

'DISQUIET' NOVELLA AND SCREENPLAY: ADAPTATION AND
CREATIVE HYBRIDITY

Julia Leigh

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Humanities, Discipline of English

University of Adelaide

February 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
DECLARATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
1. 'DISQUIET' NOVELLA	1 - 77
2. 'DISQUIET' SCREENPLAY	1 - 83
3. EXEGESIS – ADAPTATION AND CREATIVE HYBRIDITY: 'DISQUIET' AS NOVELLA AND SCREENPLAY	
Introduction	1
1. Adaptations	2
1.1 A One-way affair? Book-to-Film Adaptation	2
1.2 On Fidelity	4
1.3 Varieties of Adaptation	9
1.4 The Screenplay	13
1.5 Novelisation	17
2. Creative Hybrids	21
3. Case Studies	26
3.1 Case-study: Graham Greene's <i>The Third Man</i>	26
3.2 Case-study: Pier Paolo Pasolini's <i>Theorem</i>	37
3.3 Case-study: Ingmar Bergman's <i>The Best Intentions</i>	44
4. 'Disquiet'	53
Conclusion	68
Works Cited	72

ABSTRACT

The major creative work of this thesis consists of ‘Disquiet’, the novella and the screenplay. It is a twice-told tale. In the exegesis I explore the writing practice of working between two narrative forms. To do this I begin by establishing that the traditional focus of adaptation studies has been book-to-film adaptation. Within this field the issue of ‘fidelity’ has been a dominant concern although it is hard to find any scholar who is actively arguing *for* fidelity. I look at types of adaptation and then outline some possible new directions for adaptation studies. I pay attention to two areas that adaptation studies have largely overlooked and which are pertinent to ‘Disquiet’: the screenplay and the novelisation. Having loosely situated ‘Disquiet’, the novella, within the experimental end of the novelisation continuum I then develop the concept of the creative hybrid. I revisit the assumption that where there are two creative works based on the same story then one work must have come into being before the other. I also query whether the term ‘adaptation’ is appropriate to describe the creative process for hybrids. I look at other modes of speaking about ‘adaptation’ proposed by recent scholars and venture some terms of my own. Turning to the case-studies I first make the case for why Graham Greene’s novella *The Third Man* – which was written *before* his screenplay for a film of the same name – does in fact sit on the continuum of novelisations and/or could be called a hybrid. The second case-study is Pier Paolo Pasolini’s so-called novel, *Theorem*. The third case-study is Ingmar Bergman’s hybrid text, *The Best Intentions*. I then address ‘Disquiet’ in both its forms, highlighting the writing practices I adopted. I conclude that ‘Disquiet’ does not readily fit within either book-to-film adaptation or novelisation. I suggest that acknowledgment of creative hybrids invites a deeper understanding of the practice of adaptation.

DECLARATION

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed below) resides with the copyright holder of those works.

Publications:

Disquiet – a novella. Copyright Julia Leigh 2008

Disquiet – a screenplay. Copyright Julia Leigh 2008

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the invaluable support of my principal supervisor, Professor Nicholas Jose, and I am also indebted to Daniel Nettheim and Dr. Philip Butterss.

EXEGESIS – ADAPTATION AND CREATIVE HYBRIDITY:

‘DISQUIET’ AS NOVELLA AND SCREENPLAY

INTRODUCTION

'Disquiet' takes two forms: it is a novella and a screenplay. Both works involve the same characters, in the same location, over the same period of time, facing the same key events – a twice-told tale. Each work is intended to stand alone: that is, the reader of the novella may well never read the screenplay, and vice versa. The challenges of this exegesis are to position 'Disquiet' within the field of adaptation studies, a field which has traditionally focussed on book-to-film adaptations, and to provide a unique insight into the writing practice of working between two narrative forms.

The first part of this exegesis is intended as a broad overview of the chief concerns of book-to-film adaptation studies to date. One such concern is that of fidelity: how important is it that an adaptation be faithful to a source text? I pay particular attention to the screenplay and the novelisation, two areas largely neglected in the field. I then reconsider those concerns I have discussed in the context of what I call 'creative hybrids': I investigate case-studies of Graham Greene's novella *The Third Man*, Pier Paolo Pasolini's *Theorem* and Ingmar Bergman's *The Best Intentions*. Against this background I move to a detailed consideration of 'Disquiet', both the novella and screenplay.

My comments and page number references throughout the exegesis refer to those versions of the novella and screenplay submitted together as the major creative work of this thesis.

1 ADAPTATIONS

1.1 A One-way Affair? Book-to-Film Adaptation

Adaptation studies to date have chiefly focussed on book-to-film adaptations, that is, a literary work is considered the first or source text and the film is considered 'the adaptation'. Deborah Allison makes this primary observation when she writes:

Based on the profusion of scholarly and popular analysis of the relationship between books and films one could easily be forgiven for thinking that the exchange between the two media was a decidedly one-way affair. Countless words have been expended upon the subject of literary adaptation, in which the process of transforming stories and novels into cinematic or televisual form has been examined in ways both general and particular. (9)

The 'one-way affair' is made apparent in the somewhat misleadingly titled bibliography of Harris Ross, *Film as Literature, Literature as Film*, which lists almost 2500 articles and books published from 1908 to 1985, the overwhelming majority of which concern books adapted into film, rather than films adapted in books. Similarly, *Enser's Filmed Books and Plays* is a reference title which has over 8,000 listings for films made in the period 1928 - 1991 which have been based on books and plays. The scale of a more recent 1999 publication, *Novels into Film: The Encyclopedia of Movies Adapted from Books* by John C. Tibbetts and James M. Welsh, is further evidence of the strong book-to-film trend.

This focus of academic interest reflects industry practice: simply put, there are many articles and scholarly works on book-to-film adaptations because there are many

produced films based on novels. Not only that, many important films, most loved films, films that we know of and that we talk about, are based on novels and so are ‘on the radar’ for scholars. Denise Faithfull, writing for an audience of screenwriters in her how-to book *Adaptations: A guide to Adapting Literature to Film* notes:

Adaptations of published Australian literary texts have been a fixture of the Australian film industry since 1907 and *Robbery Under Arms* (Charles MacMahon). Each year about twenty per cent of Australian feature films are adaptations; however in a 1996 survey, industry professionals were asked to rank their one hundred ‘key’ Australian films and almost one-third of these were adaptations. Of the top twenty, seven were adaptations, with *Picnic at Hanging Rock* (Peter Weir, 1975) winning first place. (57)

Why is it that adapting books to films appeals to film producers? The answers to this question fall under three categories: prestige, financial considerations, and editorial reputation. Firstly, there is a prestige associated with adapting a literary classic – a prestige reflected in the many awards or list mentions granted to adaptations. Awards and mentions for one film can build a brand name for the producer, raise its reputation across the board. A production entity which traffics in this kind of prestige is Merchant Ivory Productions; “Merchant Ivory” being a brand name for a comfortable adaptation of a literary classic. For example, they produced *The Bostonians* and *The Golden Bowl*, both adaptations of Henry James novels; *A Room With a View* and *Howards End*, both adaptations of E.M Forster novels; and *The Remains of the Day*, an adaptation of the Booker prize-winning novel by Kazuo

Ishiguro. According to their website, the film *A Room With A View* won a treasure trove of major awards (Merchant Ivory).

Secondly, name recognition is a selling point. Those who have read the book, or even those who have just heard of the book, are considered likely audiences for the film and this in-built audience factor appeals to risk-averse producers who need to find an audience in order to recoup their significant financial investments in a project.

Thirdly, above and beyond these considerations is another less generous observation about the film industry: judging from numerous memoirs by practising screenwriters the film world is ruled by a pervasive culture of fear. Oscar-nominated screenwriter (and director) David Mamet titled his most recent book, *Bambi vs Godzilla: On the Nature, Purpose and Practice of the Movie Business* (Pantheon, 2007). Adaptations are attractive to Godzilla-producers because a book exists which helps flesh out the ‘imaginary world’ of the film, that is, it makes it easier for an individual reader/project assessor to flesh out the bones of the screenplay, to ‘visualise’ the film from the page. Also, the book’s very existence is already an editorial tick of approval which means the producer who champions it will take less editorial risk, less gatekeeping or tastemaking risk, than she or he would if championing an original untried-and-tested work.

1.2 On Fidelity

In order to later investigate the practice of novelisation or hybrid creation it is useful to first identify the key issues arising out of adaptation studies chiefly devoted to book-to-film adaptation.

Here the threshold issue is that of 'fidelity'. Questions of fidelity arise from comparing two means of expression: the book, and the film. Because in traditional adaptation studies the film comes after the book the fidelity issue is framed as – is the film faithful to the book? And the assumption therein is – is the film as good as the book?

Before we further consider fidelity it is worth noting that the initial impulse to compare two artistic means of expression is itself an ancient one: Horace, writing in c.18 BC, compared poetry to painting in his *Ars Poetica*: “Ut pictura poesis” (v.361). Translated, this means “as is painting so is poetry”, and he made this claim because he wanted poetry to merit the same careful interpretation that was accorded to painting at that time. His ‘plaintiveness’ resonates with that of contemporary film scholars who, as we shall see, strongly make their case that film should not be judged by the yardstick of fidelity and instead warrants just as careful consideration/interpretation as its technological antecedent, literature.

