ISSN 0971- 605X

POINTS OF VIEW

VOLUME III NUMBER 2 WINTER 1996

FILM AND LITERATURE

SPECIAL NUMBER



Editor
K.K. Sharma

POINTS OF VIEW

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor

K.K. Sharma
Former Professor of English
University of Allahabad
Allahabad, India

Assistant Editors

S.C. Dwivedi
Reader, Univ. of Allahabad
Suresh Nath
Reader & Head, J.S. College
C.C.S. University, Meerut
Kajali Sharma
T.S.E.College, Univ. of Bombay

Advisory Editors

S. Viswanathan, University of Hyderabad
Yasmeen Lukmani, University of Bombay
K.S. Misra, Aligarh Muslim University
Harish Trivedi, University of Delhi
Meenakshi Mukherjee, J.N.U., Delhi
Bhagwat S. Goyal, C.C.S.University, Meerut
R.S. Pathak, Dr. H.S. Gour Univ., Sagar
S.S. Deo, H.N.B. Garhwal University
G.S. Balarama Gupta, Gulbarga University
K.G. Srivastava, University of Allahabad
M.K. Choudhury, B.H.U., Varanasi
Narinder K. Rattan, M.D. Univ., Rohtak

Points of View is a biannual Journal devoted to scholarly and authoritative opinion on broad cultural issues focussing on the centrality of human concerns as evidenced in literature, art, cinema, etc. It provides a special forum for the perspectives on 'New Literatures in English,' including translations. Also, it carries detailed and careful notes, and reviews of outstanding new books. The Summer issue is a general number concerned with various authors and subjects, while the Winter issue is a special number dealing with an individual writer or a specific theme.

Manuscripts are welcome. They should conform to the *MLA Style Sheet* in all matters of form. Unused or unsolicited manuscript can be returned, if accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.

Annual Subscription rates are

India	Individuals	Rs.100.00 (by M.O.)	Institutions Rs.200.00 (Collection Charges for outstation cheques Rs.20.00)
Overseas	Individuals	£9.00, $14.00	Institutions £11.00, $19.00

(Additional charges for supplying copies by airmail £3.00, $5.00)

All editorial and business correspondence should be addressed to

The Editor
Points of View
KH/127, New Kavi Nagar
Ghaziabad--201 002 U.P., INDIA
Telephone : (0575) 718687

FILM AND LITERATURE

EDITED BY
K.K. SHARMA

K. K. PUBLICATIONS
DELHI--110006

ISBN 81-86572-93-7

First Edition, 1997

© K.K. Sharma

K.K. Publications
3350, Peepal Mahadev
Hauz Quazi, Delhi--110 006
Ph. : 3266965; Fax : 3269343

Printed in India at
Chetna Offset Press
A-27/2-A, Shastri Gali No. 3
Mauzpur, Delhi--110 053

CONTENTS

Bhagwat S. Goyal	Film and Literature	1
J.P. Tripathi	Film and Literature: A Study in Artistic Medium and Efflorescence	27
Anurag Goyal	Ideology and Aesthetics in Kozintsev's *King Lear*	35
S.S. Deo & Monica Gupta	Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*: An Analysis in Film & Literature	57
Urbashi Barat	The Moving Camera Writes: The Impact of the Film on the Novels of Graham Greene	63
K.K. Sharma	The Cinematic Device of The Flash-back in Joyce Cary's *To be a Pilgrim* and *The Moonlight*	78
Madhumalati Adhikari	Visual Narration: Cinematic Projection in Alice Walker's *Possessing the Secret of Joy*	91
O.P. Mathur	*The Guide*: The Novel and the Film	99
Attia Ab[illegible]	Hollywood and F. Scott Fitzgerald	110
Sumitra Kukreti	Glorification of Crime in Literature and Film: *The Godfather* Vs. *India's Bandit Queen*	127

CONTRIBUTORS

Bhagwat S. Goyal is Principal at S.D. College, C.C.S. University, Meerut.

J.P. Tripathi is Professor of English at the University of Gorakhpur, Gorakhpur.

Anurag Goyal is carrying on doctoral research at C.C.S. University, Meerut.

S.S. Deo is Prof. & Head, Dept. of English, H.N.B. Garhwal University, Srinagar (U.P.).

Monica Gupta teaches in the Department of English, H.N.B. Garhwal University, Srinagar.

Urbashi Barat is Senior Lecturer in the Department of English, Rani Durgavati Vishwavidyalaya, Jabalpur.

K.K. Sharma is Former Professor of English, University of Allahabad, Allahabad.

Madhumalati Adhikari is Reader in the Department of English, Rani Durgavati Vishwavidyalaya, Jabalpur.

O.P. Mathur is Former Professor and Head, Department of English, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

Attia Abid teaches in the Department of English, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.

Sumitra Kukreti is Reader in English, Rohelkhand University, Bareilly.

FILM AND LITERATURE

Bhagwat S. Goyal

Film as an art form of the age of mechanical reproduction is a hybrid product of modern technology and man's aesthetic imagination--a form that has borrowed freely from the existing art forms like literature, theatre, dance, painting, architecture, music and cinematography etc. Just a hundred years old, cinema or film has brought out a revolutionary change in the way people perceive reality, the way they see things, and the way they behave. The all pervasive influence of film has outstripped all other influences of fine arts and culture on people's imagination. Literature, in spite of being the oldest form of cultural communication, appears to have receded in background in the face of the overpowering might of cinema. Though the printed word is still held in awe and reverence as a symbol of God, the image itself has become a new kind of word to hold people in its thrall. Just as the word entices us with its magic, the image captivates us with its even more sensuous magic.

While literature remains hitched to a kind of ethereal al ··'raction to communicate its meaning, cinema carries us off our feet by the power of its sensuous images and melodic as well as disruptive sounds. While only those who have a highly developed aesthetic sensibility and philosophical depth can understand and appreciate literature, cinema can he enjoyed by all and sundry, irrespective of their level of literacy. Thus literature remains by and large an elitist form of art within the reach and comprehension of highly literate people alone while cinema is a truly democratic form of art that reaches out to the least literate and even the poorest. That is not to say that cinema does not require high levels of aesthetic literacy. But popular cinema is so direct and gross in its message-making skills that even the dumbest of them all would not miss the point of the visually stunning language of entertainment.

The enduring secret of the popularity and power of cinema lies mainly in its visual range, the extreme mobility of its images and the fluidity of its shot compositions. Commenting on the power and attraction of the visual, Fredric Jameson says: "The visual is *essentially* pornographic, which is to say that it has its end in rapt, mindless fascination."[1] Explaining it further, he writes: "Por-

nographic films are thus only the potentiation of films in general, which ask us to stare at the world as though it were a naked body."[2] Thus the visuality of cinema holds viewers in "rapt, mindless fascination." Moreover, films in general, ask us to stare at the world, as though it were a naked body. Cinema allows the viewers not only to taste the forbidden fruit, but also to reach the unreachable, to enter the bedrooms of the great and the mighty, to see the spectacles of war, to experience and see vicariously all that they cannot hope to see even in their wildest dreams.

Accounting for the phenomenon of the world becoming a 'naked body', Jameson says that ".....our society has begun to offer us the world--now mostly a collection of products of our own making--as just such a body, that you can possess visually, and collect the images of."[3] Referring to the possibility of constructing an ontology of the visual, the says: "Were an ontology of this artificial, person-produced universe still possible, it would have to be an ontology of the visual, of being as the visible first and foremost, with the other senses draining off it; all the fights about power and desire have to take place here, between the mastery of the gaze and the illimitable richness of the visual object."[4]

Having appropriated all forms of art to its advantage and apparently moving for ahead of the territory of literature, cinema, nevertheless, remains firmly anchored in certain aesthetic traditions and practices of literature. Soviet film maker, theoretician and guru of several generations of film makers, Sergei Eisenstein, was able to perceive that great literary artists had already visualised the elements that would make the components of film art. Quoting extensively from writers like Milton, Shakespeare and Dickens, he shows the presence of the elements of montage, camera shots and angles etc. in their works. In "Dickens, Griffith and the Film Today," he writes: "What were the novels of Dickens for his contemporaries, for his readers? There is one answer: they bore the same relation to them that the film bears to the same strata in our time."[5] Accounting for the popularity of Dickens' characters and the characters of cinema, he perceives a special relationship between them: "Perhaps the secret lies in Dickens' (as well as cinema's) creation of an extraordinary plasticity. The observation in the novels is extraordinary--as is their optical quality. The characters of Dickens are rounded with means as plastic and slightly exaggerated as are the screen heroes of today. The screen's heroes are engraved on the senses of the spectator with

clearly visible traits, its villains are remembered by certain facial expressions, and all are saturated in the peculiar, slightly unnatural radiant gleam thrown over them by the screen."[6]

Eisenstein has also traced the origins of the film concept of montage to certain literary techniques used by various writers. He makes particular mention of Lewis Carroll's concept of the 'portmanteau word', of "two meanings packed into one word like a portmanteau." Carroll wrote in the conclusion of his Introduction to *The Hunting of the Snark:* "For instance, take the two words 'fuming' and 'furious'. Make up your mind that you will say both words, but leave it unsettled which you will say first. Now open your mouth and speak. If your thoughts incline ever so little towards 'fuming', you will say 'fuming-furious'; if they turn, by even a hair's breadth, towards 'furious', you will say 'furious-fuming'; but if you have that rarest of gifts, a perfectly balanced mind, you will say 'frumious'."[7]

The proponents of a new kind of cinema, which they choose to call 'living' or 'direct' cinema, however do not approve of the literary heritage of cinema, specially that which is concerned with the language of cinema, because they believe that there can be no fixed rules of the grammar of cinema, as they would only hamper creative, dynamic and original film-making. Louis Marcorelles in his book *Living Cinema* observes: "The heavy literary heritage that has weighed for so long on the cinema is shown in a whole battery of stylistic figures--metaphors, symbols, ellipses....The desire to codify a 'film language', starting from a group of fundamental rules, makes one think that a film has got to he made according to technical rules on cutting, direction and montage, rules established in the very early days of cinema."[8]

If for some experimental film-makers the literary heritage of cinema is a kind of obstacle there are several others who make creative use of the techniques and concepts bequeathed by literature. Though the films fall in various categories like documentaries, ad films, news films, educational films, experimental and abstract films etc., it is the narrative film which retains its closeness to literature. As Morris Beja aptly observes: "Still, it is the story film that has been at not merely the economic but the artistic heart of the film world. And the fusion of story and cinema places film art in the continuing tradition of such narrative forms as myth, the folktale, the epic, and the novel."[9]

There is no denying the fact that film is essentially a visual art. But it does not mean that its story-telling aspect can be ignored. Many a time visuals in a film convey much more than can be conveyed by the words or dialogues spoken by the characters in it. Yet the visuals also constitute a kind of narrative that creates movement in the film. Some critics like Erwin Panofsky are so staunchly enamoured of the visuals that they feel that anything which detracts from their centrality in a film is intrusive. So Panofsky writes in his essay "Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures" that whenever such elements as "a poetic emotion, a musical outburst, or a literary conceit....entirely lose contact with visible movement, they strike the sensitive spectator as, literally, out of place."[10] When a literary classic is sought to be turned into a movie, the film maker has to ensure that what appears merely as words in the book must acquire visuality in the film. Realising this, the well known novelist F. Scott Fitzgerald in a lecture on movies said that while "a writer's instinct is to think in words," the words must be turned "into visual images for the camera...for on the screen, *seeing* is believing, no matter what the characters say."[11]

The relationship between film and literature has remained somewhat ambivalent and uncertain. While there are film makers who inisist on the close relationship between film and literature, there are others who deny the possibility of any relationship between them. Film-making being a group effort, a film does not carry the distinct signature of any one--not even of the director who may provide the unifying link to an otherwise diverse exercise by various hands. But a literary work is usually the product of a single mind, unless there is joint authorship which is rare indeed. Even in respect of the exploitation of the medium, film and literature remain distinct arts. Narrative film may find creative sisterhood in narrative literature, but the two art forms do not seen to share much of common interest or perception. Internationally renowned Swedish film-maker, Ingmar Bergman, rightly claims that "film has nothing to do with literature; the character and substance of the two art forms are usually in conflict."[12] Similarly, American writer Norman Mailer asserts that "film and literature are as for apart as, say, cave painting and a song."[13] But the influential media critic, Marshall McLuhan seems to think otherwise. He says that "the close relation...between the reel world of film and the private fantasy experience of the printed word is indispensable to our

Western acceptance of the film form...Film, both in its reel form and in its scenario or script form, is completely involved with book culture."[14]

If we examine the above statements a little more closely, we shall realise that they are marked by a clear logic of form as well as of substance. The character and substance of film art are dependent on the nature of the medium and the condition of its communication. Film, as we have already observed, is made possible by the efforts of so many people with diverse talents--story writer, script-writer, lyricist, music director, playback singers, fight-director, dance director, camera-men, director of photography, dialogue writer, sound-recordist, editor, actors, actresses, extras, producer and director etc. Because of this, a film is more like a richly-woven tapestry revealing the fruits of the combined labour of so many artisans. Moreover, a film is a visual and aural simulation of the real world--it's a reel version of the enactment of the film-maker's version of the real world. As the basic aim of a film-maker, at least of a commercial film-maker, is to make as much money as possible, his reel version is embellished with glamour and glitz, based on the manipulation of the basic instincts of man pertaining to sex and violence. It is the actual visuals and sounds that determine the substance of a film. These visuals and sounds have a direct impact on the viewer; his sense-perceptions are literally bombarded, leaving him in the grip of primal passions. The conditions under which the films are viewed--namely, in a darkened theatre where hundreds or thousands of people watch the luminous dance of shadows that nevertheless looks like the performance of real, flesh-and-blood persons--make films look like tricks of magic or the very substance of dreams. This dream-like or magical character of films leaves a more lasting impression than a piece of literature which at best can evoke memories through the magic of language.

However, there have been writers of high calibre like Shakespeare, Dickens and Conrad, who could incorporate the functions of cinema in their literary products. Joseph Conrad, in his much-quoted "Preface" to *The Nigger of the Narcissus* (1896) wrote: "My task which I am trying to achieve is, by the power of the written word, to make you hear, to make you feel--it is, before all, to make you *see*. That--and no more, and it is every thing."[15] These words of Conrad were subsequently echoed in a statement of the path-breaking film-maker, D. W. Griffith: "The task I'm trying

to achieve is above all to make you see." [16] The goal that Conrad had set for himself as a writer of novels and short stories is much nearer the goal of a film maker: "To arrest, for the space of a breath, the hands busy about the work of the earth, and compel men entranced by the sight of distant goals to glance for a moment at the surrounding vision of form and colour, of sunshine and shadows; to make them pause for a look, for a sigh, for a smile--such is the aim, difficult and evanescent, and reserved only for a very few to achieve." [17]

Conrad's insistence and stress upon the vision of form and colour "is in no way different from the aim of a film-maker, who actually presents the sight of form and colour before the viewer. The literary artists like Conrad had thus envisioned a cinema of the mind, bringing to bear a creative relationship between literature and cinema. Even when literature and film appear to be arts belonging to two altogether different realms, they seem to share certain human and aesthetic concerns which link them in a fascinating way.

In contrast to the views held by Bergman and Mailer regarding the distance and incompatibility between film and literature, there are film-makers like Griffith, Eisenstein, Resnais, Fellini and others who are proud to acknowledge the literary sources, roots and ramifications of their films. Writers like Tennessee Williams had adapted cinematic techniques to their own works. Sergei M. Eisenstein in his book *Film Form* has compared the techniques employed by the American film-maker D.W. Griffith, with those used by the English novelist Charles Dickens: "Let Dickens and the whole ancestral array, going back as far as the Greeks and Shakespeare, be superfluous reminders that both Griffith and our cinema prove our origins to be not solely as of Edison and his fellow inventors, but as based on an enormous cultured past; each part of this past in its own moment of world history has moved forward the great art of cinematography. Let this past be a reproach to those thoughtless people who have displayed arrogance in reference to literature, which has contributed so much to this apparently unprecedented art and is, in the first and most important place: the art of viewing--not only the *eye*, but *viewing*--both meanings being embraced in this term." [18]

Morris Beja speaks of the widespread conviction that "film is essentially closer to the novel than to drama. In both film and

prose fiction, the finished product is always the same. People who buy a copy of Dickens' *Great Expectations* in the twentieth century get different binding and pages from the person who bought it in the nineteenth century, but they have a right to assume they are getting exactly the same words--the same *novel* if not the same 'book'. The person who saw John Ford's *The Informer* in the 1930s watched the same film as the person who sees it today--or the person who will see it in the twenty-first century, for that matter. In contrast, every theatrical production of a play--even of an ancient Greek tragedy-is brand new."[19]

If novel and film have the commonality of sameness through time, they have their own sets of contrasting limits. George Bluestone in his book *Novels into Film* has contrasted and defined the limits of these two art forms in terms of their 'modes of consciousness' and in terms of the problem of 'time-flux.' His views provide some useful insights into the nature of relationship between novel and film. Commenting on the growing 'inwardness' of the modern novel, Bluestone quotes E. M. Forster: "...it is the function of the novelist to reveal the hidden life at its source."[20]

Bluestone then refers to the views of Howard Mumford Jones regarding the central problems which have plagued the modern novelist: "...the verbal limitations of non-verbal experience; the dilemma of autobiographical fiction in which the novelist must at once evoke a unique consciousness and yet communicate it to others; the difficulty of catching the flux of time in static language."[21] In this increasingly subjective novel "after images fished out of the stream of past time...substitute a kind of smouldering dialectic for the clean impact of drama".[22]

Bluestone also refers to the views of Bela Balazs to underscore the fundamental difference between film and novel, the former being a presentational medium, while the latter is a discursive form. "...the film, being a presentational medium (except for use of dialogue), cannot have direct access to the power of discursive forms. Where the novel discourses, the film must picture."[23] Because of this, says Bluestone, "The rendition of mental states--memory, dream, imagination--cannot be as adequately represented by film as by language. If the film has difficulty presenting streams of consciousness, it has even more difficulty presenting states of mind which are defined precisely by the absence in them of the visible world. Conceptual imaging, by

definition, has no existence in space. However, once I cognize the signs of a sentence through the conceptual screen, my consciousness is indistinguishable from nonverbal thought. Assuming here a difference between *kinds* of images-between images of things, feelings, concepts, words--we may observe that conceptual images evoked by verbal stimuli can scarcely be distinguished in the end from those evoked by nonverbal stimuli. The stimuli, whether they be the signs of language of the sense data of the physical world, lose their spatial characteristics and become components of the total ensemble which is consciousness."[24]

It is obvious here that the non-discursive, spatial and presentational medium of film cannot match verbal language in the rendition of memory, dream or imagination. Therefore, Bluestone observes further: "....the film image, being externalized in space, cannot be similarly converted through the conceptual screen. We have already seen how alien to the screen is the compacted luxuriance of the trope. For the same reasons, dreams and memories, which exist nowhere but in the individual consciousness, cannot be adequately represented in spatial terms. Or rather, the film, having only arrangements of space to work with, cannot render thought, for the moment thought is externalized it is no longer thought. The film, by arranging external signs for our visual perception, or by presenting us with dialogue, can lead us to *infer* thought. But it cannot show us thought directly. It can show us characters thinking, feeling, and speaking, but it cannot show us their thoughts and feelings. A film is not thought; it is perceived."[25]

The depiction of time-flux both in novel and film poses certain insuperable problems. Since the language consists of bounded, discrete units, it cannot satisfactorily represent the unbounded and continuous. The near-impossibility of freeing fiction from the hold of time was expressed by E. M. Forster when he spoke about Gertrude Stein's attempt to emancipate fiction from the tyranny of time: "She fails, because as soon as fiction is completely delivered from time it cannot express anything at all."[26]

Like the novelist, the film-maker also faces the problem of how to render the flux of time. "'Pictures have no tenses'", says Balazs. "Unfolding in a perpetual present, like visual perception itself, they cannot express either a past or a future. One may argue that the use of dialogue and music provides a door through which a sense of past and future may enter. Dialogue, after all, is

language, and language does have referential tenses. A character whose face appears before us may *talk* about his past and thereby permeate his presence with a kind of pastness. Similarly,...music may be used to counterpoint a present image (as in *High Noon* and *Alexander Nevsky*) and suggest a future event. In this way, apparently, a succession of present images may be suffused with a quality of past or future."[27]

The visuals in a film are generally so overpowering that the viewers get trapped in them to the relative exclusion of sounds that may be generated to their accompaniment. Bluestone gives an example from the popular Hollywood film *On the Waterfront* to illustrate this point. He writes: "When Terry Malone tells Eddie about his childhood in *On the Waterfront*, the present image of his face so floods our consciousness that his words have the thinnest substance only. The scars around his eyes tell us more about his past than any halting explanation. This phenomenon is essentially what Panofsky calls the 'principle of coexpressibility', according to which a moving picture--even when it has learned to talk--remains a picture that moves, and does not convert itself into a piece of writing that is enacted. That is why Shakesperian films which fail to adapt the fixed space of the stage to cinematic space so often seem static and talky."[28] "In the novel", says Bluestone further, "the line of dialogue stands naked and alone; in the film, the spoken word is attached to its spatial image." Though there is an inextricable fusion of sound and sight in a film, the act of seeing remains primary. At times, films can also provide us a kind of spatial analogue for the flux of time, as "the transience of the shot falls away before the sweeping permanence of its motion."[29] But this illusion cannot be maintained for long.

Bluestone provides a usable distinction between novel and film, which provides us some useful insights into the nature of relationship between the two. He writes: "Both novel and film are time arts, but whereas the formative principle in the novel is time, the formative principle in the film is space. Where the novel takes its space for granted and forms its narrative in a complex of time values, the film takes its time for granted and forms its narrative in arrangements of space. Both film and novel create the illusion of psychologically distorted time and space, but neither destroys time or space. The novel renders the illusion of space by going from point to point in time; the film renders time by going from point to point in space. The novel tends to abide by, yet explore,

the possibilities of psychological law; the film tends to abide by, yet explore, the possibilities of physical law."[31]

Some writers and critics have raised the bogey of the superiority of film to literature or vice versa. Film and literature being distinct arts in their own right, the question of superiority of one over the other is irrelevant and uncalled for. Yet a critic like Edward Murray in *The Cinematic Imagination* insists that neither Balzac nor Tolstoy could cause us to 'see' a face "as vividly as a movie camera can."[32] Murray then goes on to say that this direct 'palpability' of cinema confers on it a superiority: "Watching a film story is ordinarily a less reflective but a more moving experience than reading a novel."[33] Yet, contrary to this, some perceptive critics believe that cinema is impossible without good literature. Andre Bazin, for example, says that *Citizen Kane* "would never have existed" but for Dos Passos.[34] Wagner himself believes that "cinema is at its most convincing when it declines to be a dramatic mode and leans, rather, on its immediate antecedent in the aesthetic representation of reality (or irreality)--namely the novel."[35] He goes on to say: "Peter Robeck's *The Great Director*, produced by John Boorman for BBC West in 1966, demonstrates that, like Joyce, Griffith anticipated almost everything available to his new medium--even, at one point, Cinemascope or the wide screen, a purely visual emphasis. Seen today, much of the Babylonian material in *Intolerance* appears indebted to the paintings of Jean-Leon Gerome, but in general all the close-ups, angle-shots, flashbacks, and other devices of narrative are already in the novel."[36]

The inextricable mixture of fact and fiction and a wide-ranging inclusion of existing techniques in both novel and cinema have evoked some interesting observations from Wagner, He writes: "If the novel lacked definition at the start, so does the film now. This puts an onus on both. Nietzsche saw the Socratic dialogue as the principal pattern of fiction, 'viewed as the Aesopian fable raised to its highest power.' Narrative fiction soon came to assume the terms of all previous written matter, eventually including the poem itself. Andre Gide, claiming the rights of literature to destroy itself, put the form finally in question by stepping out of *The Counterfeiters* and asking, in a word, quite what the point was in continuing. At the inception of fiction we find a host of imaginary voyages, travel diaries, pirate romances, picaresque tales, so intermingled that it is becoming increasingly hard to sort out the

fiction from the fact, or vice versa. If fact was fabricated in narrative prose of this time, source studies are now abundantly documenting a feedback in the operation as pedants carry off, ant-like in their jaws, prize morsels of fact from the fiction."[37]

Turning to cinema, Wagner writes: "The cinema has been equally beset by this width of reference, one which is knowingly reported, for its day, in *Citizen Kane*. Poetry, travel, the newsreel, interview, now the rock documentary, plus drama, the comic strip, history, science-fiction--all press to be accommodated in the going public medium. There has ever been a recent mirror-image attempt by Woody Allen to duplicate TV techniques in cinema. Nor is it always realised that film has to put on, without 'putting on' as it were, the new and ever more ardent sexuality."[38]

In spite of all advances that film has made, it could be said that it "emerged in literature before it did on screen. The contrapuntal techniques of *Kane* are long anticipated by Hamsun, Joyce, Conrad and Gide, and in comparing his approach with that of Kurosawa in *Rashomon*, Welles said no more than that both derive from fiction. For *Rashomon* Kurosawa used Ryunosuke Akutagawa's story 'In a Grove'. It was in camera technique--in Kurosawa's case, the brilliant tracking shots through the forest--that both directors excelled."[39]

Wagner forwards an interesting proposition that 'A culture obtains the art form it desires'. Speaking of film as an art form he says: "Film is the art of a technocracy, and a technocracy is ineluctably narrative. In his valuable *Literature and Film* Robert Richardson suggests that 'if science and technology have become the forms for much of the creative energy of the twentieth century, then we should not be surprised to find the motion picture, that child of the machine, of the physics of light, and of the chemistry of film, one of the most vital, if indeed not the most vital, of the modern arts.' Arnold Hauser is brought to the bar in support-- 'The film is, moreover, an art evolved from the spiritual foundations of technics.'"[40]

Psychological elements also play a significant role in defining the relationship between film and literature. "The novel was written in a room alone by one who addressed another reading the result in a room alone. ...In the cinema the viewer came to sit isolated, comfortable, warm, *in the dark*, far more on his own than in the theatre."[41] In its treatment of time a film has a greater affinity

with a dream: "...the film is psychologically far closer to a dream than almost any other art form. Its handling of time alone evinces this. Inaction is much less tolerated than on the stage or, for that matter, in real life. Film's liberty with time is total and can be both pleasing (as a source of relief from an element that constricts us) and frightening (as chaos when divorced from its usual unity). Cinema makes an all-out assault on the way in which we structure ourselves temporally. And it was guided into this by fiction, rather than drama."[42]

The psychological implications of form in novel and cinema have a tremendous social significance. "If cinema is a waking dream, it evokes identifications with an immediacy and intensity that threaten us very deeply. The form of a novel is internal, inside its own content as it were, and thereby throws up a defence against the fears and anxieties its subject matter arouses. For Robert Gorham Davis fictional form achieves this most clearly by 'the way it returns upon itself instead of merging with the world outside.' In cinema the line between our own psychic life and that of the characters on the screen is less clearly drawn."[43]

What are the relative effects of cinema and literature on human consciousness? Robert Brown, who saw the film version of a real-life story *To Die of Love* also, observed: "The printed word had led me much more deeply into all this, told me more about the passions and the laws involved than the images on the screen."[44] But both fiction and film can have a cathartic effect on the reader or audience: "Fiction is a secondary world which helps us to enjoy what Freud called 'substitute gratification' and so satisfy desires and reduce tensions. Great films also absorb tensions but they do not require the same kind of participation. In reading a novel we must translate a symbol on a printed page; in a film people and things pass before our gaze as literally as they do in the primary world. Hence, fiction can allay anxieties and desires because it requires an active mental effort of engagement."[45]

The effect of a film or a novel on a person depends to a large extent on the receptive frame of mind he has. If he has strong urges to do something else he will not be able to sit to read a novel. In the case of a film, however, he may experience it without having to make much effort on his part. Geoffrey Wagner cites Simon Lesser, who in his *Fiction and the Unconscious*, hypothesises that "no one in a strong state of sexual desire feels like settling

down to an evening with a book. Much depends on the character of the work, but in general Lesser's observations hold: 'Even when one is somewhat disturbed, one may be able to become absorbed in a movie or a fast-moving thriller but not, let us say, in a typical nineteenth-century English novel. When anxiety or instinctual pressure becomes too urgent, however, no form of fiction is likely to engage or hold one's interest. *A certain degree of freedom from anxiety and instinctual pressure is necessary before one is likely to want to read or can enjoy reading.*"[46] Film's illusion does not always make this competition with another area of discourse; that is to say, its images are not asking to be translated into words. In this respect it is a 'hot' medium, in McLuhanese, whereas language is cool and one can walk around in it."[47]

A new dimension of the relationship between film and literature arises when we look at the films based on literary works. Almost all the great classics of the Western world have been filmed by some enterprising film-makers. From a ninety-minute film to a four-hour film--that's the time span covered by film-makers in filming shorter novels like those of Jane Austen to the novels of epic proportion like Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. The time element plays a significant role in the relative enjoyment, appreciation and critical evaluation of film and literature. While the duration of a film generally does not exceed two hours, the reading of a novel may take several hours. Moreover, the film image passes before the viewer's eyes only once, giving him little time for reflection. But a book can be read again and again, in parts or whole, according to the reader's convenience. Because of this time constraint, the film maker has necessarily to prune a literary work to suit the needs of the film. In this process, the literary work becomes only a prop on which the film is raised. Realising this, the Soviet film-maker Pudovkin, who made a memorable film based on Maxim Gorky's *Mother*, wrote: "The theme is almost always the most that one can take from a literary work in changing it into a screenplay...The development and treatment of the plot of a literary work (especially in the hands of a great master) are the result of purely literary methods. Their translation to the screen is quite impossible."[48] Taylor quotes Pudovkin further to stress the point that if the power of a literary work was achieved by literary means, the strength of a film lay in its use of cinematographic means: "An example: the shattered and exhausted mother. Her exhaustion is underlined by photographing her from above so that *it looks as if this exhaustion is driving her into the ground*. Light was used in the same

way. The father, an enormous man, takes hold of a fragile object--the clock. Illuminated from below, he casts an enormous shadow, and *this produces the necessary effect.*"[49]

Touching upon this problem, Wagner asks: "Do films of Shakespeare make the originals 'come alive'? Do they fulfil Pudovkin's famous criterion, that they have not photographic but cinematographic essence'? Language as we know it is sequential and while cinema can confer a certain degree of simultaneity of time in space, the entitles are not as disparate as certain theoreticians, like Bluestone, have attempted to propose ('the filmed novel, in spite of certain resemblances, will inevitably become a different artistic entity from the novel on which it is based.'). This can be seen in the fact that one can virtually make the same film again, but not the same novel. It is a question of Coleridge's primary and secondary imaginations. Each age, it is said, needs its own translations: Broadway turned *All about Eve* into *Applause*; the *Mayerling* and *Mary, Queen of Scots* remakes are notoriously legion; and John Huston made *The Maltese Falcon* only after two previous failures."[50]

Films and literature have affected each other mutually. They have even adopted some common devices like montage and flashback. But, says Beja, "when a cinematic device is adapted for written literature, the effect is often quite dissimilar. A flashback, for example, can be handled in a novel so that we are constantly aware that it is to be seen as an element out of the past; that is harder to accomplish in a film since, as Bela Balazs observes, 'pictures have no tenses'--which means that they are, in effect, always in the present tense. As Robbe-Grillet says in the introduction to his script for *Last Year at Marienbad*, 'the essential characteristic of the image is its presentness. Whereas literature has a whole gamut of grammatical tenses....by its nature, what we see on the screen *is in the act of happening*, we are given the gesture itself, not an account of it.'[51] Thus the presentness of the image somewhat limits its force, in spite of its visual power, whereas the multiple tenses of literature make it an extremely powerful expression of human experience and human potentiality.

