

# LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

## STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

1: Download [PDF] Film Adaptation And Its Discontents Free Online | New Books in Politics

*CHAPTER TWO Literature vs. Literacy: Two Futures for Adaptation Studies Thomas M. Leitch These are great times to be writing about the cinematic adaptation of liter-*

Leitch These are great times to be writing about the cinematic adaptation of literary texts, partly because there has been such a renaissance of publications in the field, partly because a productive rupture has arisen between the theory and practice of adaptation studies. This rupture appears in ritual response to each new film adaptation of a canonical novel. On the release of Mira Nair's brisk, colorful adaptation of *Vanity Fair*, the director disputed an interviewer's remark that Thackeray condemns Becky more than you do, arguing that the novel was serialized in a tabloid and editors would respond to him constantly about his last episode. That's what I ascribe to the classic Hollywood interference mode: He was actually admonished: You're enjoying Becky too much. Make it clearer who's the virgin and who's the whore Wilmington, , 3. Nor would Thackeray have paid them any attention if they had. Sheldon Goldfarb 15 2 16 Thomas M. Leitch agreed that *Vanity Fair* was serialized not in a tabloid but in its monthly parts, adding, The ending in the novel reflects the tension that builds up in its latter stages: This is a very interesting tension in the novel I think reflecting a tension in Thackeray himself , and it is much better expressed by the novel's ending than the film's. Micael Clarke defended Nair's film as follow[ing] the novel in important ways: Sarah Brown added that the Natasha Little version of a few years back [written by Andrew Davies and directed by Marc Munden, ] was conspicuously good sophisticatedly alert to Thackeray's irony and it had a real sense of narrative drive and momentum which I don't think is consistently true of the novel. Wagner added, Talking about videos and DVDs, I have just been given a catalogue by my university's AV department: Has anyone ever seen or used any of those? Otherwise, we'll rather go on and order movies like *Wild Wild West* or *Round the World in 80 Days* [sic] starring Jackie Chan light and entertaining enough, I suppose, if one wanted to be entertained of course. Despite their differences of opinion, all these statements, including Nair's, ignore fifty years of adaptation theory in uncritically adopting the author's intention as a criterion for the success of both the novel and any possible film adaptation. Only Brown suggests that the film could actually improve on the novel. Even she shares the habit, articulated most openly by Wagner, of ranking films based on canonical literary sources above merely entertaining films and, incidentally, in preferring evaluation to analysis when considering films in general and adaptations in particular. Although it is unlikely that these commentators or their colleagues would defend these positions as theoretical principles, they do not hesitate to adopt them in practice. One reason that adaptation theory has had so little impact on studies of specific adaptations is that until quite recently, adaptation study has stood apart from the main currents in film theory. As the titles of most of the volumes listed above indicate, they trace their descent more directly from literary studies. Studies of Shakespeare on film, for example, use Shakespeare as a locus around which to organize their analysis of film adaptation. As the center around which individual adaptations orbit or the root from which the adaptations all grow, Shakespeare or Thackeray provides not only an organizing principle for the study of specific adaptations but an implicit standard 3 Literature vs. Literacy 17 of value for them all. Kamilla Elliott observes that theories of the novel and of the film within their separate disciplines appear to have been significantly influenced by interdisciplinary rivalries , More specifically, studies of adaptation tend to privilege literature over film in two ways. By organizing themselves around canonical authors, they establish a presumptive criterion for each new adaptation. And by arranging adaptations as spokes around the hub of such a strong authorial figure, they establish literature as a proximate cause of adaptation that makes fidelity to the source text central to the field. Few empirical studies of adaptation accept these assumptions uncritically. In what is widely regarded as the founding text in adaptation study, George Bluestone notes that changes are inevitable the moment one abandons the linguistic for the visual medium , 5 and concludes, It is as fruitless to say that film A is better or worse than novel B as it is to pronounce Wright's Johnson's Wax Building better or worse than Tchaikovsky's

## LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

### STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

Swan Lake 5 6. Both Sarah Cardwell's study of television adaptations of four classic English novels and most of the essays collected in Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan's recent anthology question the primacy of literature as a touchstone for cinema. To the extent that adaptation study subordinates both specific adaptations to their canonical source texts and cinema as a medium to literature as a medium, it serves either faithfully or not, however, adaptations are studied under the sign of literature, which provides an evaluative touchstone for films in general. This approach has dominated a half century of adaptation studies for several reasons. None of the first generation of scholars who led the charge to introduce film studies to the academy had received formal training in film studies themselves. Most of them came from English departments where they had been absorbed the pedagogical habits of close reading and the aesthetic values of literature what James Naremore calls the submerged common sense of the average English department Although Naremore traces these Arnoldian ideas to Culture and Anarchy, the program of comparative evaluation at the heart of Arnold's own aesthetics emerges more clearly in *The Study of Poetry*. Having offered poetry, in which the idea is everything, as a substitute for a religious tradition undermined by such heterodox facts as the discovery of ancient fossils and the theory of evolution, Arnold urges, We should conceive of poetry worthily, and more highly than it has been the custom to conceive of it. We should conceive of it as capable of higher uses, 4 18 Thomas M. Leitch and called to higher destinies, than those which in general men have assigned to it hitherto. More and more mankind will discover that we have to turn to poetry to interpret life for us, to console us, to sustain us. Without poetry, our science will appear incomplete; and most of what now passes with us for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry. The earliest films to come in for academic study under the Arnoldian dispensation that still ruled in American universities in fell into two categories: The first approach generated myriad courses in Shakespeare and film, the second courses in the masters of European art cinema from Dreyer to Bergman, Antonioni, and Godard, and, still later, in quasi-canonical American masters like Chaplin, Welles, and Hitchcock. Under this dispensation, many films were studied under the aegis of the literary works that gave them currency. Courses in Shakespeare and film were often courses in Shakespeare through film. Other courses were conducted under the sign of literature, analyzing and evaluating the films at hand as if they were literary works themselves, mining them for the ambiguity, complexity, penetration, and personal expressiveness traditionally associated with literature. In every case, specific literary works and literature in general were stipulated as touchstones. What she does not emphasize in opposing these two approaches is their shared assumption that adaptation study is essentially aesthetic. Both categorical studies of adaptation and studies that emphasize analogies among the arts take as their central line of inquiry the question of what makes works of art successful or what, in the more old-fashioned language adopted by both Horace and Lessing, makes them beautiful. Literacy 19 This inquiry is remote from the central inquiry of academic film studies, which from its beginnings had staked its insurgent disciplinary claims by rejecting the aesthetic appreciation of literature and developing a competing methodology of cultural critique rooted in the revolutionary intellectual ferment in France during the s and s. Films were valuable not because they formed a canon of fully achieved works of art according to traditional aesthetic criteria but because they raised illuminating questions, offered insight into overdetermined historical moments or the contemporary scene, exploded shibboleths that stifled critical discussion, or otherwise promoted a more thoughtful analysis of what Michel Foucault called the human sciences. The rift between the aesthetic approach of literary studies and the analytical approach of cinema studies marked adaptation studies in two ways. It isolated adaptation studies from film studies, aligning it more closely with the programs in literary studies from which so many of its early practitioners had come. The further film studies drifted toward the left, unmasking film after film for political critique, the more firmly adaptation scholars dug in their heels on the right, championing the old-guard values of universalist humanism. At the same time, the rift widened between the theory and the practice of adaptation studies, which continued to take literary aesthetics as its touchstone and canonical works and authors as its organizing principle. It could hardly have been otherwise, since even potential methodological inversions of Shakespeare on film Hitchcock's literary sources, for example would have

## LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

### STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

enshrined Hitchcock the auteur, film studies version of the literary classic, in place of Shakespeare as the locus of meaning and value. The persistence of humanist values in adaptation studies is not so much a triumph of Arnold as a triumph of evaluation that insists that originals are always touchstones of value for their adaptations, unless of course the adaptations are better. Even the staunchest partisans of textual fidelity, after all, urge their students to revise their papers. Fidelity makes sense as a criterion of value only when we can be certain that the model is more valuable than the copy. In the absence of this certainty, teachers license Hitchcock's free adaptations and urge students to revise, not because they make no assumptions about different versions relative value, but because they make the reverse assumptions. Students may be starting with some promising material, but it stands to reason that they can make it better by reworking it because final drafts are more likely than first drafts to offer exemplary models. Hitchcock may be adapting literary originals, but he is making them into Hitchcock films, to which film scholars come to ascribe an even higher prestige value, though that value escaped Selznick. Hence Charles Barr's complaint that a film criticism centred on directors Leitch been concerned to follow up Hitchcock's statements The only Hitchcock adaptation that has continued to attract anything like the harsh criticism Selznick leveled at Rebecca is Sabotage because its literary source, Joseph Conrad's novel *The Secret Agent*, has a still higher prestige value than Hitchcock. Andereg, for example, notes that a Conrad enthusiast might be excused for feeling that Sabotage betrays its source on a rather fundamental level. In sum, the notion of fidelity as a criterion of value is based on a marketplace of competing models. Producers like Selznick insist on fidelity to literary models; filmmakers like Hitchcock get a special dispensation from following those models because they provide a brand name with even greater commercial and critical cachet; and production companies like Merchant Ivory or the BBC revive the Selznick legacy by providing what might be called a negative cachet, a guarantee that they will protect the audience from the shock of experiencing any new thoughts or feelings that would not have been provoked by their source texts. This surprising diversity of practice in the filmmaking industry and the corresponding diversity in beliefs about fidelity among different camps of film scholars raises an inescapable question. In the twenty years since Dudley Andrew complained that the most frequent and most tiresome discussion of adaptation One reason is that beneath the sharp disagreement between Hitchcock and Selznick is a deeper level of agreement most teachers of adaptation share as well. Although Selznick traces the success of a movie to its source text We bought Rebecca, and we intend to make Rebecca Selznick, and Hitchcock to its direction What I do is to read a story only once, and if I like the basic idea, I just forget all about the book and start to create cinema Truffaut, their shared view of a movie as the product of a single imagination is based on a classical view of art, grounded in both cases by a healthy respect for the marketplace. Though neither of them ever puts it this way, they share a view of art as a series of expressive works, whether literary or cinematic, whose value inheres in their finished, achieved qualities, their success in being themselves, which, for Selznick, forbids any tampering with a proven literary product and, for Hitchcock, justifies all possible uses of raw material in the service of a new work. This constellation of aesthetic appreciation assigns a doubly subordinate place to adaptation study. As the analysis of precisely those cinematic works that *Literature vs. Literacy* 21 have failed to achieve the auteur status that would consecrate them as quasiliterature, it falls into the gap between the study of literature as literature and the study of cinema as literature. Standing outside the mainstream of both literary studies and film studies, its place is marginal and liable to shrink still further with the ebb of Arnold's idea of literature as a substitute for religion. This ebb is reflected by the passing of the belletristic ideal of appreciation in literary studies, in the waning influence of elitist cultural institutions like symphony orchestras and the Broadway theatre, and in the decline of auteurism as the leading tendency in film studies. An equally dim future for adaptation studies is implicit in the more pragmatic rationale for national literacy articulated in E. Hirsch's *Cultural Literacy* Unconsciously echoing the etymology of literacy, which did not appear in the language until years after illiteracy as its antonym Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, s. The crux of Hirsch's argument is that contemporary students communicate less effectively because their knowledge, though often considerable, is more parochial

## LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

### STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

and ephemeral than that of their forbears; they are less conversant with the shared cultural markers that would allow them to grasp the meaning of what they read more precisely and effortlessly and to write with a surer sense of what their readers already know and believe. A knowledge of Hamlet is more useful than a knowledge of I Love Lucy because more past writers have used Hamlet as an analogy or point of departure in formulating their arguments and sharpening their examples, and referring to Hamlet provides contemporary readers access to a wider and more enduring audience than referring to Lucy and Ricky. Hence Hirsch proposes to reverse the modern pedagogical tendency from Rousseau to Dewey toward fostering critical thinking by subordinating rote learning to intensive study of a smaller number of texts and problems. Instead Hirsch reemphasizes an older educational ideal, the acquisition of specific information that will fit students to assume the unexpectedly onerous mantle of the common reader. In *What Literate Americans Know*, the appendix of 5, names, phrases, dates, and concepts Hirsch prescribes as essential to cultural literacy, Arnold's touchstones are pressed into a new function in this pre-arnoldian ideal. Instead of serving as a suitably inspiring substitute for religious beliefs discredited by inconvenient facts, they are intended as a national lingua franca without which communication would be limited to the most obvious and primitive ideas. In principle, they help speakers and writers to develop, 8 22 Thomas M. Leitch and readers to grasp, more complex ideas by allowing them to build on a sure foundation of common ground with their audiences a program Hirsch, Kett, and Trefil develop in their *The Dictionary of Cultural Literacy*, and Hirsch in a series of books titled *What Your Kindergartner Needs to Know: Preparing Your Child for a Lifetime of Learning*. The culture wars that have followed Hirsch's ambitious proposal to remake American education have made the implications for film adaptations dismayingly clear. It is valuable to watch a screen adaptation of Hamlet because it gives viewers access to something like Shakespeare's world and people and issues. And because, as Hirsch acknowledges, the information essential to literacy is rarely detailed or precise, 14, something like that world is close enough to allow them to play along with other citizens more or less familiar with Hamlet as they all join in the national conversation. Adaptation is at the heart of Hirsch's program for cultural literacy in a more general but equally limited sense as well. His emphasis on widely shared but superficially understood cultural touchstones presents every instance of a particular touchstone. Hirsch is not interested in ranking different appearances of a single touchstone; evaluation enters his program only in the selection of touchstones. Just as a Google search ranks websites by their links to other websites, Hirsch's program ranks both literary or cinematic works and their consumers in terms of the number of touchstones they share. Although the metaphor of adaptation might well be used to describe Hirsch's network of touchstones and their users, however, it relegates adaptation study itself to an even more marginal position than Arnold's aesthetic study of literature.

# LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

## STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

### 2: Literature vs. Literacy: Two Futures for Adaptation Studies - PDF

*Literature vs. literacy: two futures for adaptation studies / Thomas M. Leitch Adaptation studies and the history of ideas: the case of Apocalypse now / Donald M. Whaley Adaptation studies revisited: purposes, perspectives, and inspiration / Sarah Cardwell.*