So who is arguing *for* fidelity when it comes to adaptation? Virginia Woolf, in her 1926 essay “On Cinema”, was an early commentator on adaptation when she said:

All the famous novels of the world, with their well-known characters, and their famous scenes, only asked, it seemed, to be put on the films. What could be easier and simpler? The cinema fell upon its prey with immense rapacity, and to this moment largely subsists upon the body of its unfortunate victim. But the results are disastrous to both. The alliance is unnatural. Eye and brain are torn asunder ruthlessly as they try vainly to work in couples. The eye says: ‘Here is Anna Karenina.’

A voluptuous lady in black wearing pearls comes before us. But the brain says: 'That is no more Anna Karenina than it is Queen Victoria'.
(269 –270)

Her language is decidedly moralistic: the book has fallen victim to the film. (It is as moralistic as other terms later employed in film criticism which imply film does a disservice to literature: Robert Stam lists these as “infidelity”, “betrayal”, “deformation”, “violation”, “vulgarisation”, “bastardisation”, and “desecration” (*Literature Through Film* 3)). But is she arguing for a faithful film? Not necessarily. She goes on to say “it is only when we give up trying to connect the pictures with the book that we guess from some accidental scene – like the gardener mowing the lawn – what the cinema might do if it were left to its own devices” (270).

Brian McFarlane’s chapter “It Wasn’t Like That in the Book...” resurrects *Anna Karenina*. He draws our attention to a Helen Garner review of a film version of the famous Tolstoy novel, a review which begins with a reference to “a class of literature that, by its very nature, is not adaptable to screen” (qtd. in McFarlane “Wasn’t Like That” 4). McFarlane disagrees with Garner; he argues film narration can be as authoritative as the narrative voice of the novel. But Garner is not arguing for a faithful adaptation, she is arguing against any adaptation of *Anna Karenina*. Nor is McFarlane arguing for a faithful adaptation; quite the opposite, he is arguing for what he calls ‘adaptation proper’ (7). To briefly digress – what does he mean by ‘adaptation proper’? In his book *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation* McFarlane makes a distinction between:

those novelistic elements which can be transferred and those which require adaptation proper, the former essentially concerned with narrative, which functions irrespective of medium, and the latter with enunciation, which calls for consideration of two different signifying systems. By narrative is meant a series of (more or less) causally connected events working together toward the illumination of a larger, underlying pattern which shapes the whole work, while enunciation comprehends all those elements of the work responsible for the display of this narrative. (195)

Some examples of adaptation proper would be the tone of a novel, point of view, ‘feel’ and wordplay. Still, going back to the commentary on *Anna Karenina*, McFarlane is concerned about fidelity:

I suspect a training in literature doesn’t simply fail to provide an understanding of how a film is working. I think it goes further, and more damagingly, to set up a sort of Leavisite evaluative judgment, a high culture/popular culture hierarchy, in which film inevitably comes below/behind the literary text. For such evaluations, the film is only really valuable as it approximates the precursor literary text. (“Wasn’t Like That” 4)

Someone must be arguing for fidelity...but who? Not George Bluestone. According to Kamilla Elliott (“Word/Image” 2), Thomas Leitch (“Where Are We Going” 17) and many others, the foundational text of adaptation studies is Bluestone’s 1957 book *Novels into Film* . Just as Horace compared painting and poetry, Gotthold Ephraim

Lessing in “Laocoon: An essay upon the limits of painting and poetry” compared the two means of expression, seeking to distinguish one from the other (qtd. in Elliott “Word/Image” 2). And Bluestone then applied Lessing’s distinctions between painting and poetry to novels and film. Bluestone designated “the novel as conceptual, linguistic, discursive, symbolic, inspiring mental imagery, with time as its formative principle, and the film as perceptual, visual, presentational, literal, given to visual images, with space as its formative principle” (qtd. in Elliott, “Word/Image” 2) . He noted that “changes are *inevitable* the moment one abandons the linguistic for the visual medium” (Bluestone 5) and he concludes, “It is as fruitless to say that film A is better or worse than novel B as it is to pronounce Wright’s Johnson’s Wax building better or worse than Tchaikowsky’s [sic] *Swan Lake*” (Bluestone 5-6).

There is a resounding consensus among contemporary scholars that adaptation studies needs to move ‘beyond fidelity’. Simone Murray surveys this consensus in her article “Materializing Adaptation Theory: The Adaptation Industry” and it is beyond the scope of this exegesis to exhaustively catalogue the complaints against the fidelity discourse. In answer to the question posed earlier – someone must be arguing for fidelity...but who? – Murray says: “Most striking in reading back over 50 years of academic criticism about adaptation is not the dead hand of fidelity criticism, but – quite the opposite – how few academics make any claim for fidelity criticism at all” (6).

In book-to-film adaptation the issue of fidelity or faithfulness is a straw man, a ghostship, but in looking at creative hybrids, reversing the flow, we may be able to reconsider fidelity.

1.3 Varieties of Adaptation

Instead of asking if a film adaptation was faithful to a book, a new question arose: what sort of adaptation is it?

J. Dudley Andrew, writing in the mid-80s and limiting himself “to those cases where the adaptation process is foregrounded, that is, where the original is held up as a worthy source or goal”, defined three modes of adaptation: Borrowing – where “the artist employs, more or less extensively, the material, idea, or form of an earlier, generally successful text”; Intersecting – where “the uniqueness of the original text is preserved to such an extent that it is deliberately left unassimilated in adaptation”; and Transforming – whose quest for fidelity of one kind or another inevitably raises questions about the specificity of these two signifying systems” of literature and cinema (Andrew 29-34 as qtd in Leitch, *Discontents* 93). His overall approach can be considered evaluative.

Denise Faithfull says there are four types of adaptation: her overview is of particular interest because she is writing for practising screenwriters and therefore giving them permission to try different things – but at the same time she is unashamedly evaluative.

The first types are “intersections” – a term and concept she borrows from the aforementioned J.Dudley Andrew. They don’t seek to be faithful. She argues that “this kind of adaptation is cinematically inventive and compounds the original, lifting the literary or theatrical into the cinematic dimension.” (75). In her assessment,

intersections – unlike other types she identifies – offer “a two-fold pleasure: a film that works cinematically but which also matches or multiplies its source” (89).

The second types of adaptations are “variations”. “They retain the core of the original but change, add or omit significant elements, thereby creating a different text” (77). A variation, she says, is often criticised for not being faithful to the original (77). In her evaluation, she says variations “display a reluctance to veer too far from the ancestral text” (88). She disapprovingly points to the sense we get with variations “that another text, with which we may or may not be familiar, hovers behind the film”(89).

The third types of adaptations are “appropriations” – which are “rebellious departure[s] from the source” (81). They create “a new and fundamentally different text” (84). They use the source as “little more than raw material” (89) – to Faithfull’s dismay, because we don’t get the “two-fold pleasure’ of an intersection. *Beau Travail*, written and directed by Claire Denis, is an example of a radical adaptation, an appropriation even, of Herman Melville’s unfinished novella, *Billy Budd*. “The narrative in that project had no interest for me” said Denis. “I was never interested in Billy Budd. Claggart is the most interesting, because he's the one who feels his envy, in the sense that he's not the perfect one. But he's doing his duty, and he wants respect for that” (Meyer Screen 1). In the Denis version the action takes place among the French Foreign Legion in a desolate unidentified place somewhere in the Gulf of Djibouti. Hers is a beautiful, wonderful film.

The fourth types of adaptations are faithful adaptations. Fidelity alert. Faithfull doesn't hold back in her evaluation of faithful adaptations:

Faithful adaptations favour the written text over the cinematic medium, which can lead to a multitude of sins. Frequently the word reigns supreme and adaptors confine their visual interpretations to describing suitable backdrops for the dialogue or resort to narrative description through voice-over. This is why faithful adaptations look like illustrations and sound like someone is reading a book. This kind of adaptation is particularly common amongst adaptations of 'the classics' or other cherished texts filmmakers feel they shouldn't tinker with. The result is 'literary', reverential, frequently static and usually dull. (86)

In sharp contrast to an evaluative model, Thomas Leitch seeks a project of categorization which is not evaluative (*Discontents* 93-126). He uses Genette's five possible modes of how one text relates to another (here a 'text' is any text; it doesn't have to be a film or book, so this approach subsumes film adaptation, that is, his theory is not centred on book-to-film adaptation). He advances Genette's categories by exploring notions of the 'hypertextual' (any relationship between Text A and Text B such as adaptation) and the 'intertextual' (allusion). It is beyond the scope of this exegesis to investigate these categories at length; his conclusions are of most interest – "the categories I have proposed ... however useful they may be in distinguishing particular strategies, are unable to separate particular adaptations into categories because even straightforward adaptations typically make use of many intertextual strategies" (126). In other words, Leitch is forced to conclude that fixed or absolute

categorical distinctions are not plausible. Turning the tables, it's worth noting that when it comes to studying hybrids we would do well to be wary of seeking hardline distinctions.