Siegfried Kracauer, in his brilliant book *Theory of Film*, which he subtitles as 'The Redemption of Physical Reality,' has discussed some similarities and dissimilarities between film and novel. Speaking of similarities, he says that 'like film, the novel

tends to render life in its fullness.' Explaining it further, he says: "Great novels, such as *Madame Bovary*, *War and Peace*, and *Remembrance of Things Past*, cover vide expanses of reality. They aim, or seem to aim, at unfolding life on a scale which exceeds their intrigue proper. So does film. This glaring similarity between the two media is corroborated by the fact that in the novel too the story turns out to be a double-edged proposition."[52] He then continues: "No doubt it is indispensable for the novel, if only as a thread through the maze of life. Yet much as it is needed, it threatens to substitute an ordered sequence of events for life's unfathomable contingencies and thus to blur, in E. M. Forster's words, the 'finer growths' it is supposed to bring out...Accordingly in creating a dramatic intrigue the novelist, as well as the film maker, is faced with the difficulty of reconciling two divergent, if not opposite, requirements." [53]

Pointing out to another similarity Kracauer says: 'like film, the novel aspires to endlessness': "The novel's tendency toward endlessness is of a piece with its inherent nostalgia for the vast spaces of life. George Lukacs in his *Die Theorie des Romans*...says this is so because of the place the novel occupies in the historical process, as he conceives of it. His theological outlook on history leads him to assign the novel to a different era from that of the epic. The latter era he identifies as an age filled with significance--an age in which the notion of chronological time is still powerless because all humans and objects are oriented toward eternity and vritually partake of it. The novel on its part is the form of expression of a later age which no longer knows of ultimate meanings, so that the life it contains--the very life rendered by the novel--does not manifest itself in a rounded-out cycle of eternal presences but evolves in chronological time without beginning and end...This concern for endlessness has repercussions affecting the course of the story. The novelist naturally wants to bring his story to a conclusion which will put the seal on its wholeness. But in genuine novels it is precisely this conclusion that makes the reader feel uneasy; it strikes him as an arbitrary intervention, cutting short developments that might, or indeed should, be carried on and on."[54]

What are the implications of these similarities between film and novel? According to Kracauer: "If these resemblances between the two media were alone decisive, the novel would indeed be a cinematic story form. Yet novel and film also differ from each

other: formal properties are anything but identical. And the worlds to which they reach out do not coincide either. What exactly is the nature of these differences? And are they strong enough to neutralize the existing similarities?"[55]

French aesthetician, Etienne Souriau, has mentioned four structural properties of the novel which stubbornly resist translation into cinematic language. These properties show in the novel's dealings with the elements of time, tempo, space and the angle of approach. Of these the elements of time and angle of approach deserve more consideration. Referring to Souriau's views, Kracauer says: "Souriau contrasts the novel's flexibility in handling all imaginable modes of time with the rigidity of films. Thus the novelist may characterize some action as a customary one, be deliberately vague about the moment of its emergence, interrelate things present and past whenever he wants to, etc. All this film cannot do. What appears on the screen has inevitably the earmarks of an actual event. The only means by which film can evoke the past is the flashback--which Souriau calls a pretty clumsy device."[56]

The cinema may not be able to explore time with the sovereignty of the novel, but it is nonetheless much more flexible than is generally admitted. Kracauer cites an example from Satyajit Ray's landmark film *Pather Panchali*, based on a famous Bengali novel, to illustrate the flexible handling of time in cinema: "*Pather Panchali* presents a chronologically ordered sequence of episodes in such a way that the spectator feels continually urged to relive what has gone before. His imagination moves to and fro, weaving the fabric of a time which has little in common with that of the sequence. And steeped in this inner time, he is no longer able, nor does he any longer care, to establish in chronological time the events that pass across the screen. They drift, unlocalizable, through a temporal realm in which the past and the present inextricably fuse with each other."[57] He gives another example of manipulation of time in Akira Kurosawa's classic film *Rashomon*: "The pictorial reconstructions of the alleged crime in *Rashomon* are so executed and interlinked you cannot follow them without acutely realizing their relevance to the ongoing search for truth These retrospects are part and parcel of the present."[58] He believes that "Films may even achieve what seems exclusively reserved for the novel: they may show a character in company with the people he recollects....Evidently, the different treatment of time

in novel and film is only a difference in degree, not in essence."[59]

Regarding the'angle of approach' Sourlau has pointed out that the novelist is at liberty to place himself inside any of his characters and, accordingly set the outer world, or what then appears of it, in the perspective of the latter's inward being. Film on its part, the author continues, is incapable of proceeding from this particular angle of approach. The camera cannot achieve complete identification with a screen character in the fashion of the novel; all that it can do is to suggest intermittently what he sees and how he feels about it."[60]

Kracauer believes that Sourlau underestimates the potentialities of film: "Even granted that the film maker is much less free than the novelist to become one with a character of his choice, he may go far in giving the impression of such mimetic transformations."[61] He asserts therefore that inwardness is not entirely inaccessible to film. Kracauer than observes that novel and film also embrace different worlds. Speaking of the material and the mental continuum that these differing worlds represent, he observes: "The fact that both film and novel feature the flow or stream of life does not imply that they focus on the same aspects of it. As mentioned earlier, film gravitates toward a kind of life which is 'still intimately connected, as if by an umbilical cord, with the material phenomena from which its emotional and intellectual contents emerge.' Cinematic films, that is, capitalize on the suggestive power of these phenomena to convey all that which is not visible and material. In DIARY OF A COUNTRY PRIEST, for instance, it is the allusive expressions of the young priest's face rather than his explicit diary entries, which succeed in evoking and impressing upon us his spiritual struggles and sufferings; everything here hinges on the transparence to beliefs and values of a physical entity. Life, as captured by the camera, is predominantly a material continuum."[62]

What is the nature of the world predominantly represented by novel? "To be sure," says Kracauer, "the novel too is frequently engrossed in physical existence--faces, objects, landscapes and all. But this is only part of the world at its command. A composition is words, it is able, and therefore disposed, directly to name and penetrate inner-life events that range from emotions to ideas, from psychological conflicts to intellectual disputes. Practically all novels lean toward internal developments or states of being. *The world*

of the novel is primarily a mental continuum. Now this continuum often includes components which elude the grasp of the cinema because they have no physical correspondences to speak of. Unlike the country priest's spirituality, they cannot be intimated by facial expressions or so; there is nothing in camera-reality that would refer to them."[63]

The near impossibility of filming the mental universe of a novel is illustrated by Kracauer with reference to Proust's famous novel *Remembrance of Things Past.* He writes: "That life, as depicted in literary narratives, may always extend into cinematically irreproducible regions, is strikingly illustrated by the Proust novel. Somewhere in the part entitled *The Captive* Marcel describes himself as lying awake at dawn and listening to the cries of the street vendors that penetrate his bedchamber. So far this episode seems predestined to be filmed. Yet Proust details the hawker's stereotyped exclamations and intonations mainly for the sake of the memories they evoke in him. They remind him of Gregorian chants. Accordingly, the episode leads up to comparisons between the Paris street cries and these liturgical divisions. But in thus weaving the infinite fabric of observations and recollections in which his life fulfils itself, Proust evolves a continuity impervious to the camera."[64] He, therefore, reaches the conclusion that "Any attempt to convert the mental continuum of the novel into camera-life appears to be hopelessly doomed."[65]

Yet there are novels that can be turned into good films. In spite of the fact that the novel is not a cinematic literary form, as Kracauer belives, some novels like Zola's *Gervaise* have been made into brilliant films. Commenting on this novel and its film version, Kracauer says: "The novel is a boon to adapters. In fact, it is so saturated with photographable things, events, and relationships that Aurenche-Bost and Clement can afford to venture further into the psychological dimension than Zola did without deserting the material continuum he establishes. Aside from other, less important changes, they tone down his emphasis on sociological revelation--stuff eminently suitable for the screen--and feature instead Gervaise's valiant effort not to let herself be contaminated by the decay about her. Thus they create a heroine with a touch of human depth."[66]

The film version of *Gervaise*, directed by Clement, is both good Zola and good cinema. Stressing this, Kracauer writes:

"...*Gervaise* is pure Zola and good cinema to boot. That its truth to the medium goes together with loyalty to the novel must be laid to the latter's indestructible cinematic substance. The major strands of the story, as well as the description of contemporary milieus, are easily woven into the broad pictorial continuity; and the scenes of violence and animal horror in particular turn out to be genuine film material. In the case of these scenes which seem to come into their own when they are transferred from word to image the translation surpasses the original in impact and indeed aesthetic adequacy. Only the camera is able to record dispassionately the repulsive spectacle of the delirious Coupeau wrecking the laundry shop and tumbling down with the cupping glasses on his back. Of course, all this is not to underestimate the director's sensibility, which shows, for instance, in his exquisite handling of the child Nana. Nor should it be forgotten that *Gervaise* benefits by being located in that period of the past which still reverberates in our early memories and therefore favours cinematic treatment."[67]

The relationship between film and novel and film and drama/ theatre has been analysed by various perceptive critics and commentators from various angles and perspectives. The literary moorings of film have usually been traced in novel and drama as these latter provide narrative and dramatic vigour to it. James Monaco, in his influential book *How to Read a Film: The Art, Technology, Language, History and Theory of Film and Media* observes: "The narrative potential of film is so marked that it has developed its strongest bond with the novel, not with painting, not even with drama. Both films and novels tell long stories with a wealth of detail and they do it from the perspective of a narrator, who often interposes a resonant level of irony between the story and the observer. Whatever can be told in print in a novel can be roughly pictured or told in film (although the wildest fantasies of a Jorge Luis Borges or a Lewis Carroll might require 'special effects' work)".[68] Monaco goes on to comment on the basic differences between film and novel, besides the apparent one of pictorial narration and linguistic narration. He says: "First, because film operates in real time, it is more limited. Novels end only when they feel like it. Film is, in general, restricted to what Shakespeare called 'the short two hours' traffic of our stage'. Popular novels have been a vast reservoir of material for commercial films over the years...But commercial film still can't reproduce the range of the novel in time...At the same time as film is limited to a shorter

narration, however, it naturally has pictorial possibilities the novel doesn't have. What can't be transferred by incident might be translated into image."[69]

Speaking of the most essential difference between the two forms of narration, Monaco says: "Novels are told by the author. We see and hear only what he wants us to see and hear. Films are, in a sense, told by their authors too, but we see and hear a great deal more than a director necessarily intends...more important, whatever the novelist describes is filtered through his language, his prejudices, and his point of view. With film we have a certain amount of freedom to choose, to select one detail rather than another." [70]

The film and the novel have their own driving tensions. "The driving tension of the novel is the relationship between the materials of the story (plot, character, setting, theme, and so forth) and the narration of it in language; between the tale and the teller, in other words. The driving tension of film, on the other hand, is between the materials of the story and the objective nature of the image. It's as if the author/director of a film were in continual conflict with the scene he is shooting. Chance plays a much larger part, and the end result is that the observer is free to participate in the experience much more actively. The words on the page are always the same, but the image on the screen changes continually as we redirect our attention. Film is, in this way, a much richer experience."[71]

"Film can approximate the ironies that the novel develops in narration," says Monaco, "but it can never duplicate them...Naturally, then, the novel responded to the challenge of film by expanded activity in just this area: the subtle, complex ironies of narration. Like painting, prose narrative has in the twentieth century turned away from mimesis and toward self-consciousness. In the process it has bifurcated. What was once in the nineteenth century a unified experience, the main form of social and cultural expression, and the chosen art of the newly literate middle classes, has in the twentieth century divided into two forms: the popular novel (Irwing Wallace, James Michener, Leon Uris, et al), which is now so closely connected with film that it sometimes begins life as a screenplay; and the elite novel where the 'artistic' avant-garde work is being done."[72]

Film has influenced the techniques of modern fiction in other

ways also. "Like painters, novelists learned from the experience of film to analyze their art and conceptualize it. Vladimir Nabokov, Jorge Luis Borges, Alain Robbe-Grillet, Donald Barthelme, and many others write novels about writing novels (as well as other things) just as many painters now paint paintings about painting paintings. Abstraction has progressed from a focus on human experience to a concern for ideas about that experience, finally to an interest mainly in the aesthetics of thought. Jean Genet, playwright and novelist, has said: 'Ideas don't interest me so much as the shape of ideas.'"[3]

In competition with and under the influence of film, novel has also changed in some other respects. "Since the days of Defoe, one of the primary functions of the novels, as of painting, was to communicate a sense of other places and people. By the time of Sir Walter Scott, this pictorial service had reached its zenith. After that, as first still, then motion picture photography began to perform this function, the descriptive element of the novel declined. More important, novelists have learned to narrate their stories in the smaller units common to film. Like contemporary playwrights, they think now more often in scenes than in more elaborate acts...Finally, one of the novel's greatest assets is its ability to manipulate words. Films have words too, of course, but not usually in such profusion and never with the concrate reality of the printed page. If painting under the influence of film has tended toward design, then the novel is approaching poetry as it redoubles its attention to itself and celebrates its material: language."[4]

As far as the relationship between film and drama or theatre is concerned, its best illustrations can be found in the film versions of Shakespeare's plays. "Students of Shakespeare's plays as theatre," says Jack J. Jorgens, "would do well to contemplate the many similarities between theatre and film, two greedy art forms constantly devouring their neighbours: fiction, poetry, dance, music, painting, sculpture, architecture. Despite some fundamental differences, the expressive languages of these arts are very much alike...In both arts, the problems are the same: how to write with precision about performance as interpretation, the shaping of conflict, integration of verbal and visual bits of information, superimpose patterns, shifting levels of stylization and gradations of emphasis; how to read the complex ideas and emotions embedded in textures, colours, rhythms, movements, and sounds

as well as in words."[75]

Some films based on Shakespeare's plays are masterpieces of film art. Even otherwise, the plays of Shakespeare are a challenging proposition to a film-maker: "Shakespeare films are interesting as films because they stretch the capabilities and challenge the inhibition of art. They suggest that 'symptomatic dialogue' is not the only effective kind, that 'verbal poetry is an essential aspect of cinematic expression, and... the present lack of poetry in film impoverishes and depletes the art."[76]

Some Shakespeare films are sheer poetry, because film medium itself is more amenable to poetic rendering. As Jorgens rightly observes with reference to the Soviet film-maker Kozintsev, who made some of the most outstanding Shakespeare films like *Hamlet* and *King Lear:* "The filmic mode is the mode of the film poet, whose works bear the same relation to the surfaces of reality that poems do to ordinary conversation. A filmic rendering of Shakaspeare, says Kozintsev, 'shifts the stress from the aural to the visual.' The problem is not one of finding means to speak the verse in front of the camera, in realistic circumstances ranging from long-shot to close-up. The aural has to be made visual. The poetic texture itself has to be transformed into a visual poetry, into the dynamic organization of film imagery."[77]

Commenting on the power of the filmic mode, Jorgens observes: "The great strength of the filmic mode is that it takes advantage of the film's power to tell a story 'by overcoming the forms of the outer world, namely space, time, and causality, and by adjusting the events to the forms of the inner world, namely attention, memory, imagination, and emotion.' It acknowledges the importance of everything that is not literal in Shakespeare's plays by exploring through sounds and images what Stanislavsky called 'subtext', 'the manifest, the inwardly felt expression of a human being in a part which flows uninterruptedly beneath the words of the text, giving them life and a basis for existing...a web of innumerable varied inner patterns inside a play and a part...all sorts of figments of the imagination, inner movements, objects of attention, smaller and greater truths and a belief in them, adaptations, adjustments and other similar events."[78]

In conclusion, it can be said that the relationship between film and literature has several complex dimensions-ideological, sociological, aesthetic etc. Literature, particularly in the form of novel

and drama, employs narrative and theatrical seductions to draw the readers and audience into its magic circle. The filmed versions of novels sometimes are charged with even more subversive potential. *The Last Temptation of Christ* provides a good example. While the novel by Nikos Kazantzakis, under the title *The Last Temptation* has been hailed as a modern classic, its film version, entitled *The Last Temptation of Christ* has been banned almost in every country on the grounds of its alleged blasphemy and sacrilege. This film almost raised the same kind of tempestuous storm as did Salman Rushdie's novel *The Satanic Verses*. One shudders to think what would have been the fate of the film based on *The Satanic Verses*, if it had ever been made. Moreover, postmodern literature would need a postmodern treatment for its film version. We are reminded of Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*, when we read an account of postmodern cinema: "Postmodernist cinema is characterized...by different forms of pastiche or stylistic multiplicity. Sometimes this is internal to one film, as in *Kiss of the Spider Woman*, with its parodies of Hollywood romance and melodrama set into the narrative of the developing relationship of two political prisoners. A more complex example is Terry Gilliam's strange film *Brazil*, which Linda Hutcheon sees as postmodern because of its 'ironic rethinking of history' with its parodic recalls of other films like *Star Wars* and *Battleship Potemkin*, along with the undecidable mix of different historical periods in the film; futuristic sets mingling with drably 1930s clothes and presentation of a world dominated by computers and advanced automation whose archaic design and unreliability suggest that they too belong to the 1930s.....Along with these forms of temporal discontinuity goes the film's generic heterogeneity, with its unsettling lurches between comedy and tragedy, utopia and dystopia, adventure story and satire."[79]

REFRENCES

[1]Fredric Jameson, *Signatures of the Visible*, (New York: Routledge, 1992), p.1.

[2]Ibid., p.1.

[3]Ibid., p.1.

[4]Ibid., p.1.

[5]Sergei Eisenstein, "Dickens, Griffith and the Film Today", in *Film Theory and Criticism*, ed. Gerald Mast & Marshall Cohen, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), p.303.

[6] Ibid., p.303.

[7] Sergei Eisenstein, *The Film Sense*, (trans. Jay Leyda), (London: Faber and Faber, 1977), p.15.

[8] Louis Marcorelles, *Living Cinema*, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1973), pp.27-8.

[9] Morris Beja, *Film & Literature*, (New York: Longman, 1979), p.22.

[10] Cited by Beja, *op cit.*, pp.24-5.

[11] Cited by Beja, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[12] Cited by Beja, *op. cit.*, p.51.

[13] Ibid., p.51.

[14] Ibid., pp.51-2.

[15] Cited by Beja, *op. cit.*, p.52.

[16] Ibid., p.52.

[17] Ibid., p.52.

[18] Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*, (ed. and Trans. Jay Leda), (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949), p.34.

[19] Beja, *op. cit*, p.68.

[20] George Bluestone, "Limits of the *Novel and the Film*", in *Novels into Film*, rep. in Mast & Cohen, *Film Theory & Criticism*, p.291.

[21] Ibid., p.291.

[22] Ibid., p.292.

[23] Ibid., p.292.

[24] Ibid., p.292.

[25] Ibid., p.292-93.

[26] Cited by Bluestone, *op. cit.*, p.295.

[27] Ibid., p.297.

[28] Ibid., p.297.

[29] Ibid., p.297.

[30] Ibid., p.299.

[31] Ibid., p.300.

[32] Cited by Geoffrey Wagner, *The Novel and the Cinema*, (Ratherford: Associated University Press, 1975), p.11.

[33] Ibid., p.11.

[34] Ibid., p.15.

[35] Ibid., p.26.

[36] Ibid., p.26-7.

[37] Ibid., pp.43-4.

[38] Ibid., p.44.

[39]Ibid., p.63.

[40]Ibid., pp.16-7.

[41]Ibid., p.135.

[42]Ibid., p.135.

[43]Ibid., p.135.

[44]Cited by Wagner, *op. cit.*, p.149.

[45]Ibid., p.147.

[46]Ibid., p.147.

[47]Ibid., p.147.

[48]Cited by Richard Taylor, *Film Propaganda: Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany*, (London: Croom Helm, 1979), p.81.

[49]Ibid., pp.81-82.

[50]Wagner, *The Novel and the Cinema*, pp.67-8.

[51]Beja, *op. cit.*, p.75.

[52]Siegfried Kracauer, *Theory of Film*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1978), p.232.

[53]Ibid., p.232.

[54]Ibid., p.233.

[55]Ibid., pp.233-34.

[56]Ibid., p.234.

[57]Ibid., pp.234-35.

[58]Ibid., p.235.

[59]Ibid., p.235.

[60]Ibid., pp.236-37.

[61]Ibid., p.236.

[62]Ibid., p.237.

[63]Ibid., p.237.

[64]Ibid., pp 237-38.

[65]Ibid., p.238.

[66]Ibid., p.241.

[67]Ibid., p.241.

[68]James Monaco, *How to Read a Film: The Art, Technology, Language, History and Theory of Film and Media*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), p.27.

[69]Ibid., p.27.

[70]Ibid., pp.27-29.

[71]Ibid., pp.29-30.

Ibid., pp.30-1.

[73] Ibid., pp.31-3.

[74] Ibid., p.33.

[75] Jack J. Jorgens, *Shakespeare on Film*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), p.4.

[76] Ibid., p.6.

[77] Ibid., p.10.

[78] Ibid., p.11.

[79] Steven Connor, *Postmodernist Culture*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), p.177.

FILM AND LITERATURE : A STUDY IN ARTISTIC MEDIUM AND EFFLORESCENCE

J.P. Tripathi

Both film and literature show a mirror to life. They are mediums of expression of life. Both are also art forms and represent artistic blossoming, i.e. the process of growth and maturing as art form. The appeal of film is mostly pictorial and visual, music is only an accessory aid to film, often presenting tone and emotional background. Appeal of literature is mostly auditory and verbal. The weapon of literature is the sequence of words, the cadences, syntax, rhythm, imagery, symbol and primarily music.

Film is a form of art of very recent origin resulting from the advancement of science. Film originated as a source of entertainment and recreation, and is, even now, not considered a serious form of art. Its appeal is to a limited audience. Film can communicate with even the illiterate and caters generally to commoners and masses of urban origin.

Literature appeals mostly to the literate, the educated classes, and the really powerful branches of literature, by auditory appeal, cater to the even so-called illiterate masses. Rural masses can live without films but not without epics such as the *Ramayana*, the *Mahabharata*, or in Christian countries without the *Bible*, *Paradise Lost* and other epics. As such, literature has had mass appeal and base and has become part of folklore and folkmind. Literature has run in the human veins and has become part and parcel of man's mental, emotional and spiritual make-up.

The older the civilisation and culture of a country, the greater the hold of literature on the human psyche and soul. In comparision, films have not yet entered the frame of human mind. There is an alienness still connected with them. Eyes are always raised against films but not against literature unless it be recent literature which is oversexed and Freudian in nature or one that is close to pornography or yellow literature.

Literature states and implies, films mostly state and state through pictures and visual renderings and camera devices. Music is mostly a companion device like dance. But music is the life of literature, particularly of all poetic forms. The chief instrument of literature is imagination; it provokes the reader and audience

to fill up the gaps of statement. What literature implies, film camera catches up for exposure; the consequence is more unhappy for films. Hence we conclude that while literature enlarges, elevates and widens the impact of life, films bring a sort of limitation and narrowing down of effects.

I begin my critical survey with a comparision of a literary event in film. I take the event of the incarnation of Lord Krishna in the film serial *Sri Krishna*. Prior to incarnating himself, Lord Vishnu appeared in a vision to Vasudeva and Devaki and revealed to them their devotions of past life and the fact that he was getting incarnated as child to them. And instantly in front of the couple he became a natural infant to them:

Ityuktva aasiddharistusnim bhagwanatmainayaya
Pitroh Sampashyatoh Sadyo babhoov Prakritah Shishuh.

"After saying this the Lord became silent and by his 'Maya' just while the parents were looking at he turned into a natural infant."[1]

The textual perusal of the *Shrimadbhagwad* shows that the great poet *Vyas* clearly wanted to show the miraculous power of God to transform himself from a spiritual form to a physical baby in the flash of a moment. The omnipotence, the omniscience and the omnipresence of God are proved by this incident. The perusal of the other incidents that follow is more pertinent. The poet *Vyas* says that when Vasudeva desired to go out of the birth-room taking his son, by *Yogmaya* the sensory and knowing powers of all the gate-keepers and city-dwellers were taken away and all the well-tied doors, when Vasudeva came with Krishna, opened of their own as darkness is dispelled by the sun and when he reached the rain-flooded Yamuna, the river gave him a path like the ocean to Vishnu. All this is described in verses forty-seven to fifty in Canto 10, Chapter 4[2] of the epic. In the five verses of the epic five miracles are rendered: one is that Lord Vishnu becomes a living natural child before the parents; Yogmaya takes away the powers of cognition of the gatekeepers and townmen; the doors automatically open at the approach of Vasudeva with Krishna; the Yamuna gives a path to Vasudeva carrying the baby Krishna and *Shesha Nag* follows Vasudeva protecting the child from the rains.

The filmmaker takes the help of heavy rains, thunder and lightning flashes under the impact of which people lose their waking powers. The most ludicrous part of the film device is that

the infant Krishna touches the first doors and they open; others are shown as opening of their own accord. An infant touching a door and its opening is in itself a miracle but puerile. What the epic writer implied was that everything was happening due to the spiritual power, the *Yogmaya*, the executive agent of Lord. God the Brahman, in the form of the baby, does nothing. The Yamuna's giving way and Sheshnag's following Vasudeva protecting the baby from rain are the consequences of his spiritual power. The film-maker in this context creates his personal myth which contradicts the eternal Indian mythology and spiritual tradition. The epic writer leaves the five miracles to the reader's imagination; he states one percent, while ninety-nine percent of the miracles is to be filled in by the reader in his own way. The film-maker fills the gaps by his own imagination and with the help of whatever mechanical devices are available to the film industry. In the case of the epic the impact is sublime; in the case of the film it is ludicrous and often farcical.

Taking yet another issue of literature, let us see the efficacy of film in rendering it. The situation occurs in Act II of *Abhijnan Shakuntalam* written by the famous Sanskrit dramatist Kalidas. Dushyanta, having entered the forest containing the hermitage of Sage Kanva, is awestruck by the extraordinary beauty of Shakuntala and expresses it in the following verse:

> Anaghratam Pushpam Kisalayamalunam Karruhai-Rana viddham Ratnam Madhu Navamanaswaditrasam
>
> Akhandam Punyanam Phalamivacha Tadrupamanagham Najane Bhoktaram Kamih samupasthasyati Vidhih.[3]

"Like a flower unsmelt, a flaming leaf untorn by nails (of hands), a diamond unpierced, a new honey which has not been tasted, like the fruit of endless pious deeds, that holy beauty, I don't know, to whom will the creator provide."[4] The damsel Shakuntala has divine origin. She is the daughter of Vishwamitra and a divine female angel, and hence her divine beauty. A film will pick up a beautiful actress and decorate her with wild flowers and will make her to impersonate the ideal damsel of Kalidasa. Howsoever beautiful a girl might be, she cannot impersonate the superhuman beauty of Kalidas's Shakuntala. The literary device used by the dramatist is generalisation and abstraction. No fleshly palpable earthly contours are given to her body. Any film actress will have definite bodily contours and will be made of gross earthly mass which the film, by visual devices and camera work, will bring into

prominence. Naturally, any film-rendering of the drama can be very attractive and enticing to the audience because of the enchanting cultural, religious and natural Indian background of scenery and action. But in this process the sublimity and divinity of impact created by the dramatist is bound to evaporate from the film.

I am at the moment reminded of a seminar organised by the American Studies Research Centre, Hyderabad on Ernest Hemingway, his works and film. As many as seventeen papers were presented but only four papers were read on film versions of Hemingway's work. This is the gross proportion of the popularity of literature and film. In the seminar hall of the Centre there was a very large screen on which the film version of Hemingway's novel, *A Farewell to Arms*, was shown. With great curiosity, impatient devotion and expectation I watched the film. Scene after scene of the novel unfolded itself gradually. Most vital and living parts of the novel were curtailed, but many spots of scenic value were projected. Most disappointing was the enactment of the role of Catherine by an actress of short stature. Of course, the actor who played the role of Frederick Henry, was tall, and beautiful and impressive. This actress provided fleshly contours to the ethereal Hemingway heroine Catherine who is tall and blond, with yellowish brown skin and grey-coloured eyes. Hemingway presents Catherine's bodily features through Henry's eyes: "Miss Barkley was quite tall. She wore what seemed to me to be a nurse's uniform, was blonde and had a tawny skin and grey-eyes. I thought she was very beautiful."[5]

Rinaldi, an Italian officer, introduces Henry to Catherine after he finds he could not consummate his profane love with a morally tall and stout girl like Catherine Barkley. Rinaldi terminates his affair with Catherine by saying "A tall girl for a sister." Catherine's tallness is both physical and ethical. I noted that the actress, who played the role of Catherine, was not physically tall enough. The film-maker must not have understood the intention of Hemingway or, might be, he did not have a tall-statured film actress to act the part of Henry's sweetheart. But I noted that the film-maker either could not apprehend Hemingway's purpose or ignored it or at best could not afford to vindicate it. The result was a distortion of the fact and spoiling of the effects that Hemingway intended. This shows the failure of film to rise ot the stature of literary medium and artistic blossoming of adequate nature.

We have noted above that the description of feminine beauty

in literature is only suggestive and implied. The reader has to have his own image of Shakuntala, to which end the general and abstract descriptions of Kalidas provoke him. Similarly, the reader has to create his own personal image of Catherine Barkley to which Ernest Hemingway inspires him. Dushyanta's anxious aspirations for Shakuntala furnish the other literary device to create the picture of Shakuntala in the readers' and audience's mind. Similarly, Henry's impatient and feverish desire for Catherine furnishes the literary device for evoking Catherine's beauty. On the contrary, the film furnishes a limited and confined view of Catherine's beauty in the model of the actress's body. The audience's mind is pinned down; it does not soar; imagination is clinched. Literature liberates through the outlet, expansion and widening allowed to the imaginative device.

In the ASRC seminar auditorium when the film *A Farewell to Arms* ended, I felt deeply irritated. The film was positively a flop. Why? Hemingway's intentions as a poet-novelist were nullified. In the post-film session we discussed the novel and the film. In the stylistic manner of presentation, Hemingway relied on the art of the unsaid or his own theory of the iceberg, only one eighth of which is above water. The film badly failed to utilise this stylistic device because films as a medium utilise only photographic and camera devices which are all merely mechanical. The implicational, imaginative and poetic devices of literature and the mechanical devices of film preclude interchange. So the impact of films is closed and narrow.

I cite only one image in the novel that, I fear, the film ignored, i. e. the dog nosing a refuse-can: "A dog was nosing at one of the cans. 'What do you want?' I asked and looked in the can to see if there was anything I could pull out for him; there was nothing on top but coffee-grounds, dust and some dead flowers." The dog nosing the refuse-can and finding only dust and dead flower is portentous and ominous. After a short while Henry will find Catherine reduced only to a 'dead flower' and will find only her 'dust', mortal remains, with the soul gone away. The film, to the best of my memory, fails to focus on this image or to utilise it as a potent symbol of the end waiting for Henry.

Why did the blossoming and growth of the film as an art form fail? I think the film was bound to fall as literature has many mouths and tongues to speak with, which the film has not. I am tempted

to quote the closing lines of *A Farewell to Arms:*

> 'You can't come in yet.'
>
> 'You get out', I said 'The other one too.'
>
> But after I had got them out and shut the door and turned off the light it wasn't any good. It was like saying good-bye to a statue. After a while I went out and left the hospital and walked back to the hotel in the rain.[7]

This is the closing of the novel, which, according to critics, was written and rewritten many times by Hemingway. In the present form the closing of the novel is artistically and emotionally very satisfying. These words are to be read in close relation with the dog nosing the empty refuse-can with dust and dead flowers. The literary presentation is almost excellent. 'It was like saying good-bye to a statue'--the statement epitomises the sorrow, the sense of bereavement, the farewell bidden to a flower of love now turned into dust. Every reader's fancy is let loose, and imagination makes free play. Gaps of meaning are filled by every reader.

The closing part of the film is dull and almost insipid. The film-maker seems to have the above sentence in his memory when the statuesque face and the dead body of the film actress are being kissed by the hero, Henry. All nuances of suggestion and connotation are closed. Kissing the dead body and departing--this physical action is the terminating point. *A Farewell to Arms* ends without ending--the possibilities and connotations are numerous. But the film ends where it ends. The visual mechanical device does not bring the audience's imagination into play. The end of the novel, by provoking and challenging imagination, persists in the readers' psyché; it haunts the mind and so does the Hemingway heroine Catherine, but not the film heroine.

