context of good versus evil in the film, analogous to a duel between a white knight and a dragon. The early part of the film is very leisurely paced.

Sons and Lovers. 1960. D: Jack Cardiff. C: Trevor Howard, Dean Stockwell, Wendy Hiller, Mary Ure, Heather Sears, William Lucas.

Sons and Lovers is adapted from the sprawling, realistic D. H. Lawrence novel of a young man whose mother pushes him into work she considers better than the coal mines has been rearranged for better dramatic effect. The film does well with the relationship between Paul's father and mother—who quarrel and still love each other—and between Paul and his father (note the father's look and shrug as he examines one of Paul's paintings). The black and white photography highlights the grime of the Midlands mining area of England.

A Tale of Two Cities. 1935. D: Jack Conway. C: Ronald Coleman, Elizabeth Allan, Edna May Oliver, Reginald Owen, Basil Rathbone, Blanche Yurka, Isabel Jewell.

Many scenes and characters in the novel have been omitted in the film. The narrator's comments are, of course, lost, and, consequently, the panoramic effects of the Dickens' novel of the French revolution have been lessened, while the romance and melodrama have been highlighted. Still, this is a brisk, entertaining film, which has been lavishly produced and well cast. In general, it is an effective cinematization of a very long novel. Colman is very good, the epitome of heroism and gallantry, as Sidney Carton who gives up his life for another man's and that man's love.

The Trial. 1963. D: Orson Welles. C: Anthony Perkins, Jeanne Moreau, Romy Schneider, Elsa Martinelli, Orson Welles, Akim Tamiroff.

In this visually splendid version of the Kafka novel about K who is placed on trial for unknown crimes, Welles rearranges the chapters a bit. The film, however, remains generally faithful to the novel. Some scenes are memorable: K's flight from the painter's cage pursued by children; the final debate of K and the Advocate, their shadows projected on a screen. The biggest change and the biggest problem are in the ending. In the novel, K is carved up by the guards in a ritual execution. In the film, K tosses the guard's bomb back at them; then Welles cuts to shots of an atomic blast. This is Welles' visual virtuosity going one step too far, and it distorts the entire film.

B. *Film Adaptations of Dramas*

The Admirable Crichton. 1957. D: Lewis Gilbert. C: Kenneth More, Diane Cilento, Cecil Parker, Sally Ann Howes, Martita Hunt.

The film is based on James Barrie's play about a butler who proves most resourceful when the household is shipwrecked. The film remains faithful to the original, although new locations have been used. Some glibness has been introduced into the dialogue. The cast is good, if somewhat stiff. Part of this stiffness may be due to the plot whose theme of class divisions may seem dated by modern standards.

Chimes at Midnight. 1966. D: Orson Welles. C: Orson Welles, Keith Baxter, John Gielgud, Jeanne Moreau, Margaret Rutherford, Alan Webb.

This film brings together a variety of Falstaff scenes from several Shakespeare plays to form one play about Falstaff. This film could appropriately be used as a coda to class discussions of Falstaff or of the history plays. Welles handles the pageantry, the farce, and especially the character relationships (Falstaff-Hal, Hal-King Henry) well. The film is notable for the skill with which various scenes have been put together, especially in the framework Welles has supplied: At the start, Welles has taken a few lines from *Henry IV*, Part 2 and has Falstaff and Justice Shallow walking and talking about their adventures ("We have heard the chimes at midnight."); at the close Falstaff has died of a broken heart, the "green fields" scene from *Henry V* is played, and Falstaff's impossibly large coffin is hauled over the hill. Welles hedges, however, on the important question of Hal's rejection of Falstaff by taking a line from *Henry V* in which Hal promises to pardon a man and having it refer to Falstaff—thereby softening the blow and weakening the point that Hal has no choice but to reject Falstaff.

The Devil's Disciple. 1958. D: Guy Hamilton. C: Burt Lancaster, Kirk Douglas, Laurence Olivier, Janette Scott, Eva LaGallienne, Harry Andrews, Basil Sydney.

Shaw's 1897 play of the American Revolution and the transformations of a rascal to a man of God and a man of God to a patriot was deliberately anti-romantic. Shaw worked to make it clear that Dick and Judith were not in love and that Dick's transformation transcended romance. This film turns the play into a costume action film. Anderson's bravery is portrayed in an extended action sequence, and romance between Dick and Judith is quite clear. It is an enjoyable film and might be helpful to spark class discussion, but it is in an entirely different vein from Shaw's play. Olivier, however, is quite witty as General Burgoyne.

The Fan. 1949. D: Otto Preminger. C: Jeanne Crain, Madeleine Carroll, George Sanders, Richard Greene.

Lady Windermere's Fan, Oscar Wilde's Victorian drawing room comedy, is about a married woman who almost follows her mother (and she does not know the woman is her mother) into an improper way of life. The filmmakers introduce Mrs. Erlynne and Lord Darlington, now elderly, as they reminisce about the incidents of the play. This extends the presence of Lord Darlington who is the most witty character in the play. It also diffuses some of the play's melodramatic aspects, though many remain. In some ways, though, the framework makes the work seem slick and superficial.