What lies beyond fidelity, and also beyond categories or norms? Leitch's new direction is literacy. In his chapter "Where Are We Going, Where Have We Been?" he argues for an active engagement with text. He says:

Instead of asking how has an adaptation succeeded or failed in capturing the leading textual features of its source text? Instead we can ask; How has a given adaptation rewritten its source text? Why has it chosen to select and rewrite the source text it has? How have the texts available to us inevitably been rewritten by the very act of reading? How do we want to rewrite them anew? (332)

Leitch's key question is: "Living as we all do in culture marked by traces of thousands of texts, how do we want to respond to those texts, and what kind of skills do we need to do so?"(332). This call for a focus on skills, on the actual writing practice of adaptation, will be addressed in an exegetical consideration of 'Disquiet' as screenplay and as novella.

Another new direction is that proposed by David Kranz: he calls for "an appreciation for the economic, historical, cultural and ideological pressures which impinge upon the productions of ...film adaptations" ("Trying Harder" 85). Similarly, Simone Murray argues that closer attention be paid to "the adaptation industry" (15). She is interested in the industrial dimensions in contemporary media cultures and would like

to see a thorough mapping of the contemporary Anglophone adaptation economy (20).

Peter Lev in his chapter “The Future of Adaptation Studies” proposes two further new directions. Very simply, he calls for a “detailed study of the screenplay” (336). Speaking about film, he suggests we acknowledge an adaptation may have more than one source of influence. He says:

I believe one important direction for the future is greater hybridity. Films are often based on multiple works, visual as well as textual. Paintings, photographs, news articles, historical events, films, television shows, and so on can be sources for films; one loses some of the richness of this impure art by limiting sources to novels and plays. (335)

All of these proposals for new directions will be borne in mind when it comes to our case-studies and study of ‘Disquiet’.

1.4 The Screenplay

A cursory glance at Amazon.com will reveal there exists a vast literature on ‘how to write a screenplay’. The first modern bestseller was Syd Field’s *Screenplay – The Foundations of Screenwriting* first published in 1979: over half a million copies have been printed (Parker 4). Other immensely popular works are *Making a Good Script Great* by Linda Seger and *Story: Substance, Structure, Style, and the Principles of Screenwriting* by Robert McKee. This body of literature is not new. In 1920 over 90 books on screenwriting were published in English (Azlant 209).

Conversely, the screenplay has been largely neglected in academic discussions on adaptation: it's as if researchers have leapfrogged the screenplay in their eagerness to consider book-to-film adaptations. There are a few notable exceptions: one of these is Marilyn Hoder-Salmon's "Kate Chopin's *The Awakening*: Screenplay as Interpretation" in which she set out to investigate adaptation by practice, that is, by writing her own adaptation of a famous novel. She says "In taking adaptation studies one step further by creating an original screenplay for interpretive purposes, I enter an area with almost no precedents" (12). Writing in 1992, she found only one related study: a dissertation on Faulkner's *Light in August* in which segments from the novel are adapted into both screenplay and chamber theatre scenes (Hoder-Salmon 12). Another notable exception, different in approach, is Kevin Alexander Boon's 2008 work, *Script Culture and the American Screenplay*, which considers the screenplay as a literary object worthy of critical inquiry.

Why this neglect? Peter Lev posits two pragmatic reasons. First, "screenplays are often difficult to access, requiring travel to faraway archives" (337). That accessibility has been difficult in the past is instanced by Grahame Greene's *The Third Man*: the film was shot in 1949 while the screenplay was first published in 1973 by a small publisher. Still, with the advent of internet websites such as Drew's Script-O-Rama which makes hundreds of scripts freely available online it would seem accessibility isn't the terrible obstacle it once may have been. That said, screenplays not in English are still harder to find because the majority of screenplay websites are Anglophone. Screenplays created before computers, that is, in typescript, are also harder to find because getting them online is more labour-intensive than a few clicks of a button. Another access consideration is copyright and

a producer's unwillingness to make screenplays freely available. Lev's second (and less contestable) reason for the general neglect of screenplay study is that "understanding the connections between screenplays (often multiple drafts), literary sources, and finished films involves lengthy, painstaking research" (337).

We can posit further reasons:

1) This is my Occam's Razor reason: adaptation studies grew out of the word/image debate and the most obvious comparison to be made in the chain of creative production leading to an adaptation is between the start and the finish, between the word medium and the film medium. Apples and oranges. Word/image is meatier, more mysterious (at first glance!) than prose/screenplay comparison.

2) Screenplays are an acquired taste. Unlike books and films which are created as 'finished works' for a wide audience, a screenplay is written for a small professional audience. This is changing, marginally, with the occasional mainstream publication of a screenplay based on a successful film. Most of us are familiar with reading novels but few of us are familiar with the practice or habit of reading screenplays. Because a screenplay is 'bare bones' it exercises different imaginary muscles. Scholars, students need to develop these muscles.

3) The earliest films were gags: no screenplay required. Later, as the first theatres dedicated exclusively to movies opened, and with advent of the 12-minute reel, fictional narrative began to emerge as the leading model for all cinema (Leitch, *Adaptation and Its Discontents*, One Reel Epics, 26). Leitch puts the year of this emergence at 1907 (26). The screenplays of this era were more or less shot lists, descriptions of scenes in continuity. Screenplays began as short shrift. In time, the screenplay and its conventions were established. It is beyond the scope of this

exegesis to chart the history of the screenplay but given the inauspicious origins of screenwriting it is hard to believe that in the rise and fall of fortunes across the film industry there once was a time when screenwriters were kings. Linda Costanzo Cahir says that prior to a film's director being considered the single most influential force in the creation of a film it was the screenwriter, the adapter who forges her own vision of the parent literary work, who was the most important, with the other members of the production team, including the director, functioning as technical assistants in service to the writer's concepts (87). A catchphrase from Mel Brooks in *History of the World, Part One* comes to mind. He played dual roles – the king and piss-boy, the boy who collected the king's urine – Brooks' line was "it's good to be the king." The memoirs of contemporary screenwriters indicate that today the role of screenwriter is that of piss-boy. Curiously, this has nothing to do with the fact that the film is a collaborative medium: playwrights rarely complain about being subordinate; any changes to the text of a play need to be approved by the playwright and a play's reputation rides on the playwright. Jose Rivera is a contemporary playwright and screenwriter and so he is in a good position to shed light on the different position of the writer in the film and theatre industries, even when working in film under the best possible conditions. He says:

Perhaps I'm naïve - I guess I am, mostly because *The Motorcycle Diaries* is my first made film, I wasn't prepared emotionally for the extent to which it is the director's movie and not mine. I was not prepared for that. And in a way it was...not hurtful...it was disappointing in a professional and personal way that this is treated as a movie by Walter Salles – who as you know from this interview I could not respect any more than I do; I mean, I love the man. But it is

something to feel that as people experience film, they really do experience film as the vision of one person, and that person is not me in this case. Whereas in the theater, no matter who the director is, the play is my play, and I know it and the audience knows it. (Rivera interview).

1.5 Novelisation

Just as the screenplay has been overlooked in traditional adaptation studies so too the novelisation. In Part One it was established that the theory and practice of adaptation has to date been largely directed from book-to-film. Academic study of the reverse direction, film-to-book, “has been almost non-existent” (Allison 8). Jan Baetens, writing an article in 2005 on novelisation says “Whereas there are numerous studies available on the interaction between literature and film, novelisation itself has not yet been the object of in-depth research” (45). There is a simple enough reason for this oversight, if we can really call it that: novelisations are most often based on screenplays, so any comparison is text to text, and as we have seen with book-to-screenplay research, traditional adaptation studies are geared towards issues raised by the word/image debate, by ‘adaptation proper’.

Are there novelisations from film to book, bypassing the screenplay? Linda

Constanzo Cahir claims:

Curiously, there is not one, single, sustained literary novel that functions as a translation of a film, that reconfigures and transforms the original cinematic material into the writer’s notion of the integral meaning and value of the film text. While there are many novelizations of screenplays, there is no novel that translates a film in

such a way that the literature merges as a self-reliant text, an accomplished and individualistic offspring of the movie. To date, there is no film-based novel that attempts a direct and conscious translation – a literal, traditional, or radical translation – of a film from the language of cinema into the language of literature. Simply put and curiously, in the case of the novel, there is no existing literature that attempts to do with film what film has done with literature. (Cahir 142).

The claim is a bold one because it is almost impossible for anyone to be on top of all published books, and there are arguably some exceptions. Award-winning author Jonathan Lethem's *Girl in Landscape*, for example, scuttles the claim. First published in 1998, and widely reviewed, the novel is – according to Lethem in an interview in the *Washington Post* – "a very deliberate attempt to rewrite John Ford's movie *The Searchers*' in an interplanetary context...I did *The Searchers*' from the point of view of the Natalie Wood character. On Mars." Still, *Girl in Landscape* is an extremely unusual project and Cahir may even argue that it fails the test of adaptation because it departs too far from its source. Whatever the case, she effectively highlights that film-to-book 'direct and conscious translation' is, at best, rare.