Literature is a fine art; it is the artists' art. But film is the artistes' art. While art-literature is more imaginative, intuitive and spiritual, film is more pictorial, gesture-based and therefore physical. Literature has great unity of inspiration, conception, execution and finish and hence its immense appeal. Film by nature is characterised by heterogeneity. It is the fruit of many synchronised activities--the script writing, the song writing, the music direction, the shooting and camera work, dancing and playback, comments and, finally and above every thing else, the film-director's work. Scenery, costume, change of landscape and several other devices are utilised in it. Hence the unmanageable heterogeneity of film and great unity and appeal of literature. Even drama, which uses literary as well as theatrical resources and therefore is called

double art or compound art, has unity because it is conceived by one brain, i.e. the dramatist's.

Comparision of film with literature as art form can be made if film and literature on the same topic exist. But this is a bare idealistic proposition. Most films are based on literature and are secondary and derivative. Any art form of derivative nature cannot vie with the original source. Hence comparative evaluation of film and literature is almost a wild-goose chase.

We have stated earlier in this article that to represent reality literature uses infinite devices, such as fancy, imagination, implication, suggestion, writing between the lines, or writing between words, selection, idealisation, and remains content even in drama with ideal probability, a working representation. Film is very likely to occupy itself with more reliable representation and may try to represent reality as it is. I cite here another instance from Ramananda Sagar's film version of the *Ramayana*. I take the instance of the Kakabhushundi episode. The film emits human voice from the beak of a crow with black-coloured wings and appearance. The Hindu mythology represents the said creature as part bird and part angel. In fact, the myth speaks of the spiritual luscent form. But the film, for satisfying the film-viewers, resorts to showing the grosser bird form. The case of Jatayu, the soul of an eagle, is very closely represented as an eagle. The grosser bird form representation looks ludicrous along with the mixture of crow-voice and human voice and eagle and human noise. The film presents verisimilitude in such a rough manner. But in literature, i.e. the *Ramayana*, everything is to be reproduced by the reader himself. So literature energises mental activity and creativeness, while film leads to a dampening of wits.

Shakespeare had no problem in painting Caliban. In the *dramatis personae* he is represented as :'a savage and deformed slave'. Clear shape of Caliban's identity is given by Trinculo who addresses him in the following words: "why, thou deboshed fish...wilt thou tell a monstrous lie, being but half a fish and half a monster?" A real picture of Caliban, half fish, half monster, developing from gross earthly form to human aspect is symbolical. So the picture of Ariel is also symbolical and allegorical. Thus, deeper meanings and realities can best be represented in literature, and not in film because of the circumstances of film medium.

Also, literature places great reliance on eternal primitive

devices, without daring exact representation. Let us take, for example, Duke Orsino's description of Viola's beauty (in male attire):

> Diana's lip
> Is not more smooth and rubious; thy small pipe
> Is as the maiden's organ, shrill and sound,
> And all is semblative a woman's part.[9]

Shakespeare mentions only the rubious smooth lips and the shrill sharp voice. This is the minimal method of suggesting female beauty. Similar is Viola's assessment of Olivia's beauty:

> 'Tis beauty truly blent, whose red and white
> Nature's own sweet and cunning hand laid on
> Today, you are the cruell'st she alive,
> If you will lead these graces to the grave....[10]

Here is the mention of red lips in a white complexion and the word 'graces' tells the rest of the story of Olivia's beauty. Thus, abstractions and generalities are Shakespeare's devices. A film will present two model actresses to embody these abstractions of beauty. Shakespeare's Violas and Olivias are ideal beauties; film versions will present only the gross versions of earthly beauty.

REFERENCES

[1] Vyas, *Shrimadbhagwad*, X, IV, verse 46.

[2] Ibid., verses 46 to 50.

[3] Kalidas, *Abhijnan Shakuntalam*, Act II, verse 10.

[4] Translation into English mine.

[5] Ernest Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms* (Penguin Books, 1961), p.18.

[6] Ibid., p.242.

[7] Ibid., p.256.

[8] Shakespeare, *The Complete Works*, ed. Peter Alaxander (London, Glasgow, 1964), p.16.

[9] *The Complete Works*, p.352.

[10] Ibid., p.354.

IDEOLOGY AND AESTHETICS IN KOZINTSEV'S *KING LEAR*

Anurag Goyal

Film aesthetics is not just a matter of visual compositions or designing and editing of shot sequences or using screen space effectively. It is basically a matter of the ideological orientation of the film maker - the depth of his understanding of life, his insight into the oppressive nature of power and social structures built on it, and his desire to break himself free from the trap of false consciousness. Some film makers follow a status-quoist ideology and their aesthetic strategies and choice of subjects reveal this very clearly. Other film makers make films to highlight the existing social injustices, inequalities and other evils and adopt a progressive socio-aesthetic stance to advocate the need of social change and amelioration of human lot.

When it comes to the filming of Shakespeare's plays, film-makers of different ideological persuasions have made films based on them according to their own predilections. In this article, however, only Kozintsev's filming of *King Lear* will be discussed. Shakespeare's *King Lear* carries two major thematic strands, one of which has been taken as a focal point by Peter Brook in his film, while the other has been adopted by the Soviet film-maker, Grigori Kozintsev. Referring to these contrasting thematic treatments, Jack J. Jorgens observes: "There are two *King Lears*. One depicts an irremediable crack in nature, an apocalyptic decline and fall of an archetypal kingdom and its rulers. It is a story of jealousy and lust for power eating away at the bonds of love between parents and children, of blindness and vanity, of men preying on each other 'like monsters of the deep.' It contains enough physical violence to disturb both the strictures of classical tragedy and the decorum of the modern censor, but like modern works it also assaults audiences with mental cruelty as fierce people humiliate, curse, and mock one another, slash each other with sadistic fervour. As Lear's kingdom is convulsed by evil, man is transformed. When the good are banished or hunted, masters become monstrous mad children, and servants sleazy rodents. Nature, if not an amoral force, seems allied with aggression and brutality. Justice is absent as the play shows Nature shuddering in a nihilist orgasm, evil destroying both itself and the good, leaving behind devastation, emptiness, and men too scarred and stunned to go on living. Lear's pain is generalised, as

Christian humanist values - forgiveness, humility, compassion - shatter against his anguished query. "Why should a dog, a horse, a rat have life, / And thou no breath at all ?" Civilisation is left in ruins. This is Peter Brook's *King Lear* - a bleak existential tale of meaningless violence in a cold, empty universe."[1]

Referring to the other theme of *King Lear* which Kozintsev has portrayed in his film, Jorgens writes: "The other *King Lear* is the story of man's journey from unfeeling ignorance to self-knowledge and pity. It is a tale of losing oneself to find oneself, of learning stoic endurance and the nature of reality as the trappings of civilisation are stripped away. Despite massive suffering and acts of cruelty, we witness a hopeful progress from crassness, materialism, and wilful tyranny ('there was good sport at his making', 'nothing will come of nothing', 'out of my sight') to fundamental questioning ('who is it that can tell me who I am ?', 'Is man no more than this ?', 'Handy dandy, which is the justice and which is the thief?') to ever-deepening understanding ('O I have ta'en too little care of this', 'he childed as I fathered', 'I stumbled when I saw', 'ripeness is all'). If the families of Lear and Gloucester make terrible sacrifices for this knowledge, the man left to rule - Lear's godson and alter ego, Edgar - is no power-hungry tyrant but 'a most poor man, made tame to fortune's blows, / Who by the act of known and feeling sorrows, / Am pregnant to good pity,' a man who urges at the end what could not be said at the beginning, that we 'speak what we feel and not what we ought to say.' This is Grigori Kozintsev's Lear: a Christian - Marxist story of redemption and social renewal."[2]

Kozintsev did a lot of interdisciplinary research while making the film version of *King Lear*. He kept a regular diary of his notes pertaining to his interpretation of the play, his study of various theatrical traditions like Kabuki of Japan, his deep involvement with the theories and practices of theatre critics and playwrights like Meyerhold, Peter Brook, Blok, Brecht and Stanislavsky etc., his perceptive appreciation of film makers like Eisenstein, Orson Welles, Dovzhenko and other greats of film history, his keen insight into the novels of Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, Gorky and Pasternak etc., and his penetrating gaze into the essence of Shakespearean tragedy. These notes were subsequently published in the form of a book entitled *King Lear : The Space of Tragedy* (The Diary of a Film Director).[3] The book provides not only excellent tips to the prospective film makers, but also unravels the complex thought

processes of the film maker, the relationship between the playwright's vision and film aesthetics, the search for an appropriate film form to embody the essence of Shakespeare's spiritual world, and dazzling insights into the meaning of *King Lear.*

Kozintsev, at the very outset, clarifies his approach to the filming of *King Lear.* Referring to the time of the action of the play, which takes place in pre-history, he says: "The problem is to ensure that the inner action, the intense exploration of life, should not explode at the end of the film but should continue on in the spiritual world of the audience. One should not demonstrate, but provoke."[4] This approach, which had 'reaching the farthest boundaries of man's soul and human spirit' as its guiding spirit, is further elaborated when Kozintsev describes his experience at a rock garden in Japan. He writes: "The consecutive sequence of empty space and individual shapes concealed within itself some deep significance which was hard to grasp. The stone garden had to be studied like music. The harmony of the space took hold of one, the natural law of its construction began to unfold, and one began to live in the rhythm which the artist had given it." [5] Describing the relationship between the aesthetic object and the viewer, he further remarks: "The point was not in the garden itself and what it contained but in me, and in what had been aroused in me at the encounter with art. With gravel and a few stones."[6] These observations, *mutatis mutandis,* fully apply to Kozintsev's own art work, *King Lear.*

The aesthetics of Kabuki theatre of Japan also attracted Kozintsev, who absorbed its elements in his own aesthetic make-up. Its force of passion and the completeness of form decisively impressed him: "Eisenstein discovered the structure of cinematography in Kabuki aesthetics: reality was taken apart and then put together again according to a different code, in which each component became only one unit of influence, an equal irritant in the order of editing, in the montage of attractions.... Synthetic art, which was so much talked about in the first years of the revolution, was before our very eyes. The cascades of movements executed by Sadanji Ichikawa were broken by static poses, gesture was followed by sound, sound turned into colour, song into dance. Everything was metaphorical and had a particular significance which was far removed from its apparent likeness." [7] The elements of artistic deconstruction and aesthetic construction in Kozintsev's *King Lear* bear close similarity to these features of Kabuki aesthetics.

Kozintsev also felt a spiritual kinship with the 'mask' in Kabuki theatre. Referring to the use of mask in a Kabuki performance, Kozintsev writes: "'I hear the smell of the fields, covered in flowers,' the masked actor replied." Explaining the spiritual significance of the mask, he says: "The mask is so flexible that it can change its expression even when it is motionless. The artist breathed life into a piece of wood; the slightest change of light, or change in the direction of one's glance makes one look again at the slanting eyes with holes instead of eyes. It is as if the mask follows you, spies on you, enters into a wordless conversation with you. There is something sad and tragic about its expression." [8]

While talking to the Japanese film director Akira Kurosawa about the Noh Theatre, Kozintsev began to "understand that 'putting on a mask' was just as complicated a process as 'getting inside a part.' Before the opening of a production the actor stands for a long time in front of a mirror. A boy hands him a mask. The actor takes it carefully and silently studies its features. The expression of his eyes alters imperceptibly, his face changes. It is as if the mask enters the man. And then slowly and triumphantly he puts on the mask and turns towards the mirror. They are no longer two separate entities, man and mask, but a single whole." [9] Elaborating this relationship between the man and the mask, he says: "A sculptor was making a mask. This face was chiselled from humanity, a part of an unknown continent called 'man.' In every one of them - masks polished by centuries - there was hidden a sign of character or spiritual state. In order to act with the mask one has to find the sign, unleash the movements, give it the fullness of life." [10]

Kozintsev imbibed Dostoyevsky's concept of 'fantastic reality' in his film aesthetics, which was also expressed by Kurosawa in his film on Dostoyevsky's *Idiot*. Kurosawa wrote about Dostoyevsky: "He is the one who writes most honestly about human existence." [11] About Kurosawa's film *Idiot*, Kozintsev says: "The life of the film contained at the same time a contemporary reality, and a kind of ancient religious element, the strange peace of Prince Myshkin's spiritual world, and Rogozhin's inflamed conscience." [12] Kurosawa's treatment of the theme of *Macbeth* in his film *The Throne of Blood* illustrated his aesthetic handling of the inner dynamism, about which Kozintsev says: "What hunts and pursuits could compare with the inner dynamism of this almost motion-less film?" [13]

The question of influences on a filmmaker or an artist is a tricky

one. Kozintsev, however, says: "Influence in art is not only the result of one artist learning from another, it is the threads of the twisting spiral of history, the continuity of life where old contradictions develop new forms and new generations ask once again the age-old and very simple question : 'What does man live for?' "[14] Kozintsev sought an answer to this question in Hiroshi Teshigahara's film *Woman of the Dunes* based on the Kobo Abe's novel. In this film most of the scenes consist of two persons and sand. "The sand is at once the plot, the atmosphere of the action, and a philosophical commentary on what takes place.... But this is the life of mankind, its meaning lies in the increasing effort, the continuous labour, the digging of the sand: tomorrow the sand will slide back again and threaten to bury mankind."[15]

Kozintsev drew the elements of his film aesthetics from various sources, including Ikebana, the Japanese art of flower arrangement, and Zen. He quotes Sofu Teshigahara about Ikebana: "Ikebana is not just a matter of beauty, but of character.... I regard Ikebana as people.... The beauty and dignity which one can see in a face lined with age and a body bent with years of hard work are also present in a withered flower, and it is for this reason that such a bloom may be represented in Ikebana."[16]

Kozintsev assimilated and adapted Ikebana to his own aesthetic requirements. This is obvious when he writes: "Ikebana does not copy, it creates nature. There are only three elements: line, colour and the abstract spirit - the last being the most important. 'Do not try to produce a facsimile of something in the material world, but rather give shape to those thoughts and feelings which exist within you.'" [17] Kozintsev's aesthetic approach to film making, particularly the filming of *King Lear*, becomes clearer when he observes further: "The beginning of beginnings, the first and foremost is the art of cutting.... There is something powerful and cruel in the work of the artist of Ikebana: he destroys flowers in order to give them new life, breathing his own life into them; he kills in order to prolong the life of his own soul..... One must cut, cut and cut again, is a beautiful example of the economy of resources in art, the accuracy of form and restriction to the barest essentials." [18] This cutting down to the barest essentials is what Kozintsev himself has tried to achieve in his *King Lear*.

Another element that helped shape Kozintsev's film aesthetics in *King Lear* was the art and philosophy of Zen, which "teaches that language is a coarse and often treacherous instrument; neither letters nor words are capable of grasping the truth of nature. Years of obedience bring man to a freedom from external influences and false thoughts. The highest form of intuition, of spiritual strength capable of direct communication with reality is awakened. Truth is revealed in all its simplicity without any instructions as to how to find it, or how to define it. Man is freed from worry, care, anxiety; and he is prepared for death at any time."[19] Kozintsev quotes Ivan Kieyevsky, a nineteenth century Russian philosopher, to elaborate this idea further: "A logical awareness translates deed into word, life into a formula, and fully grasps an object, destroying its influence on the spirit. When living by this way of reasoning, we are living by a plan rather than living in a house. If a thought is clear in one's mind or is accessible in words, it is powerless over one's spirit and one's will. When it develops so that it cannot be expressed then only has it matured. This inexpressible quality, which is reflected in expression, gives strength to poetry and music."[20] Kozintsev too leaves a lot unsaid in his *King Lear*, keeping in mind Pasternak's view that 'the merit of poetry was that there was more left unsaid than there was said.'[21]

In his quest for a suitable film form for his *King Lear*, Kozintsev had a close interaction with the film-maker and theatre director Peter Brook, who staged *King Lear* in Russia. Commenting on Brook's production of *King Lear* in Russia, Kozintsev says: "The bareness of the evenly lit stage, plain sackcloth, a few pieces of iron , the leather costumes (reminding one of decayed sheepskins dug up by archeologists from an ancient burial ground) enclosed the action of the tragedy in a cold and timeless emptiness. It was as if all the clocks in the world had stopped. Only one rusty repetitive mechanism, sometimes buzzing with the vibration of metal (the sound used in the storm scene), drove men along their eternal path of misfortune."[22]

Brook's emphasis on Kent's last speech in which he admonishes Edgar for trying to bring the dying Lear back to consciousness: 'Vex not his ghost: O, let him pass! He hates him/ That would upon the rack of this tough world/ Stretch him out longer' reminds Kozintsev of Kierkegaard, who wrote: 'All that I See is empty, everything I

live by is empty, everything in which I move is empty.' For Kozintsev, Brook's production outlined "the tragedy of the meaninglessness of man's existence, the absurdity of history," [23] yet he felt that "in a production which emphasised hopelessness, hope triumphed."[24] Remembering Gogol who had said that in spite of the depiction of the negative side of life in *The Government Inspector*, there was one positive hero, namely LAUGHTER, Kozintsev says about Brook's *Lear*: "Art won a triumphant victory in *Lear*; it was the main hero. As far as I was concerned Peter Brook and Paul Scofield (who played Lear - A. G.) were talking not so much about the powerlessness of man, but about the power of art. But this art was created by man. The complete harmony of production - its rhythm and the music of Shakespeare's poetry - was too powerful to appear as a last prayer for mankind.... And even the emptiness of the cold iron surfaces reminded one of the warmth of life, of the continuing movement of art."[25]

There was some difference of opinion between Kozintsev and Brook regarding the aesthetic approach to be adapted for making a Shakespearean film like the one based on *King Lear*. Like the French film director, Alan Resnais, who tried to overcome not only reality of space on the screen but also the reality of time, Brook was interested in the delocalization of space and wanted to film *King Lear* without any traces of history showing on the screen. Moreover, Brook believed in filming a Shakespeare play in CLOSE-UPS: "The material inscribed on the celluloid dictates its length. So if I have a close-up of a man, the length of the close-up is in proportion to its interest, in its context, in relation to what the face expresses - and says.... What happens when the close-up, in Shakespeare, carries material through another vehicle? As the speech ceases to be dialogue and becomes the vehicle of inner meanings, I then recognise that in Shakespeare speech is a carrier. Speech in constant glow is the vehicle... then (if) you destroy the speech rhythm and follow the image rhythm, the power of the Shakespearean text is destroyed."[26] But Kozintsev tended to differ with Brook in certain respects. He agreed with him regarding "the power of delocalized space on the screen," but he believed that "close-ups as the foundation for the action are often less effective in sound films than they were in the silents.... A close-up is essential when there is a need to look deep into a character's eyes, into the man's spiritual world."[27] But Kozintsev sees Shakespeare's text "not only as a dialogue but as a landscape, notes from the author's

diary, lines of verse, quotations." [28] Though in Brook's production one could 'hear' palaces, horses, battles and the storm, how could the cinema help such expressiveness, asks Kozintsev. "Here the strength of the visual outweighs the audible." [29] Therefore, says Kozintsev, "I am trying to find a visual Lear. Nature in this context would have to become something like the chorus of Greek tragedy." [30]

What does making a film, particularly a Shakespearean film, mean to Kozintsev? "It means living for several years under the persistent influence of Shakespeare's picture of life, which you see as yet only dimly, one feature at a time, but the main point is the 'all-embracing thought' (Dostoyevsky) - which you take as the most important. And every day, everything you see, hear, read and learn convinces you of the burning necessity of displaying this thought, making a picture of a life which really exists." [31]

How does Kozintsev interpret and visualise *King Lear*, the play? "The play itself is disorderly with an ill-assorted collection of material, a dissimilarity of styles, an abruptness in the frequent changes of scene. This is all the unity - not of unartistic style - but of life, of history.... Marx wrote that history repeats itself, first as tragedy and then as farce. In *Lear* there are a large number of such repetitions. Tragedy and farce are so entangled at the dusk of civilisation that they are almost indistinguishable.... *Lear* has no end - at least there is no finale in the play: none of the usual solemn trumpets of tragedy, or magnificent burials. The bodies, even of Kings, are carried out under conditions of war; nobody even says a few elevated words. The time for words is over.... The people that remain are scorched and tempered by fire. They watch the dawn of a new, inhumanly difficult epoch, life struggling to rise up again from the ruins." [32] Kozintsev further states: "I do not believe that there is one single correct interpretation of Lear. The more deeply you study the text the less clear the essence of the tragic, the secret of its influence becomes." [33]

How does Kozintsev perceive the structure of a Shakespearean tragedy? "Working on a Shakespearean tragedy reminds one of archeology; the search is always going deeper, beneath the limits of the top layers; the whole is usually reconstructed from fragments. But the strange thing is that the deeper you dig, the more contemporary everything that comes to the surface seems as it reveals its significance." [34] And what method does he follow to conceive

Shakespeare's tragedies? "I conceive Shakespeare's tragedies while I am walking; I hold imaginary conversations with friends who are no longer living and with favourite authors. I argue with them and learn from them."[35]

Contrast is the basic principle as well as the central metaphor of *King Lear*. That is why Kozintsev decided that his Lear would be short, while his courtiers and kin, the people surrounding him, the mainstay of his kingdom, would be 'enormously tall.' In order to characterise them he made them look like "Folds of heavy cloth, square figures with heads like bulls." [36]How did they act and behave? "While the kingdom is divided they stand in strict order of rank: the head of the family, the eldest son, the councillors, the guard. They stand with their feet planted firmly on the ground; to them it does not seem to move.... The eldest daughters, the heirs to the throne, are tall, fat and big boned. They are not princesses but old women.... The guards' horses are covered with heavy dark-coloured cloths with slits for their eyes.... It would seem like the world of a solid, everlastingly unshakable ruler. And suddenly it all totters, collapses, falls apart and is destroyed."[37]

The relationship between art and life, between mirror and reality is one of the most problematic of aesthetic discourses. Referring to the practice that nothing that is solidly built, tightly bound and firmly tied up is allowed to be shown on contemporary stage, and recognising the truth of the observation that art is a reflection of life, Kozintsev asks: "Is it really possible for any self-respecting mirror to reflect something which has no connection with real life, and in which relationships are inconstant, feelings changeable and the contours of characters unstable?[38] Discussing this problem further in relation to *King Lear*, Kozintsev writes: "The reflection of life in art is of course not brought about by a mirror. But how then?.... Only a worthless object, cheap glass with a coat of amalgam simply reflects. One can reflect suffering in art only with sympathy and with hatred for the cause of grief.... The evil doings of the Duke of Cornwall, Edmund, Regan are caused not by the pathological make-up of their characters but by the circumstances of political activity. They have to get results as quickly as possible. It is necessary for their affairs. There is no time for subtleties.... The problem is not to link Shakespeare with art, even the most contemporary art, but with life."[39]

King Lear is very close to contemporary life. Today, says

Kozintsev, the "bloody melodrama which has long seemed alien to reality has died on the stage and come to life (and with what force!) in everyday affairs: political treachery, heads of state overturned, documents forged, secret assassinations, a career forged out of the blood of those nearest - is this really only a theatrical fantasy?"[40] Similarly, "If you look into the depth of the action in *Lear*, far from the external events, the rational seems absurd, the fixed turns to chaos; it would not be easy to answer questions about it. So Shakespeare himself has not fallen behind the times."[41]

The shape of the film *King Lear* forms of its own accord, says Kozintsev, "when one begins to understand the everyday course of events as opposed to the theatrical events. Then the action breaks through its theatrical wrapping; realistic situations intensify until they are clearly visible: far distant horizons begin to appear, and thousands of people can be seen behind the mere handful."[42]

There is so much of creative filmic potential in Shakespeare's *King Lear* that "There is no need to invent, it is all in the poetry. The difficulty is to overcome the stereotyped effect of reading: *Lear* should be read not like a play but like a novel where far from hiding behind his characters the author often follows historical reality in all its breadth and depth and in all directions. Here we have customs, landscapes, the daily life of the palaces and the villages, the highways and byways."[43]

Soliloquies in Shakespeare's plays can be exploited for the purposes of an effective film aesthetics. Kozintsev sees them as scenes in code: "Shakespeare's soliloquies are often not only speeches spoken by the main characters ,but whole scenes in code: they contain their own characters, landscape, objects, their own peculiar interpretation and a wealth of life-like details. All you have to do is to break the code in which it is written."[44] Some film-makers think that soliloquies being a theatrical form, they can be dispensed with in cinema. But Kozintsev thinks otherwise. In his view soliloquies, instead of being superfluous passages, are " most important, representing the intellectual atmosphere of the action, their individual outlook on life; Lear quarrels not only with the other characters but with the very laws of creation, with history; without these passages Edmund becomes a common villain, Edgar a conventional figure; if Cordelia is deprived of her rhymed aphorisms... she loses part of her poetry, her innocent charm."[45]

The theme of *King Lear* has generally been understood as

representing a conflict between good and evil. But Kozintsev believes that the contrasts in the play are not so much between good and evil as between human and inhuman. "But human does not by any means mean humane. Lear is a person even at the beginning of the action, in spite of his tantrums and capriciousness. The violence of his impromptu actions belongs to the realm of what we call human which is not at all a.synonym of humaneness, but which can often describe a completely different and contrasting side of human nature. But underneath the mask of power there is a live personality which will reveal itself in time ." [46] Referring to the characters representing these two contrasting worlds, Kozintsev says: " Edmund, Lear's eldest daughters and the Duke of Cornwall are heartless individuals. For them Lear, Cordelia, Kent and Gloucester are die-hards from the chronicles of ancient time. The new age has reared new citizens: they are distinguishable by an excessive will, an absence of prejudice, and a cold sense of purpose. In essence they are programmed calculating machines of power....These robots come to life only when certain reflexes and instincts give the necessary signal - instincts of sex and fear."[47]

Just as the thoughts of Dostoyevsky's Raskolnikov were centred on one point which seemed to be the main one, Kozintsev meditates on the main point of Lear. " There are perhaps two: 'Off, off, you lendings' (what exactly is a real ' unaccommodated' man in this society?) and ' None does offend, none, - I say, none.' In the extremity of the situation in which he poses the questions, they are fearless thoughts." [48]

The question mark is definitely the most important punctuation mark in Lear's speeches. But Lear not only asks questions, he also demands an answer. 'Is man no more than this? ('...unaccommodated man is no more but such a poor, bare, forked animal as thou art.')" It is as if he puts a knife to the throat of his interlocutor and cries out for an answer: 'Why should a dog, a horse, a rat have life, and thou no breath at all?'.... He no longer believes in words. Instead of an answer, let anatomy open up Regan's bosom (or any other person living in those times): Is there any cause in nature that makes these hard hearts?' .... He talks to the skies as an equal: the clouds are as white as he is; the character of the storm is like a king's .... And who is he addressing? Who is he questioning? .... Both himself and us."[49]

Kozintsev quotes Chekhov to comment on Lear's perception

of need. 'Need' has different meanings for Regan and Lear. "The answer to the question, 'How much land does a man need? - 'four arshins' (the length of a coffin) - aroused Chekhov's indignation. He replied. 'A corpse needs four arshins but a man needs the whole world.'... Regan, the Duchess of Cornwall, explains to her father, who has given away all his power to his heirs, that now he is away from home she has not enough provisions to feed a hundred knights - his train, or his personnel as we would call them today. According to his daughter, the father is thus receiving all that he needs.... The door slams shut. Lear is left alone, an argument begins, but not with his over-calculating daughter, but with some other force, another idea.... 'O reason not the need,' says Lear, 'Allow not nature more than nature needs / Man's life is cheap as beast's.'... This is no longer a contrast between the poles of extravagance and death. The quarrel is between freedom of thought, the breadth of desire on the one hand, and calculation, restriction and hard-heartedness on the other."[50]

The shooting techniques adopted and invented by Kozintsev throw a floodlight on his film aesthetics. Believing in the directorial task of 'selection and restriction,' Kozintsev did not make films to distract people from life by showing them the magnificence of the dress or pageantry of the ceremonies. He said: "I wanted to bring Lear as close as possible to life.... I did not want to shoot the film in colour for this very reason. I do not know what colour grief is, or what shades suffering has. I wanted to trust Shakespeare and the audience: it is shameful to sugar Lear with beautiful effects.... One can show how beautiful ancient palaces were and one can also show the unpleasant business which was usually carried on inside them. There is an arithmetic of life and algebra of existence. I wanted to deduce the formula of history on the screen; the natural law of build-up followed by explosion. This was the formula deduced by Shakespeare's poetry."[51]

Exercising modesty in the method of shooting, Kozintsev used the visual angle and light to help create "Shakespeare's world, in which what had come down through the centuries with all its life-like qualities was clearly visible and in which everything which belonged to a specific age was only dimly discernible, with only the general outlines showing."[52]

In his shooting of *King Lear*, Kozintsev focused not just on an actor, but on his "whole living environment, a single cell in the

world of tragedy. (He) wanted to see Lear in the midst of the fear, flattery, and lies of the sleek figures of the officials, with their imaginary importance and their false values - the world of politics."[53] Illustrating his point with examples from the play, Kozintsev writes: "The brazen, tough faces of Cornwall's band are like members of the Ku-Klux Klan with their nooses of rope and cans of petrol.... Can you understand the Duke of Albany without seeing him in a library surrounded by books? Of course, he is a book-lover.... Gloucester's dying, decrepit little world: wrinkled, grey-headed old men shivering over the fire; the tapping of sticks along empty corridors , coughing and muttering .... Tramps, beggars, newly released convicts - the many faces of Poor Tom ; in their midst Edgar and later Lear are homeless among the homeless, on the ' rock bottom' of the kingdom.... The tragedy of Lear is created not only by madmen ... but by collective madness arising on the crest of events. It is related both to the deification of the King and to the epidemic of suspicion and fear which catches hold of the elder sisters and their subjects."[54]

Commenting on his shooting technique, Kozintsev wrote further: "The main scenes would be shot coarsely, sharply, spotlighting the roughness, the coarse-grained textures - sackcloth, rags, dark weather-beaten forces. This is how we shot crowds in the twenties: one could even see the pores of the skin and the pock marks. I wanted the substance of the film to express the motif (important to the philosophy) of the raising of the shrouds; the savageness of the life's essence hidden beneath the wrapping of civilization. This is how the 'bare forked animal' looked without adornment."[55] Thus Kozintsev used film aesthetics as a mode of translating Shakespeare's vision of life in terms of meaningful art.