Hamlet. 1948. D: Laurence Olivier C: Laurence Olivier, Jean Simmons, Eileen Herlie, Basil Sydney, Felix Aylmer.

This strange film trims the characters and action considerably. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and Fortinbras are cut out. Olivier defines (and thus reduces) the film through Hamlet. In a voice-over introduction he says: "This is a story about a man who could not make up his mind." Olivier, probably at the peak of both his athletic and acting skills, is a well-spoken, Oedipal, swashbuckling Hamlet. Sometimes the film is visually striking—the ghost scenes, the duel. Sometimes the treatment is overliteral in both the adaptation—some events are both shown and described; and in the visual images—lingering shots of the mother's bed. This dichotomy is apparent in, for instance, Hamlet's killing of Claudius: Olivier gives Hamlet a Douglas Fairbanks leap onto Claudius, then allows Claudius a stagy death as he slowly places the crown upon his head before he dies.

Henry V: 1945. D: Laurence Olivier. C: Laurence Olivier, Renee Asherson, Robert Newton, Leo Genn.

This was Olivier's first attempt at directing Shakespeare on film. To establish the work firmly in both a theatrical and film context, Olivier begins the film in Shakespeare's Globe Theatre, then takes the play out from the proscenium arch until the last scene. In spite of this, some of the sets in the middle portion of the film look like cardboard. Today, especially after Olivier's *Hamlet* and *Richard III*, this device may seem labored. Olivier seems to be still working on the problem of how to do soliloquies on film: Pistol's soliloquy to the audience is forced. And yet, it is a spirited film, colorful, and carefully produced.

The Importance of Being Earnest. 1953. D: Anthony Asquith. C: Michael Redgrave, Michael Dennison, Richard Wattis, Edith Evans, Margaret Rutherford, Joan Greenwood, Dorothy Tutin.

This version of the Wilde play about a man called Jack who is Jack in the city and Ernest in the country is basically a filmed play. The film even begins and ends with a theatre curtain. There are some gratuitous shots that could not be shown on a stage (Lady Bracknell on a train going to Jack's country place), but mostly the action is within the stage play's settings. Consequently, Wilde's work adapted so is slow, dull, and stagy in a medium where the eye becomes bored with watching people sit and talk. Some of the Wilde wit remains, of course. Edith Evans is quite grand as Lady Bracknell. But Michael Redgrave is too old and reserved for Jack and the other actors play too stiffly.

Julius Caesar. 1953. D: Joseph Mankiewicz. C: Marlon Brando, John Gielgud, James Mason, Louis Calhern, Edmond O'Brien, Greer Garson, Deborah Kerr.

This film features a naturalistic interpretation of Marc Antony by Marlon Brando which is quite refreshing and original, but which jars with the more classical playing of John Gielgud and the softer, more probing work of James Mason as Brutus. It is a film of many styles, predominant of which is a guilded, reverent, Harvard-Classics attitude. Brando's handling of the mob scene is impressive and rhetorical, but otherwise the film is plodding and unremarkable, and is especially eclectic in Act IV. A 1970 version starred Charlton Heston as Antony, with Gielgud as Caesar, Jason Robards, Jr. as Brutus, and Richard Johnson as Cassius. This film is often visually inventive, but has uneven performances and loses all coherent style, again, in Act IV.

Long Day's Journey into Night. 1962. D: Sidney Lumet. C: Katharine Hepburn, Ralph Richardson, Jason Robards, Jr., Dean Stockwell, Jeanne Bari.

Claustrophobic, serious dramas that trade on the singleness of setting and the confinement of the theatre itself to reveal pent-up emotion and tortured souls, often do not adapt well to film. This is a well-intentioned version of O'Neill's autobiographical play, but the claustrophobic quality of the play is gone. It is, by the very nature of the original play, a talky film.

The Man Who Came to Dinner. 1941. D: William Keighley. C: Monty Woolley, Bette Davis, Ann Sheridan, Jimmy Durante, Billie Burke, Richard Travis, Grant Mitchell, Mary Wickes, Elizabeth Fraser, Reginald Gardiner.

Only minimal "opening up" has been done to this Kaufman-Hart play about the pompous author who is forced to stay with a family and who takes over their household. Some actions have been extended (e.g., the penguins). There are even some establishing shots (e.g., Banjo on the plane). But the film is successful with so little tampering because part of the fun is that these maniac events, with the parade of crazy people, occur in one house. The frantic pace of the play seems even faster in the shorter running time of the film.

Oedipus Rex. 1968. D: Peter Saville. C: Christopher Plummer, Lilli Palmer, Richard Johnson, Orson Welles.

Filmed in an ancient Greek amphitheatre, this film often seems no more than a declamation of the play. Choosing to do the play "on location," the filmmakers give the film color and authenticity, but limit the cinematic "opening up" essential for film adaptation. Stop-action shots of Oedipus killing Laius run behind the credits and reappear occasionally as Oedipus remembers. These form the only notable shift in setting and technique. Consequently, the film is lifeless, in spite of the impressive cast. A 1957 version directed by Tyrone Guthrie utilized Greek masks which many found ritualistic and hypnotic, but also distracting.