Taking a closer look at novelisation, film-to-book adaptation, it is important to distinguish 'filmic books' from novelisations. That is, books which are influenced by film, whose prose is imagistic and/or uses prose equivalents of filmic techniques such as the close-up or intercutting. In her novel *Orlando*, Virginia Woolf (our early commentator on traditional adaptation) can be said to be influenced by film (Ouditt

146-156). Further, within this group of filmic books using film techniques, novelisations can be distinguished from plot-driven books which are virtually films-in-waiting, that seem to have been written in order to sell the film rights. Cormac McCarthy's *No Country for Old Men* is a high-brow example. With these books both the author and the reader have almost interiorised the film world. Lastly, novelisations can be distinguished from original novels which are closely allied to a film franchise, which take a film's hero on a new adventure. By way of example, best-selling author Sebastian Faulks has recently written a new James Bond story, *Devil May Care*, commissioned by the estate of the dead original creator, Ian Fleming.

What do we mean by 'novelisation'? Baetens, looking for a prototypical or 'mainstream' definition identifies three approaches to novelisation: the first is where a novel is written on the basis of a screenplay and subsequently the publication of the book coincides with the release of the movie. Second, there are the novelisations of science fiction movies, television series, role-playing games or computer games; third, there are mass distribution paperbacks written after the film, the kind of book one finds in airport and supermarket stands (46).

Novelization is not an unheard of practice— although it is fair to say most films are not novelised. Randall Larson's *Films Into Books* lists a bibliography of more than 2,500 titles. Novelisations based on *Dr. Who*, *Twilight Zone* and *Star Trek* TV series are the most prolific. *Star Wars* has engendered its own novelisation galaxy. While the bulk of novelisations may be 'recent', novelisation itself is not a recent practice.

Larson notes the practice can be found as far back as the 1920s; and King Kong was novelized in 1933 (Larson 3-4).

Earlier we have seen that a reason for the prevalence of book-to-film adaptation is the ‘value-added’ prestige a book can bring to a film – but with novelisation it is quite the opposite. Mainstream novelisations, those discussed above, are poorly respected in both the film world and in the literary world. Has anyone heard of a prize in either industry for ‘best novelisation’? Perhaps this is no surprise if the authors are hacks on deadline racing for simultaneous release, working an average of four to six weeks on a book, an average determined by Larson in his survey of novelisation authors (Larson 12). In her brief discussion on the topic, Linda Constanzo Cahir castigates novelisations of the commercial hit films *Pretty in Pink*, *Top Gun* and *Dirty Harry*, saying: “While these novels remain faithful to the details of the screenplay’s story, they lack the style, complexity, subtlety, and inventiveness of literary excellence” (140). Deborah Allison quotes Jonathan Coe’s caustic appraisal as representative of the prevailing attitude: he calls novelisation “that bastard, misshapen offspring of the cinema and the written word” (qtd in Allison 3).

But there is good news on the novelisation front. There is in fact a continuum of novelisation – ranging from Baeten’s “standardised subnovelistic canon” (48) of mainstream novelisation to a more experimental form, which he acknowledges with mention of writers Alain Robbe-Grillet and Marguerite Duras (48). That continuum is heavily weighted toward mainstream novelisation. Against contemporary currents in both writing practice and in adaptation studies, we shall now turn to the more experimental end of the continuum.

2 CREATIVE HYBRIDS

Having familiarised ourselves with the lay of the land, we will now stake out a specific area of study within the cross-pollinated fields of adaptation, screenplays, and novelisations. So far we have been using the language of a ‘one-way affair’, of book-to-film adaptation, or film-to-book novelisation, a linear directional language which may be misleading. It is misleading because it assumes that when there is a book and a film, or a book and a screenplay, that one came first, then the other. While this is most often the case – a creative traffic in one direction or the other – it is not *always* the case.

There exists another admittedly very small class or group of creative works at the far end of the novelisation continuum which we can call – for now at least - hybrids. Certainly, hybridity is a widely used term; it has currency in contemporary debates about cultural crossover and it also has a place in scientific discourse; we shall adapt the broad term to suit the purposes of this exegesis. In this discussion of hybrids we shall limit ourselves to works created by one author, where there is (more or less) one story, and where there is an inherent relationship between film and literature from the very first moments of conception. These delineations or limitations are guided by the project of ‘Disquiet’, novella and screenplay, with one author, and one story, a twice-told tale.

A study of different types of hybrids enables us to revisit the very basic idea of a ‘source text’. As we have seen, Peter Lev (335) suggested that with traditional book-to-film adaptations we also acknowledge that the book might not be the only source

of a film. Photography, architecture, all manner of things can be a source for a film that is based on a book. As well as taking onboard this idea of multiple sources we can also rethink 'source' in a more fundamental way.

What form does a film or a book take before it finds form as a book and/or a film?

The question is a little like the famous zen koan: what is my original face? And as with a koan, the answer is 'beyond rationality'. To parlay a term often used in mystical religious traditions but one that is not strictly religious we could say the answer lies in the 'mysterium tremendum et fascinans', in the fearful and fascinating realm of mystery. Who knows where stories arise from. Very rarely do they arise all in one piece. Literary journalists often ask writers "where did you get the idea?".

There can come an anecdote as an answer ("I was reading my grandfather's diary and I came across an entry in which...") but one suspects such anecdotes are chiefly for convenience's sake. Reading a diary entry may well have sparked a work, but sparked against which flint. It is enough for the purposes of this exegesis to say there is 'something' that arises before an artist fixes on the best form that the 'something' should take.

Now – what if the first form of the 'something' is double, or doubled, what if the prose already contains a future film. Graham Greene's novella *The Third Man* was written almost as an exercise for fleshing out the world of a screenplay that he had been commissioned to write. Pier Paolo Pasolini created the novel and film of *Theorem* simultaneously. Ingmar Bergman's novel *The Best Intentions* was specifically written as a detailed creative blueprint, a super screenplay, for Bille August to direct. We shall return to each of these examples in our case-studies. If we

had more space we could also marvel at Marguerite Duras' prose hybrid *The North China Lover*. This work utterly confounds the notion of source: first she wrote the novel *The Lover*; then she wrote a screenplay; the film *The Lover* was made; and then, after falling-out with the film's director, she wrote *another* novel/prose hybrid based on the very same story, in which she explicitly referred to the work's hybrid nature.

The process of writing 'Disquiet' in both its forms is slightly different to each of the case-studies. First, the 'something' arose. Second, an extremely rough 10,000 or so words were bashed down on the page, lucid monkey-typing, over one weekend, with no thought for either screenplay or prose style – except to say that the 'something' was highly visual; it played out in the mind's eye. And then came a first draft of a screenplay, a shaping of that crude written material into the conventions of the screenplay. Then came the novella – patient work with a great deal of attention paid to the sound of each sentence, to every turn of phrase. Then came subsequent drafts of the screenplay interleaved with subsequent drafts of the novella. Which came first? Neither.

When we reconsider the notion of the 'source text' we also revisit fidelity. Firstly, as the one creator of both works, to whom is one being unfaithful? Or put another way, an author of a book and of a screenplay based on her own book, cannot be unfaithful to herself. Secondly – and going a little deeper with this notion of infidelity – even if the author is happy enough with her own dual creations, can we as readers/consumers say that one work sets a benchmark for the other, thereby setting up fidelity criteria for success of the other work? With hybrids this wouldn't seem to be possible – the

answer to which is the source would still be ‘neither’. Which is not to say the reader/consumer can’t set other criteria for success, can’t evaluate each iteration of that ‘something’ in terms of medium specificity. That is, by asking how well does it work on the terms it has set for itself.

‘Hybrids’, ‘iterations’, ‘experimental novelisations’ – how are we to think of these narratives? Maybe we can extend the metaphors of abstract mental conceiving, conception, to physical conceiving (a well-worn extension, a cliché) so that the original ‘something’ is the first cell which then splits into twins. A novella and a screenplay as twins. Which twin came first? Neither. But on second thoughts that metaphor needs finessing – for a novella is not an exact double of a screenplay. In his maligning of mainstream novelisation Baetens says that the practice “does not so much aspire to become the movie’s *other* as it wants to be its *double*. This strategy of conflict avoidance makes it an anti-adaptation – defined as an adaptation that strives to identify itself *as* an adaptation and to deny the ruptures every adaptation necessarily poses” (50). So let us accept the necessary rupture: monozygotic or identical twins wouldn’t be apt – perhaps dizygotic or un-identical twins...what a mouthful.