While shooting *King Lear*, Kozintsev constantly remembered Dostoyevsky and Meyerhold. "While shooting Lear, I remembered the landscapes of Dostoyevsky, and Meyerhold's crowding on the 'truck-stages'...not because they resembled the castles and roads, the kings and dukes of Britain... (but) in the very depth of portrayal there is a feeling of the breaking apart of the epoch ... it is all charged with everyday life like gunpowder and unless the world changes it will burst into the air , into the immeasurable void, will scatter as ashes, and the black whirlwind of history will take the harvest from the charred earth in its iron hand. It is the same feeling of tragedy."[56]

Kozintsev wanted that "the rhythm of Shakespeare must take hold of the camera itself," [57] and what he wished to achieve on the screen was that "the energy of the verse carries the shots along with it, charges the cinematic fabric with electricity." [58] The internal rhythm of *King Lear* is the essence of tragedy. "Rhythm is the basis for everything: the spiritual life of the actors, the movement of the cameras, the relationship between man and space, the tension of chiaroscuro." [59]

For Kozintsev , editing as a major device of film aesthetics , was not just a matter of scissors, razor blades or tins of film cement. Rather, "It was as if the celluloid had a life of its own: every metre concealed buds of meaning, hints of emotion, springs of thought.... Each frame of a shot was worth its weight in gold ....Editing was a contemplation, an embodiment of feeling, an animated movement. Metres, shots, frames ceased to have a separate existence; a new reality appeared under one's fingers: the mould of a spiritual world, a rocket shooting towards the area of the screen." [60]

The use of space in film constitutes one of the significant elements of film aesthetics. What is the structure of space in cinema? And what are its properties ? "So far as space is concerned, it is clear that film space has a structure and properties which distinguish it radically from physical, sculptural, pictorial, theatrical, or any other kind of space.... Film space lacks such characteristics of physical space as tangibility, density, weight, expanse, depth and continuous existence. But on the other hand it affords possibilities which real space does not. The camera can move at any speed in any direction. It can divide objects and give significance and unity to a small, chosen section of reality. It can analyse space by fragmenting it, then re-forming it into a new whole. The camera can abolish distances, can make objects as large or as small as it likes. It can accentuate, abolish or distort perspective. Finally, the camera can control... forms, volumes, and appearances." [61]

Discussing the concept of space signified by the atmosphere of Lear's palace, Kozintsev quotes the Chief Engineer of the automated stations in the then Soviet Union: "space is an aggressive substance, so far as man is concerned, harmful to life. Everything is against us - the enormous vacuum, unimaginable temperatures, cosmic radiation, interminable space..." [62] Kozintsev then asks the question, "How do people feel in the presence of the King?," and quotes the same engineer for the answer: "One side of the station

is lit by the sun, and figuratively speaking, is like being in the Sahara Desert but twice as hot, the other side which is in shade is twice as cold as the Antarctic. But when the station turns, the whole system is reversed.... This is how the banishing of Cordelia and Kent happens; and the quarrel with the King of France." [63]

The tragic quality of space is a complicated concept which Kozintsev explains with reference to Orson Welles' all-time great film *Citizen Kane*. He writes: "The enormity of the material world and at the same time the fictitiousness of this world of marketable worth is contained in a single man: Orson Welles' *Citizen Kane*. The expansion of his possessions and the contraction of his spiritual world. Everything is realistic on the screen - the photography creates objectivity of expression , but the wide-angled vision distorts the perspective: space is stretched out and elongated; however the sharpness of the most distant perspectives is retained. It is the tragedy of a man who turns out to be alone in the midst of an innumerable quantity of objects. After mastering the production, multiplying and selling of things - thoughts, feelings also being things - the man himself becomes a thing, a soulless man in an emptiness stuffed full of things." [64]

The concept of space in theatre was well-articulated by Gordon Craig. Kozintsev has made references to this in his diary. He writes: "According to Craig's conception the vastness of space carried the theatre on to another plane of thought; behind the plot and the characters, behind the external events towered the threatening, eternal powers of existence.... Craig discovered in the very music of Shakespeare's poetry, in the abundance of its generalised images, in the mysteries of its meaning, the loneliness of the human soul in a world of commerce and industry, the falsehood of civilization's outer covering, the depravity of its emotions." [65] Kozintsev also observed that " beyond the theatre lies not the depths of life but the flat surface of the screen. Space is not a biosphere of time ... but the illusory reality of the cinema : the screen has made a tight covering over life." [66]

It has to be remembered, however, that space in the cinema "is not an intractable, solid thing, but something which can be handled on the screen with the same omnipotence as we manipulate physical space in thought, imagination, or dreams. Thus it has the properties of abstract space with the reality of the sense world. This peculiarity of cinema has possibly led to more freedom of approach in other

media, particularly graphic arts. It also relates to ideas about space which modern science has brought into our concept of the universe. The cinema can demonstrate visually what science proves empirically: that the space we experience through our senses in everyday life has only an illusory tangibility."[67] Kozintsev's *King Lear* has used almost all these dimensions, implications, areas and meanings of space.

Kozintsev's film aesthetics and ideology as revealed in *King Lear* can be seen at work in his observations about the opening scene of the play. He writes: "There must not be anything wild, primitive or prehistoric about the beginning of the play. It should be as similar as possible to contemporary diplomatic receptions: polite inscrutable faces; the savage animal beings are hidden behind a civilised exterior."[68]

How should Lear appear in the first scene? Kozintsev says: "In the first scene Lear's face must not be visible; only the mask of power. The change in his position is illogical. He is completely uninterested in all details of human life. He is blind and deaf to everything that is natural....There is no hint of the real suffering and then the thoughtful eyes which appear later, when the mask has disappeared....I repeat: at first it is a mask of power rather than regal serenity."[69]

Kozintsev's visual script of the first scene is worth quoting in detail as it reveals both the depth of his aesthetic mastery of the medium and his ideological persuasion. He observes: "The first scene (the division of the kingdom) bears no resemblance to palace ceremonials, it is more like a gambling house, only everyone's eyes are fixed not on cards, but on a geographical map. None of the characters moves an inch, it is almost as if nobody breathes. Only one tiny movement is perceptible in the enormous hall: the King's finger traces lines on the parchment, outlining the new boundaries of the kingdom. They will be announced any moment."

"The question the King asks his heirs - 'Which of you shall we say doth love us most' - is a kind of invitation: '*faites vos jeux.*'"

"A strange miniature ballet begins: an almost imperceptible movement from a courtier (his nerves couldn't stand it longer) alternates with a similar almost unnoticeable gesture from someone else: someone catches his breath and in reply, someone else makes a small step forward."

"A more noticeable movement comes from the flames flickering in the candlesticks. Drops of sweat break out on the foreheads of those standing in front. In the background behind those gathered round the throne stand the courtiers who are not taking part in the game but only betting on the players - thus binding their own fate with the others. In the darkness of distant halls stand the phalanxes of the guards, forming the boundary which separates those who hold power from those who hold no rights at all."

"The people without rights, the crowds in their thousands, await their fate outside the confines of the castle, outside the confines of the second line formed by the cavalry. In their ignorance they mistake the game for divine providence. The old man, who is no different from them, seems to them like a god as he now bends over the map. The game comes to an end, the lights go out - the lights on the battlements of the towers; soon another fire will flare up, the time of ruin, destruction and war will begin."[70]

'Sound' constitutes yet another significant element of film aesthetics. According to Kozintsev, "Sound is a very complex conception. A certain tone. Are we really only concerned with what is heard?.... 'What was sobbing within her? What was fighting?/ What did she want from us?', wrote Blok about Komisarzhevskaya....Gogol heard the strange sound of a string ringing through the mist and his *Diary of a Madman* finishes on this note....Blok repeated the image but strengthened it, changing the quality of the sound: 'So ring out like an arrow in the mist/ Angry mood and angry sigh!' ....Lear can (and evidently must) speak quietly and of course completely naturally, but his thoughts and feelings must sound like an arrow in the mist."[71]

Just as in the visual construction of a scene, the metaphorical significance is more important than the literal, the symbolism of sound is more important than its literal use. Kozintsev says about the use of sounds in *King Lear* : " ... it is not so much the noise of the wind and thunder that one must be able to hear, but the voice of evil celebrating a victory."[72] Moreover, silence is of vital importance in sound cinema. Kozintsev rightly says: "In sound cinema silence is very effective. We were trying to create a magnetic field of silence, an expanse of fear - and praying to God that no one's boots would squeak, or their breathing be audible. There was not a sound, only the oppressive silence of enormous buildings. Only a change in the expression of a courtier's eyes: the moment was

approaching, any time now... and the silence was broken by a fanfare, signalling his entrance? No. By a drum roll? No. By a canon salute? No. In the dead silence, the fool's bell sounded-a long way behind the door, but quite distinctly."[73] But Kozintsev also knew that the "linking of visual portrayal with sound is not easy. Sound travels over space and changes its shape. No one is surprised by the epithet 'silence' in describing a landscape. It can be not only silent but also dumb."[74]

Music forms one of the most powerful components of sound in cinema. Kozintsev used music in *King Lear* as an aesthetic device. As he put it: "The music does not accompany the shots, but transforms them. In the key episodes it wedges itself between events just as the lyrical digressions wedged themselves between the story line in *Dead Souls* .... The music should be the voice of the author."[75] Kozintsev used music in a contrapuntal manner: "The composer and I immediately agreed that the music would be linked with the inner meaning rather than external action and would develop contrary to the events, independent of the construction of the scene. Our general programme consisted of not illustrating or accompanying anything."[76]

Kozintsev could also hear the sounds of nature, which he tried to capture in *King Lear*: "Tragedy also has a voice: the whole world of nature is drawn into a dialogue. The clouds pronounce soliloquies, fire and the sword speak to people."[77] For Kozintsev music played an important function in a film like *King Lear*: "The music carried on a dialogue with the characters and changed the expression of their eyes. The area of action was immediately made wider and deeper although on the screen nothing more than a face showed. These shots would have lost their significance without music. We tried to show that the earth on which our actors walked was ordinary earth and that the circumstances of the action were real. But with the music there also appeared over it all the 'gods, disasters, spirits, fates, wings, and tails.' One can put it more simply: the metaphors and hyperboles which we had cut were reintroduced into the texture of the work."[78] In the scene in which Lear shouts:' Blow, winds , and crack your cheeks! Rage! Blow!', "the voice should belong to music. Music is nearer to the original. What sort of music should it be?... the rumbling of darkness moving over the earth. Music from the past, man's pre-history?... Or a foreboding of the future, of what might happen if the powers of evil are not held in check?"[79]

Finally, Kozintsev , in his search for an appropriate sound aesthetic for *King Lear*, used the purity of sounds as a counter-comment on the evil deeds: "The blacker the deeds become., the purer sounds the voice of tears. We chose a place in the choral music where only the highest and purest voices were singing: the mothers are weeping. The chorus is asking, 'You murderers, what are you doing?'... Now this sound must be turned up to full volume; the clash of steel is powerless to drown the voice of mankind. The harder the steel tries to overcome it (when we re-recorded the sound-track we included the noise tape with the crackling of fire and the thundering of destruction), the clearer it sounds. And then there is nothing left but the chorus....There was a particular significance in the conflict of image and sound, the chaos of noise and the structure of the music: by its very nature villainy has to drown and deafen - Cordelia is ordered to be put to death quietly so that no scream should ring out, so that no-one should hear so much as a groan. Why are these two defenceless people dangerous? Because they could move the soldiers to pity them, Edmund says. They must not be pitied. Pity is a threat, a danger.... Shostakovich expressed pity like a force. There is such an abundance of feeling contained in the grief of his 'lament' that it gives rise to faith: the evil times will pass, they cannot do otherwise if such a voice is heard."[4]

Kozintsev's King Lear remains embedded in our memory and consciousness long after we have seen the film and read his diary. It is an unforgettable experience. The ideology and the aesthetics of *King Lear* raise it to the level of a masterpiece of world cinema. Kozintsev has used all the resources and power of film aesthetics to translate Shakespeare's literary vision and world-view into a memorable and moving experience.

REFERENCES

[1] Jack J. Jorgens, *Shakespeare on Film*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 1977, p. 236.

[2] Ibid., pp. 236-37.

[3] Translated into English from the original Russian by Mary Mackintosh, with a foreword by Peter Brook, and published in 1977 by Heinemann Educational Books, London.

[4] Grigori Kozintsev, *King Lear: The Space of Tragedy*, (London: Heinemann, 1977), p. 1.

[5]Ibid., p. 3.

[6]Ibid., p. 4.

[7]Ibid., p. 5.

[8]Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[9]Ibid., p. 12.

[10]Ibid., p. 13.

[11] Cited by Kozintsev, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[12]Ibid., p. 10.

[13]Ibid., p. 11.

[14]Ibid., p. 14.

[15] Ibid., pp. 14-15.

[16]Ibid., p. 15.

[17] Ibid., p. 16.

[18]Ibid., p. 16.

[19]Ibid., p. 18.

[20]Ibid., pp. 18-19.

[21] Ibid., p. 19.

[22]Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[23]Ibid., p. 23.

[24]Ibid., p. 24.

[25] Ibid., p. 24

[26]Ibid., p. 25.

[27] Ibid., p. 26.

[28]Ibid., p. 26.

[29]Ibid., p. 26.

[30]Ibid., p. 26

[31] Ibid., p. 48

[32]Ibid., p. 48.

[33]Ibid., p. 52.

[34]Ibid., p. 49

[35] Ibid., p. 44.

[36] Ibid., p. 32.

[37] Ibid., p. 32.

[38] Ibid., p. 32.

[39] Ibid., p. 33.

[40] Ibid., p. 33.

[41] Ibid., p. 32.

[42] Ibid., pp. 33-34.

[43] Ibid., p. 34.

[44] Ibid., p. 34.

[45] Ibid., p. 55.

[46] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[47] Ibid., p. 35.

[48] Ibid., p. 43.

[49] Ibid., p. 44.

[50] Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[51] Ibid., pp. 36-37.

[52] Ibid., p. 37.

[53] Ibid., p. 39.

[54] Ibid., p. 39.

[55] Ibid., p. 85.

[56] Ibid., pp. 108-9.

[57] Ibid., p. 113.

[58] Ibid., p. 113.

[59] Ibid., p. 174.

[60] Ibid., p. 172.

[61] Ralph Stephenson and J. R. Debrix, *The Cinema as Art* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1978), pp. 100-101.

[62] Kozintsev, op. cit., p. 35.

[63] Ibid., p. 35.

[64] Ibid., p. 157.

[65] Ibid., p. 160

[66] Ibid., p. 107.

[67] Ralph Stephenson and J. R. Debrix, op. cit., p. 102.

[68] Kozintsev, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

[69] Ibid., p. 47.

[70] Ibid., p. 36.

[71] Ibid., p. 42.

[72] Ibid., p. 50.

[73] Ibid., pp. 118-19.

[74] Ibid., p. 229.

[75] Ibid., p. 243.

[76] Ibid., p. 243.

[77] Ibid., p. 245.

[78] Ibid., p. 249

[79] Ibid., p. 51

[80] Ibid., pp. 253-54.

HEMINGWAY'S *A FAREWELL TO ARMS* AN ANALYSIS IN FILM & LITERATURE

S.S. Deo & Monika Gupta

Any work of art is primarily a reproduction of a sensate experience through impressions made upon the observation of the artist. A novel and the film made on it are, however, identical in theme and also aim, but the two are not necessarily the same in their artistic presentation. Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* is both a literary novel and a film, but the artistic excellences attained by each are certainly of a different meaning and magnitude. The book *A Farewell to Arms* (1927), a masterpiece in a love theme, is successfully knitted in the sensibility of a war fought in the Italian and the Austrian borders. The film, too, has been a masterpiece in bringing out the theme of the novel through visual effects on the screen, but their merits stand miles apart.

Literature, particularly fiction writing, feeds upon the individual impressions of an object, theme, happening, or situations the author observes and, at times, undergoes. It is very often the detail of the impression he has had undergone, and thereafter reproduced in an honest and contemplative description. The work of a novelist is to convey the chain of happenings in the form of a statement he personally feels, and ascribes it a viewpoint which is individual but has a tendency of growing universally. Hemingway, in presenting "The Farewell to Military Arms,"[1] evinces his individualistic approach to the idea of both arms and love, establishing the fact that he writes for the sake of writing, presenting a personal viewpoint, or to say, an experience and, not an ambition of becoming popular. The book as a piece of literary art reflects Hemingway's "desire to reshape the broken image, the battered world and the blighted values of life,"[2] presenting his hatred for war as the theme of the novel. Since the writer has to depend upon the images as a weapon of exhibiting the sensibility behind an episode, Hemingway has succeeded in highlighting the sinews of war and the slow and dumb working of love. It is also there that the imagery used by him exhibits the gauge of his impressions of war as well as love. The book comes as a statement, a photograph of the impulsive but thematically very strong entities of both war and love. The ideal of a romantic "relationship which had started off with sexual frivolity" between Frederick Henry and Catherine has perfectly been matured into a classical "sense of

togetherness"[3] The value and art are retained in their perfect sense of meaning, and also description therein of the impulsive conflicts of war and love.

Whereas the film "A Farewell to Arms" is a reproduction of the novel, *A Farewell to Arms*, a lot of distortion has been made in both its value and meaning. It is true that a novel "tends to abide by, yet explore the possibilities of psychological law," and also that the film "tends to abide by, yet explore the possibilities of physical law,"[4] the film on the book has diverted the whole effect to a different end. The meeting of Henry and Catherine in the field of war is by virtue of their official deployments, where the aesthetic of beauty and duty together converge for the sake of the aesthetic of love. The ethics of the glorification of love through sexual infatuations takes place on an implicit, a natural way, such that the sense of togetherness seems to have been bestowed upon them, and not acquired through any of the physical bindings. The film has truly been a successful effort because it makes the theme more clear through visual effects. Naturally, the spectator feels comfort in witnessing the sensibility and the related happenings with his own eye. The film has, of course, been advantageous in making the whole story an episode under the visual scrutiny of the spectator. But the movie as a reproduction of a book is limited in communicating the idea as well as the emotion embodied by the author. It is not only twice, but thrice removed from reality in the author's point of view of feeling and thinking. The movie, "A Farewell to Arms", is the imitation of the author's imitation of an episode in war and love. The heroine in the book is sincere, given to duty, idealistic and slow-going, and very hard to be initiated into sexual relationship. Henry is, likewise, a passionate hero in warfare, ambitious to fight great wars, and has courage to grow like a Shavian, professional soldier, without ever submitting his romantic glamour to any creature of beauty on earth. But, the simple-hearted Henry, a perfect soldier, given to his sense of duty and valour, is seen naturally falling down like a huge castle at the throes of a sane and gentle creature like Catherine. The film on the same issue fails and seems to have aimed at a different purpose.

A work of literature succeeds in plot, and a film on story. The process of a book of fiction extends aesthetic pleasure through its inward movement by virtue of which the character appears to be introvert. Hemingway is a genius in this regard because his

art of characterization involves an introspective detail of the inner being put in the mess of most human impulses and emotions. Catherine is a foreign national in Switzerland, and never knows that she would die in love of a foreign hero, ending in an alienated sort of death. Her infatuation is silent for Henry, and silently does she grow in her love in an aesthetically ecstatic order, establishing Hemingway's ambition "to concern himself with the ultimate crisis of human experience, to surprise the human soul naked as it faced up to an ultimate challenge."[5] Literature relates the essential reality, whereas the film the apparent.

"A Farewell to Arms" as a film is an attempt of presenting Henry's infatuation towards Catherine. The love episode, including the passionate romance between Frederick Henry and Catherine Barkley, has so finely been communicated that the cause behind every happening appears to be a naturally knitted fibre down which further happenings keep on clinging. The different episodes in the graph of happenings in the main book are so naturally interwoven that the presentation of the theme comes as a full statement from which a single word dropped would alter the whole meaning. It is, of course, the plot construction of the novel which had really won laurels for Hemingway in channelizing the most terse as well as the fluid emotions into an artistic presentation.

The film, however, grows on the story of the novel itself; it lacks the presentation of an organic whole of the happenings. For instance, "the baby" in the book is a "symbol of new life and a promise of stability" giving them both a feeling "as though something were hurrying"[6] every time. The film has missed in giving a serious thought to the meaning of the baby in the life of the two. It is not as well a fine presentation of the episode in a meaningful way. Since a novel is dependent entirely upon a symbolic medium, standing between "the perceiver and the symbolized percepta,"[7] the concept of performance and real reading are changed, bringing to light the fact that the two can never be distinguished. The film on *A Farewell to Arms* succeeds in conveying its message to the people, but, again, it has fallen short of projecting the author's message as in literature. The film maker has no rule to follow, and so he has taken liberty to the extent that his production confines it to a tale of romance, and not to dedication and sacrifice. Of course, Hemingway has depicted Catherine as the leading character before whom the adolesence courage and love of Frederick Henry completely submit. But the

film tends to overshadow her by Henry, perhaps, more for the praise of valour by the film-going masses.

The prime question, which relates to both the novel and the film, is that of aesthetics, concerning beauty born of virtue, and not an experience exploited in senses. It is true that Hemingway often uses "sex, as he used drink, to blot out painful thought," but the passion turning to love takes up "the quest for meaning."[8] *A Farewell to Arms* as a novel presents innate pleasure through beauty, a virtue far above the real. Whether it is Henry's passion for Catherine, or the passionate reverie of the latter, things are certain that the novel grows on the implicit cause of the innate, say truth, between the two. The book, of course, is more truthful because Hemingway makes Henry's attraction for Catherine natural by presenting a sensual picture, which draws any reader very close to an imaginatively innate pleasure. The film has avoided the descriptive excess, keeping in mind that a viewer "cannot be both broad and critical together."[9] Even if Hemingway is held guilty of "Catherine's death because of his fondness of the hero",[10] the former leaves behind her aesthetic impression on the minds of the readers. An outburst of passion developed into an intense love, and, finally, ended in a calamitous finish, makes the novel marvellous. Catherine, in the novel, stands opposite to war, "symbolizing a new ethos, a positive re-affirmation of life-principle."[11] The end, naturally tragic in a sense, overtakes Catherine Barkley and Frederick Henry as "painful reminder of the dichotomy between the individual will and reality."[12] The film, of course, is more successful in depicting the movements of the main episode as the sensibility has beautifully been made available to the spectators. It is definitely there that the film on *A Farewell to Arms* is "reeking with morality,"[13] but the confinements are to a particular view beyond which spectators can neither think, nor understand. It can well be analyzed that in a novel the writer leaves everything to the individual reader to imagine and think in his own special way. The film forces upon a viewpoint through its visual effect, a scene, a situation, which the general spectators consider in a common way. It can be said that the tendency in a film is to popularize the viewpoint the producer has made upon the reading of the book. The novel, *A Farewell to Arms*, is superior to the film because the impression held by our imagination is far superior to those held by our sight. Needless to point out, the organic impressions formed in the mind are broader than the picture conceptuated by the sight, given with the rule that "our eye is

weaker than our mind."[14] The book, *A Farewell to Arms*, is, in a sense, about "people acting under pressure, not in any everyday environment, but in abnormal conditions of extreme stress."[15] The film on the theme is to make appeal to the "perceiving senses," free to work "with endless variations of physical reality."[16] The fact is that the issue of the glorification of Catherine's departure as a symbol of revival of new life has never been picturized so poignantly as it appears in the book. The emphasis, of course, has been laid upon the hero; neither does Catherine Barkley, nor her beauty, finds scope in the picturization of the scene. Emphasis has been laid upon the hero, Frederick Henry, making him discover that the "attempt to find a substitute for universal meaning in the limited meaning of the personal relationship is doomed to failure."

A novel is the display of an introvert action of the protagonist, whereas a film is an extrovert approach in bringing out the inner being. It is so that a novel has "to retreat more and more from external action to internal thought, from plot to character, from the social to psychological realities."[18] The film is like the paraphrase of the novel. A film is a cooked food on the raw material supplied by the author, made relishing with the suppliants, like dialogues, visual aides and several other effects. The producer of the film, "A Farewell to Arms," has made the film palatable in his own way, which the spectators applaud with its war and love theme. The book still dominates over the artistic presentation through visual aides. A book like *A Farewell to Arms* is time-art in which "the formative principle is time", compatible to the speculation that the formative influence in the "film is space."[19] A novel is still a standard to a film, and not that a film can standardize it upon the novel on which it is made. The dominant "informing characteristic of representational art is the transparency of the mode by which fictional world is created."[20] The film on *A Farewell to Arms* can be judged by reading the text; the novel is tested through it. It is true that the movie encourages the reading of the text, but the bondage of the scope still distinguishes it from the latter. The book is created and read in terms of space, whereas a film has to be confined to time. It can otherwise be said that the film on *A Farewell to Arms* has a characteristic to grow from the universal to the individual, whereas the book grows through the system of elevation of the individual to the universal.

REFERENCES

[1] Wylder Delbert, *Hemingway's Heroes* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1969), p. 78.

[2] C: D. Narasimhaiah, ed., *Asian Response to American Literature* (Delhi: Vikas Publication, 1972), p. 259.

[3] Ibid., pp. 259-60.

[4] George Bluestone, *Novel into Film* (Berkely, Loss Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), p. 61.

[5] Edward Wagenknech, *Cavalcade of the American Novel* (Calcutta: Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. 1974), p. 374.

[6] Ernest Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929), p. 239.

[7] A. A. Mendilow, *Time and the Novel* (London, 1952), p. 88.

[8] *Cavalcade of the American Novel, op. cit.*, p. 375.

[9] Allen Tate, "Technique of Fiction", *Forms of Modern Fiction*, ed. William Van O'Connor (Minneapolis, 1948), p. 33.

[10] John Killinger, *Hemingway and the Dead Cods* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1960), p. 48.

[11] *Asian Response to American Literature, op. cit.*, p. 261.

[12] Ibid.

[13] George Bernad Shaw, "The Drama, the Theater and the Films", *Harper's Magazine*, London, CXLIX, September, 1924, p. 226.

[14] J. P. Mayer, *Sociology of Film* (London, 1946), p. 278.

[15] Stewart Sanderson, *Hemingway* (Writers and Critics Series; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1961), p. 37.

[16] *Novels into Film, op. cit.*, p. 20.

[17] *Cavalcade of the American Novel, op. cit.*, p. 376.

[18] *Novels into Film, op. cit.*, p. 467.

[19] Ibid., p. 61.

[20] Keith Cohen, *Film and Fiction: The Dynamics of Exchange* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1979), p. 8.

THE MOVING CAMERA WRITES: THE IMPACT OF THE FILM ON THE NOVELS OF GRAHAM GREENE

Urbashi Barat

Perhaps the adjective most frequently used for Graham Greene's novelistic techniques is *cinematic*. Ever since photography was invented, of course, the camera has been an important source of inspiration for the writers, and even before films came into existence, as Leon Edel has pointed out, novelists like Balzac, Tolstoy and Flaubert had turned themselves into moving cameras (1974:177). Thus Christopher Isherwood's famous, if somewhat simplistic formulation, 'I am a camera', can be said to sum up novelistic methods in general, and those of the twentieth century in particular.

Isherwood's remark is so applicable to Graham Greene, however, that it seems to have been made with him in mind rather than with the modern novel as a whole. Not only was Greene an avid film-goer, whose childhood viewing of popular adventure films remained as potent a source of creativity as his early reading (Greene 1981b:14), for many years he reviewed films and books on films (notably for the *Spectator* and the short-lived *Night and Day*) and wrote film scripts and film stories for American studios. The roots of his involvement with films thus go deep as far down as his early formative years in Berkhamsted, the old Hertfordshire market town where he was born and grew up and which was to generate his art. 'Here in Berkhamsted was the first mould of which the shape was to be endlessly reproduced, he comments in his autobiography (1981c:11), and Berkhamsted's old-fashioned High Street boasted of a cinema-hall incongruously jostling against the shops and the dentist's clinic. This was to form an enduring and meaningful image throughout his work, so that films and film-going act almost as markers, as it were, of his characters, his theme and his world.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the writers in Greene's novels are constantly aware of the way in which films have affected contemporary methods of narration. Thus, in *Stamboul Train*, his first major work, which, incidentally, was based on a film (*Grand Hotel*) and which was, moreover, written with an eye to the possibility of its being filmed, Mr Quin Savory muses on how to capture the

sense of movement of the cine-camera in the prose of the novelist (104). Later, in *The End of the Affair*, Bendrix, the novelist-protagonist, discusses how his dissatisfaction at the way a film based on one of his books had turned out suddenly dissipates when he discovers that a cinematic image immediately communicates, and more effectively than literary rhetoric can, the passion that he had wanted to convey in his writing (43). The film, then, can provide a striking and effective objective correlative for thoughts and feelings, and it is so used in Greene's own novels, where the characters are often film-goers themselves.

The unreality of the popular film is usually an ironic counterpoint to the reality of the human situation in Greene's work. In *It's a Battlefield* Milly's attempts to get her husband released from his death-sentence are placed against a description of Royalty visiting a cinema:

> 'Business at a standstill,' said Conder. Mounted police backed their horses at the edge of the pavement keeping the road clear. 'If you wanted to buy something, you couldn't. If you wanted to meet a man on business, you couldn't. We've been sitting here now for a quarter of an hour. 'Patience', Conder said, 'you've got to be patient. This is a State occasion. The Queen's going to a talkie.' (105-6)

A man's life and his family's happiness are petty and insignificant beside a Royal visit to a film; it is obvious that Milly's efforts are futile, and the theme of individual and social isolation that lies at the core of the novel is conveyed without any overt comment on the novelist's part.

In later novels it is not so much film-going as the effect of the film on the viewer that is important. In *Brighton Rock* Pinkie takes Rose to see a film on their wedding night, to delay the consummation of their marriage, a prospect he dreads and loathes. But the film they see is a romantic one and only serves to remind him of the ordeal ahead of him. The artificial emotion of the film, moreover, reinforces his own deep feelings, 'and suddenly, inexplicably, the Boy beg [ins] to weep' (179): not because he is moved by the film music or by the unreality of the situation in the film, but because of its ironic relevance to his own, which sharpens his sense of horror, loss and despair at what is happening to him. Similarly, D. in *The Confidential Agent* reflects upon the ironic contrast between the world of the popular film and that of the world in which he lives:

> It was curious and pathetic...It was as if some code of faith and morality

> had been lost for centuries, and the world was trying to reconstruct it from the unreliable evidence of folk memories and subconscious desires--and perhaps some hieroglyphics upon stone. ----If *we* lived in a world, he thought, which guaranteed a happy ending, should we be as long discovering it? (65)

Films and film-going achieve a symbolic effect in *The Quiet American*. On the night that Fowler arranges for Pyle's death, he goes to see a film to pass the time and to establish an alibi for himself. But *Scaramouche*, with its romantic adventures in a world in which black and white never blend into greys, is no escape from what he has done, for its hero and his actions provide an ironic comment on Pyle's life and brand of innocence:

> ...Errol Flynn, or it may have been Tyrone Power (I don't know how to distinguish them in tights), swung on ropes and leapt from balconies and rode bareback into Technicolor dawns. He rescued a girl and killed his enemy and led a charmed life.

The relevance to both Pyle and Fowler is unmistakeable, and Fowler concludes grimly:

> It was what they call a film for boys, but the sight of Oedipus emerging with his bleeding eyeballs from the palace at Thebes would surely give a better training for life today. No life is charmed. (180)

This is not just a bitter comment about the real world, or about the shallowness and triviality of Pyle's romantic ideas, which Greene had elsewhere called 'a Metro-Goldwyn philosophy' of 'fake kindliness and superficial truth' (1976:25). The contrast between Scaramouche and Oedipus underlines the fact that *The Quiet American* is a story about a journey towards self-knowledge that must inevitably lead away from childish romance to pain and acceptance.

Allusions to cinema-going might be less frequent in Greene's later novels (after all, fewer people do go to see films these days), but wherever they occur they are significant. Thus in *Monsignor Quixote* the priest is quite bewildered by a pornographic film he had chosen to view, attracted by its innocuous-sounding but misleading title, *A Maiden's Prayer* (138). As they leave the hall his friend the Mayor explains what the film had really portrayed, and Father Quixote is astonished:

> He had always believed that human love was the same kind as the love of God, even though only the faintest and feeblest reflection of that love, but those exercises which had made him want to laugh aloud, those grunts and squeals...[sic] (140)

His response is an indication of more than his unworldliness. For

he worries that his reaction of amusement to pornography, and thus perhaps to sexuality as well--one of the basic human drives--should be so atypical, and accordingly so inhuman. Like his predecessor, the whisky-priest of *The Power and the Glory*, Father Quixote believes that participation in everyday life and everyday emotions is the mark of humanity, and fears that he might have lost his. Through his protagonist's feelings about a film, then, Greene examines the measure of manhood.

What he suggests through Father Quixote, as through so many of his previous novels, is that pornography and sexuality are very different. Whereas pornography is artificial, superficial and futile, human love can and does ultimately lead to the divine. The distinction between pornography and sensuality (Allain 1984:181-2) constantly emphasized throughout his work, which has behind it the old Augustinian distinction between *agape* and *amor*, thus projects itself in the metaphor of the pornographic film in his last novels. When Anna-Luise in *Doctor Fischer* dies, her husband, 'sick with grief' (102), goes to a soft-porn to arouse himself, but finds it meaningless, 'like designs in a prehistoric--writings in the unknown script of people I knew nothing about' (111)--which is what D. earlier had felt about film romance.

In his last novel, *The Captain and the Enemy*, however, Greene's focus has altered slightly. The landlord of the inn to which the Captain takes Victor warns them that the film now showing in the local hall is unsuitable for a child (16); the Captain accepts the landlord's suggestion, but is the life he introduces the young boy to any the less unnatural and harmful? Later, when he takes Victor/Jim to see *King/Kong* the differences in their reactions indicate the differences in their temperaments, and ultimately explain and foreshadow what happens to them. Where the boy sees the story of the great ape as one of cruelty and victimization, to the Captain it is one of love.