She is the author of *Life After Death*: Pucci and James Thompson describe an explosion of Austen-related materials in an impressive array of media, from traditional print to cyberspace, during the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century<sup>1</sup>. Phases appear within this effusion, however, particularly in film responses to her work. In the s, films were occupied with the novels themselves. Gradually, however, film responses have shifted their focus so that by the end of the first decade of the new millennium, a large number of Austen films present the novels not as the result of brilliant literary endeavor, but as the inevitably limited product of a historically-bound being, Austen the woman. This conversion of Austen from author to artifact may not necessarily threaten her cultural position in terms of how much attention she and her work receive, but it does have consequences for the nature of her cultural position. A quick comparison of film adaptations of the novels during the s and during the s reveals a change taking place. From *Prada to Nada*, claiming a foundation in *Sense and Sensibility*, is forthcoming in *In the case of Clueless*, Heckerling famously did not cite Emma or Austen in the film, and it was not until critics pointed out the similarity that she acknowledged the connection. Darcy from his performance for that version, as Mark Darcy, the romantic male protagonist. From *Prada to Nada* assiduously courts the connection to Austen: Trailers for biopics reinforce this premise, as well. She was a young woman no one understood. Until she met the one man who would change her life. Rather, I am interested in what the trend indicates about approaches to Austen and her work, and what the consequences of those approaches might be. In considering the relationship between original text and film response, for example, critics such as Deborah Cartmell, Imelda Whelehan, Thomas M. Leitch, Gina Macdonald and Andrew F. According to this approach, intertextuality is value-free: Although such critics also recognize that ideology does play a role in the creation of a film response Whelehan<sup>12</sup>, they generally overlook the point that ideology itself confers value and is not guaranteed to benefit those subject to it. The films themselves comment on each other in this way. Knightley and then costuming and grooming him to increase the resemblance. As Sarah Maza, Walter C. Metz, and Jessica Durgan have shown, adaptations as a genre reflect the values and concerns of the particular period in which they are made, thereby affecting the understanding and cultural position of the original text. These ideological elements transfer directly into audiences. Describing her undergraduate students, M. Casey Diana contends that viewers who begin with the films and then read the novels have a significantly different experience than those who follow the opposite route. For many people, evidently, the interpretation of a text provided not just by the inevitable choices involved in filming but also by the premise of the film becomes a mode of understanding the original text. What then does the growing tendency to produce makeover and biopic responses to Austen and her novels indicate? Darcy and the Bennet sisters are not so different from their own. The trailer for *Sense and Sensibility* attempted seduction, pausing enticingly between each infinitive: Can we learn history—can we regain that capacity for retrospection ostensibly lost in a postmodern age. Seen this way, makeovers like *Clueless* function less as a fresh expression of old truths and more as an effort to infuse something old with any truth at all. This doubt about relevance also could explain the impulse to account for the novels in terms of biography. Supposedly arising from the need to establish an authentic past, this approach is really an aspect of the recent fascination with biography as a way of understanding literature Cartmell and Whelehan<sup>8</sup>. Your browser does not support the HTML5 video tag. In other words, instead of the irony that the person without the experience has the insight into human nature, the biographical approach manifested in *Becoming Jane* insists that insight can only be derived from experience. A great deal is lost as a result of this suspicion of literature as a vehicle for meaning. Certainly, the assumption that film as a genre necessarily offers an entirely different way of

## LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

### STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

telling a story cannot hold, however films are valued for this difference. A large number of essays in the special issue of *Persuasions On-Line* devoted to the film, for example, addressed that topic. In fact, film critics have often suggested that film responses benefit thematically, narratively, and structurally from a close, but not necessarily mimetic, relationship to the original. Not absolute fidelity, mind you: Print and screen are different mediums. In fact, the biopics in particular disregard the point that writers, Austen included, make the things they write, and that the act of making is not the same thing as translating or transferring. Was it a young man called Tom Lefroy? Admittedly, other authors, even male authors, have had their work reduced to biography. Such a maneuver shrinks the novels and Austen. Explaining text as biographical eruption has a dangerous tendency to reductionism and to speculation, a tendency pointed out as early as W. That is not to suggest that biography has no role in a critical engagement with literature. Perhaps that is impossible; it is likely that the novels will continue to transcend our understanding of where they came from. Such complicating acknowledgments are not likely to be significant checks on the trend in the construction of a dominant discourse about Austen or the construction of Austen within it. Forster, whose work also has been adapted for popular viewing audiences without reducing it to biographical facts. The author would like to thank Angela Weisl, Cathryn Wiatroski, and Mary Zedeck for their invaluable aid in writing this article. For a more extensive discussion of the relationship between *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* and *Sense and Sensibility*, see, for example, Leung. See, for example, Ealy; Elley; or Ansen. For a thorough treatment of the relationship between cultural capital and ideology, see Guillory. Works Cited Ansen, David. *Becoming Jane* DVD case. Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield. *UP of Kentucky, Two Jane Austen Adaptations*. Cartmell, Deborah and Imelda Whelehan. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. *Popular Feminism Turns to History. Remaking the Past in Contemporary Culture*. Pucci and James Thompson. Gina Macdonald and Andrew Macdonald. *The Problem of Literary Canon Formation. The Jane Austen Book Club. Women, Politics, and the Novel. Two Futures for Adaptation Studies*. Welsh and Peter Lev. Macdonald, Gina, and Andrew Macdonald. *Jane Austen on Screen. From Classicism to Romanticism. Dangerous Liaisons in the Reagan-Thatcher Years. Imaging Moby-Dick in and The Jane Austen Phenomenon: Remaking the Past at the Millennium*.

# LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

## STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

### 3: Karen B. Gevirtz

*/ James M. Welsh -- It wasn't like that in the book-- / Brian McFarlane -- Literature vs. literacy: two futures for adaptation studies / Thomas M. Leitch -- Adaptation studies and the history of ideas: the case of Apocalypse now / Donald M. Whaley -- Adaptation studies revisited: purposes, perspectives, and inspiration / Sarah Cardwell.*

Welsh and Peter Lev All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher. Includes bibliographical references and index. Film adaptations—History and criticism. Literature and motion pictures. Lev, Peter, 1941— PN Manufactured in the United States of America. To our friends and colleagues, early and late, whose efforts we do appreciate. Special thanks to Tom Erskine, who first suggested we form an association with annual meetings, and to the late William Horne, the congenial cohost of several such meetings. Frankenstein No one sits beside the prof here in the dark, but behind me they whisper and giggle and bark their disdain for what? To the monster the child was like a flower, therefore she was a flower, and since a flower can float, so should the child. To the students, some thirty years younger than I, the monster is merely dumb, the girl a splash, like a punchline, a machine to produce laughs. A bus passes; I wave it on. What is the night to do when its terrors shed their beauty? I stumble home, past villagers hungry for duty. Issues of Screen Adaptation: Brian McFarlane Literature vs. Leitch Adaptation Studies and the History of Ideas: Whaley Adaptation Studies Revisited: Imaging Moby-Dick in and Walter C. Welsh Returning to Naples: Telotte 65 Chapter 6 77 Part II: Politics and Adaptation Chapter 14 Literary Hardball: History, Biography, and Memoir Camille Claudel: But without people like Rebecca M. Crawford, then president of Salisbury State. Thereafter, LFA could not have survived over three decades without the continued support of later presidents Thomas A. Nelson Butler, William C. Merwin, and Janet Dudley-Eshbach, who currently heads the institution. Walker and David T. Johnson, and their capable business manager, Brenda Grodzicki. Whaley, director of American studies at Salisbury, has been supportive in attending, organizing, and running LFA conferences. At Towson University, we thank Greg Faller and William Horne for their many contributions to LFA conferences, including creative and scholarly work but also moving furniture, as needed. Reprinted with the permission of Southern Utah University Press. The goal is to teach, by example or theory, and to explore some potential new avenues of discussion as well. Transforming the Screen, 1997, published in 1997, appeared as volume 7 in the prestigious Scribners History of American Cinema series. Contributors to the present volume include teacher-scholars from England, Romania, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States; though the United States is best represented at least quantitatively, one-third of the contributing authors are non-American. LFA has always reached out for a larger and more general audience. The fact that the journal has survived for more than thirty-five years is perhaps an indication that this goal has been achieved. An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation Certainly, fidelity hovers in the background of many of the essays included here, but the anthology also presents film as having a separate identity and separate aesthetic principles, as suggested by Professor McFarlane and others. In other chapters see e. Leitch and Walter C. Metz, 1997, intertextuality is presented as a possible alternative to fidelity criticism. Tibbetts on the biopic of the American composer W. Some may protest, of course, that the medium of film has its limitations, that it is epidermal, even superficial, that it cannot probe the depths of psychology or emotional consciousness. Beckett himself wrote an exercise on the nature of perception in a film entitled, appropriately enough, Film and starring, appropriately enough, Buster Keaton. So much for conventional wisdom. The book is a famously whimsical romp that turns narrative conventions upside down and delights in playing with unconventional structure. So how did Michael Winterbottom solve this problem? He transformed the whimsical spirit of the novel by imagining his film as a movie being made of a movie of a book about a book. Yes, certainly, in a way and to a degree. Go figure, and ponder the future of adaptation and what the process might mean nowadays. Most of the novels of Jane Austen

## LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

### STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

have been filmed and refilmed, with varying degrees of success. Indeed, the Austen adaptations have become a reliably commercial enterprise, with the recent version of *Pride and Prejudice* starring Keira Knightley holding its own with the Christmas blockbusters of *Dickens* and *Oliver, with a Twist*. Of course, in the case of massive novels, length will almost certainly be a problem. Every facial tic and verbal nuance could be captured, lovingly, in an eight-hour adaptation, every gasp, every sigh, every wink of the eye. But what about a feature film that has to be captured in less than three hours? Even though *Oliver Twist* followed upon the tremendous success of *The Pianist* in 2002, and even though Polanski was working with much the same crew, including the playwright Ronald Harwood as screenwriter. Published in 1837, *Oliver Twist* was the first success of young Charles Dickens, and is second only to *Great Expectations* in terms of popularity. *Oliver Twist* played by Barney Clark is the name given to an orphan of unknown parentage, born and raised in a miserable workhouse, where he is mistreated by the parish beadle, Mr. Brownlow, who rescues the boy from a life of crime. Welsh Harwood described this simplified version as follows: The multilayered Dickens narrative is simplified to a story of survival in a grim and uncaring world. Indeed, the David Lean adaptation probably still constitutes the gold standard for film adaptations of this Dickens classic. Lean used expressionist camera angles and lighting techniques to contrast the darkness of the underworld with the cozy whiteness of the Brownlow sequences. Polanski takes a similar approach. Adapting a Stereotypical Ethnic Villain One particular challenge in this example, beyond the obvious narrative sprawl that needs to be contained, is how to adapt the character of the Jewish villain in a way that may not be utterly offensive. Sir Ben Kingsley took the challenge for the Polanski adaptation and was certainly capable of doing justice to the role. For a director who had lost his mother to Auschwitz to even think of approaching such material, Lane implied, could be tantamount to a betrayal; but can such criticism be fairly applied to the director who made *The Pianist*? A Question of Translation or Transformation? At first, early in the eighteenth century, English novels were considered inferior to works of history and biography, even immoral, in an era when sermons were commonly published and read for enlightenment. Readers expected honesty and truth; novelists therefore disguised their fictions as fact. Early novel readers had to be weaned away from their taste for accuracy and fidelity to the facts. Aristotle believed that art should imitate life, which is the mantra of *The Poetics*, his analysis of tragic drama. In English literature, the lines between art and life, between the fictional and the factual, began to blur first in fiction, then in theatre, as plays became increasingly realistic during the nineteenth century. But if life is merely reflected through the lens, is it art? And what of the marriage between cinematography and theatre that enabled the cinematic illusion merely to extend the theatrical illusion? On the other hand, should not one question the accuracy of such stories or histories? Can there be any more central issue in the field of adaptation studies? Even for nonbelievers and infidels? Hitchcock and Selznick Court Rebecca The problem will effectively be framed in an auteur context, perhaps, if we consider the example of the Daphne du Maurier novel *Rebecca*, adapted for the screen by Robert E. Sherwood and Joan Harrison. She expected better treatment with *Rebecca*, and Selznick was determined to protect her future interests and integrity. Selznick clearly stated his intentions in a memo dated 12 June 1939. According to Tom Leitch in his *Encyclopedia of Alfred Hitchcock*, the producer and the director each had his own notion about how to proceed with this adaptation: Although Selznick won this battle in fact, the film was nominated for eleven Academy Awards and won the Best Picture Oscar, Alfred Hitchcock ultimately won the war, when the auteur theory emerged in France in the late 1920s and in America a few years later. An industry dominated by Hollywood studios was clearly in transition, as the studio era, defined by all-powerful producers like Selznick and Irving Thalberg, was drawing to a close. Hitchcock the auteur director was not especially worried about absolute fidelity to his sources. Hitchcock was not destined to become famous for his adaptations, however; usually he did not assail the work of writers of the magnitude of Joseph Conrad, or the popularity of Dame Daphne du Maurier. Even so, Hitchcock did adapt all sorts of material to the screen, drama as well as fiction. His technologically daring film *Rope*, for example, was adapted for Hitchcock by Hume Cronyn and Arthur

## LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

### STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

Laurents from the play by Patrick Hamilton. Although not exactly a box-office success, this cult film became famous for xxii James M. Welsh its dramatic irony, its twisted style, and its technique most notably for its inventive long takes. If traditional Hollywood cared about issues of fidelity, it was not especially out of respect for literature or for those who created it but in order to avoid disappointing readers who knew what they wanted and expected, as demonstrated by the uninspired literalness of the first Harry Potter movies, for example. That sanitized image will consequently change the nature of the character in both instances and the larger meaning of the story itself. The Persistence of Fidelity, Again Such flawed film adaptations are interesting because they at least play for high stakes.