And how shall we speak of the process of moving between two texts? The metaphor of shuttling – as in weaving – is pleasing because weaving is a *back-and-forth* slow steady act of creation: in the study of ‘Disquiet’ we can shuttle between the two works, novella and screenplay. Shuttle or shuffle: just as the two works, novella and screenplay, came about through shuttling, shuffling. Kamilla Elliott in her analysis of adaptation strategies (not categories) took Lewis Carroll’s *Alice in Wonderland* as her

point of departure. In Alice-like fashion she likened literature and cinema to “reciprocal looking glasses” which would theoretically “ensure...an endless series of inversions and reversals” (Elliott, *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate* 212). This ‘reciprocal looking glass’ image for a prose medium and a film medium has merit because it dispenses with source and any one-way direction. It could also work well for a prose/screenplay comparison. Linda Costanzo Cahir, again looking at the book medium and the film medium, not the book and the screenplay, and still considering the novel as “source text” (97), is in agreement with Elliott when she says “the novel and the film are seen as independent entities, to be assessed independently and, simultaneously, to be explored inter-relationally” (Cahir 98). Her analogy is that of the diptych:

Studying the novel and the novel-based film hinged together, one to the other, allows for an illumination the sort of which occurs in a diptych...in a successful diptych, when the panels are set side by side, motifs in the second evoke and comment on the first, even as the first evokes and comments on the second. Each canvas illuminates the other....The most successful diptychs, much like the best metaphysical conceits, work because, while the boldness of the coupling might startle us (much as a radical film translation placed in comparison to the source novel might), the diptych guides us toward discoveries of unities that were previously unconsidered. (98)

The novella and the screenplay of ‘Disquiet’ were never designed to be considered side-by-side, unlike the two panels of a true diptych. That is, this exegesis was not the ultimate goal of the creative process. The simple goal was for the two works, novella

and screenplay, to each make their own way in the world. Still, we shall see that the guiding principle of the diptych is enabling when it comes to considering both ‘Disquiet’ and other case-studies of hybrids. Both the looking glass and the diptych are very visual metaphors, they play on our sense of sight: the looking glass reflects and the diptych illuminates. Resonance is another term, not visual, it has to do with the synchronous vibration of sound. How do two works telling the one story, born of the one ‘something’, resonate? All three approaches are distinctly non-hierarchical and it is in their spirit that we shall turn to the case studies.

3 CASE STUDIES

3.1 Case-study: Graham Greene’s *The Third Man*

Graham Green’s *The Third Man* falls into a category of hybrids where the author wrote two different works based on the one story – one in the form of prose and one in the form of a screenplay – and where the film medium was from the outset inherent in the prose. Because Greene is an enormously well-known author, and because the film *The Third Man* was a great and enduring success (it won the 1949 Grand Prix at Cannes and in 1999 the British Film Institute selected it as the best British film of the 20th century) we are lucky that both the screenplay and the prose version, the novella, are easily available. Another reason *The Third Man* makes for a good case-study is because Greene himself has gone on the record about the process of his ‘adaptation’. John Tibbetts in *Novels into Film* calls the prose version of the story a “novelization of the screenplay” (279) but this is not quite right. As we shall soon see, Greene wrote the novella *before* he began the screenplay – but if it were as simple as that then we wouldn’t be able to call the novella a novelisation or a hybrid at all. The creation of *The Third Man* in both its forms muddles any notion of source

text or one-direction adaptation. Above all, *The Third Man* is a good case-study because it usefully illuminates the broader sociological context of adaptation – in the manner earlier called for by David Kranz and Simone Murray.

Greene famously had a kind of shameless (or perhaps *modest? self-deprecatory?*) attitude to his own work, at least early on in his long prolific career. He divided his novels – novels proper – into “entertainments” (his name), a class in which he included Brighton Rock, and into more serious literary works such as *The Power and the Glory*. His entertainments, as the name suggests, he could almost wave away with a sniff. He worked in the film industry but sneered at screenwriters. Writing about a lunch he attended where Louis B Mayer was celebrating the decision of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer to produce films in the United Kingdom, Greene excoriated his fellow writers in attendance: “...the writers, a little stuffed and a little boozed, lean back and dream of the hundred pounds a week – and all that’s asked in return the dried imagination and the dead pen” (*The Lost Childhood* 212). Did he himself write *The Third Man* with a dead pen – no, he did not. That kind of comment about screenwriters does not seem out of character for Greene. He thrived on antagonising other people. Shirley Hazzard touches on this character trait in her memoir *Greene on Capri*. She refers to his “inclination or compulsion to foment trouble, to shake up tameness and disturb the peace” (71). In this way, taking pleasure in being disagreeable, Greene was not unlike a man known as Harry Lime, the shadowy presence at the heart of the novella, the screenplay and the film *The Third Man*.

Harry Lime has invited his friend, Rollo Martins (in the novella his name is Rollo but because the actor Joseph Cotten objected to this when he read the novella/treatment

the name was changed for both screenplay and film to Holly Martins) to Vienna shortly after the end of World War 2. Almost immediately upon his arrival Martins learns that his friend Harry Lime has been killed in a traffic accident. He attends Lime's funeral. There he meets Major Calloway who advises Martins to leave Vienna. Martins feels compelled to further investigate the death. In the course of these investigations he again crosses paths with Major Calloway and learns about Lime's true work in Vienna: Lime is a racketeer who exploited war-time shortages by selling diluted penicillin, an unscrupulous practice that resulted in pain, injury and/or death for his unwitting customers. Just when Martins is prepared to leave Vienna who should he catch glimpse of – but Harry Lime. Alive and well. The plot thickens...

The location, Vienna after the war, is a vital element of *The Third Man*. Greene is giving us the portrait of a place, a particular world. The director Carol Reed explained the success of the film by saying it was one of the first British films allowed to be made chiefly on location. Until that time, making films in studios had falsified and glamorised all (qtd in Sinclair 5). The novella opens with the narrator, Major Calloway, telling the reader that “if you are to understand this strange, rather sad story you must have an impression at least of the background – the smashed dreary city of Vienna divided up in zones among the Four Powers...” and the narrator goes on for over a page to describe Vienna the city (Greene novella 13-14). We will return to the question of narration. Not long after, when Martins is on the way to Lime's first funeral, Greene gives us another full page description of place – of the streets Martins passes through and how they are policed, of the cemetery in a corner of a vast snow-bound park. In the screenplay, which in accordance with screenplay conventions minimises ‘big print’ or location description, the opening is of Martins

flying into Vienna, largely aerial shots and airport shots. When Martins makes it through customs and is on the way to (he thinks) meet Lime we have the following short scene:

“TRAVELLING SHOTS: LOCATION (DAY)

As the bus makes its way through the ruined and devastated parts of Vienna, showing Martin’s reactions to the scenes, obviously new to him, for he looks with great interest and with a sense of revulsion. (Greene screenplay 20)

Comparing the long prose descriptions of place, Vienna, with the screenplay we can see why Greene called screenplays “dull shorthand” (Greene novella 9). Of course, there is a reason behind the shorthand: in a film we will ‘see’ the location ourselves, with our own eyes, and we don’t need language to build it brick by brick. And pragmatically, if a film is being shot on location and not in a studio then the choice of locations will boil down to choices which suit the director and also are achievable within the production budget and schedule. Happenstance is a large factor in determining locations. Greene knew that unless a location was absolutely ‘key’ to the story – as in the Ferris Wheel scene and as in the cemetery – there was little point in outlining it in detail. With the cemetery he did go into some detail in the big print – but to a much lesser extent than in the novella. Actually, he gave a different description because in the screenplay he focussed on the various statues and headstones in the cemetery and even though he touched on the “great pompous family headstones” (Greene novella 20) mentioned in the prose he elaborated upon this family in the screenplay (Greene screenplay 21-22). Same writer, same cemetery, same headstones, different description.

This discussion of location becomes even more curious if we compare the screenplay to the film. The film's opening differs to that of the screenplay – in fact it is more akin to the opening of the novella. Why? The film opens with the voice-over of an unknown narrator (the voice is Reed's), echoing Major Calloway's narrator point-of-view, and it shows a montage of many shots of the city – establishing a sense of place and explaining how the city was policed – just as Calloway instructed readers of the novella. As for the cemetery scene, the director Carol Reed for whatever reason made the decision not to shoot the headstones and statues clearly identified by Greene in the screenplay.

Another thought about location: the very choice of a strong unique location, a particular world, is – arguably – an early indicator that there may be the watermark of “film” in a prose work. Location or place is ‘all around’; it's everywhere on screen, visually omnipresent. This is not to say all good films need unique locations – but a good location helps.

This key choice of location in *The Third Man* was not made by the writer. It was made by the producer, Alexander Korda. He didn't make the choice for aesthetic or thematic reasons or because he loved Vienna – he made it for commercial production finance reasons. Charles Drazin in his book *In Search of The Third Man* says:

After the war Sir Alexander Korda was keen that his company London Film Productions should establish links with the former occupied or enemy territories on the Continent. For many years these countries had been without British or American films, and Korda saw an opportunity to make a substantial profit by promoting his old productions. But strict

currency controls throughout Europe made it difficult to remit the earnings back to Britain. The practical solution was to put these revenues to some constructive purpose in the countries in which they were generated. (Drazin 4)

In his preface to the novella, Greene gives his version of how things came about:

So years back, on the flap of an envelope, I had written an opening paragraph: ‘I had paid my last farewell to Harry a week ago, when his coffin was lowered into the frozen February ground, so that it was with incredulity that I saw him pass by, without a sign of recognition, among the host of strangers in the Strand’. I, no more than my hero, had pursued Harry, so when Sir Alexander Korda asked me to write a film for Carol Reed – to follow our Fallen Idol – I had nothing more to offer than this paragraph. Though Korda wanted a film about the four-power occupation of Vienna, he was prepared to let me pursue the tracks of Harry Lime. (Greene novella 9)

Korda sent Greene to Vienna to do some research – under contract to write “an original post-war continental story to be based on either or both of the following territories: Vienna, Rome” (Drazin 5). In Vienna Greene met up with the journalist Peter Smollet – the introduction was made by Elizabeth Montagu, working for the producer Korda, who had given Greene stories written by Smollet, one of which had to do with a children’s hospital and diluted penicillin. Greene’s curiosity was piqued. He left for Italy, where he sat down to write the novella, from March 2 – April 24 1948.