Films are a significant experience to Greene, then, and must be taken seriously. They are as important as the academically more respected genre, the drama (1937a:37), for their purpose is the expression of moral and aesthetic truth (1935a:353). Telling the truth is after all the primary duty of the artist: 'This is not only a matter of the artistic conscience but of the social conscience too,' he explains in *Why Do I Write?* (1948:40). This the camera does 'with more exactitude and vividness' than the prose of most

contemporary playwrights, so that 'the truth of the general scene' and 'the truth of the individual drama' are easily recognized and accepted by the audience (1935c:940). The cinema is especially close to the novel (1937b:356), for both are built up of simple ideas that must be felt with passion by the imaginative mind (1937a:70) and of simple stories clearly located in time and space that widen out to touch universal human experience (1937c:659). This is largely achieved through style (1948:40). The camera eye, like the neutral omniscient narrator of a novel, respects physical reality, but even as it seems to re-create it, its angle of vision is selective and thus ultimately non-naturalistic, remaining, however, morally truthful and aesthetically pleasing.

Greene's belief in the importance of the film led him to apply their techniques to his novels; indeed, if James had formulated his novels on the lines of the drama, Greene constructs his novels as though they were films, or, as Evelyn Waugh puts it, Greene the writer 'has become director and producer' (Waugh 1948:323). His presentation of a situation, a character or a scene is not only strongly pictorial, it is cinematic. For instance, when Coral Musker in *Stamboul Train* regains consciousness after having fainted, she sees a strangely distorted world:

> she thought that it was she who was bending over a stranger with a long shabby moustache. She felt pity for the experience which had caused his great anxiety, and her solicitude went out to the friendliness she imagined in his eyes. She put her hands down to his face. He's ill, she thought, and for a moment shut out the puzzling shadows which fell the wrong way, the globe of light shining from the ground. (26-7)

The angle of vision is that of a camera shot taken from the ground, looking upwards. Striking as it is, however, this is no gimmicky experimentation with a camera: it is used to suggest the future moment when the situation will be reversed and Coral will attempt to succour the dying revolutionary, and to indicate, moreover, that this is a world where common human values are turned upside down and concern for other people is replaced by self-centred and-imposed isolation.

Similarly, in *A Gun for Sale* the hired killer takes in the details of his victim's room in a moment:

His eyes, like little concealed cameras, photographed the room instantaneously: the desk, the easy chair, the map on the wall, the door to the bedroom behind, the wide window above the bright cold Christmas street. (6)

The scene is set immediately, recording not just the spare furnishings of the room but also Raven's attitude: the murderer is cold, calculating, unmoved, his bitterness reflected in the phrase 'bright cold Christmas street'. Minute attention to detail is accompanied by careful selectivity, so that each is functional and contributes dynamically to the action or theme. When Scobie in *The Heart of the Matter* is forced to admit to his wife that the bank has refused him a loan, he attempts to console her, while his eyes--and the camera-eye with him--follow a lizard pouncing on an insect: what Scobie sees and knows but will not admit to is dramatically enacted by the animal's movements. Louise accuses Scobie of not loving her, and 'the lizard flicked across the wall and came to rest again, the wings of a moth in his small crocodile jaws' (59).

Although the impact of the film on Greene's novels becomes especially obvious from *Stamboul Train* onwards, it is present in his earlier fiction too. For instance, in *The Man Within*, his first published novel, Andrews, desperately fleeing from Carlyon, sees the light from Elizabeth's cottage from a distance, and stumbles forward to reach it:

> The gray stones of a cottage suddenly hunched themselves up between the trees. To the man raising his head to see the ramshackle bulk it was though the uneven, knobbled shoulders of the place had shrugged themselves from the earth. (14)

This a vivid cinematic rendering of his state of mind through a moving image. With time and experience Greene's handling of technique of the moving camera becomes progressively more sophisticated and economical. Thus, the movement of the camera in *The Name of Action*

> ...across a widening gap Chant saw for the last time the figure of Mr Crane, the American engineer, diminishing moment by moment, as the tug swung the barge into the centre of the river. (200-1)

becomes markedly more subtle in *The Power and the Glory* and *The Heart of the Matter*. The panning and tracking shots used in these two novels, particularly in the opening scenes, have been so frequently commented on that they do not require reiteration: in both the camera establishes the atmosphere and sets the characters in perspective, and even suggests their narrative patterns. In *The Power and the Glory*, for example, the camera moves from Mr Tench to the vultures as they rise and flap 'across the town, over the tiny plaza, over the bust of an ex-president,

ex-general, ex-human being, over the two stalls which sold mineral water, towards the river and the sea' (7)-- the sea over which the whisky-priest hopes at first to escape the fate that is pursuing him; that the attempt to fly is doomed to failure is indicated by the movement of the vultures. Towards the end of the scene a ship begins to set sail, and the camera--and with it the reader--shifts to the ship as it leaves: 'The land went backward at a low and even roll, and the dark came quite suddenly' (19). The darkness is at once literal and metaphorical, and contrasts with the 'enormous sense of freedom about the gulf'; the whisky-priest is 'far back inside the darkness' on his mule. Immediately the reader is brought back from his temporary freedom to the dark land, which has become even darker by contrast.

Similarly, the dissolve in *The Name of Action*

> The cold self-conscious stare from the image in the mirror at the long table's end melted into and became the reflection of an excited face laid across the lights and dim scenery through the carriage window (6-7)

does not add very much to the plot, but in *The Tenth Man*, when it is used to merge the sounds and shapes of physical experience during Chavel's and Therese's walk together in the autumn mist (92), the dissolve symbolizes the present state of their relationship and foreshadows their final separation. Incidentally, *The Tenth Man* is a film story like the better-known *Third Man*. Written as a story outline for Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, it was never made into a film and lay forgotten in the studio archives for forty years, until it was discovered accidentally in 1983 by a London publisher and published as a novel two years later. By this time, however, Greene was no longer looking towards the cinema for his techniques; the greater use of non-cinematic devices such as letters and diaries from *The End of the Affair* onwards, the increased importance of dialogue and polemic from *The Honorary Consul* onwards, and the sketchiness of the physical environments in his last novels, preclude the employment of filmic methods of narration.

Nevertheless, there are certain methods, based on film editing, that Greene has always used. The most frequent of these, especially in the early novels, is the montage, which the novelist defines by quoting from Raymond Spottiswoode's *Grammar of the Film*: 'the production of a concept or sensation through the mutual impact of other conceptions or sensations: in its structural aspect, the juxtaposition of shots, series and sequences in such a way as to produce this impact' (Greene 1935b:472). Greene's equiva-

lent of the montage in his novels is a series of concrete images. In *The Man Within*, for instance, montage is used to portray Andrew's state of mind when he sees the dead Elizabeth:

> A spring of blackberries in a muddy lane, a shrill voice talking in a crowded bar, a man with a scrubby beard, a wheel that turned endlessly with gathering speed, a shock of stars that plunged across a great dark gap of space, voices raised in shouts, the whistle of wind in spars, the sound of water, a red face plunged at him shrieking questions, and then silence, a white face lit by candles and darkness and an aching heart. (21708)

The series of images brings together Andrews's experiences and his feelings about them. His 'aching heart' has been caused by his troubled and unhappy association with the smugglers (the water images), by his testifying in court (the voices) and by Elizabeth, whom he loves but is now dead (the white face lit by candles).

It is in *Stamboul Train* that montage is seen to its best advantage, for the entire novel is constructed on this technique, which is particularly appropriate in a work which presents a group of ill-assorted people going with varying objectives to different destinations, who have only one thing in common: the long train journey from Ostend to Constantinople. The atmosphere is evoked and the theme of isolation communicated through the series of vivid but unrelated images constantly juxtaposed against each other. Thus, the novel opens with the purser of the Channel steamer watching the passengers cross the quay to the train. A succession of images as they flit through his mind create the physical and emotional atmosphere. It is a grey, cold and wet afternoon, and the only sounds are those of the crane, the rain and the sea; the purser is immediately reminded of the uncomfortable journey just completed, evoked again through a sequence of similar images, thus linking past and present together. Then he looks up enviously at the crane operator, saved by 'thirty feet of mist and rain' from the people below. The feeling that individual isolation is the only reality in this world is reinforced as the purser calls out to Coral to remember him, though he knows that he himself will forget her like all the others, whether it is the school teacher who claims to be English, the Jews, the tourists on a conducted tour, the sick and the old; and the narrator concludes:

> This was the first thing she [Coral] shared with Richard John--below the tramp of feet, the smell of oil, the winking lights of signals, worrying faces, clink of glasses, rows of numerals--a darkness in the purser's mind. (11-12)

Through montage, then, Greene shows his readers that people are not really concerned about others; everyone is lonely and exploited, and individual efforts to reach out to others must quickly die out and all human relationships fail against the might of selfishness and greed.

Another striking example of the effective use of montage may be seen in *Brighton Rock*. Ida is waiting in a plush hotel bedroom for a night of pleasure with Phil Corkery, but outside the window

> the sea ebbed, scraping the shingle, exposing a boot, a piece of rusty iron, and the old man stopped, searching between the stones. The sun dropped behind the Hove houses and dusk came, the shadow of Mr Corkery lengthened, coming slowly up from the Belvedere carrying the suitcases, saving on taxis. A gull swooped screaming down to a dead crab beaten and broken against the iron foundation of the pier. It was the time of near darkness and of the evening mist from the Channel and of love. (146)

There is irony, of course, in the contrast between the luxurious, almost voluptuous, hotel room and the world outside, but there is something else as well. The world outside is a seedy, decaying, dying one; because Phil is coming to join Ida here he becomes associated with the images of decay. This 'places' not only him but Ida too, establishing her position in the structure of the novel, and identifying her with the scavenging gull as she pursues Pinkie and Rose.

In *The Heart of the Matter* Scobie examines Louise's dressing-table while she is asleep, with its pots and photographs, placed together in any order, and the description ends with a summing up of the meaning of her collection: 'It was as if she were accumulating evidence that she had friends like other people' (22). Greene's montage here is not entirely cinematic, for he informs the reader of its implications, in an extension of his practice of using abstractions at the end of a series of concrete details. Evidently he is turning towards more purely literary methods, and the process is accelerated by the adoption of first-person narration in many of his later novels. In *The End of the Affair*, accordingly, the montage has quite a different effect. When Bendrix, the novelist-protagonist, talks about how to decide on the details to include in his work, he wonders:

> How can I disinter the human character from the heavy scene--the daily newspaper, the daily meal, the traffic grinding towards Battersea, the gulls coming up from the Thames looking for bread, and the early summer of 1939 glinting on the park where the children sailed their boats--one of those

bright condemned pre-war summers. (25)

The montage sets the scene, of course, but it also contrasts the outer world of calm and placidity with the turmoil in Bendrix's heart--and it also reminds the reader that the calm is in fact deceptive, for behind it lie the tensions of a war that would engulf contemporary civilization, just as the end of the affair leads to the shattering of Bendrix's world.

Other devices of film editing are used to construct Greene's later novels which are more subtle and effective than montage. These guide the reader's emotional response, and give the novel visual and temporal variety and the illusion of continuous movement by frequent cuts and by varying the angles of vision of a single piece of action. *Stamboul Train*, again, contains the earliest effective examples of the quick cut in Greene's work. For instance, Myatt asks Coral to have breakfast with him. At first she thinks of refusing, but then she remembers the stale and unappetising food she has with her as the fragrance of freshly-made coffee and bread wafts down to her. Immediately after that Mabel Warren and Janet Pardoe are seen sharing their breakfast, with strong black coffee (49-50). The sudden juxtaposing of the two scenes, without a break, contrasts the two pairs of lovers, Myatt and Coral, Mabel and Janet, but it underscores the links between them as well, and ironically foreshadows the ending of the novel.

Greene invariably divides his novels into a number of small scenes rather than presenting them as a flowing continuity, so that there are constant shifts in the point of view that resemble film editing. As Waugh remarks, 'It is as though out of an infinite length of film, sequences had been cut which, assembled, comprise an experience which is the reader's alone without any correspondence to the experience of the protagonist' (Waugh 323). The action seems to be cut, and then re-created in a new context. Waugh himself refers particularly to *The Heart of the Matter*, but this technique is especially interesting in the case of two earlier novels, *A Gun for Sale* and *Brighton Rock*. The protagonists of both these novels are criminals and villains, whose moral ambiguity is their most striking characteristic. Accordingly, the novelist constantly shifts the point of view, so that four different viewpoints, the protagonist's own, and those of the unsympathetic world, of the sympathetic bystander and of the author, are constantly placed against each other, forcing the reader continually

to reconstruct the character. The response to him fluctuates from moment to moment, so that one can neither judge him nor condemn him. The opening paragraph of *A Gun for Sale* presents the world through Raven's eyes, so that he seems a brutal killer who does not, however, realize that he is damaging himself nor, indeed, what he is doing, his lack of self-knowledge itself pleading for some compassion. Then Anne passes him on the street, and feels sorry for him because of his disfiguring harelip and forgets him; but immediately after that he overhears his landlord, a detective and a maid calling him ugly, unprepossessing, acceptable only because he pays his way. All these views, filtering to the reader through Raven's point of view, combine to underline his intense alienation. Pinkie in *Brighton Rock* is presented in similar fashion, sometimes appearing inhuman, evil, and immediately after that shown to be a young boy cruelly treated by circumstances, a suffering human being.

It is from *Stamboul Train* that Greene's editing techniques come into their own. From now on the novels are divided into three to five large parts, and then into smaller sections, the chapters often being made up of four-to six-page units. The last chapter of *A Gun for Sale* is a fine example of the way in which cinematic technique expresses theme. It consists of five short scenes, each devoted to a different character. In each scene the characters reflect upon the violence that has affected their lives in some way or the other. They have no connection with each other: the violence has had no permanent effect on their lives. There are no transitions between the sections: the novelist simply cuts from one location to another. The theme is one of human isolation: the scenes themselves are isolated units. Each presents the viewpoint of a person returning to his or her own routine existence unaffected by the events portrayed in the novel.

In *The Power and the Glory* each scene is devoted to one character and situation, each separate and yet integral to an understanding of the character, indispensable to the action, functional in itself, and ironical in its juxtaposition with the others. While the 'hero' is unquestionably the whisky-priest, the lieutenant's view is also given importance, to balance between the 'bad' hero and the 'good' villain, to suggest their equal status as fallen human beings, and to point to their recognition of human qualities in each other. By constantly showing him through shifting angles of vision, the priest becomes a fully realized human being rather than a

caricature.

Chapter IV of the novel will explain Greene's method. Here a scene featuring the dentist is followed by one with Padre Jose, then with those describing the education of Juan and of Coral, and then one with the police chief and the lieutenant. The scenes are unified through viewpoint, consisting of a centre of consciousness interspersed with authorial comment (a literary rather than cinematic device), and by the recurrent motif of pain. The dentist is used to pain, for it is part of his profession: the fear of pain makes the apostate priest refuse to help those who need him: the pain of the martyrs in the stories of Juan's mother foreshadows the ordeals that the whisky-priest will have to endure, with a further parallel in his contribution to the education of Coral, whose reaching adolescence is marked with pain. The chapter closes and comes full circle with the police chief's toothache and the lieutenant's painful gesture of affection, tweaking a child's ear. The scenes thus become an integral unit.

The novel that contains the largest number of sections is *The Heart of the Matter*, which is entirely built up of fifty-six short scenes. There are four important ways in which film editing is used here: the use of very s! t scenes: the rapid cutting from scene to scene: the brevity of descriptions: and the balanced proportion of dialogue to narration. Only once does the scene remain the same in more than two consecutive scenes, and that is the turning-point in Scobie's life: his meeting with Helen Rolt. In each scene the plot advances, cinematically, through interaction between characters. Thus, for example, the novel begins with Wilson sitting on the balcony of his hotel looking out at the scene below: Wilson and his setting are thus placed against each other before he is joined by Harris. The latter is evidently, from the way he talks to Wilson, contemptuous of the natives and contemptuous equally of Scobie's attitude to them: obviously Scobie is very different from the conventional colonial. This feeling is reinforced by the quick cut to a scene which shows Scobie at work, where he is clearly respected by both his superiors and the Africans. Although, therefore, Harris's belief that Scobie loves the natives may be justified and the reader's sympathy for him arranged for, his character must be assessed in the light of what his compatriots think of him too. The earlier conversation is important also because it shows up Wilson's deceit--he does not want to admit he reads poetry--though the reader might feel sorry for his embarrassment.

(11-20)

Each scene, moreover, is linked to the one before in an unobtrusive way, so that while the cuts give the impression of cinematic movement there is also a smooth-flowing continuity which Greene had once praised as excellent camera technique: 'It is as if the camera were handled like a brush in broad sweeps as distinct from the restless pointilliate effect given by many cuts' (1937b:759). For instance, when Wilson quite unjustifiedly accuses Scobie of having an affair with Helen, Scobie calls him 'crazy', and Wilson begins to weep, looking up with hatred at Scobie because he has seen him cry: the next scene opens with wailing of the sirens in the rain 'which fell in interminable tears' (133-4).

After this novel, however, the moving camera is gradually kept aside as Greene begins to experiment with more traditional novelistic techniques such as first-person narration. The turning-point is *The End of the Affair*, in which everything is seen through the narrator-protagonist's consciousness and which, accordingly, must do away with cinematic objectivity. The movement away from the cine-camera to the pen coincides with a renewed interest in the drama and a career as a popular playwright, just as his novelistic career had begun when he had started reviewing films. His lack of success as a script writer and his dissatisfaction with the film versions of his novels (except for *The Third Man*, which he believed was superior to his original story) were undoubtedly factors behind his loss of interest in the cinema. Besides, Greene's earlier novels had perceived the problems of good and evil through swiftly-paced stories full of action, which were suitable for cinematic presentation: now he examines problems that cannot so readily be explored through camera techniques, and dialogue, essential to the popular stage, takes over from the earlier description and narration: most of *Doctor Fischer* and *Monsignor Quixote* consist of dialogue, and in *A Burnt-Out Case* and *Travels With My Aunt* there are even stories within stories. These make for good reading but not good viewing.

Greene does not, of course, totally abandon the devices he had learnt from the cinema, for they are a part of the fabric of all his novels and what distinguishes them from those of his contemporaries. It is simply that other, more traditionally literary, methods of narration become more prominent. The moving cam-

era continues to write till the very end of his novelistic career, but its whirring is now muffled by the scratching of the pen. It remains, however, the mode in which he excels and the most striking part of his method.

REFERENCES

Allain, Marie-Francoise. 1984. *The Other Man: Conversations with Graham Greene*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Edel, Leon. 1974. 'Novel and Camera'. *The Theory of the Novel: New Essays*. Ed. John Halperin. NY: Oxford Univ P: 177-88.

Greene, Graham. 1980a. *Brighton Rock*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1980b. *A Burnt-Out Case*. Harmondsworth: Penguin..

---. 1988. *The Captain and the Enemy*. London: Reinhardt.

---. 1982a. *The Confidential Agent*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1981a. *Doctor Fischer of Geneva, or the Bomb Party*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1975. *The End of the Affair*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1979. *A Gun for Sale*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1981b. 'The Lost Childhood.' *Collected Essays*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1982b. *The Heart of the Matter*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1980c. *The Honorary Consul*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1983. *The Human Factor*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1976a. *It's a Battlefield*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1976b. *The Lawless Roads*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1980d. *The Man Within*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1931. *The Name of Action*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

---. 1980e. *The Power and the Glory*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1973. *The Quiet American*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1981c. *A Sort of Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1937a. 'Subjects and Stories.' *Footnotes to the Film*. Ed. Charles Davy. London: Dickson.

---. 1977. *Stamboul Train*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1985. *The Tenth Man*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1981d. *The Third Man and The Fallen Idol*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1982c. *Travels With My Aunt*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1935a. Untitled article. *Spectator*, CLV, September 6, 1935:353.

---. 1935b. Untitled article. *Spectator*, CLV, September 27, 1935:472.

---. 1935c. Untitled article. *Spectator*, CLV. December 6, 1935:940.

---. 1937b. Untitled article. *Spectator*, CLVIII, February 26, 1937:356.

---. 1937c. Untitled article. *Spectator*, CLVIII. April 23, 1937:759.

---. 1948. *Why Do I Write? An Exchange of Views between Elizabeth Bowen, Graham Greene, and V. S. Pritchett.* London: Percival Marshall.
Waugh, Evelyn. 1948. 'Felix Culpa?' *Commonweal* XLVIII, July 16, 1948:323.

THE CINEMATIC DEVICE OF THE FLASHBACK IN JOYCE CARY'S *TO BE A PILGRIM* AND *THE MOONLIGHT*

K. K. Sharma

It is now a commonplace of art criticism that literature and film are the two most important art forms of the post-War period and that there exists a very close relationship between them. Patently, as Morris Beja affirms, "there is great value in looking at the two genres together; such a pairing enables us to get a sense of all that they share, to be sure, but also of all the traits that they do not, so that one may grasp as well what is unique about each form."[1] In fact, literature and film are interdependent upon each other. No doubt, initially it was literature that had an edge over cinema and inevitably the latter was dependent upon the former, but the fast, unprecedented progress in cinematic art since World War II unmistakably influenced every major literary genre. Thus the poets, playwrights and fictionists have employed the varied, invaluable cinematic devices in their writings. This is true of even such major original geniuses of the present century as T.S. Eliot and James Joyce. It is a well-known fact that T.S. Eliot in *The Waste Land* and James Joyce in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Youngman* and *Ulysses* employ the cinematic devices of "montage", "condensation", "shots", "cut", "collage", "dissolve", "flash-back", "fade-in", "fade-out", etc. The present article is an attempt at demonstrating how Joyce Cary makes the functional, artistic use of the cinematic technique of flashback in two of his masterpieces, *To be a Pilgrim* and *The Moonlight*.

Though primarily a cinematic device, the flashback is now employed in the modern novel as well. It enables the writer to delineate incidents occurring prior to the opening scene of a book. The use of this technique upsets the chronological order of events. The story does not move uniformly forward in time, but travels back in the past at one or more stages and reappears in the present. Recollections, narrations, dream-sequences and reveries are the various devices used by a writer to depict past incidents. As J. W. Beach points out: "There seem to be two main reasons for the manner of narration which departs widely from the chronological order of events. One...is a question of the reader's interest--of story-telling strategy. It is too cumbersome, too dull, to try to get in at the beginning all you know about your character. The thing is first 'to get him in with a strong impression'; and then, to give him the

development which he deserves, you 'work backwards and forwards over his past.' The other reason is a question of naturalness, lifelikeness, and getting away from the formality associated with an author."[2]

Cary uses the flashback technique in two of his novels, *To be a Pilgrim* and *The Moonlight*. Its principal form is the main character's recollections, though at times the past reappears in a character's narration or reverie also. Wilcher in *To be a Pilgrim* and Ella in *The Moonlight* repeatedly remember the past events. It is through this device that the principal episodes, prior to the opening scenes of the two stories, are presented. It is essential for the author to present them, since they form integral parts of the stories.

The flashback in *To be a Pilgrim* and *The Moonlight* is the only technical device whereby Cary can convey his meaning artistically and effectively. Wilcher in *To be a Pilgrim* and Ella in *The Moonlight* must be presented through the flashback because "their life is the life they have lived rather than the life they are living."[3] These two novels depict the clash between past and present, and hence past and present are shown intersecting and interrupting each other throughout the two narratives. While discussing his use of the flashback technique with the *Paris Review* interviewers, Cary remarked:

> The flashback in my novels is not just a trick. In, for example, *The Moonlight*, I used it in order to make my theme possible. It was essential to compare two generations. You can't do that without a flashback contrast; the chronological run-through by itself is no good.[4]

To be a Pilgrim is throughout interspersed with flashbacks. The time-ribbon in this novel is again and again upset. It opens with an unfortunate incident in Wilcher's life, viz. his separation from his housekeeper, Sara, whom he wants to marry. Since his relatives are opposed to his marriage with her, they get her imprisoned for theft. Wicher falls seriously ill and is put in the care of his niece Ann, a qualified doctor, who cleverly takes him to Tolbrook to keep him away from Sara. Robert, his nephew, comes back from South Africa to prevent him from marrying Sara. After that the story moves forward and backward in time. While moving in the present, it primarily deals with Robert, Ann, Wilcher and Sara, but it often travels back in the past to unfold the stories of Lucy, Edward, Bill, Amy, Wilcher and others. A large number of past

incidents are presented through the flashback technique so that we may understand the presnet situations and the events about to occur. The flashback is employed mainly in the form of Wilcher's reminiscences of the past, which form an integral part of his present life. These recollections of old people and incidents throw light on the present, and thus help us to understand it.

The use of the flashback device in this novel is indispensable. The circumstances of Wilcher's life, as shown at the very outset of the novel, compel him to seek relief in the memory of the past. In the first place, he is an old bachelor of seventy-one suffering from a heart disease. He has not been able to realise his dreams and visions. Since he feels that he will not live long, he wishes to spend the remaining few months of his life in the company of those whom he knew and loved:

> I am an old man, and I have not much longer at Tolbrook. This is April, and before next April I shall have left for ever. I want to use every moment of these last months at home with those I love, with Lucy and Amy, Bill and Edward.[5]

Wilcher feels isolated because as an old man he finds himself incomprehensible to the young. "An old man's loneliness," he says, "is nobody's fault. He is like an old-fashioned hat which seems absurd and incomprehensible to the young, who never admired and wore such a hat."[6] Naturally, in order to forget his painful loneliness, he frequently recalls the old days when people understood him. Secondly, he is a man of contemplative nature absorbed in dreams and visions. He has a sensitive nature and an impressionable mind. Old things, such as old trees, are so dear to him that he does not wish to part with them. He is orthodox and conservative. He loves the past, and hates those who are indifferent to it. Thirdly, he is living in a very old house at Tolbrook. Hence beds, rooms, tables, chairs and other things of the house quite often remind him of persons and episodes belonging to the past. Fourthly, he is living in the company of Ann and Robert, who constantly remind him of Edward, the father of Ann, and Lucy, the mother of Robert. Edward, his elder brother, and Lucy, his elder sister, were the two persons he loved and understood; they were his models for many years. Lastly, he is extremely disgusted with the young generation and the changes taking place all over the world. On the very first page of the novel, he criticises modern people: "People boast of their liberties nowadays, but it seems to me that we have multiplied only our rulers."[7] No wonder, then, if

the new generation and the new world often remind him of the old generation of an entirely different kind.

The revelation of the past through the flashback is, thus, a natural enough device. Besides, it serves an important purpose. It enables Cary to present before us the entire personality of Wilcher, and thus illustrate his theme of man's urge for creating his unique world. Without a thorough knowledge of Lucy, Edward, Bill, Amy and others, we cannot comprehend Wilcher; they reveal him to us sometimes by contrast, sometimes by comparison.

The person who haunts Wilcher's memory most is Lucy. She is an integral part of his world. He has always desired to have that sort of energy, faith and courage which she possessed. She is indispensable for understanding his nature, because it was she who inspired him with a dream of the life of a pilgrim. He owes his religious fervour to her. She is unforgettable for him in yet another way. She did not let him feel the oppressive weight of loneliness. It was only after her death that he knew what loneliness actually was.

Wilcher's mind is also crowded with memories of his elder brother, Edward. Though endowed with religious instinct, he is very lustful. The lasciviousness in his nature is the result of Edward's influence on him. It was his impact that made him a dandy at the university. Edward persuaded him to have sexual relation with the little maid of the family. He took him to his mistresses--Mrs. Tirrit and Julie. Edward, Julie and Tirrit encouraged him to enjoy life. Since he was fascinated by them in his youth, he often remembers them in his old age.

Wilcher constantly recollects Bill and Amy, who also form an essential part of his world. They were free souls and, like children, were incessantly busy with creating new worlds. He experienced a strange pleasure in Bill and Amy's company. Amy's indifference to material possessions was a matter of great admiration for him, since he failed to overcome his craving for earthly possessions.

Sara, whom Wilcher remembers again and again, exerted a profound influence on him. She gave him faith and happiness, and impressed him by her sincerity. He regarded her as a woman of principles. He thought: "Sara had renewed to me that joy which is the life of faith."[8] He believed that nobody in the world, except Sara, understood others, and she had that capacity because she

had charity in her soul. She revealed to him the fact that men are only travellers in this world.

Wilcher's recollections of Lucy, Bill, Edward, Amy and Julie throw light on his character. He remembers them because caution and possession, which have always worried him, never disturbed their peace. He has ever wished for the life of a wanderer--a free soul, having no roots in the world. Since he found Lucy, Bill and his father embodying his dream of life, he is unable to forget them. When under the impact of the stimulus, given to him by his memory of Bill and Lucy, he escapes from Tolbrook to meet Sara, he reflects:

> "After all ... I am a Wilcher--I am like Bill and Lucy; like my father who spent half his life in camps and lodgings. It is in my blood, which is all English. The Latin, the Celt strike root; they want only to make a home somewhere; and if they must wander they take with them always a dream or legend of home. But the English soul is a wanderer, a seeker. You find it in every corner of the world... ."[9]

Gladys, John and Lottie, whose lives are portrayed through the flashback technique, also serve an important purpose in the novel. They are the connecting links between the two worlds--the world of Wilcher and the world of Ann and Robert. Gladys, John and Lottie discarded religion and morality for a world of pleasure-seekers, where disloyalty and despair prevailed.

Besides revealing Wilcher's character artistically, the flash-back serves another purpose. It enables the novelist to make the past criticise the present directly as well as obliquely. Sometimes Wilcher, one of the last relics of the old generation, comes in direct conflict with Ann and Robert who represent the present generation. But quite often his recollections of the past and his comments on it offer a brilliant indirect criticism of the new world, inhabited by Ann, Robert and others. The following instances will serve to illustrate this point.

Wilcher discusses Robert with Ann. All of a sudden, discovering in her a resemblance with her father, Edward, he sees Edward before his mental eyes. He has Ann before his psysical eyes and Edward before his mental eyes. When he compares and contrasts them, he is shocked to discover how different Ann is from her father. But he cannot help her because he believes that nobody can impart happiness to one who rejects all faith. He says:

> But all these girls nowadays, after their first twenties, have that look. Sad and responsible.

> When I see Ann, daughter of that gay, that brilliant Edward, going about as if her life were finished, I want to stick pins in her. But what can I do? No one could plant happiness in a soul that rejects all faith.[10]

Thus Wilcher criticises the younger generation, lacking faith and religion.

Let us take another example. Wilcher is shocked by Ann's abusive remarks on his father's habit of beating Lucy and other children for their faults. He thinks that it is futile to talk to children like Ann and Robert because they have only information, and little education. They do not mind going to bed with each other, but are shocked to hear that a bad child should be punished. He affirms that he and Lucy, whom Ann pities for their hard upbringing, had greater happiness in their childhood than Robert and Ann had. He is convinced that the new generation cannot understand the virtue of law and discipline, which alone are the source of peace amid the turmoils of the world. At this point, he racalls some of the incidents of his childhood, which show that Lucy and other children were very happy, though they were often beaten by their father. The following ideas about the children's world of his time, which pass through his mind, offer a criticism of the concept of children's world, held by Ann and her generation:

> But none of us was encouraged to self-pity, the disease of the egotist. Religion was not our comforter. How could we be comforted by hell fire; and individual responsibility for sin? We lived in the law, that ark of freedom. A ship well founded, well braced to carry us over the most frightful rocks, and quicksands. And on those nursery decks we knew where we were, we were as careless and lively as all sailors under dicipline.[11]

The novel constantly portrays the conflict between the present and the past, the new and the old. The present generation, characterized by aimlessness, despair, want of faith, coldness, lack of vitality and warmth, is criticized by the old generation which, as revealed through the flashback, had purpose, faith, religion, hope, warmth and energy.

In short, the use of the flashback in *To be a Pilgrim* enables Cary to present his theme of the creative freedom of the imagination effectively. The novel demonstrates that men create their own worlds and are, therefore, perpetually in conflict with one another. Thus Wilcher creates a peculiar world of his own. Lucy and others of her generation lived in a world different from that of their father's. Lucy, Edward, Wilcher, Sara, Julie, Bill and Amy existed in their own worlds and hence quarrelled with one another. The world of

Lottie and others was different from those of their predecessors, and was incomprehensible to Wilcher; and Ann and Robert move in an entirely new world, which constantly puzzles Wilcher. Cary presents all this effectively by showing the progress of generations not consecutively, but contemporaneously through the flashback technique. Cary's use of this device contributes a good deal to the condensed form in which the vast material of the book is cast. If he had narrated events chronologically, the whole presentation would have lost much of its effectiveness and vividness.