Othello. 1952. D: Orson Welles. C: Orson Welles, Suzanne Cloutier, Robert Coote, Michéal MacLiammoir, Fay Compton.

It is sometimes impossible to discuss Welles' Shakespearean films without noting his budget limitations and filming difficulties. *Macbeth* (1948) was shot in 28 days but was not released until almost two years later due to dubbing problems. In *Chimes at Midnight* (1966), he was forced to have Spanish castles pose as English ones. *Othello* was filmed from 1949–51 in several countries. Dubbing problems (synchronization of soundtrack and action, especially the action of someone speaking) are obvious: Often the voices are garbled or come out of nowhere. Welles takes liberties with the text (the film begins with the funeral of Othello and Desdemona, Iago hanging in a cage). And yet, Welles is an innovative, if idiosyncratic and financially strapped, director. His *Othello* bristles with energy and new interpretations, and new shots (e.g., Roderigo is killed in a Turkish bath). A more conventional version is a filmed play, the 1965 filming of Laurence Olivier's National Theatre production.

Pygmalion. 1938. D: Anthony Asquith. C: Leslie Howard, Wendy Hiller, Wilfrid Lawson, Marie Lohr, David Tree.

This version of Shaw's play about a professor of phonetics who changes a flower girl into a lady has a screenplay by Shaw himself, though the ending, which is different from that of the play, is by other hands. The change in ending is important if the film is shown for a class discussion of the play because of Shaw's contention that Higgins and Eliza *cannot* fall in love. His prose sequel to the play argues this point. The romantic ending, as well as new scenes written by Shaw, were carried over to the hit stagemusical, *My Fair Lady*. Shaw proved a good film adapter of his own play—in this case—for the screenplay compresses, visualizes (the Ascot races, the ball), and extends the action of the play.

Richard III. 1956. D: Laurence Olivier. C: Laurence Olivier, John Gielgud, Cedric Hardwicke, Claire Bloom.

This treatment of Shakespeare's play is not slavishly reverent to Shakespeare's play (the play opens with lines from Colly Cibber's 18th century adaptation). But it is faithful, literate, well-read, not overly cinematic, and yet utilizes film techniques to show what Shakespeare described (the final battle, Clarence drowning in a barrel of wine, Shakespeare's shadow imagery) and to extend actions well-suited for film (Richard's dreams). Olivier has omitted Richard's courting of Elizabeth and Queen Margaret's curses, and has intensified the play's focus on the evil, but fascinating character of Richard. Richard's introductory soliloquies are openly addressed to the audience and do not seem forced or stagy because the audience is treated as another character, as a confidante.

Romeo and Juliet. 1936. D: George Cukor. C: Norma Shearer, Leslie Howard, John Barrymore, Edna May Oliver, Basil Rathbone, C. Aubrey Smith, Andy Devine.

This sumptuously mounted film of Shakespeare's play is about star-crossed lovers. It is perhaps too sumptuously mounted for what is basically an adolescent melodrama. As Romeo and Juliet, Howard and Shearer are simply too old to suggest young passion. Barrymore is likewise too old for Mercutio but is at least amusing and spirited. Rathbone is perfect as Tybalt, the king of cats. A 1954 British version, directed by Renato Castellani, starred Laurence Harvey as Romeo and Susan Shentall as Juliet. A 1968 version was directed by Franco Zefferelli and starred two young actors, Leonard Whiting and Olivia Hussey. This film has proved popular with young audiences and does suggest youthful passion. But some scenes, such as the clownish death of Mercutio, seem seriously misread.

Under Milk Wood. 1971. C: Richard Burton, Peter O'Toole, Elizabeth Taylor, Victor Spinetti.

Dylan Thomas' radio play about a sleeping Welsh town is a play for the ear and the imagination. In this film, with Burton reading Thomas' words on the soundtrack, one is torn between the attractive location shots, the actors' actions, and the beauty of the words on the soundtrack. One can listen and see at the same time, but *Milk Wood* was fashioned solely for the ear and would require complete restructuring for film. It is a disappointing film. The original cast recording (with Thomas) or the 1954 B.B.C. recording (with Burton) are better for class use.

Bibliography

Amelio, Ralph J. *Film in the Classroom: Why Use It, How to Use It.* Dayton, Ohio: Pflaum/Standard, 1971.

Balazs, Bela. *Theory of the Film.* New York: Roy, 1953.

Bluestone, George, *Novels into Films.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1957.

Eckert, Charles W., ed. *Focus on Shakespearean Film.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Gessner, Robert. *The Moving Image.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1970.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *Film and Theatre* London: Harrap, 1936

Morris, Peter. "Shakespeare on Film," *Films in Review* (March 1973), pp. 132–162.

Reed, Herbert. *A Coat of Many Colours* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1945.

Richardson, Robert. *Literature and Film.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1969.

Truffaut, François. *Hitchcock.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967.

Wagner, Geoffrey. *The Novel and the Cinema.* Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University, 1976.

Winston, Douglas Garrett. *Screenplay as Literature.* London: Tantivy Press, 1973.