How did Greene conceive of the novella? Why even though it is written in a fairly conventional prose style is it a hybrid? We have discussed the process of creation and the answer, that it is a hybrid because the film from the outset was inherent in the prose, becomes even clearer in his preface:

To me it is almost impossible to write a film play without first writing a story. Even a film depends on more than plot, on a certain measure of characterisation, on mood and atmosphere; and these seem to me almost impossible to capture for the first time in the dull shorthand of a script. One can reproduce an effect caught in another medium, but one cannot make the first act of creation in script form. One must have the sense of more material than one needs to draw on. *The Third Man*, therefore, though never intended for publication, had to start as a story before those apparently interminable transformations from one treatment to another.

(Greene novella 9)

Once the novella was finished Greene and Reed met with Korda to go over it in detail. Reed then collaborated with Greene in writing the first draft of the script, going with him to Vienna for a week of research. Here we see that one conundrum of screenplay study is identifying the author of a screenplay, even identifying the author of the first draft. Once the first draft of the script was ready Greene and Reed went to California, to meet with Korda's appointed American co-producer, David Selznick. Selznick's involvement with the screenplay and the production, via notes and meetings, is well-documented in Drazin's *In Search of the Third Man*. The screenplay draft published by Faber and Faber is not the first draft of the script; Reed

and Korda and Selznick each made suggestions which shaped, to some degree, the published screenplay. Greene had to accept or fight off these suggestions from third parties, exercising his creative judgment, and being ultimately responsible for the creative work as a whole. It is beyond the scope of this exegesis to do more now than note screenplay study invites interrogation of the notion of ‘author’; in practice, questions of multiple-authorship, or different degrees of authorship, come into play. As Peter Lev noted, screenplay scholarship is difficult because it is hard to go behind closed doors and gain access to the minutiae of who contributed what to a screenplay, to trace how it evolved (337).

What were some of the shifts between the novella and the screenplay?

A striking difference, alluded to earlier, is that of point of view. The novella is narrated by Major Calloway, somewhat awkwardly, because we wonder how Calloway was able to penetrate so effectively into Martins’ inner thoughts and feelings. Greene uses the framing device of an address to the reader, a signalling of a story to follow, “an ugly story if you leave out the girl: grim and sad and unrelieved, if it were not for that absurd episode of the British Council lecturer” (Greene novella 15). The screenplay loses this point of view entirely. The framing device of any sort of voice-over, any sort of “I’m telling you a story”, is dropped altogether in all drafts of the screenplay – and it was only at the producer’s last minute behest that the finished film opens with the voice-over and images of Vienna montage prologue we have discussed above. In fact, at Selznick’s demand Carol Reed had to go back to Vienna three months after the shoot had wrapped in order to shoot those opening scenes.

There are numerous small omissions, the most significant of which is a kidnapping scene where the Russians kidnap Anna. Greene says in his preface that “it was not satisfactorily tied to the story and it threatened to turn the film into a propagandist picture” (Greene novella 11). Once more we see filmmaking in its broader sociological context: Greene and his producers had political concerns – or more accurately, apolitical concerns. It is an understatement to say that 1949 was a highly sensitive political time. One suspects that in an effort to maximise audiences in as many territories as possible, and in an effort to keep the powers-that-be happy, it was these sociological concerns rather than story concerns that drove the decision to cut the kidnapping scene. Regardless, its omission does not diminish the story; it is an example of the extra material Greene specifically set out to write in the novella. About this notion of extra or excess, “more material than one needs to draw on” (Greene 9): here we are touching on a crucial difference between prose and screenplays. Traditional screenplays are economic, they are ‘needs’-oriented, their strict parsimonious conventions discourage any sense of excess or what might be called, disparagingly, ‘fat’ or ‘fluff’. In her how-to-guide for screenwriters, Denise Faithfull advises against poetic turns of phrase, asides or observations in the big print. She says “these poetic indulgences leave the story dead in the water” (43). With prose, this is not the case. James Wood in *How Fiction Works* argues that the careful selection of detail in prose is all important and he makes the key point that “literature can carry more detail than it needs” (64). There can be surplus detail in literature just as life is full of detail. He talks about the role of irrelevance in fiction; good fiction can (should!) include elements which are “studiedly irrelevant” (69). This idea of fiction’s surplus or studied irrelevance applies to both detail in description and to story incidents and so makes for a sharp contrast with the needs-only (bare bones,

‘dull shorthand’) guiding principle of the conventional screenplay. A creative hybrid welcomes details over and above the mise-en-scene details of screenplay (lighting, set design, make-up, costumes, choreography, camera angles etc).

It is easy enough to spot the omission of a story incident but less easy to see where an underlying theme of a work is stronger in the prose, weaker in the screenplay. Here we are moving into the territory of McFarlane’s ‘adaptation proper’. In this case-study, the theme is that of the divided mind, a theme that preoccupied Greene. In his first novel, *The Man Within*, the central character says:

He was, he knew, embarrassingly made up of two persons, the sentimental, bullying, desiring child and another more stern critic. Always one part of him spoke, another part stood on one side and wondered, “Is this who I am speaking? Can I really exist like this?” (qtd in Hazzard 72).

The novella teases out this theme first of all with a mix-up in names – Rollo Martins checks into the hotel under the name Pete Dexter: already he is divided. Later Major Calloway makes this observation: “There was always a conflict in Rollo Martins – between the absurd Christian name and the sturdy Dutch (four generations back) surname. Rollo looked at every woman that passed and Martins renounced them for ever. I don’t know which one of them wrote the Westerns.” (Greene novella 15). The point of a divided mind is made repeatedly, for example, when Martins is about to meet Anna “he [Martins] was calm now, Martins not Rollo was in the ascendant” (Greene novella 40). It is a notion of division within one character. In the screenplay, however, the split-personality approach to Martins is eliminated and instead the double relationship between Martins and Lime is expanded. Imagery and verbal

suggestions present a new motif of the double in the screenplay. For example, in the screenplay there is a moment, not in the novella, where Anna confuses Martins with Lime.

Anna: Harry, what is it?

Martins: For Heaven's sake, don't call me Harry again

Anna: I'm sorry. (Greene screenplay 102)

The shift in nuance or theme is that, in the screenplay, the focus is on Martin's confrontation not with an aspect of himself but with his alter ego, and in confronting his old friend Martins finds a new maturity and a new moral centre (Gomez 334).

The omission of the kidnapping scene did not make an impact on the overall meaning of the story. A change to the final moments of the novella did, however, lift the narrative to another level. In the novella, at the second funeral, Martins rushes after Anna. Calloway describes the scene: "I don't think he said a word to her: it was like the end of a story except that before they turned out of my sight her hand was through his arm – which is how a story usually begins" (Greene novella 119). It is a happy hand-in-hand ending. The director Carol Reed, collaborating with Greene on the first draft, persuaded Greene to change this ending. So in the screenplay we have something different, something unromantic, something distinctly unhappy. Anna judges and rebuffs Martins:

He begins to walk down the road. CALLOWAY turns and watches.

ANNA is approaching. MARTINS stops and waits for her. She reaches him and he seeks in vain for a word. He makes a gesture with his hand, and she pays no attention, walking right past him and on into the distance.

MARTINS follows her with his eyes. From outside our vision we can hear a car horn blow again and again. (Greene screenplay120)

The above discussion of the novella puts paid to any lurking possibility that the novella, our hybrid, the first step of a two-step process, is nothing more than a film treatment. A film treatment is generally a 15-30 page document written before a screenplay which sets out the dramatic and cinematic way a writer intends to ‘treat’ the story in terms of style and unfolding narrative. According to the Australian Film Commission a level of detail that includes reported speech, locations, description etc is neither required nor productive in a treatment (“What is a Treatment?” 7-8). Detail within scenes and dialogue are to be avoided. Present tense is uniform. On all these counts *The Third Man* is squarely not a film treatment (and nor are any of the other hybrid case-studies).

Finally, even though this exegesis is focussed on hybrids and so on the relationship of prose to screenplay, it is worth quickly noting that two of the most famous elements of the finished film appeared in neither the novella nor the screenplay at any stage: the zither player was a discovery of Carol Reed’s while on location; the cuckoo clock speech was an innovation of the actor Orson Welles. Writers – who needs ‘em.

3.2 Case-study: Pier Paolo Pasolini’s *Theorem*

In addition to the *The Third Man* there is another case study within the “one author, two texts” category of hybrids that deserves mention, not because this exegesis proposes any exhaustive survey but because it shows that there are no norms at the far end of the novelisation continuum.