The Moonlight differs from *To be a Pilgrim* not only in subject-matter, background and point of view, but also in the use of the flashback. In *The Moonlight,* a better balance is maintained between the backward and the forward movements of the narrative. That is to say, in this novel, the story does not travel back into the past as often as it does in *To be a Pilgrim.* Consequently, the use of the flashback in this novel is not as frequent as in *To be a Pilgrim.* This, perhaps, is due to the fact that Cary gives Ella the company of an elder sister, who keeps her away from that loneliness in which Wilcher is shown living in *To be a Pilgrim.* A lonely old man is mostly absorbed in thoughts of the past.

The novel opens with the scene in which Ella is extremely happy to see Amanda in the arms of Harry Dawbarn. Perhaps the only aim of Ella's life is to see Amanda, her illegitimate daughter, married to Harry. Her efforts in this regard result in her vehement clash with her eldest sister, Rose, who holds that Harry, an ordinary farmer of moderate education and doubtful character, is not a suitable match for the highly intellectual Amanda. This quarrel between Rose and Ella is due to their different approaches to love, sex and marriage. Naturally, it is essential for the novelist to describe, in detail, their past life so as to make clear to the reader their different attitudes towards sex. To achieve this end, he resorts to the flashback device.

The omniscient narrator takes us back to the first fierce quarrel between Rose and Ella during their childhood. Ella at the age of five set Rose's bed on fire simply because Rose prevented her from going to a water party. The scene is necessary, for it shows that Rose and Ella have essentially different natures--the former is responsible, sober, reasonable and firm; while the latter is reckless, passionate, violent and pleasure-loving.

The flashback continues even after this scene of violent quarrel

and brings before us the scene of Rose's amorous relation with Groom. This scene is an important part of the novel because it acquaints us with Rose's views on love and marriage. The flashback shows how she sacrifices love for filial duty and family welfare. The purely sexual and romantic aspect of a woman's life does not matter much to her. Her sense of responsibility towards her family is associated with her belief in strict morality. She does not approve of her father's loose sex-life, and objects to his bringing Mrs. Carron to the Villa.

The flashback continues further and introduces to us Rose's younger sister, Bessie. In Chapter VI, there occurs a change in the use of the flashback technique. Hitherto it is the omniscient author who transports us to the old times, but now we are taken back to the past by Ella's recollections. This change makes the technique more convincing in the sense that seventy-four years old Ella, having nothing to do with the present except to see Amanda married to Harry, is bound to remember the good old days. Besides, she is contemplative, emotional and sensitive. Hence in her imagination, she lives in the past, which had given her numerous unique experiences. The persons and events of the present remind her of the bygone days. After her quarrel with Rose, followed by our travel back in time to witness the scene of quarrel between the two sisters in their childhood and that of Rose's love-affair with Groom, Ella is shown on page thirty-three rushing into the Butler's pantry. On page forty-four, we are told how in the pantry she not only remembers Rose's old instruction that the first water out of a metal tap should never be used, but also suddenly recalls the youth of Bessie and her marriage with Groom.

The use of the flashback here is necessary, since Bessie's concept of sex, love and marriage is to be brought to light in order to present the different views on sex of the three women of the same generation--Rose, Bessie and Ella. It is made clear to us that Bessie was a flirt with a craving for physical pleasures. Thus Bessie, as portrayed through the flashback, presents a contrast to Rose in regard to sex, love and marriage. Ella's sympathy and support for Bessie shows that she and Rose have different views on love and marriage.

After acquainting the reader with Bessie's views on sex, Cary has to evince Ella's attitude towards love and marriage. For this, again, he resorts to the flashback technique, and takes the reader back to the scenes of Ella's love-making with Geoffrey Tew. In

Chapter nine, Rose talks to Ella about the proposed change in her will. She tells her that though she wishes to see Amanda happily married to Professor Moss, she will never force the marriage on her. This at once reminds Ella of Rose's interference in her love-affair with Geoffrey Tew and Bessie's love-affair with Groom. The scene is of great importance, as it expresses Ella's views on love and marriage. The reader learns how in her early youth her aim was to fall in love, marry and have children.

A remarkable feature of the flashback technique as used in *The Moonlight* and *To be a Pilgrim* is that remembrance of the past occurs simultaneously with action in the present. For instance, in the following passage of *The Moonlight*, Ella, while climbing up the stairs, thinks of the old unforgettable scene of her falling in love with Geoffrey Tew:

> But now, as with her agile but rheumatic legs, she climbed the stairs up which, fifty years ago, she had danced, she thought, "Yes, I did love him, even then--I loved his voice, his eyes, his hair, the way he twirled his glass, even his long nose..., and that was why, the next time I was going to meet him, I changed my frock three times... . And as soon as I came in, Geoffrey took me by both hands and said, 'How lucky this is--it is just what I hoped for, that you would be the first. I wanted to thank you for backing me up so splendidly last night.'
>
> "How did I back him up ?" Ella asked herself in wonder, as she had asked herself a thousand times since. "I didn't say a word--I did'nt dare. I was such a coward. But it seemed that he felt my sympathy... ."
>
> "Oh," thought Ella, entering the box attic and sitting down on an old trunk, "how can I forget how I felt then. And he saw it, he felt it, too. He turned pale and said in quite a faltering voice, 'I have been longing to see you again'...."
>
> "How quick he was, how sensitive," Ella reflected. "Yes, he seemed so assured and confident, he horrified me by the way he spoke to Rose--just laughing at her. Yes, he was really rather impertinent to Rose. But that was because he was so sensitive--he was that kind of young man, like--." The image of Robin Sant appeared in her imagination, but she at once rejected it.[13]

The use of the flashback technique in Chapter XII is purposeful. It gives us a peep into the sexual ideas of Ella, Bessie and Rose. Ella is alarmed by Amanda's intimacy with Robin, and therefore overhears their talks on one pretext or the other. Robin's remark that there is a great difference between the silly ones who are cheated and the wise persons who see through a plot leads her to think about herself and her relations with Geoffrey Tew. She thinks how she fell in love with Geoffrey, and is reminded of the

other incidents of that period of her life. The next chapter records a number of other incidents related to Ella's love-affair.

A little later, Ella finds Amanda and Robin talking joyfully. She thinks that Amanda does not feel anything, and is therefore not at all upset by Harry's departure. This brings back to her mind her misery caused by her separation from Geoffrey. Here the device of the flashback enables the novelist to show the past making an implicit criticism of the present. Amanda, standing for the present generation, does not feel Harry's separation, while Ella, representing the old generation, was broken-hearted by her separation from Geoffrey.

In the last but one paragraph of Chapter XIV, Ella is, again, transported to the past as a result of her looking at an old picture. She remembers Bessie's relations with Ernest. She also recollects that Bessie hated Rose when the latter remarked that she was not a true wife. A little later, she recalls the scene when she was playing piano for Ernest. Then Bessie came in, and asked Ernest if he had fallen in love with Ella. Towards the end of Chapter XVII and in Chapter XVIII, Ella is engrossed in the memory of her love for Ernest Cranage. The use of the flashback here is significant in that it presents a contrast between the past and the present generations. Ella's love-affair with Ernest and her craving for a husband and children are juxtaposed with Amanda's and Kathy's coldness towards Harry and Robin respectively.

Chapter XX shows how the past, revealed through the memory of Ella, indirectly criticizes the present. Ella is exceedingly perturbed by her mistake in telling Amanda her real parentage. This leads her to recall how Rose advised her never to disclose Amanda her real parentage. She also recollects the whole episode of her love for Ernest Cranage resulting in the birth of a baby. These incidents of her past life implicitly criticize Amanda and Kathy's views on husband, children and sex-life. While the present generation, represented by Amanda, Kathy and others, is cold, intellectual and passive in these matters, Ella and Ernest of the old generation are vigorous, emotional and active.

When Amanda asks Ella if she ever had an income of her own and led an independent life, Ella recalls how on getting the legacy after her father's death she went all alone to London to see Amanda much against Rose's wish. The flashback shows Ella's deep love for her natural daughter, Amanda. Though she had

exhausted her funds, she was still determined not to go to the Villa. A large part of the past as revealed here offers an oblique criticism of the present generation of Amanda, Kathy, Iris and Dorothy, who do not consider babies interesting in any way.

In Chapter XXXII, Cary, with the help of the flashback, depicts conflict both among the women of the old generation and between the women of old and new generations. Iris, Dorothy and Bertie come to the Villa on the occasion of its sale. The omniscient author shifts us back to the time when about the question of the education of Muriel, Dorothy and Amanda, there arose a quarrel between Rose on one side and Bessie and Iris on the other. Iris insisted on sending the children to Beltham, while Rose expressed her deep hatred for that school.

Some of Ella's recollections of the past at the time of the sale of the Villa are essential in that they throw light on Bessie's concept of motherhood, and display the conflict among several women on this point. The bitter quarrel of Dorothy and Iris regarding the possession of some of the goods of the Villa reminds Ella how Rose always said that Bessie spoilt Dorothy. While searching for Rose's blotter, Ella goes to Amanda's room. When she talks to Amanda about Harry, marriage and children, she is shocked by her notions, especially by her remark that she will not be a fit wife and may not find babies interesting at all. Ella attributes all this nonsense to her education and her school, Beltham, but Amanda admires her education and her school. This takes Ella back to the past. She remembers how Bessie used to say that her children must be ready for the new world. She, then, recalls the scene of Bessie's last illness, which unfolds her deep love for her children and her awareness of spoiling them. Bessie's idea of motherhood is contrary to that of Amanda, who thinks that she might feel bored with babies and would be a bad mother.

Chapter XXXVII offers another instance of Cary's artistic use of the flashback technique. Ella thinks of Amanda's pregnancy and remembers Bessie. She compares the two women, representing two ages, in regard to their concepts of responsibility towards children. Bessie stressed that a woman must necessarily be a successful mother and ought to make her children decent, cultured and happy. She criticized herself for being unfit to be a wife and mother on account of her selfish and pleasure-loving nature. The scene also informs us of Rose's concept of love. Speaking of

Groom, she remarked: "He understands love but not duty, and without duty love is only a sentiment."[1] Ella also recalls Rose's sense of responsibility for Amanda and the children of Bessie.

In the last chapter of the novel, the fight between the past and the present reaches its climax. The past, as shown through the recollections of Ella, offers a direct criticism of the present. Just at the beginning of the chapter, Ella is shocked by the corrupt, careless and defiant looks of Amanda, who has committed guilt but has not the moral sense and power to accept it. Her mind goes back to old days, and she sees in Bessie and Rose an antithesis of Amanda.

In short, the flashback is necessary for *The Moonlight.* It enables the novelist to achieve his aim of writing this novel, viz. the dramatic presentation of different views on sex, held by the women of two or three generations, so as to depict the working of the woman's creative imagination in the sphere of sex-life. With the help of this device, Cary succeeds in placing side by side the women of old and new generations, and in presenting simultaneously their conflicting attitudes towards sex. In the earlier part of the novel, he portrays various ideas of the old generation in a way which suggests an implicit criticism of the views on sex, held by the new generation. But as the story progresses, the indirect conflict between the women of old and new generations becomes frequently direct. Thus in the earlier part of the novel, Rose, Bessie and Ella--the representatives of the old generation--are shown in conflict with one another, and their views on sex, expressed through these conflicts, criticize implicitly the concept of sex, held by the new generation of Amanda, Kathy and others. Afterwards, the conflict between Iris and Rose--the two women belonging to two older generations--is depicted. And in the second half of the novel, the conflict between Rose, Bessie and Ella on the one hand and Amanda and Kathy on the other becomes more and more apparent. Rose, Bessie and Ella embody vigour, passion and imagination, where-as Amanda and Kathy are dull, cold and excessively intellectual. Similarly, the men of old generation like Mr. Venn, Groom, Geoffrey Tew and Ernest Cranage, whose lives are portrayed through the flashback, present a sharp contrast to the new generation represented by Robin and Harry, who regard love and marriage as only a matter of convenience and adjustment.

REFERENCES

[1] Morris Beja, *Film and Literature: An Introduction* (New York: Longman, 1979), p. XIII.

[2] The *Twentieth Century Novel* (Ludhiana: Lyall Book Depot, 1965), p. 360.

[3] Barbara Hardy, "Form in Joyce Cary's Novels", *Essays in Criticism*, Vol. IV (April, 1954), p. 183.

[4] "Joyce Cary", *Writers at work: The Paris Review Interviews* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1958), p. 54.

[5] *To be a Pilgrim* (Carfax Edition; London: Michael Joseph, 1959), p. 114.

[6] Ibid., p. 120.

[7] Ibid., p. 9.

[8] Ibid., p. 36.

[9] Ibid., p. 300.

[10] Ibid., p. 13.

[11] Ibid., p. 46.

[12] *The Moonlight* (Carfax Edition; London: Michael Joseph, 1959), p. 74.

[13] Ibid., p. 301.

VISUAL NARRATION : CINEMATIC PROJECTION IN ALICE WALKER'S *POSSESSING THE SECRET OF JOY*

Madhumalati Adhikari

Discovering appropriate strategies to communicate covert messages aesthetically constitutes one of the crucial concerns of the present day literary artist because the mounting complexities of life demand a technique capable of projecting the inner and outer hues of human existence adequately. The simple traditional method of narration has become ineffectual. This exigency has led to a search for evocative and visual/cinematic metaphors for a narrative strategy that would raise new meanings from the ashes of old presuppositions. Fortunately for the literary artists of today, the cinematic technique has extended the horizon for portraying the composite and heterogeneous feelings and experiences of life visualized from various angles. The newly established system through expansion, repetition and compression unveils the simultaneity, contrast and equivalency of events.[1] In fiction, the difference between *telling* and *showing* had been felt by various writers. The significance of the 'camera-eye' and 'focus' is enhanced and implemented by the modern literary artist.

Alice Walker in her different novels has employed the cinematic technique to project the integration and disintegration of individuals. One of the significant benefits of this technique is that it reveals and yet conceals facts as per the convenience of the expert writer/director. The complex means of interrogation and utterance in the novel also chart the subtle patterns for re-assessing the major ethical commitments founded on the drive to secure justice for women. This paper would scrutinize the application of the cinematic technique in *Possessing the Secret of Joy* and discover the advantages of visual inscription targeted to feature unarticulated human challenges.

Alice Walker's *Possessing the Secret of Joy* can be superficially labelled as a revenge novel, but it rises above the humdrum genre because of the permanent psychological and physical maiming of the female protagonist Tashi through the cruel and debasing African ritual of 'circumcision' or 'initiation' (117).[2] The fabric of Tashi's tragic tale is patterned by other motifs created by Adam her husband, Olivia her sister-in-law, Benny her retarded

son, Pierre, Adam's other son from Lisette and M'Lissa, the *tsunga* or the tribal midwife and a witch doctor. Varied integrated forces are specified through a fictional account that is visual. The novel consists of twenty chapters and each chapter presents the viewpoint of a single character expressed through a varying length of either five crisp lines (12) or five long pages (40-44). The positioning and the movement of the camera pans the 'thought picture' of a single character through his/her camera-eye to focus on a distinct field of vision that evokes specific emotional responses in the reader/viewer. Varied shots of the same event projected from the angle of either Tashi or Adam or Olivia, monitor the point of view of the reader. Repeated references to Tashi's crying by Tashi, Olivia, Adam and the village elders create a multidimensional picture, meanderingly retold in the tradition of black folk culture. The repetition, commonly used in cinematic technique, not only reinforces the emotive significance of the incident but also transforms it into a metaphor. The linear narrative, disrupted by different speakers, varies the version either to communicate the feeling of a series of pictures or to fill up the blanks in the story and offer conceptual wholeness. Olivia's first meeting with Tashi is engraved in her memory because she found that Tashi 'was the only person weeping. Yet she *uttered not a sound*' (7, emphasis added). The picture more visual than aural frames women's predicament in society wherein she is not permitted to articulate her misery. The village elders consciously overlook Tashi's sorrow, 'What little girl, Pastor? There is no little girl crying here' (8). Adam, present on the occasion, cannot remember Tashi's tears. His memory presents Tashi as always 'laughing' and 'flitting cheerfully' (14). It is another example of patriarchal callousness. Conflicting angles of vision turn into metaphors of oppression, violence and pain. Men disregard female suffering, and women, naturally, identify with gender-related agony.

The narration in the novel is generally monologic, but divergent voices interrupt and re-inscribe the story through *cinematic-cuts* and *transitions* that are introduced in separate chapters and sections of the novel. Walker in *Possessing* seldom uses *straight-cuts* that propel the action smoothly in a linear direction to further the plot; her preference is either for *cross-cuts* that focus on different events simultaneously or *contrast-cuts* that frame antithetical situations. The focus on the peaceful environment of Mizee's home is speedily shifted to the violent death of Dura, Tashi's sister, which, according to Tashi, was murder (78-81);

Olinkans rejoice and welcome the missionaries but Tashi remains overwhelmed by sorrow (8). The strategy plays a significant role in stationing the reader at a vantage point and enabling him to witness the scene, similar to cinema viewing. This grants credibility to the description. V.F. Perkins has rightly noted, 'The credibility of the movies comes...from our habit of placing more trust in the evidence of our eyes than in any other form of sens(ory) data' (62)[3]. Walker's narration through the characters positions the reader to visualize Tashi's fragmentation and re-generation. Her smothered voice is articulated through the visual action of stone-throwing at Pierre 'like Kali' (143) and her painting of a 'menacing and evil' cock (76-77). The translation of inner fury and fear into physical acts concretizes the abstract and makes it perceptible. The sudden shift from the present to the past, a time montage, is made conceivable through Tashi's rememory. The white psychiatrist's leading questions regarding her mother bring back the images of 'furrowed brow' (19) and the official story of her birth (20).

In movies, the opening scene is normally presented through the *establishing shot*, a long range view that allows the viewer a territorial framework in which they come to understand subsequent action. The first shot in the *Possessing* focuses on the image of death. It is followed by a metaphorical framework that narrates the mythical story of Baba a panther, his wife Lara and his co-wife Lala. Despised and ignored by her husband, Lara learns to love herself. Her self-confidence makes her beautiful; she regains her husband's affection. This becomes the cause of conflict between Baba and his co-wife Lala. Unable to stand the friction, Lara happily dies by drowning herself. The triangle of love in the myth enables the reader to understand the subsequent action and the theme. In the novel, Tashi, Adam and Lisette form the three points of the triangle. M'Lissa, the evil factor, is peripheral to the central theme and yet the extraneous evil vitiates Tashi's life which in turn eclipses the happiness of every character closely connected with Tashi. Thus, the story is about Tashi's metaphorical death, metaphorical regeneration and physical death through the firing squad. She dies a martyr's death. The initiatory myth establishes the dominant motif and it is not the only one that Walker employs, but, like Toni Morrison, she creates many myths associated with love-making. circumcision, making of a *tsunga* and the death of a *tsunga*. Through the formation of myths, Walker relates and establishes new images of the inner and the outer

world.

The first narrated myth, very visual in quality, explains indirectly how in socio-cultural context women's exploitation through desertion takes place. But it need not be always fragmenting; it can be a means to attain wholeness and self-awareness. Tashi's issues and ideologies are clearly embedded in the myth and these become tranparent at the close of the novel. Man's myth-making abilities, says Richard Chase, suffuse 'the natural with preternatural force towards certain ends by capturing the impersonal forces of the world and directing them towards the fulfillment of certain needs.'[4] Walker creates the new myth to project Tashi's isolation, longing for love, and finally her victory over the debilitating feeling through self-love. The new perception of reality with its cathartic value enables her to purge her feelings of deprivation. The myth concretizes Tashi's psychological predicament and the view is open to all types of interpretations. Rightly, Parker Tyler, an American novelist and a film maker, has commented that a film exists somewhere between what a film maker makes and a filmgoer sees. Literary texts also follow the same pattern as scenes and visuals created in the text energize various mental images and emotional reactions in the reader.

Dream and daydream sequences in films/texts, an oft-repeated strategy, provide to a viewer/reader insights that enable him to make forays into the conscious and the unconscious world of the character. It frequently transforms into a symbol and an indicator of subsequent action. In other words, it plays a significant role in maintaining the progress of causality. In *Possessing*, the Tower of Tashi's dream, and her entrapped presence there-in with broken wings (26) initially expose and concretise her fears of sexual oppression and confinement. The Tower, Pierre explains, represents the termite tower and Tashi, like the termite queen, is imprisoned in it. She is 'expected to reproduce as helplessly and inertly as a white ant' (277) She is the symbol of blind procreation where her will has no meaning. The theme of female oppression and protest would have remained vague, had it not been visually inscribed and reinforced through the tower and the writing on the banner, RESISTANCE IS THE SECRET OF JOY (279). The image of the Tower is introduced very early in the novel and repeated several times to give momentum to the action. Imitating the cinematic technique of '*freeze framing*,' the Tower is projected by Walker from a precise photographic angle of vision

that begins with a long-shot of hut-like structures (224) and then the shot is violently disrupted by a close-up that frames the termite colony (226). The motivation of such a narration is to reduce the distance between the reader and the text.

Alice Walker in most of the chapters relocates the rendering of facts by shifting between *close-ups* and *long-shots*. The journeys down the memory lane of Tashi, Adam, Olivia, presented through *flashbacks*, often begin in the present with a close-up view like the doctor's clinic (18) or the court room (35). Not for long, Walker lingers on the close-up details but swiftly passes on to a long-shot spanning the location of the rooms either with medical or judicial ambience. It shifts again, disrupting time to record Tashi's mother's furrowed brow, her tattered clothes, rough feet, the razor that Tashi had bought to kill M'Lissa, the old man Mizee and the calm and serene peaks of the Alps. The reason for using the close-ups and the long-shots is to show the dumb objects that live with us and whose fate is bound up with our own (55).[5]

The traditional method of reporting is indicated by the use of inverted commas, but interestingly enough, Walker has rejected the system. Thoughts and actions flow on freely; characters surge forward with their uninterrupted version that brings it closer to a visual form of narration, commonly used in cinemas. The voice of the narrator always in the first person (be it Tashi's, Olivia's or Adam's) achieves the quality of multiple view-point that lends to the event a feeling of *synchronicity*,[6] a much favoured device of the cinematic technique. The trauma of circumcision viewed by Tashi, Olivia, Adam and even M'Lissa has metaphorical similarity but varied dramatic representation. This offers diverse perspectives to the reader.

The quality of a film radically alters with the expertise of the cinematographer. His decision of connecting or disconnecting shots (known as *editing*) can either make or break a film. This technique, very often manipulated by the modern fiction writer, allows the reader to compare the affinities and contradictions of isolated events interlinked by the conscious will of the author. Walker, adept at editing, begins with Olivia's version of Tashi's weeping (6), leaves it incomplete and jumps to focus on Adam's narration (13-14). But soon she abandons it also to pick up the strands of Tashi's reporting (15). Vsevlod Pudovkin defines it as 'relational editing', a process which 'relates separate scenes and

even separate shots of the scenes to one another, thus, as it were forcing the spectator (reader) to compare the two actions all the time, one strengthening the other' (125).[7] Through this very strategy, Tashi's meeting with three different psychiatrists, two white and one black, in three different scenes (18, 70-73, 113-121) is compared to establish the difference.

The movement in the novel, non-linear in nature, bounces from one action, character, scene to another action, character and scene. Alice Walker, like Toni Morrison, employs the filmic technique of the *jump-cut* or discontinuous editing to achieve a sense of 'discomfort, disorientation, disharmony, and confusion' in her characters communicable to the reader to ensure the projection of a hostile environment. The dislocation of time and space deconstructs all that is familiar. The court room drama (35-39) reproduces before the reader different cuts of time and facts: the first projects the rough cross-examination of Tashi by a black advocate and her confession of buying three razors to kill M'Lissa; the second cut in the same scene is about the benign white psychiatrist Mizee and his beautiful razor that had caught Tashi's attention; the third begins with a long-shot, an aerial view of Switzerland, its natural beauty and Tashi's arrival at Schmerikon; and the final shot captures the picture of Tashi and Adam as two tired tourists. The first shot, rough in nature, gradually melts into a picture that is mellow in essence. The jump-cuts metaphorically narrate Tashi's life story.

Metaphorical dissolve, a filmic technique that synthesizes two images or actions by their implied meaning,[8] is repeatedly employed by Walker to emphasize certain dominant perceptions. Tashi's dread of the Tower erupts from its visual similarity with the shape of the male *genitalis* and its inherent implications. It had become the painful cause of her physical and psychological circumcision. In the short chapter after the birth of Benny, Tashi's retarded son, varied images are presented:

> I [Tashi] felt as if there was a loud noise of something shattering on the hard floor, there between me and Adam and our baby and the doctor. But there was only a ringing silence which seemed oddly, after a moment like the screaming of monkeys (58).

The shattering noise of broken relationships dissolves into a 'ringing silence' and this again melts into the babble of 'screaming monkeys.' The realization of emotional distancing from Adam and

the world, in general, concretizes discordant and irreconciLable sounds and feelings.

In the prison scene, Walker organizes *substitute images* to enhance the dramatic quality of the scene and to make a statement that is ironic in nature. A substitute cut is always metaphorically related to the initial shot either positively or negatively. In Tashi's detention cell (255) and the AIDS cell, the presence of Death is tangible. But the irony lies in the fact that a healthy individual lies condemned by man-made laws and fatally diseased humans are nursed carefully, even though nature has sentenced them to death. For all of them 'death is easier than life, as pregnancy is easier than birth' (249). By inverting the truth, Walker magnifies the tragedy of life. Juxtaposing of two shots with their affinity and contrariety enlarges the scope of perception and clearly frames the essentials.

The positioning of the camera providing a *bird's eye view* or *low angle shot* varies the meaning of the representation. The bird's eye view gives a privileged position to the onlooker, literally and figuratively, by allowing him/her to look down on the other individual with an implied attitude of condescension or accusation.[9] The scene of Tashi's departure from the Olinkan village illustrates the technique distinctly. Tashi, sitting 'astride on a donkey in the pose of a chief, a warrior' (22), looks down on Olivia, and Olivia standing on the ground level is dwarfed as she views Tashi through a low angle shot. Walker expertly alternates the angle to project the attitude and the psychology of Tashi and Olivia.

Alice Walker in *Possessing the Secret of Joy*, through the use of the cinematic technique, bridges the distance between the past and the present, various geographic locations travelled by mind and body, and the emotional relationships, essential for our existence and initiated by compatible and incompatible fellow beings. The questing journey of the protagonist is converted into a three-dimensional and universal picture of Man. The reader is made a permanent witness to the haunting relevant questions asked by Alice Walker through mirroring images that make 'seeing' possible. The community of readers re-discover the meaning of 'possessing the secret of joy' by looking into their own lives via Tashi's. The cinematic representations in the novel translate abstract experiences into concrete and the narrated events into visible facts.

REFERENCES

[1] J.A. Cuddon, *A Dictionary of Literary Terms* (London: Penguin Books, 1982), p.46.

[2] Alice Walker, *Possessing the Secret of Joy* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992). All textual references are from this edition.

[3] V.F. Perkins, 'Form and Discipline,' *Film as Film: Understanding and Judging Movies* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1972), pp.59-70.

[4] Richard Chase, *Quest for Myth* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1949), pp.69-74.

[5] Bella Balazs, 'the Close-up' *The Theory of the Film*, trans. Edith Bone (New York: Roy, 1953), pp.52-59.

[6] Cuddon, p. 50.

[7] Vsevolod Pudovkin, 'From Film Technique,' *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, Ed. Gerald Mast, Marshall Cohen and Leo Braudy (New York: Oxford UP, 1992), pp.121-126.

[8] Cuddon, p. 52.

[9] Cuddon, p. 51.

[10] Cuddon, p. 51.

THE GUIDE: THE NOVEL AND THE FILM

O. P. Mathur

> A good film adaptation of a novel will not be judged because of systemic resemblance with the novel.... In an adaptation the story must be the same..., but the narrative units simply cannot be produced equally in two different means of expression.[1]

Literature and the common media, especially journalism, had already been undergoing a process of overlapping and interaction, but the invention of motion pictures, radio and then of television has brought about a qualitative change in this process. Cinema, going far beyond the replication of stage drama on account of its having drawn generously upon various arts like photography and music, has achieved extraordinary enrichment and unlimited freedom and has become "the Tenth Muse"[2], "the finest of the fine arts".[3] With its ability to present numerous types of characters, scenery and motifs in all their realistic details, trick photography, speedy threading together of scenes, both long and short, ensuring a continuity of emotional response from the spectators, effective dramatization of flashbacks, interiorization of soliloquies and monologues, artistic manipulation of distancing, speed of action and the flux of time, handling of songs and dances of all types amidst varieties of environment, all made to impinge upon the viewer's consciousness by background music, cinema seems to have reached the ultimate among the audio-visual arts.

In fiction perception is received through an entirely different channel--the printed page--which acts as the palimpsest for all that the cinema presents and possibly more, with the additional advantage that the reader can stop at any point for better understanding and absorption, move back and forward, or even skip over a few portions, while the average spectator of a film is bound to the projection of the relentless unwinding of the reel. Both cinema and fiction seek to tell a story, long or short, external or internal, and arouse the reader's feelings, imagination or thought. But while the film does it through the stimuli of the eye and the ear, fiction achieves it by activating his imagination through reading, and the best of fiction often goes beyond it by sharpening his awareness of the human situation, of his environment and of suggesting solutions of his various social, economic, emotional or metaphysical problems and dilemmas or sometimes by leaving him to find his own way out of the labyrinth. In other words, while the world

of the novelist is transferred from the writer's mind into the reader's with as much or as little approximation as possible, the world of the cinema is literally seen and heard: it exists on the screen for a period of time. As George Bluestone puts it, "Where the novel discourses, the film must picture".[4] In fiction this sense-perception is replaced by mind-to-mind communication, direct "showing" by "telling".

Their codes of communication being so different, the 'reconstruction' of a novel into a film involves a great deal of 'deconstructive' activity--cutting, compressing, enlarging, twisting, transplantation and much plastic surgery of various types--culminating into everything being put into dialogue, gesture, wordless action, suggestive scenery, songs, music, etc. All this adaptation must be geared towards some clearly conceptualized objective.

Though a large number of Indian novels in Hindi and regional languages had been "filmized",[5] the present writer is aware of only a few such cases among Indian English novels (novels of Jhabvala excepted, for she no longer belongs to India). The recent film versions of Upamanyu Chatterjee's *English August* and Shashi Tharoor's *Show Business* are hardly available in India. Raja Rao's *Kanthapura* was made to represent the Gandhian movement in the T. V. Serial based on Nehru's *Discovery of India*. It was a faithful and powerful version because the objectives of the novelist and the serial director coincided. R.K. Narayan's own *Mr. Sampath* was made memorable by Motilal's inimitable acting.

The film *Guide* (directed by Tad Danielewski in English and by Vijay Anand in Hindi) is not so much a version as a 'conversion' of R. K. Narayan's famous novel. The reasons for this are twofold. One is, of course, the desire of the director to make of it an extravaganza to be shown simultaneously in two thousand theatres in U.S.A. and so to make big money out of it.

The second reason is equally important. R. K. Narayan's novels in general have a slow, tranquil movement,[6] deep undertones of irony, ambiguities of action, ambivalence of characterization, toning down of much that is dramatic, social density and subtlety of underlying perspectives and messages. Perhaps most of these characteristics could have been made to cross over into a film but not of the kind that the director had in mind for which much had to be ignored, twisted, added and compressed and the spectacular specially created or highlighted.

Many of the numerous minor points of difference between the novel and the film are dictated by the routine necessities of cinematic production. Thus the encapsulation of Raju's early career into a brief flashback and Rosie's explanation to Raju's mother and the brevity of treatment of events like the gradual acceptance of the role of a swami are quite justified. To the same class belong changes in the names of places and persons arising from the shifting of the locale from the south to the north (from Mangal to Rampur and Velan to Bhola) and the bringing in of a village with the suggestive name of Anjanpur (अनजानपुर) and of Mani as Raju's assistant. But there are quite a few other changes which are far more important and not so well justified.