#### 4: PDF Download The Drift Affect Adaptation And New Perspectives On Fidelity Free

/ James M. Welsh --It wasn't like that in the book--/ Brian McFarlane --Literature vs. literacy: two futures for adaptation studies / Thomas M. Leitch --Adaptation studies and the history of ideas: the case of Apocalypse now / Donald M. Whaley --Adaptation studies revisited: purposes, perspectives, and inspiration / Sarah Cardwell --The Cold.

#### 5: LIBRIS - The literature/film reader :

Introduction: Issues of screen adaptation: what is truth? / James M. Welsh -- It wasn't like that in the book-- / Brian McFarlane -- Literature vs. literacy: two futures for adaptation studies / Thomas M. Leitch -- Adaptation studies and the history of ideas: the case of Apocalypse now / Donald M.

#### 6: Ebook The Oxford Handbook Of Translation Studies as PDF Download Portable Document Format

Literature vs. Literacy: Two Futures for Adaptation Studies. Article. Full-text available. Thomas M. Leitch; View. ENGLISH STUDIES AND GENERATION WRITING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AT THE.

#### 7: The Literature Film Reader - [PDF Document]

Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate. Article Literature vs. Literacy: Two Futures for Adaptation Studies. Article. Full-text available. Thomas M. Leitch; View.

#### 8: The Literature Film Reader Issues of Adaptation - [PDF Document]

Brian McFarlane Literature vs. Literacy: Two Futures for Adaptation Studies Thomas M. Leitch Adaptation Studies and the History of Ideas: The Case of Apocalypse Now Donald M. Whaley Adaptation Studies Revisited: Purposes, Perspectives, and Inspiration Sarah Cardwell.

#### 9: adaptation de comics au cin m | Download eBook PDF/EPUB

The Literature/Film Reader Issues of Adaptation Edited by James M. Welsh Peter Lev THE SCARECROW PRESS, INC. Lanham, Maryland â€¢ Toronto â€¢ Plymouth, UK SCARECROW.

## LITERATURE VS. LITERACY : TWO FUTURES FOR ADAPTATION

### STUDIES THOMAS M. LEITCH pdf

*Supper in Beaucaire. The city, case study 2 : city of Raleigh, NC Arena small area plan Day you were born 4th Neural Computation and Psychology Workshop Report on Ontario Hydro draft demand supply planning strategy The Atlas of Medieval Europe The worked bone from the Chalcolithic site of Gilat: interim report Caroline Grigson A man named Dave. Originally published: New York: Dutton, 1999. Upsc management optional notes After Capitalism (New Critical Theory) Painting with Elke Sommer. Sites for seniors The Ruined Cottage Jewish Heritage in Gibraltar Consideration of H. R. 12800, the Bituminous Coal Act of 1936. Apple thunderbolt display manual The song of the sword Problems in basic business finance Family guy theme sheet music Teens who make a difference in rural communities Mcgraw-Hills SAT II chemistry Global blue chips : great companies from developing economies Reaching the promised land Middlebrook guide to the Somme battlefields Trex 700n dfc manual Economic analysis of product innovation Amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 The Castoriadis Reader (Blackwell Readers) Jurans quality planning and analysis for enterprise quality Hegemonic power and harmonic convergence Indian Fairy Tales (Large Print Edition) The Indian Bureau Developing a new XML standard for the application for admission to postsecondary schools in the U.S. and Anonymity : the literary history of a word. An introduction to population genetics theory and applications My reply to the synod (1901) Principal interaction fields of Texas metropolitan centers Specifications for microfilming manuscripts Existential Thought and Therapeutic Practice Synonym-Word Finder*