Unlike Greene's two-step process with *The Third Man*, *Theorem* was a simultaneous creation. In 1968 Pasolini shot the film of *Theorem*, and before the film got to screen he published the novel. He said it was as if the book had been painted with one hand while with the other he was working on a fresco, the film (qtd in Hood, Introduction). Both works stemmed from an idea that had taken shape five years earlier. There is little on record about the ins-and-outs of the process of creation, the exact time-line. The screenplay is not published in English. We can see that the final film does not include all elements of the novel. For our purposes it is enough that the author/creator himself clearly acknowledges the sense of parallel creation. For this reason, the film of *Theorem*, we can say, was inherent in the prose and so while the novel is a not a 'book of the film', that is, it is not a crude mainstream novelisation, it does fall within our idea of hybrid novelisations.

In the above discussion of *The Third Man* we said that Greene's prose style was 'fairly conventional'. To elaborate: Greene accesses the consciousness of his characters; he goes inside their heads; there is an interiority. The tale is narrated by Calloway, in the past tense. It unfolds in a linear fashion from A to Z. There is plenty of dialogue, presented in the same style Greene used for his novels proper. If he hadn't told us it was written with the intention of being transformed into a screenplay then it could perhaps pass as any other of his entertainments. Pasolini is another matter. On the one hand, the novel *Theorem* bears much stronger watermarks of its hybrid twin-nature than does Greene's novella; but on the other hand, it also includes elements that are so patently uncinematic they almost annul any idea of hybridity. If we were looking at book-to-film adaptations we'd likely say the work was an

‘intersection’ because it maximises the possibilities of prose – it’s not faithful, it’s more than a variation, and it’s too similar in story/themes/character to be an appropriation or radical departure. All credit to the author for his daring.

About the story, the plot – which is the same for the book and the film: an unnamed extremely beautiful young man, a foreigner, an incarnate Christ figure, arrives at the family villa of a conservative Milanese industrialist. He proceeds to seduce each and every member of the household: the housekeeper, Emilia; the son, Pietro; the daughter, Odetta; the wife, Lucia; the industrialist, Paolo, himself. Part One ends when out of the blue the guest receives a telegram and announces, dramatically, giving no explanation, in one of the very few instances of reported speech in the novel, “I have to leave tomorrow” (Theorem novel 78). In Part Two the household must accept the consequences of the visit, of each seduction.

For much of the novel Pasolini goes to great lengths not to enter into the heads of his characters: he never says “Odetta thinks X” or “Odetta feels Y”. This is in keeping with one of the screenplay’s major conventions – namely, the directive to write only what can be seen on screen, ‘to show not tell’. Interiority, characters who do a lot of thinking, usually poses an obstacle for adaptation (Faithfull 45). Pasolini does not use absence of interiority as a blanket rule but for most of Part One – and later in Part Two – it is the overwhelming guiding principle. At times he is overt about this choice of literary technique: for example, “We shall not enter Lucia’s consciousness” (149) or “We shall not even try to enter into Paolo’s consciousness, just as we did not enter the consciousness of Lucia” (167). At other times he has to dance around an absence of interiority. He does this by focussing on the ‘exterior’, on gazes and on

gesture. We shall see that 'Disquiet', in its own way, similarly eschews interiority and places particular attention on gaze and gesture.

Describing Emilia: "She gazes toward the youth in a very strange way like someone who does not have the courage to look and at the same time is so unaware that she feels no shame at her own insistence. On the contrary, her gaze becomes almost as if she were the one who was [sic] offended by that indiscreet insistence" (17).

Here he uses Emilia's gaze to convey her mood and he employs the technique of likening her to someone else in order to convey her feeling. It's not really 'someone' but Emilia who does not have the courage to look etc.

Describing Lucia: "...for an instant one has the impression (fleetingly and perhaps basically false) that she looks like a girl from the people" (10).

Here he wants to tell us that sometimes Lucia could sink from her uptight role back to more relaxed girl from the people. He externalises this by putting the reader in the position of the "one" who gets an impression by looking at Lucia – it's an impression only, fallible.

About the guest: "This attitude of his and the expression in his eyes, which seemed to say, 'It's nothing serious!' became still more marked when..." (20).

Here Pasolini concentrates on the gaze. The guest's eyes communicate what he could very well think (or speak).

About Lucia: "She repeats this gesture frequently, without losing her dignity, like a mother tending the wounds of her son" (31).

This is one example of the many instances where Pasolini writes as if he is seeing through a camera. We don't know for sure what she is feeling but gain an inkling via gesture – what she is going with her hands – and via metaphor: she is just like a mother tending the wounds of her son.

An absence of interiority is one watermark of a hybrid. Another is the tense of *Theorem* – by and large an “historical present which denies attempts to set the action at a particular time, season or date” (Hood, Introduction). As we have heard, present tense is the screenplay tense. Pasolini pushes or tests the present tense in the prose. He treats time in a rather basic fashion and is not concerned to give the reader an exact idea of how many days have passed between events, how many hours have passed during a day. This is reminiscent of the very basic DAY/NIGHT screenplay convention: a scene is introduced by the moniker day or night. A screenplay uses fewer textual markers denoting detailed passages of time. Here we can remind ourselves that George Bluestone thought ‘time’ – how time unfolds in a narrative – was the formative principle of novels (and space was the formative principle of film).

Some examples of Pasolini's treatment of time:

“It is an afternoon in late spring (or, given the ambiguous nature of our story, of early autumn), a silent afternoon.” (16)

“Perhaps it is still the same night as when we left Pietro contemplating the sleeping guest. (We underline it for the last time – the facts of this story are as one in place and time.)” (27)

“More time has passed.” (112)

Another way Pasolini indicates a change in the passage of time is via chapters. That is, he uses a chapter break for each scene. Part One opens with each new scene as a distinct short chapter. It is the physical break on the page, the white space, that denotes time. He also uses scene headings at the start of these chapters. For example, page 49 is headed in All Caps (as per screenplay convention) “19. BREAKFAST IN THE OPEN AIR”. There follows half a page of text describing the scene, the rest of the page is white space. In this way we are reminded of the screenplay which moves via ‘scene headings’ through the story. A screenplay is less concerned with verbal transitions or segues than is a novel.

Even though *in parts* the novel reads from scene-to-scene in screenplay fashion the structure of *Theorem* as a whole is not at all like that of a conventional screenplay.

Linda Seger in *Making a Good Script Great* outlines conventional screenplay structure. She subscribes to the three-act structure, what she calls “beginning, middle and end – or set-up, development, and resolution” (19). Such a comment (annoyingly) verges on truism so she goes further:

These acts for a feature film usually include a ten – to fifteen-page set-up of the story, about twenty pages of development in Act One, a long second act that might run forty five to sixty pages, and a fairly fast-paced third act of twenty to thirty-five pages...The movement in and out of one act into the next is usually accomplished by an action or an event called a turning point. (20)

In a diagram she further notes that the first turning point is between pages 25-35; the second turning point is between pages 75-90; the climax is approximately five pages from the end; and then the resolution follows at 1 –5 pages from the end (Seeger 20).

Seeger would send Pasolini straight to the back of the class. Part One unfolds in scenes – with next to no interiority – as discussed. That said, this section does include a couple of chapters which consist wholly of long poems – one from Odetta’s point of view; one from an omniscient narrator’s point of view. There is a long chapter which is set apart from the main narrative, the story of the household; it is an historical digression on the Jews setting out across the desert (71-76). And there is a long quotation, over two pages, from another novel, Tolstoy’s *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* (51-52). (Again we are reminded of the multiple sources that go into creative work). We can also note that the work uses an unusual framing device of ‘presentation of data’. The first words of the novel are “the first data in this story of ours consist, very modestly, of the description of the life of a family” (3). Pasolini, addressing the reader, assuming a strong authorial voice that is self-aware of the narrative process, lays out a persuasive presentation or proof of his ‘theorem’: a framing device far better suited to prose than to the screenplay which conventionally eschews a strong authorial voice, direct address and writerly self-awareness .

At the end of Part One there is an appendix consisting of long poems written in the plaintive first-person voices of those characters whose thoughts and feelings had previously been hidden or masked. Part Two then crosses back into a scene-by-scene unfolding of the consequences of the guest’s departure. And amid these scenes are more long poems as well as very deliberate interpolations in the form of

philosophical religious/political questions-and-answers. In a chapter titled 'An Investigation Into Sainthood' Pasolini writes:

And it is precisely in connection with this journalistic investigation that the reader must undergo the violence – perhaps unjustified violence – of an interpolation. It is the series of questions which the journalist puts to the people gathered in the courtyards of the farmstead: an interpolation which moreover belongs to a kind of language used in daily cultural commerce – in newspapers and in television – which is downright vulgar rather than trite. (152-153)

The narrative 'unjustified violences' of Pasolini's – his poems, historical digressions, quotations, questions-and-answers – all put the hybrid *Theorem* at a great remove from mainstream novelisation. His use of repetition (the repeated visitations and their consequences), of recasting his concerns, forms part of his scientific-literary method. The work reads as a report on the unstable element of desire. It is a striking literary experiment.

3.3 Case-study: Ingmar Bergman's *The Best Intentions*

So far we have looked at case-studies where there was one author and two texts, a hybrid novelisation and a screenplay, as well as a finished film. Now let us turn to another category: where there is one author of a hybrid and that one text serves as the screenplay for the finished film. So – one author, one hybrid text, one film.