R. K. Narayan has given a rather simplistic and incomplete explanation of 'the eternal triangle' which forms the infra-structure of both the novel and the film: "In my story the dancer's husband is a pre-occupied archaeologist who has no time or inclination for marital life and is not interested in her artistic aspirations. Raju the guide exploits the situation and weans her away from her husband. That is all there is to it--in my story".[7]

In fact, there is much complexity in the motivations and reactions of the three major characters--Raju, Rosie and Marco. In the film the minor characters have been left largely untouched. Raju's drinking bouts and gambling have been dramatised and his too possessive love of Rosie also clearly highlighted by his not allowing Marco to meet her even once in spite of his personal visits. Rosie, treated in a more favourable light, yields to Raju only after she is made to 'discover' that Marco is a womanizer. Though deeply hurt by Raju's perfidy, her love for him remains unabated and she in made to visit the fasting Raju and, on his death, to apply the dust of his feet on the parting of her hair. But poor Marco is made to suffer for the glorification of Rosie. In the novel he is a scholar and not a womanizer. Though he commits the mistakes of marrying Rosie, of neglecting her and of entrusting her to the care of an attractive young man like Raju, he is no villain; and his 'fatal flaws', those of being too liberal in his choice of a wife and his being too trustful, are almost virtues. His real mistake is being too rigid in not accepting Rosie's entreaties for pardon, though he makes overtures for a compromise, which prove to be too late for, though Rosie left to herself might have relented, she is now under Raju's control. Marco is generous enough even to acknowledge in his book the help of his wife's seducer for the assistance rendered

by him. All the three major characters are complex and, to a certain extent, bundles of contradictions and they often appear to be victims of the irony of circumstances. The director could perhaps have sincerely attempted to put the blame for their destinies on these expiating factors and not taken the path of least resistance of justifying Rosie at the expense of Marco who in the film becomes the undeserving victim of the director's search for a stylized villain. R. K. Narayan rightly commented, "That was the point at which I lamented most...."[9]

But perhaps the novelist was not so much justified in his lamentation on another point--the director's obliteration of Malgudi, the novelist's favourite locale of all his novels and stories, which he has portrayed so lovingly in its geographical details, cultural density and socio-economic development from novel to novel with the gradual percolation of modernity. The shifting of the locale to Udaipur, a beautiful lake-city of Rajasthan, was probably done to ensure the availability of every type of scenery in and around one place--palaces, hills, caves, old market-places, lakes and some sort of a desert for a camel-ride. As mentioned by R. K. Narayan in his essay "Misguided Guide", the director's team went over a large number of places in India and finally decided on Udaipur. The American director's decision must have been a well-considered one, for as the author was told, "Please remember that we are shooting, for the first time in India, in wide screen and Eastman color, and we must shoot where there is spectacle."[9] Later the director declared, "There is no Malgudi, and that is all there is to it."[10] To support his decision he argued that "they could as well have planned a picture for black and white and narrow screen if all one wanted was what he contempuously termed a 'Festival Film', while he was planning a million-dollar spectacle to open simultaneously in 2,000 theatres in America."[11] R. K. Narayan's Malgudi is a quiet little town which, being his own creation, was dear to his heart, and so he resented its total exclusion. But its atmosphere is likely to break through and escape from the large screen of a spectacular film. It really belongs either to the pages of a book to be read at leisure or to a sort of tele-film or a film meant for a select audience which can appreciate its subtleties and nuances. The director was therefore right in his own way, for in his film he was aiming at a grand spectacular extravaganza and not at the portrayal of small-town country life which would hardly have been a viable financial proposition as far as he could foresee. He could have chosen Mysore, but again that would not have been R. K.

Narayan's Malgudi. So the director was for his own purpose justified in shifting the locale to a picturesque town like Udaipur which could provide every type of scenery that the novel and the film required and much more, and R. K. Narayan's unhappiness was more subjective, based on his love for the object of his own creation like Keats's sympathy for the imaginary empty town in his 'Ode on a Grecian urn' or like Hardy's for Wessex or Arnold Bennett's for Five Towns or James Joyce's for Dublin, and numerous other such attachments. R. K. Narayan was shocked at the blotting out of Malgudi without the air of which he must have thought that the film would have been asphyxiated forgetting that the novel and the film are two different genres with different objectives and requirements.

In fact, the director was also justified in quite a few other things that he did to the novel. To R. K. Narayan's complaints he replied "I have only exteriorized what you have expressed. It is all in your book."[12] The statement, though somewhat exaggerated, is basically true, for the ambiguities, ironies and suggested profundities of a Narayan novel have got to be simplified and made more explicit in a film. The director has filled in the skeleton of the story of *The Guide* with flesh and blood transforming it into a sumptuous feast for the eye, not without suggestions of depth and meaning, in the language of cinema. R. K. Narayan's novel is a story occasionally hinting at symbolic events like the snake-dance or the contrasted attitude of Marco towards the stone erotica and towards the charming Rosie in flesh and blood. In addition to these, the director has created many other visual symbols for an effective expression of certain situations and emotions of characters-- Anjanpur (अनजानपुर) and its unknown lands and people (Raju's facing the world alone and on his own after his release); the sunrise after Rosie's regaining consciousness after the spell of unconsciousness caused by her attempt at suicide (beginning of a new life for Rosie and the dawn of love between her and Raju); the uninhibited camel-ride to the fort of Chittorgarh (the lovers' enjoyment of the feeling of having broken the shackles of marriage and bursting into a land of freedom symbolised by the immortal fort with its phoenix-like renewal of life); Raju and Rosie separated by stone pillars in the cave (their being separated by rigid social restrictions); the vast backgrounds of mountains, skies and clouds against which Raju loiters singing his love-song and the charm of nodding flowers when the lovers are together (the universe with all its vastness and glory against which the eternal drama of love is enacted); scenes of long

spreading sheets of water and of labyrinthine forests (Raju's feeling of utter and unfathomable loneliness and confusion after his mother's departure); Raju's attempt to escape from the fishing nets (his getting inextricably entangled in the results of his own actions); pillars of black stone (pointers to Raju's approaching death); Raju's noticing a beam of light coming through a hole (his receiving enlightenment); and Rosie's applying the dust of dead Raju's feet on the parting of her hair (the Indian concept of love like that of Savitri which refuses to recognize death as the end of love).

A novelist has enough time for verbal exteriorization of his characters, situations, emotional reactions and mental cogitations. They can partially be voiced through dialogues or dramatized through action, gestures, etc. For the verbal expression of deeper emotions or dilemmas, the director has a few audio-visual devices, the most important of them being songs and symbols which the director of the film *Guide* has used with sensitivity. The enveloping melodies of *Guide* are means of heart-to-heart communication between the characters and the spectators, and the film will long be remembered for the lyrical beauty and the appropriateness of its songs which give expression to the otherwise inexpressible emotions of the characters at almost all important turns of events--Raju's existential situation of belonging nowhere after his release from prison ("यहाँ कौन है तेरा मुसाफिर, जाएगा कहाँ...."), the gradually deepening love of Rosie for Raju against changing magnificent backdrops and increasing troupe of dancers and also her quick rise in the world of dance under the supervision of Raju to whom she has blindly entrusted her everything, completely lost in the world of art (the long musical and spectacular extravaganza of "पिया तोसे नैना लागे रे...."); Raju's increasingly coming under the enticement of Rosie's love ("तेरे मेरे सपने अब एक रंग है...." and "गाता रहे मेरा दिल, तू ही मेरी मंजिल...."); his growing loneliness after his noticing Rosie's resentment towards him ("दिन ढल जाये हाय रात न जाय...."); Rosie's disillusionment at Raju's perfidy and dishonesty ("भोसे छल किये जाय, हाय रे हाय, देखो सैयाँ बेईमान...तेरे मेरे दिल के बीच अब तो सदियों के फासले हैं, यह याद होगा किसे कि हम एक राह चले हैं...."); and the implied celebration of the final merger of the highly individualistic Raju with the spirit of the community ("अल्ला मेघा दे। रामा मेघा दे पानी दे...." and "हे राम हे हे राम, राधे श्याम राधेश्याम...."). R. K. Narayan, with his characteristic simplicity, often leaves it to the reader to imagine the feelings and dilemmas of characters. Here is Rosie's suppressed reaction to Raju's revealing to her the news of his impending arrest:

"She listened to me as if I had been addressing a stone pillar. Even now I can recollect her bewildered, stunned, expression as she tried to comprehend the situation. I thought she would break down.... She merely said, 'I felt all along you were not doing right things. This is *Karma*. What can we do?'"[13]

The director has clearly and lyrically brought out Rosie's reaction in the song mentioned above, which is on a level that can touch the average spectator. Similarly, Raju's dilemma about the continuance of the fast, the sprightliness he has on the fourth day of the fast and his "peculiar floating feeling"[14] have been dramatized by the director for the average viewer through the medium of Indian philosophy in two 'floating' Rajus debating about the basic problems of life and death. For the film-going audience of all intellectual standards this is far more comprehensible and effective than the novelist's words, however suggestive they may be for the reader. The dilemma has been effectively transferred from the fictional code to the cinematic.

The film director has used other devices too to bring out or re-interpret the characters and events of the novel or even add to them by introducing new incidents--Rosie and Raju's mother both coming together to the prison-gate to receive Raju on the scheduled date of his release (showing that though they have developed some sort of working relationship, they have not been fully reconciled, which they do later after Raju's death); Raju's mother wondering why Rosie married Marco at all (providing the director an opportunity to show their early lives in a flashback); the huge dancing troupe formed by Rosie (providing rich and varied spectacle and also bringing out first Raju's and later Rosie's own organizational ability in addition to her artistic talent); Rosie's attempted suicide and Raju's saving her from frustration not only by his love but also by his preaching feminine independence (Rosie's gradual shaking off the chains which bind her to Marco and the frustration caused to her by his evil contours mapped by the director); Marco's two attempts to see Rosie both obstructed by Raju (emphasising Raju's possessive love of Rosie); the coming of Raju's mother and Rosie together to have a 'darshan' of the fasting 'hermit' and incidentally witnessing his release, this time from the bondage of life, and the sorrowful and somewhat philosophical reconciliation of both after what his mother considers to be his 'self-sacrifice' (by these visits which are quite natural, for both did not live very far away, the director completes the circles

of Raju's two entanglements and releases of different kinds and also focusses attention on the effect that Raju's sacrifice creates on his mother and also presumably on the spectators -- "calm of mind, all passion spent").

In all these respects--the use of symbols and songs and the introduction of new scenes--the director has made the story of the novel more effectively and impressively presentable on the screen within the time-frame of three hours, espicially the presentation of a certain amount of ambiguity in Raju's 'voluntary' decision to continue the fast in all faith and sincerity and his dilemma whether it will actually rain or his death will be a fruitless 'sacrifice'. Raju's dilemma, which is largely implied or hinted at but briefly in the novel, has been splendidly exteriorized in the film by flashing on the screen two Rajus successively and repeatedly debating the eternity of the soul, as preached in the Gita and the spirit of God pervading the whole universe. This scene, along with the songs, could have been highly appealing to the audiences, thus becoming one of the major factors behind the film's success. In all these and other similar modifications and additions the director has been successful in making a film in which, to appropriate the phrase of George Bluestone, "the verbal limitations of non-verbal experience"[5] have been transcended in a work of art which is true both to the kindred points of film and literature. There does seem to be an element of truth in what the director Tad Danielewski told R. K. Narayan, that he had only exteriorized what was already there in the novel.

But a regrettable exception must be mentioned here--one in which the director seems to pander to the likes and dislikes of the average spectator. That is the 'happy' ending of the novel in the torrential rain, the consummation of Raju's fast. In the novel Raju's quietly slipping out of life is suggested while he is stepping into the river for his morning bath--an ideal death, for a bright shaft of sunlight symbolically illumines the surroundings, almost like an angel's ladder for Raju to climb up to Heaven. The bright dawn and the morning sun can be interpreted as the dawn of Raju's heavenly life. It could have been a wonderful opportunity for the director to show the effulgence of spiritual salvation making worldly tragedy an object of celebration as it is at the end of T. S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral*. But the director has missed the opportunity and has made Raju's end, what R. K. Narayan calls with understandable exaggeration, "harrowing"[6]. Moreover, in the novel there is hardly any indication of the rain except in Raju's own dying words,

possibly the result of his own wishful hallucination, "Velan, it's raining in the hills. I can feel it coming up under my feet, up my legs".[17] Obviously, the rain in the hills cannot come up Raju's feet or legs: the sensation of cold that Raju feels creeping up is indicative of his approaching end, any real rain having already been belied by the novelist's own mention of the bright sunshine. The ending manipulated in the film may be populist, but it is unrealistic, it does not flow from the novel, and it is hardly a fitting consummation of Raju's whole life as a guide. His death as presented in the film brings a sort of reward for the villagers, while his death without the rain would have guided them into the mystery of self-sacrifice and the acceptance of divine dispensation. Like Christ or Gandhi, saints and prophets of God teach the common people by their words and their conduct in life: they hardly reward them in their deaths. Thus this one material change made by the director has effectively buried under torrents of currency notes the sophisticated and symbolic ending of the novel though it could not have been beyond the capability of the director to make it create with all the resources of the camera a mesmeric effect on the silver screen.

The film *Guide*, on the whole, is an excellent example of how a director can produce from a great novel a meaningful and popular film, retaining and at places highlighting from the novel some of the essentials of Indian life and philosophy, a meaningful and popular film by keeping fairly close to the story and yet altering or re-interpreting the characters and incidents as he thought necessary in the light of the requirements of the cinematic production and also adding haunting melodies, spectacular dances and visual symbols. The total exclusion of Malgudi may perhaps be justified though successful films have been made on rural life. But it is a pity that the director did not apply his mind sufficiently so as to attribute the fall of Rosie into Raju's embrace not to the imaginary villainy of Marco but to the irony of events and also to retain the quiet and radiant ending by relegating the rain to the dying Raju's hallucination and not try to impose a populist ending.

However, as it is, the film *Guide* and the novel are two independent creations and R. K. Narayan in desperation had to train himself "to give up all attempts to connect the film with the book of which I happened to be the author".[18] This is the statement of an aggrieved novelist who could not reconcile himself to the director's alterations, though not all defensible, made in the novel for the film. Both are great works of art in their respective genres.

Still the novel scores over the film which has perhaps already met the ultimate destiny of all such 'greats', that of being submerged under the deluge of new films catering to the ever-changing tastes of the public. The plays of Shakespeare will last longer than their film versions which keep superseding one another. The same is true of films made on great novels. The film *Guide* too is now rarely revived, though it lives largely by its lyrical melodies, while R. K. Narayan's novel, brought out earlier than the film, continues, and will continue, to be read and enjoyed for generations to come.

REFERENCES

[1] Gaston Roberge, *The Subject of Cinema* (Calcutta: Seagull Books, 1990), p. 210.

[2] Anthony Asquith, Quoted by P. V. Rajamannar, "The Film as a Fine Art" in *Film Seminar Report* (New Delhi: Sahitya Natak Akademi, 1955), p. 18.

[3] Extract from *The Indian Express* in *Film Seminar Report*, *op. cit.*, Appendices, p. XV.

[4] George Bluestone, "Film, Theater and Literature" in Gerald Mast & Marshall Cohen, *Film Theory and Criticism* (New York: O.U.P., 1974), p. 292.

[5] The word has been used in K. A. Abbas, "The Importance and Significance of a Good Film Story--Its Power with the Masses" in *Film Saminar Report*, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

[6] R. K. Narayan himself points out one such ambiguity--the ending of the novel--in his essay "The Writerly Life" in his *A Writer's Nightmare* (New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1988).

[7] R. K. Narayan, "Misguided 'Guide'" in *A Writer's Nightmare*, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 210.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

[13] R. K. Narayan, *The Guide* (Mysore: Indian Thought Publications, 1971 edition), p. 193.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

[15] George Bluestone, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

[16] R. K. Narayan, *A Writer's Nightmare*, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

[17] R. K. Narayan, *The Guide*, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

[18] R. K. Narayan, *A Writer's Nightmare*, p. 213.

HOLLYWOOD AND F. SCOTT FITZGERALD

Attia Abid

From 1896 to 1946 movies were the most popular and influential medium of culture in the USA. Edison had predicted that moving pictures would provide home entertainment for families of wealth but the working class men and women took hungrily to them and by their nickels turned an instrument of science and amusement into the first mass entertainment medium. These were critical years of change in the social structure of American life, and a new social order was emerging in the modern industrial city. However, their advent posed a challenge to existing cultural policies and institutions. Movies need to be looked at as an art form, and an influence on other arts. They must be understood in their larger sense as a mass medium and cultural communication. For that, the organisation and business tactics of the movie trade, the social and professional lives of movie workers, must be examined among other things beside a handful or major Directors, a few classic films and even a great inchoate mass of movies. Robert Sklar says: "Movies have historically been and still remain vital components in the network of cultural communication, and the nature of their content and control helps to shape the character and direction of American culture as a whole."[1] It is said that while writing is a solitary art, movies are collaborative. Their power was shaped by many factors and it must not be forgotten that they were controlled by men who did not share ethnic or religious backgrounds. Thus their entire history has been dominated by struggles at many fronts, sometimes negating the apparent advantage enjoyed by men who otherwise adhered to the proper capitalist values and conservative political beliefs.

By 1930 moviemakers came to be regarded by newspapers and magazines with considerably more respect, awe, and even envy, as the possessors of power to create the nation's myths and dreams. Writers began acknowledging that movies had taken over cultural functions they themselves had once exercised or aspired to exercise. "Dreams hung in fragments at the far end of the room, suffered analysis, passed...to be dreams in crowds, or else discarded."[2] There had never been a totally uniform cultural expression in the USA. There had always been schisms and struggles, alternatives and counter-views, but the combatants had come from similar backgrounds and utilised either the written or spoken

medium. The vision had been thus imparted by the clergy, statesmen, educators, businessmen, essayists, poets and novelists. Now there was a total transformation. People like David Selznick, Darryl Zanuck and Irving Thalberg shifted Hollywood's style toward dignified, elevated, respectable pictures set in the past and usually drawn from classics or current bestsellers. Famous novels and historical themes lent themselves to big-budget treatment as well. Unlike the earlier movie-makers, the immigrant furriers, haberdashers and glovemakers, this second generation was more deeply entwined with the values not of the marketplace but traditional American culture. They were like Lincoln, men of humble origins whose power at a certain moment gave them responsibility over the nation's destiny.

They saw themselves as eighteenth-century gentlemen, Jefferson's natural aristocrats, leaders of their culture, through their talent, and earned wealth. The movie-makers of the '30s were aware, in a sophisticated way, of their myth-making powers, responsibilities and opportunities. The Depression had shaken some of the strongest and oldest of American cultural myths, particularly the middle-class homilies about the virtues of deferred gratification, and the assurance that hard work and perseverance would bring success. The historian, Warren Susman, has pointed out that this loss of cultural certitudes created a mood of self-reproach and a sense of foreboding about the future. In the face of Nazi Germany, democratic ideals and traditional American myths seemed political weaknesses. Thus it seemed almost a patriotic duty to revitalise and refashion cultural mythology, and re-cement foundations of public morale. This goal was not lost on Directors and Producers who were becoming skillful in communicating their messages with subtle nuances beneath the surface of overt content. When they discovered the Hollywood dream-machine, writers like Scott Fitzgerald must have echoed Keats: "Then felt I like some watcher of the skies/When a new planet swims into his ken."[3] However, with wonder there was also loss because producers had usurped their ability to command the attention and allegiance of a larger public, and also the fact that movie-making was too costly, too single-minded in its quest for profits, and therefore too narrowly conceived to permit deviation from familiar cultural norms. Dos Passos complained that according to statistical surveys of literacy, it was staggering to know that the number of Americans capable of reading a page was rapidly on the decrease. "The old standards just don't ring true to the quicker minds of this

unstable country....Intelligent men...In the enthusiasm of youth decided to set themselves up as writers....It is natural that they should turn to the easy demands of the popular market, and to that fame which if it is admittedly not deathless is at least ladled out publicly and with a trowel."[4] However, Hollywood's contribution to American culture was essentially one of affirmation, though some have called it escapist. The French critic, Roland Barthes, was of the opinion that these "collective representations...transformed petit-bourgeoise culture into a universal nature." Because the '30s were the first fully conscious era of cultural myth-making, they have been called the "golden ages" of Hollywood movies.

A lot has been written about Hollywood including the rise of political activism there, wartime union conflicts, blacklisting and so on. Autobiographies of actors and actresses provide insight into the tinsel town and miracles. But novels are few: Nathaniel West's *Day of The Locust*, Scott Fitzgerald's *The Last Tycoon*, Budd Schulsberg's *What Makes Sammy Run* and *The Disenchanted* and Sheilah Graham's *The Beloved Infidel*. It is said that no very good American writer had ever taken movies seriously enough. Dos Passos in *The Big Money* caricatured and mauled Josef Von Sternberg. Fitzgerald did something deeper and more enduring: "Out of the very heart of the American dream, at the topmost pinnacle of American success, he plucked an alien, a 'mere producer', and gave him back to us as one who might have been with White-Jacket and Huck Finn, Lambert Strether and Sister Carrie."[5] The reference is to Monroe Stahr, the hero of *The Last Tycoon*, the prime-mover of a Hollywood picture studio who is treated better than such characters have been treated in stories since Dreiser and Norris. He is described with intimacy and datachment, and there's no trace of envy or adulation in the picture. He writes as an equal would about a man he knows and understands. A frame of reference is established taking into purview the Hollywood magnate, the workers on the lot and the people in the dusty sun-scorched bungalows of Los Angeles. Earlier in his chronicles of the Jazz Age, Fitzgerald had referred to such "odorous aliens", men who had moved up from the impoverished masses "swarming like rats, chattering like apes, smelling like all hell...monkeys."[6] However, establishment of a frame of reference for common humanity has been the main achievement and is considered great. Dos Passos felt that Hollywood was the most important and difficult subject to be dealt with in those times, and Fitzgerald managed to invent a set of people seen really in the

round instead of lit by an envious spotlight from above or below. "He was even able to invest with some dignity the pimp and pander aspects of Hollywood."[7]

In 1926 the Fitzgeralds decided to return to America from Europe. Their morale was shaken, Zelda was ill, and their money was running out. They wanted to settle down and lead an orderly life. John Considine of United Arts asked Fitzgerald to do a "fine modern college story..,one of the hectic flapper comedies" for Constance Talmadge. They badly needed the money so he agreed to go for $ 3500 down and $ 8500 on acceptance of the story. He thus got an opportunity to go to Hollywood and learn the movie business. But they were delayed because he felt he had appendix. However, they were given a grand welcome in Los Angeles, renewed old friendships and made new ones. They found themselves part of a congenial group, and the famous actress, Lois Moran, made him have a screen test hoping he might be her leading man. He was 30 and she 20. He was fascinated by her youth, beauty and innocence. There was a whirl of parties, night clubs and practical jokes. He himself admitted years later: "I had been generally acknowledged for several years as the top American writer both seriously and, as prices went, popularly.I...was confident to the point of conceit. Hollywood made a big fuss over us and the ladies all looked very beautiful to a man of thirty. I honestly believed that with no effort on my part I was a sort of magician with words....Total result--a great time and no work."[8] *Lipstick*, a story about a girl at a prom, set in Princeton, without naming it, was rejected, and no film was made on it. However, Lois Moran was important for his imagination and she appeared as Rosemary Hoyt in *Tender Is The Night.*

Zelda had had a breakdown and in the beginning of 1931 had recovered so that they were living quietly in Montgomery. But this sort of life was not to his taste, and he was glad to take up an offer and go to Hollywood again. MGM had asked him to revise Katherine Brush's script of *Red-Headed Woman.* He met old friends, and as Arthur Mizener says: "His old feeling of excitement about the movies came back to him and he got his beautifully defined feelings about Hollywood--its colour and scale, its fantasy, the sadness of the occasionally fine mind caught in all this falseness and shoddy."[9] However, he remembered it as a time of failure, was disillusioned and disgusted vowing never to return. Actually, as he confessed, it was on Zelda's behalf that he was jittery. Her

father, Judge Sayre, had died and it was bound to affect her adversely. On his return he wrote "Crazy Sunday," and Sheldon Grebstein says, "the story reminds us that perhaps of all American wirters F.Scott Fitzgerald best exemplifies Heinrich Heine's dictum, 'From my great wounds I make little songs'"[10] He thus chose a phase of recent experience in which he suffered disappointment and disgrace, then deliberately exploited it as the basis for the story's locale, major characters and the precipitating episode. It is held that he expressed one aspect of the Hollywood milieu which differentiates it from the run of common life--there the most private matters--marital infidelity, sexual problems--are discussed as though they were public knowledge. Relations that would take months to develop in real or normal life are accelerated, foreshadowed, developed in one or two brief encounters. The story's emphasis is upon the artificiality and theatricality of this microcosm and the conduct of its inhabitants; the motif of frenetic make-belief is rendered both metaphorically and as direct exposition. Even nature seems sensitive to the histrionic conduct of these Hollywood people and provides a fittingly cinematic backdrop for the plot. However, throughout the story Fitzgerald suggests that work is really the basis of sanity for everyone in the film industry.

By 1936 his income reached a new low and he was in financial straits. "Terrible debts" amounted to 40000. Again, he looked to Hollywood but, as he confessed, people thought he was a "complete moral and artistic bankrupt." *The Crack-Up* revealed his alcoholism and more to the wider public, and Hollywood drew back. He himself accepted that the creative side had been dead for three years. However, the old fascination for the place returned, and he wanted to conquer it. It offered a lot of prospects and as he wrote to his daughter: "I feel a certain excitement. The third Hollywood venture. Two failures behind me though one no fault of mine....I want to profit by these two experiences--I must be very tactful but keep my hand on the wheel from the start--find out the key man among the bosses and the most malleable among the collaborators--then fight the rest tooth and nail until, in fact or in effect, I'm alone on the picture. That's the only way I can do my best work. Given a break I can make them double this contract in two years."[11] He was excited and determined to do a good job, to give everything he had. He was asked to do a story of adolescents around 17 but because of his shoulder problem he refused. Then he got a break with MGM and kept completely sober. He spent much of his time in having pictures run off for him, and studying other writers' scripts,

keeping a file of notes on the pictures he had seen. When he had revised "A Yank at Oxford" and he was working on "Three Comrades," he called himself a semi-amateur. To his surprise, his good health and morale had miraculously returned and he seemed to be keeping to his resolutions. He continued writing miraculously about what he called this "tense crossword puzzle game, creative only when you want it to be a surprisingly interesting intellectual game." He lived in "The Garden Of Allah", and entered the social life of Hollywood, "with a renewal of his old innocent delight in big names", as Arthur Mizener says. However, that did not last, and as Budd Schulberg wrote: "There seemed to be something physically or psychologically broken in him that had pitched him forward from scintillating youth to shaken old age."[12] He himself felt he was watching "the disintegration of his own personality", and he couldn't cope with the social hype of Hollywood. He realised that he hadn't made the changes at the main corners and was paying "the price for losing his way by years of unhappiness". The "spoiled priest" of yesterdays was never the same, no matter how much he thought and tried. Out of frustration he even tried committing suicide. However, though strength was failing him, his gift for writing was improving and once aroused he could perform wonders.

He met Sheilah Graham, Lily Sheil of London's East End, in Hollywood and she broke off her engagement to Lord Donegall, and was committed to Fitzgerald from then on. She has recorded their relationship in *The Beloved Infidel*. He recast his relationship with her in Stahr's relationship with Kathleen in *The Last Tycoon*. She also resembled Zelda. Anyway, she gave him a purpose in life, and brought peace, order and happiness into his life that had been missing since the '20s when his relationship with Zelda had begun to sour. Though he felt that he could keep his feelings for work alive for long only by drinking, he tried to abstain and completed the script of *Three Comrades* by '38. When the Producer, Joseph Mankiewiez, changed it, he was enraged and wrote: "For nineteen years....I've written best selling entertainment, and my dialogue is supposedly right up at the top. But I learn from the script that you've suddenly decided that it isn't good dialogue and you can take a few hours off and do much better....Oh Joe, can't producers ever be wrong? I'm a good writer--honest. I thought you were going to play fair."[13] He satirised him in *The Last Tycoon* but gave up hope of getting creative satisfaction in Hollywood. He was now thinking of it as "a strange conglomeration of a few excellent over-tired men making the pictures, and as dismal a crowd

of fakes and hacks at the bottom as you can imagine." But he started working on "Infidelity", and wrote to his daughter: "You don't realise that what I'm doing here is the last tired effort of a man who once did something finer and better."[14] It was a difficult script and turned out well but had to be dropped because of censorship trouble. While he was still bound to MGM he worked on *The Women* and "Madam Curie" but overall his movie venture was disappointing and he started thinking of the print media because he was "in a small way an original" and "it certainly wasn't advisable to let his name sink...out of sight." However, he was tired.

Walter Wanger hired Budd Schulberg to do a picture about the Dartmouth Carnival, and as Schulberg was a fresher, he got Fitzgerald as the senior hand. Schulberg later admitted that he thought Fitzgerald was dead because the era (Jazz Age) which he had exploited and which had exploited him was dead; he had spoken for a shell-shocked generation without ever going to the Front, and was one of the historians of the no-man's time between the Wars. However, they got on well as friends but Fitzgerald messed it up with his alcoholism, and in spite of Schulberg's efforts to cover up, he wandered about "a tactless ghost from another age of college pleasures", and got no screen credit. He felt he had let Schulberg down and disgraced Wanger. Besides, he had also fallen ill, and when he recovered, his contract had expired and he had to go from picture to picture. He was hired to do some revision on *Gone With The Wind* but made little impression. He then worked on *Air Raid* but that too was shelved. He began drinking heavily and even quarrelled with Sheilah Graham, who had all along stood by him.

He was writing stories for *Esquire*, including the Pat Hobby Series. The latter were not good by his standards but they caught the Hollywood atmosphere and made fun of the author's weaknesses. They are a sardonic portrait of a broken-down script writer, "a complete rat" but not a "sinister" character; it is, what in his worst moments, he saw himself becoming. However, it proved that he hadn't lost his ironic attitude or double vision. He then got some brief weeks on "Raffles" of United Artists, and *Colliers* showed interest in the story of *The Last Tycoon* which he had been inspired to do ever since he met Irving Thalberg in 1931. That was a promise to free him from the drudgery of movie work, and he began enthusiastically making notes and arranging his impressions about Hollywood; Mizener calls it "elements of a myth", minutely detailed,

a wonderfully perceptive portrait of a place and time. Fitzgerald called it a "labour of love" and felt "alive again." Thus though it took years to collect material, the actual unfinished novel took just four months to write. During this period there was hardly any movie work and he wrote to his daughter in 1939: "Sorry you got the impression that I'm quitting the movies--they are always there....But I'm convinced that maybe they are not going to make me Czar of the Industry right away, as I thought ten months ago....Life has humbled me--Czar or not we'll survive. I'm even willing to compromise for Asstt. Czar!"[15]

Lester Cowan bought the rights for "Babylon Revisited", and Columbia asked him to do the script of the story. He made a heroic effort saying he had "more fun than I've ever had in movies." He finished it, and it was called "Cosmopolitan." They tried to get Shirley Temple to do Honoria/Victoria but that was not possible and it was shelved. It was his last picture assignment. He explained to his friend Katherine Tighe: "Only in the last few months has life begun to level out again in any sensible way. The movies went to my head and I tried to lick the set up single-handed and came out a sadder and wiser man."[16] He had thought that he had really found an unexpected connection of identity in Hollywood, and "he could dip his little golden brush into waters of whose depth he was never afraid", but it was an "authority of failure." Alfred Kazin is of the opinion that in a sense he had been writing movies all his life and his facile prismatic genius was not of a different order.

Fitzgerald continued to work on *The Last Tycoon*, and he was a writer who simultaneously knew the experience as a participant and judged it as an uninvolved observer. He was like Cecilia who "accepted Hollywood with the resignation of a ghost assigned to a haunted house." Stephen Vincent Benet says that the novel "shows what a really first class writer can do with material and how he gets under the skin. It doesn't depend for success on sets or atmosphere, local colour or inside stuff; it doesn't even depend for effect on the necessary exaggerations of the life that it describes. All that is there--the Martian life of the studios, brilliantly shown. But it is character that dominates the book, the complex yet consistent character of Monroe Stahr, the producer, hitched to the wheels of his own preposterous chariot, at once dominating and dominated, as much a part of his business as the film that runs through the cameras, and yet a living man. Had Fitzgerald been permitted to finish the book, I think there is no doubt that it would

have added a major character and a major novel to American fiction. As it is *The Last Tycoon* is a great deal more than a fragment. It shows the full powers of its author, at their height and at their best."[17]

Hollywood is a symbol of a self-enclosed, self-sustained world, a miniature empire, a microcosm of American history and national identities. It is a world free from outside unwelcome intrusion, sealed off from the disturbing human presence, controlled by an isolated genius, an automaton sharing power with responsibility. But its own inexorable logic makes it free from all human warmth, all palable life, even to make it "a cold frozen world of eternal winter."[18] Hollywood is invested with symbolic implications, with its primary emphasis on timeliness and relevance, notwithstanding, a system that is designed to destroy the very determined individualism and personal integrity that one tenaciously holds on to and defends. Hollywood was a perfect symbol for Fitzgerald's own version of the capitalist myth. It was an adequate situation to express the unmatched romantic grandeur of the old before the setting in of corruption of all dreams and values by the excessive materialism of the new industrial age and a dehumanised commercial culture. It had become the contemporary image of the New World; now more vulgarised and dissolute, with a diminished stature of modern man. But paradoxically, it still had the power of evoking romantic glamour in its history, the illusions which could fill in the gap between the old vision of the American Dream and the present material actuality--and what it had cost in the loss of the old heroic vision, the loss of all idealism. There was no longer a possibility commensurate with man's "capacity for wonder."

The earliest symbolism of Hollywood as a capitalist myth of success is to be found in the allegorical reverie, "The Diamond As Big As The Ritz." It is a story which recreates the infinite wonder of moneyed splendour that is Hollywood, what is made possible with an "unlimited amount of money," selfishness and brutality of a pioneering adventurer, Braddock Washington, the epitome of an avaricious and aggressive American Tycoon, who becomes the prototype of Fitzgerald's later caricatures. He represents the extreme absurdity and madness of the American dream of wealth and power. He becomes the symbol of strident modern capitalism, the banality and morbid bourgeoise vulgarity and despotism of the American myth of success. But he is not without his disenchantment with the dream.

The pattern repeats itself in the colossal vitality of Gatsby's illusions. Both Jay Gatsby in *The Great Gatsby* and Monroe Stahr in *The Last Tycoon* are the true functionaries of the American myth, in the service of "a vast vulgar and meretricious beauty," and its cynical powerful corruption. They are the last of the breed of men who believe in and practise individualism and unlimited economic freedom. But as outsiders are the trapped and tragic victims of a myth whose sole aim seemed to be the continuing prosperity envisaged as a basic corollary of the American dream. But like their author, both Gatsby and Stahr are morally adrift, knowing the falseness and yet clinging desperately to what they cannot themselves relinquish as something noble and what gives them their social stature. In *The Last Tycoon*, Hollywood becomes that last citadel into which converge all hopes and dreams, desires and fulfilment, and what gives shape and purpose to American ambitions and the characteristic elements of its society. As Michael Millgate observed: "Part of Fitzgerald's distinction as a social novelist derives from his perception that by presenting an 'epic hero' whose business acumen, exceptional as it is, forms only one aspect of his total personality; he could at once increase the stature of the hero and decrease the importance of the business, herein lies the special interest of Jay Gatsby and Monroe Stahr."[19] The dream constitutes what the business tycoon aspires for--a combination of hope for wealth and the adjuncts of youthful innocence, beauty and romance. For Gatsby they are embodied in the person of Daisy, without whom life is "material without being real." In *The Last Tycoon*, Hollywood is a symbol of Stahr's empire, the "green light" of his intense hope. But it is their ironic destiny that in trying to redeem the promise, they are helpless "pioneer debauchees" of the dream. The grotesque shift of fortune makes them innocent pursuers of corrupted wealth, beauty and romance. The golden dream is thus tainted and slurred. Stahr provides an insight into whatever justification Hollywood had, to be contrived and made to survive as a moral entity. What Nathaniel West had been seeking in his novel *The Day Of The Locust*, that moral idea meets with a negative. Even though *The Last Tycoon* is a fragment, it is nearer the moral centre of the Hollywood dilemma. West's conception is nightmarish, filled with horrible images of distorted figures, a moral and spiritual wasteland. Fitzgerald even surpasses the satire of Schulberg who had been reared and nurtured in Hollywood, and had occasion to observe the social scene at close quarters. The American dream had become solidified in the glitter and glamour

of Hollywood, and motion pictures had attained that moment which Fitzgerald had always evoked in his art. Hollywood would "manufacture" dreams where American hopes had been lost. The movies were more than art and entertainment; they revived a new capacity for hope, dream and illusion, a meeting point for the American past, a metastasis of American culture, a moulder of identities and national destinies. The historical perspective comes out in a wider cultural and social context in Monroe Stahr and *The Last Tycoon* than in Dick Diver and *Tender is The Night* where it had been rendered falteringly.

It was in this sense of national history and American destinies that *The Last Tycoon* was an artistic construct recapturing *The Great Gatsby*. Even in the atmosphere of newness, connections, contacts, illusions, freshness and beauty, there is longing, a search for warmth and the burning glow of the past, of the "mining town in lotus land", that Hollywood has become, peopled by those who have come to wean back, retrieve, form and shape the new American dream. Holywood, like America itself, hankers for the rootedness and understanding of the past. The reference to Andrew Jackson's homestead, the Hermitage near Nashville, the Presidential figures of the past--Abraham Lincoln et al--create symbolic associations of a past that Hollywood needs in order to be connected with the authenticity of that dream. Fitzgerald had linked up the figure of Lincoln "as a symbol of the past through the...separate perspectives gradually broadening out to a perception of the essential links between the past and the present."[20] The Lincoln figure is not simply Hollywood's appropriation of the American past created as a movie entertainment as in the scene where a visiting Danish nobleman, Prince Agge, confronts the remote figure of the President in period costume, but is a typical projection of an urge of the film industry to forge an equally valid figure who could approximate itself to the standards and values of the past that the American-Hollywood present is hankering after. Thus the symbolic value of the Lincoln image, in terms of its historical and social significance, is the focal point of Stahr's tremendous inner conflicts that sum up his aspirations, the goals he desires to attain and the reasons of his reaching the pinnacle of the Hollywood hierarchy that the English screen-writer, Boxley, understands: "He had been reading Lord Charnwood. He recognised that Stahr like Lincoln was a leader carrying on a war on many fronts; almost single-handed he had moved pictures sharply forward through a decade, to a point where the content of the 'A Productions' was wider and richer than that

of the stage. Stahr was an artist only, as Mr Lincoln was a general, perforce and as a layman."[21] His tremendous verve and action are necessary to demonstrate to his collaborative professionals the effectiveness of his skill as an artist with an unequalled drive and initiative. Stahr covincingly argues with Boxley why movie is an art form, a medium of artistic expression and experience, though Boxley has been rather sceptical of what is essentially an entertainment medium and what could be turned into an artistic experience from Stahr's own limited capabilities and talents. Stahr eventually wins over Boxley without losing much time for what he effectively dramatises to the Englishman in that "pretty stenographer" scene is the quality of a "character in action" which aptly makes explicit the action manifesting character, absolutely an artistic effort and achievement.

The new conception of the tragic hero for *The Last Tycoon* came in the charming and captivating image of Irving Thalberg. Stahr shared his hypochondria, ruthlessness and impatience with mediocrity, inability to take things easy, live life at a higher pace than normal, and the same bourgeoise artistic taste. Though Thalberg's life was pathetic rather than tragic, Fitzgerald believed "tragedy and doomed and heroic things do happen" in Hollywood. However, Stahr, in his humble impoverished beginnings, is also a continuation of the Lincolnesque-Alger myth of success, the "rags to riches" legend. The need for a messiah-mythical figure neatly coalesced in Fitzgerald's quest for a superman hero to save mankind from the holocaust of impending doom that the Second World War symbolised in the possible death of human civilisation. Stahr's own will and imagination helped him to dominate the movie world. He became a tycoon of great power and magnitude, a prince among entrepreneurs. He exercised genuine authority in a democratic social set-up, but his authority is of the old capitalistic order, paternalistic, the last fading embers of what once glowed with power now lingering smoulderingly on the precincts of Hollywood. It is indeed a significant image of the American business civilisation at a vital juncture of irreversible transformation in its national history. He represents the tradition of responsibility and power in a society becoming increasingly acquisitive because of its supreme accent on material success. He only succeeds as "a symbol for vanishing American grandeur of character and role." His inevitable tragic isolation, followed closely by his doom and death, is largely a matter of a symbolic end to a long-drawn losing battle of American pioneering aspirations. It implies the end of an era and an ideal.

Monroe's struggles against the powerful interests of the film industry, the banalities of big money, communist gangsterism, and whatever went against the grain of powerful and responsible individualism, were his symbolic fight against his unwillingness to compromise his artistic sensibilities to the demands of an unscrupulous, insensitive and ruthless enterprise. His preoccupation with the pursuits of money, beauty and aesthetic pleasures, and the innocuous manoueverings for the good of people only became manifest in his recreation of illusions in motion pictures. But the businessman and artist are apparently antithetical figures. Stahr's life in the studio--in the projection room, in the story conferences of screen-writers, show him to be the hard working, intelligent producer, a difficult and determined task master. With his chorus of yes-men and insistence on his angle of the story, he is a typical Hollywood tycoon, but he is very different too. The screen-writers, story conferences are the most effectively presented scenes. It was Fitzgerald's own experience as a writer for the screen that gave him the close view of this aspect of the movie-making process. It was one of the crucial moments in his Hollywood experience that made him realise why creative impulse was at a discount in movie stories. It was certainly what a hack writer could do better than a novelist with a gifted sensibility, and what a novel, as an artistic medium, could do better than the movie. William Faulkner put this succinctly, reviewing his own experience as a screen-writer: "A few years ago I was taken on as a script writer at a Hollywood studio. At once I began to hear the man in charge talking of 'angles', and then I realised that they were not even interested in truth, the old universal truths of the human heart without which any story is ephemeral--the universal truths of love and honor and pride and pity and compassion and sacrifice."[22] A creative writer and artist has his individuality and independence; he cannot be a flattering, fawning underling. Screen-writers like Boxley know what it means to work under Stahr's supervening genius and his absolute mastery of the intricacies of film-making. The conference becomes symbolic of his public mask, but behind that lies the private figure. The true centre of the novel lies in the ironic distance between these two positions. His professional stature as a producer insulates him from the life of the Hollywood community. The characters who figure in the script-writers' conferences like Wylie White, Jane Maloney, John Bronca, Reinmund, George Boxley etc. seemed mental cadavers, the merchandise that he would like to buy for what they have in their minds. He admits: "I never thought that I had more

brains than a writer has. But I always thought that his brains belonged to me--because I knew how to use them. Like the Romans--I've heard that they never invented things but they knew what to do with them."[23] He also knows precisely where in the hierarchy of movie-making each one stands. He tells Wylie White: "It takes more than brains. You writers and artists poop out and get all mixed up, and somebody has to come and straighten you out....You seem to take things so personally, hating people and worshipping them--always thinking people are so important--especially yourself. You just asked to be kicked around. I like people and I like them to like me, but I wear my heart where God put it--on the inside."[24]

Stahr transcends not only the inherently associated limitations of a businessman, but attains the heroic proportions and the aura of doom and tragic grandeur. The motion picture venture had begun as a self-sufficient, self-propelling, profiteering institution, once the vision and enterprise of a single individual, his shadow and shaping power. Now his waning vitality and physical resources lack the power to resist the growing tide of materialistic, exploiting onslaught on the creative and the artistic. He is subsumed under the very organisation that he helped to build and nurture. His own survival now faced annihilation, and he struggled to clinch victory over the piling destructive forces against him. But he can only fight a losing battle against the monolithic empire. He is virtually hemmed in from all sides--the big financiers, labour unions and all such collaborative agencies that engage themselves in the enterprise, and are out to put impediments in the way of his endeavours. He must inevitably give-in to forces that have become too unwieldy for his control. As Director he commands unquestioned obedience and loyalty from all subservient to him in the movie venture. But he must also share it with other artists. In spite of his implicit faith in the efficacy of creative freedom, it is ultimately his unifying imagination which holds final responsibility for the resultant artistic product. There is a secret conspiracy to pass this unique authority that Stahr combines and concentrates within himself to lesser but more envious and manipulative directors like Pat Brady. In fact, a real economic situation is symbolically transposed to Hollywood, lending it the same psychological and symbolic overtones associated with Daisy in *The Great Gatsby*. Stahr represents the golden age of American capitalism now about to be over. He is in every sense the last tycoon who had grown up dead cold but had learnt "tolerance, forbearance, and even affection." He cares for his

subordinates and co-workers--that is the "extra" that he puts in. But his idealism itself sets in the process of self-destruction. The haunting ambience of death stalks his pursuits everywhere, and there is a sense of destiny overtaking all he stood for. With him is dying an era of American past, the pioneering frontier phase of American history, and Hollywood itself.

Pat Brady and Brimmer are symbols of what will replace Stahr. They are the breed of men, destructive tycoons, symbols of materialism and selfishness. They represent collective, collusive forces of dehumanised capitalism and organised brutal labour power. Pat Brady is a composite image of Wall Street, the enormous leviathan, the depersonalised concentration of the capitalism of the East, corporate capitalism trying to destroy individual enterprise. He belongs to the gangster-capitalists of the bootlegging-Prohibition era of the Twenties. His loss of identity is so complete that he always lurks in the background like impending doom. Even his daughter is disillusioned and realises that his rise to power has been through pure luck, a chance, and trading on other people's talents. He has learnt little about the "feel of America" and has no talent for film-making. He is an exploiter and manipulator without any scruples. Even in their approach to love and sex, Stahr and Brady are opposed to each other. Here too Stahr preserves a dying order in the old European and American tradition--Kathleen, the replica of his dead wife, Minna, is a symbol of his romantic yearnings. On the contrary, Brady's materialism and unethical conduct is best illustrated in the episode where his daughter, Cecilia, stumbles on the figure of Birdie Peters in his closet:"...I don't know, but I ran across to it and opened it, and father's Secretary, Birdie Peters, tumbled out stark naked--just like a corpse in the movies...a mistress stuffed naked into a hole in the wall in the midday of business."[25]

Movies had exercised a curious fascination for Fitzgerald so much so that he used cinematic techniques in his major novels which, no doubt, enhanced his style and contributed to the unique quality of not only his themes but characterisation and formalist concerns as well. He had a camera eye, and used the literary equivalents of such film techniques as pans, close-ups, long shots, slow motions, and freeze frames to mention but a few. He also used editing processes like straight-cuts, dissolves, fades and montage, as transitional devices from one scene to another, one chapter to another, one segment to another. Aural devices too have been used in the manner of sound-tracks to create sound effects

and atmosphere--dialogues, speech patterns and music have all been effectively harnessed. Last but not least, time has been presented through film techniques of flashback, cinematic use of colour and lighting, and visual and dynamic presentation of character. As an artistic medium, the motion pictures had made a new cultural conquest, supplanting old traditional values by investing and merchandising new ideas and attitudes to life. For Fitzgerald the movies had "a more glittering, a grosser power than had ever before existed to seduce and enslave the mass mind."[26] He intended to explore and portray the motion picture industry as a cultural and social phenomenon, the Hollywood community with its fantastic glamorous life determining the social aspirations and urges of the American people. Hollywood thus becomes a larger than life symbol, a world vaster and grander than the ordinary one. The movies could display wealth and success as a glorious dream, and for Fitzgerald "the movies and wealth were locked up in the same purse in his imagination"; he saw them as synonymous. But all this dreaming of "money and glory" was almost inaccessible, "beyond the impregnable walls of Hollywood" that Fitzgerald had hoped to conquer.

Fitzgerald had, however, found the most cogent and authentic symbol in Hollywood for his final indictment of the American dream and its disillusioning impact. Even in its fragmented version, *The Last Tycoon* delivers the message loud and clear. Moreover, his judgement came not a day too soon as America was getting ready to enter the European War when Fitzgerald died in Dec. 1940. Edmund Wilson called it a novel about Hollywood, but it is more than that. It talks about the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest. There is no place for those defeated by time or events. For people like Manny Shwartz who "once...used to be...regular [men] of decision" there's nothing except nostalgia and despair. Had Stahr lived, and not been murdered, as Brady's gang was plotting, his future would not have been different. However, as Arthur Mizener points out, the parallel drawn by Fitzgerald between the moral and economic conflict in Hollywood and the conflicting moral and economic traditions of American society, and a fluid society's "a-historical blindness" make the novel "an image of American experience, not only in our time but through the country's history."

REFERENCES

[1] Robert Sklar, *Movie-Made America* (New York: Random House, 1975), p.vi.

[2] F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Last Tycoon,* ed. Edmund Wilson (New York: Scribner, 1953), p.56.

[3] John Keats, "On First Looking Into Chapman's Homer," *The Golden Treasury,* ed. Oscar Williams (New American Library, 1953), p.141.

[4] Dos Passos, "A Note On Fitzgerald," *F. Scott Fitzgerald,* ed. Alfred Kazin (London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1967), p.159.

[5] Ibid., p.157.

[6] *Letters,* ed. Andrew Turnbull (London, 1968), p.68.

[7] Arthur Mizener, *The Far Side of Paradise* (Boston, 1951), p.226.

[8] *Letters,* pp.16-7.

[9] Sheldon Grebstein, "The Sane Method Of Crazy Sunday," *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald,* ed. Jackson R. Bryer (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), p.289.

[10] Arthur Mizener, *The Far Side of Paradise,* p.243

[11] *Letters,* p.16.

[12] "Old Scott", *Esquire* (Jan. 1961), p.23.

[13] *Letters,* pp.563-64.

[14] Ibid., pp.32-3.

[15] Ibid., p.61.

[16] Ibid., p.601.

[17] Stephen Vincent Benet, "The Last Tycoon," *F. Scott Fitzgerald,* ed. Alfred Kazin, pp.130-31.

[18] Robert L. Carringer, "Rosebud Dead or Alive: Narrative and Symbolic Satire in *Citizen Kane,*" *PMLA,* Vol.91, No.2, p.191.

[19] Michael Millgate, *American Social Fiction: James to Cozzens* (New York, 1965), p.107.

[20] Robert Sklar, *The Last Laocoon* (New York, 1967), pp.335-36.

[21] F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Last Tycoon,* p.106.

[22] Quoted in Joseph Blotner, *Faulkner: A Biography* (New York: Random House, 1974), p.1357.

[23] F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Last Tycoon,* p.125.

[24] Ibid., p.17.

[25] Ibid., p.64.

[26] Lloyd Morris, *Postcript to Yesterday* (New York, 1947), p.153.

GLORIFICATION OF CRIME IN LITERATURE AND FILM: *THE GODFATHER* VS *INDIA'S BANDIT QUEEN*

Sumitra Kukreti

The interpenetration and interdependence of literature, film and society have been established beyond debate. Literature reflects trends, customs and tendencies prevalent in society, while film provides a panorama to all these. The purpose of literature and film is not only entertainment but social amelioration. The former emphasises social amelioration, while the later lays more stress on exhilaration and entertainment. Since time immemorial it has been a burning issue whether art (literature, dance, painting, music architecture, sculpture, etc.) should be for the sake of art or it should be for the sake of life. Regarding the purpose of art, Plato emphasizes "moralism and utilitarianism,"[1] while Horace stresses that "literature should be '*duke at atile*'"[2] (delightful and instructive). In 20th century, Leo Tolstoy claims that "Art must remove violence, only art can do it. The greatest purpose of art is to make people good by choice."[3] On the basis of aforesaid discussions, it can be maintained that in art exhilaration and sanctification should go hand in hand which unfortunately is a rare unification.

In the present scenario, literature as well as film presents a distorted image of reality, for both these media of expression tend to glamorise violence and sex to become more saleable and popular. In the present work the author aims at analysing critically, comparing and contrasting the two, *The Godfather* by Mario Puzo and *India's Bandit Queen* by Mala Sen, as both of these works supplied theme for the films. *The Godfather* glamorise violence while *India's Bandit Queen* is a sharp blow on the cult of identity worship that inspires people to crave for name and fame, irrespective of any consideration of the means used for this purpose. Media is largely responsible for projecting his new value pattern and thrusting it on readers and spectators that wealth is the solution to all worldly problems and that it is most glorious thing on earth.

The Godfather by Mario Puzo was published in 1969, and it immediately gained popularity and was called a "staggering triumph"[4] in popular literature. The novel is the "sweeping saga of"[5] of a family and deals with the detailed narration of the life of its chief protagonist. It updated the Gangster genre in the movie produced by Francis Ford Copola. As a child Vito Andolini was living happily in his village Corleone in Sicily. After the brutal murder

of his father, he migrated to New York. Due to nostalgic fondness and to preserve some tie with his native village, Vito Andolini altered his name to Vito Corleone, got married to an Italian girl and settled down in New York.

Rapidly moving time brings change in the life of Vito Corleone and once a contented, self-restrained and reserve man finds himself in the role of a murderer of Fenucci, the local mafia chief. He is a man who does repent after committing the first murder, for he is fully conscious of the fact that society will neither condemn him nor deplore the murder of Fennuci. Though he never speaks about it to anyone, the "whole neighbourhood within a few weeks also knew. Vito Corleone was treated as a 'man of respect' by everyone."[6] Then he takes over the business of olive-oil and gradually becomes the largest importer of olive-oil. Meanwhile, he is fully indulged in crime, and it is nearly impossible for him to come out of it. He has three sons, Sonny, Michael and Frederick. After Sonny is killed and Frederick is incapable of managing the family business, Michael takes over the family business and kills all the enemies of Corleone family, thus making his explicit victory over others; but Vito Corloene dies without enjoying this victory.

Though all these things have a living, breathing sense of improbability, yet the readers and cine-goers empathise with characters and situations in the life of the protagonist. In the film *The Godfather*, the character of Vito Corleone has been glorified to the extent of presenting him as the invincible don, the greatest power of the underworld, one who is worshipped by the Italians, who would like to go to him, instead of lodging complaint to the Police in the time of need. Whether they need financial help or wish to avenge their sufferings, the solution is a visit to the Godfather as they cherish immense faith in his justice and power.

Despite being a simple, semi-literate man, Vito Corleone has achieved great success in the business world. He is a man who never repents after committing his first murder and this is something rare in real life. He is also never seen repenting over the life-style he has chosen, despite the moment when his eldest son Sonny commits a bank robbery at the age of sixteen, and after being rebuked and enquired, he replies that he has seen his father committing his first murder, so it is natural for him to follow the same path. The Godfather realises that since he could not live a virtuous life himself, he has no right to expect his son to adopt

the course of a gentleman."[7] He becomes a mouthpiece for expressing the resentment, pain and failure of the father when he reacts to his son's statement that "everyman has but one destiny."[8] This grumble does not suffice for a father whose son has chosen a wrong destiny. The words containing great dramatic appeal become a phrase, and form an inseparable part of Vito Corleone's philosophy. If he had tried, he might have averted his son's degradation and eventual untimely death that follows inevitably to all people clinging to crime. In such a society where terror pays more dividend than anything else, the path of terrorism is an irresistible temptation. If within a fortnight illegal business can make fortune, there is no need to have perseverance for decades to have the same. Once Godfather has accumulated great wealth, none can dare interrogate its source.

Contrary to the above novel and film, Phoolan Devi, the chief protagonist of *India's Bandit Queen* opts for the life of bandits, as she has no other alternative. She got married at eleven, and her husband, already a widower, was "almost 20 years older"[9] than her. Having been ill-treated by him and his third wife, Phoolan left his house and later the police put her behind the bars for petty offence of throwing a stone to Maiyadin who was "attacking the neem tree with an exe"[10] which belonged to her father. After sometime when she was in dire need of police protection against continual threats of dacoits to kidnap her, they did not pay any heed to her requests. Ultimately, she was kidnapped and molested by the dacoit leader Babu Singh Gujar. After the assassination of Babu Singh Gujar, she was warned by the gang members to stay in the gang without causing trouble. Her words to the authoress in an interview, "I was to be Vikram's mistress or I would be killed,"[11] reveals the irrevocability of her choice and the compulsive circumstances deciding her fate. Her pathetic realization that "a piece of property has no choice"[12] evinces the role of society and circumstances in deciding her future course of action. She was emotionally attached to Vikram and avenged his death by massacring twenty-two thakurs who "had abetted in her capture and rape"[13] and Vikram's murder. It was the demand of survival that within a year her gang of seven men was recognised as next only to that of Malkhan Singh in power. There was a cash prize of rupees two lacs on her head.

Later the chief minister of M. P., Mr. Arjun Singh, and contemporary P. M., Mrs. Indira Gandhi, herself intervened in the matter

and the then S. P. of Bhind could convince Phoolan Devi to surrender her arms. The surrender ceremony took place on 12th February, 1983. Mala Sen describes the event in these words:

> Thousands of villagers has walked many miles to witness the event. Phoolan Devi was a national legend. Songs had been written about her exploits....Dasyu Sundary mounted the 23 foot high wooden platform which had been constructed for the occasion ... Man Singh and the rest of the gang, seven men in all, followed her up the steps. Portraits of Mahatma Gandhi and the goddess Durga, benevolent avtar of Kali, adorned the centre of the stage as she specified. The three garlands she had asked for had also been provided and hung on a chair.[14]

Everything turned out but just for her. She had decided to surrender to the Madhya Pradesh Police after the verbal agreement was made with the Central Govt. represented by the S.P. of Bhind. She laid down her own terms and conditions:

> ....neither she nor members of her gang would be hanged; that the gang would not be extradited to Utter Pradesh; that they would be allowed to live together in jail; that they would be given two proper meals a day; that her family would be rehoused in Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh; that her goat and cow would be brought to Gwalior with her family; and that she and the members of her gang would be released after eight years.[15]

Later developments in Phoolan's life are well known, as she was released from the prison in 1993, contested election and was elected for the parliament. Another testimony of identity worship has been narrated by Mala Sen. She had visited the village of Pan Singh Tomar, an athlete turned bagi in 1987: "...the villagers realised we had come to research the story of baghis for a film, the hut we had been invited into was soon crowded and we were informed that 'the Great Pan Singh Tomar' had put their village on the map."[16]

To conclude, it can easily be assessed that the character of Godfather was glamorised by the novelist Mario Puzo as the *New York Magazine* expressed its opinion "you cannot stop reading it, and you will find it hard to stop dreaming about it."[17] This comment itself is a great support to the views expressed in this research paper. To dream crime is to aspire it, and it leads to the resultant contamination of the imagination of the readers and cine-goers. Thus the energy and vitality of youth go waste in dreaming and planning about the overnight success,[18] whether achieved through fair means or foul. Instead of critlcising and presenting the negativity of violence, 20th century novelists and film producers glorify it and Mario Puzo and Francis Ford Coppola are no exception. Similarly,

Phoolan Devi was glamorised by the Indian media. Who is the defaulter? Is it the authoress of *India's Bandit Queen* Mala Sen, or the director Shekhar Kapoor, or the Indian masses that gave a mandate to Phoolan Devi, or the society that made her life unbearable and created such circumstances as to become a dacoit was irrevocable destiny for her?

Though the debate whether literature imitates life or life is an imitation of literature remains inconclusive, yet regarding the relationship between art and morality it can truly be assessed that "art cannot be divorced from morality, for it then ceases to be a human value."[19] No doubt human values are changing rapidly in the twentieth century yet there must be a medium to keep our moral values intact and alive. For this purpose nothing is better than the media and it must be employed to "teach and to delight."[20] Art, whether movie or literature, deals with human beings as the pivot figure, and if it helps in transcending their lives, makes them a better human being so that they can encompass noble spiritual values, then and only then it will serve its purpose.

REFERENCES

[1] Wilfred L. Guerin et.al., *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992), p. 239.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ragini Ramchandra, *Indian Literary Criticism, An Enquiry into its Validity and Continuity* (New Delhi: Reliance pub., 1989), p. 53.

[4] Mario Puzo, *The Godfather* (New York: Penguin, 1969).

[5] Ibid. p. 1.

[6] Ibid. p. 206.

[7] Ibid. p. 208.

[8] Ibid. p. 208.

[9] Mala Sen, *India's Bandit Queen* (New Delhi: Harper Collins, 1993), p. 42.

[10] Ibid. p. 60.

[11] Ibid. p. 76.

[12] Ibid.

[13] M. J. Akbar, "Phoolan Devi: Queen of Dacoits", *Sunday*, 1981, quoted by Mala Sen, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

[14] Ibid. p. 215.

[15] Ibid. p. 213.

[16] Ibid. p. 49.

[17] Mario Puzo, *op. cit.*, p. 1

[18] Jerry Pinto, "And Quietly flows The Don", *Times of India*, September 15, 1996, p. 4.

[19] Ragini Ramchandra, *Indian Literary Criticism*, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[20] Butcher et.al., *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine art* (New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers, 1985), p. 239.

POINTS OF VIEW

Declaration under Section 5 of the Press & Registration of Books Act, 1867

1.	Place of Publication	Ghaziabad
2.	Periodicity of Publication	Biannual
3.	Printer's Name Nationality Address	K.K. Sharma Indian KH/127, New Kavi Nagar Ghaziabad--201 002
4.	Publisher's Name Nationality Address	K.K. Sharma Indian KH/127, New Kavi Nagar Ghaziabad--201 002
5.	Editor's Name Nationality Address	K.K Sharma Indian KH/127, New Kavi Nagar Ghaziabad--201 002
6.	Owner's Name	Mrs. Kuhu Sharma KH/127, New Kavi Nagar Ghaziabad--201 002

I, K.K. Sharma, hereby declare that the particulars, given above, are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

K.K. Sharma

Printed by K.K. Sharma for Mrs. Kuhu Sharma at Chetna Offset Press, A-27/2-A, Shastri Gali No. 3, Mauzpur, Delhi--110 053

NEXT SPECIAL NUMBER

CENSORSHIP, ART & LITERATURE

SOME INVALUABLE TITLES ON LITERATURE IN ENGLISH

- **Feminism and Literature: New Points of View**
  Ed. K.K. Sharma, D.Litt., Former Prof. of English, Univ. of Allahabad
  1996 ISBN 81-86572-81-1 Rs. 400

- **Alienation in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold**
  Shrawan K.Sharma, Ph.D., G.K. University, Hardwar
  1996 ISBN 81-86572-83-X Rs.300

- **Melting Memories (A Collection of Poems)**
  Asha Viswas, Ph.D., Reader in English, B.H.U., Varanasi
  1996 ISBN 81-86572-85-6 Rs.120

- **The Poetry of Madan G.Gandhi: A New Metaphysical Voice**
  Narinder K. Rattan, Ph.D., Reader, M.D. University, Rohtak
  1996 ISBN 81-86572-84-8 Rs.360

- **Major Indian English Novelists: Some Points of View**
  Harish Raizada, D.Litt., Former Professor Of English, A.M.U., Aligarh
  1996 ISBN 81-86572-86-4 Rs.360

- **Bhabani Bhattacharya: Some Points of View**
  Ed. K.K. Sharma, D.Litt., Former Prof. of English, Univ. of Allahabad
  1995 ISBN 81-86572-80-5 Rs.240

- **Mapping the Shore: Exercises in Criticism**
  Asha Viswas, Ph.D., Reader in English, B.H.U., Varanasi
  1995 ISBN 81-86572-81-3 Rs.240

- **Symbolism in Anita Desai's Novels**
  Kajali Sharma, Ph.D., T.S.E. College, University of Bombay
  1991 ISBN 81-7017-283-7 Rs.190

- **Rabindranath Tagore's Aesthetics**
  K.K. Sharma, D.Litt., Former Prof. of English, Univ. of Allahabad
  1988 ISBN 81-7017-237-3 Rs.90

- **Modern Fictional Theorists: Virginia Woolf & D.H. Lawrence**
  K.K Sharma, D.Litt., Former Prof. of English, Univ. of Allahabad

- **Tradition in Modern Novel-Theory**
  K.K. Sharma, D.Litt., Former Prof. of English, Univ. of Allahabad

- **Joyce Cary: His Theme and Technique**
  K K Sharma, D.Litt., Former Prof. of English, Univ. of Allahabad

K.K. Publications

3350, Peepal Mahadev, Hauz Quazi, Delhi--110 006
Telephone: 3266965 ; Fax: 3269343