Ingmar Bergman's *The Best Intentions* was simultaneously made for television and for film. The Swedish television version premiered in 1991 and was 325 minutes

long. The film version premiered in 1992 and was 182 minutes long. That year it won the prestigious Golden Palm at the Cannes International Film Festival. The hybrid novelisation was first published in 1991 in Swedish. The translation copyright notice reads “[copyright symbol] 1989, 1993 by Joan Tate”. The North American publisher, Arcade Publishing, made a point of emblazoning the title page and cover with a declaration that the text was indeed a novel: “The Best Intentions” is followed by the line “A Novel by Ingmar Bergman”. Looking at adaptation in its broader sociological context one gets the feeling that a written work ‘becomes’ whatever the publisher calls it. In its hope to maximise sales – because readers are accustomed to reading novels, not strange screenplay/prose hybrids – the publisher deemed the text a novel.

There was only one written text. Ingrid Dahlberg, the producer of both the TV and film versions, writing in response to a direct written enquiry on this point, said: “Ingmar Bergman used to write his scripts this way and you might very well read them as novels. But the script is the filmscript and might well end up as theater as well. The text is what it is” (Dahlberg email 18 June).

In his preface to the novel Bergman gives us some background as to his process of creation. He said that ever since his autobiographical *The Magic Lantern*, he’d had it in him to make a film about the time when his parents were young – the beginning of their marriage, their hopes, shortcomings, and good intentions (Prologue 1). To begin his process he started “rather aimlessly to draw up a pattern of action based on statements, documentation, and as I say, photographs” (Prologue 1). His locations were based on real places in his family’s past: the university town where his father studied theology and his maternal grandparents’ summer house. Despite such strong

autobiographical roots he goes on to say “I do not wish to maintain that I have always been so conscientious with the truth in my story. I have drawn on my imagination, added, subtracted, and transposed, but as is often the case with this sort of game, the game has probably become clearer than reality” (Prologue 2). So *The Best Intentions* is not only hybrid in the sense of melding fiction and screenplay writing techniques, the prose on its own terms is a hybrid of autobiographical fact and fiction.

The Best Intentions was always intended to be made into a film by someone other than Bergman himself. Still, being a film director in his own right, Bergman wrote a lot like a director. He says he was “extra thorough” with his “explanations “(Prologue 2). For Bergman, fidelity is a virtue: both the film and TV versions of *The Best Intentions* are specifically designed as faithful adaptations. During the writing process he mentally cast two actors for the roles of his parents: Pernilla Ostergren as his mother, Anna, and Samuel Froler as his father, Henrik. Because of Bergman’s great stature in the filmmaking world he was able to choose his own director – Bille August – and also make suggestions for the actors. Both of the actors he had imagined appeared in the film. In an interview Bille August says that Bergman came to him with one condition – that Pernilla be given the role of Anna (August Interview screen 3). Once August agreed to this he and Bergman met regularly to talk over the script, in detail, and to discuss in particular ways in which the long television version could be cut down to the film. (It is a happy turn of fate that Pernilla Ostergren married Bille August during the filming of the project.) On a practical filmmaking level, in the broader context of adaptation, Bergman from the outset knew that because of his reputation he would be able to influence the finished film in ways not usually available to a writer. Not only was he writing with a film in mind – he was

writing knowing it would very likely be made (something even the most experienced screenwriters can rarely dream of).

At the end of his prologue Bergman writes:

This book has not in any way been adapted to the finished film. It has to remain as it was written: The words stand unchallenged and I hope have a life of their own, like a performance of its own in the mind of the reader.

(Prologue 2)

The reader of a hybrid is actively engaged in imagining a performance; the reader is watching a film play out in their mind, guided by the writer who – in comparison to the ‘dull shorthand’ of the conventional screenplay – has been allowed much more room, many more literary ‘tricks of the trade’ with which to excite, enable, enrich the visual imagination of the reader.

The Best Intentions as a case-study is useful because its form is very close to the screenplay form – much closer than Greene’s *The Third Man*, and closer again than Pasolini’s *Theorem*. We will be looking for signs of ‘the novel’ in the screenplay.

First, why is the (so-called) novel so like a screenplay? Bergman says he wrote it “in cinematic, dramatic form” (Prologue 2). It is written in present tense, in keeping with screenplay convention. Most strikingly, it is heavy in dialogue, and the great majority of this dialogue is laid out in a way very similar (but not identically) to the way a screenplay is laid out. In the novel the character is named in bold print, the line of dialogue follows, flush to the right margin. Between each character’s speech there is a physical line-space. For example:

Henrik: I think about you and the boy all the time. I yearn too much.

Anna: I'm never coming back.

Henrik: I know.

Anna: Never. Whatever you say. (297)

Not all of the dialogue is presented in this dramatic style. Some is incorporated within a paragraph, as reported speech, a common technique used in the novel. For example: "He keeps Henrik waiting for an appropriate spell of time, then lowers the paper and says with nasal courtesy, "Yes, your grandfather is expecting you in room seventeen, up the stairs there, on the left"" (3). These 'prose' sections are woven very lightly, only occasionally, through the otherwise dramatic dialogue dominated narrative. To add to this screenplay impression Bergman uses parentheticals in those large tracts of dramatic or filmic dialogue: just as we would expect to see in a conventional screenplay. A parenthetical is a tiny note – in parentheses – where a writer gives a hint of how an actor is to deliver the line. How-to screenwriting manuals advise they be used sparingly. Here is an example of Bergman's use of parentheticals:

Frederick Bergman: My word of honor, Henrik. (*Pause.*) You'll have it in writing. (*Cheerfully.*) Let's draw up an agreement. You decide on the sums of money, and I'll sign it. What do you say, Henrik? (*Suddenly.*) Grandmother and I have lived together for almost forty years. (7)

Or we see a parenthetical instruction for the tenor of the whole speech:

Ernst (*abruptly*): By the way, would you like to come with me to Upsala for a few days? (46).

Another screenplay trait (one we have encountered with Pasolini) is Bergman's focus on gesture and gaze – that is, on physical movements, on what we “see” in the film playing out in our minds. For example, “Frederik Bergman gets up and places himself in front of his grand-son, then whips off his gold-framed glasses, a gesture of violent rage” (5). And here is gesture and gaze together: “Henrik lowers his arms and the remains of the blue wool. A nail has been driven through his heart. His eyes are glazed” (91). And again. “Mrs Karin nods urgently. She is calm and dignified, with no trace of anger in the plump face or the sharp, blue-gray eyes” (91). The hidden director in ‘Bergman the writer’ is unabashed in the following long-winded, almost mechanical description of the physical actions required of the actor: “She leans forward and kisses him on the cheek, pats his hand, then gathers up the sheets of paper and puts them back in the envelope, which is then slipped into the bigger envelope, places the latter in the drawer of the bedside table, and turns the key” (116).

Bergman's frequent references to light – how the light falls in the mental film – are another indicator of film being deeply inherent in the prose. That said, to describe how a scene is lit is not the typical purview of a screenwriter – the visual rendering of a scene is a director's job, or more accurately, lighting a scene is a result of collaboration between the director and cinematographer. Some examples: “The sun is bright behind the tattered blind in the young man's modest lodgings...” (8); “Dusk is

light and transparent” (117); “The parsonage welcomes them with burning torches on the gateposts and the steps, lighted candles in the windows...” (195).

What is it that makes the work a prose hybrid? What elements of the written text lift it away from the screenplay?

As with Greene and Pasolini, Bergman uses a framing device to tell the story. He opens with a clear first person statement that he, Bergman himself, is the narrator of the text: “I choose an early spring day at the beginning of April, 1909” (3). As a narrator he is self-aware; he reflects on the process of the narration; he comments on the action, confides directly with the reader, thus breaking with screenplay convention: “Now we’ll talk about Frida Strandberg, Henrik’s fiancée for the last two years. Of course, it’s a very secret engagement, known only to their closest friends” (13). He also comments on the nature of composing the work itself, given its roots in autobiography; these comments are over and above concerns of the story and so break with screenplay convention. For example, in a scene where Ernst is arranging for a family photograph to be taken Bergman writes in a bracketed aside to the reader: “(The photograph actually exists, though it is from a somewhat later period, probably the summer of 1912, but it fits better into this context, and anyhow this isn’t a documentary)” (76). Later Bergman says of one scene “As far this episode is concerned, I have heard no comments, either one way or the other” (86) and then he goes on to recall something once said by his real Mother, on whom the character Anna is based.

A surplus of detail, a watermark of fiction, is evident in the text. On the opening page Bergman describes things we cannot ever see on the screen: for example, he says that throughout the town “the students are all asleep, and the professors are all preparing their lectures” (3). As Greene did, he gives long descriptions of particular rooms, for example, the young man’s lodgings (8). And in a way we haven’t seen yet with Greene and Pasolini, Bergman also gives long back-stories for his characters, even for some relatively minor characters. Rather than simply have Henrik meet Frida (his first fiancée) for a coffee Bergman outlines for over two pages just how they met, the back-story to their relationship (13-14). Similarly we get a long back-story of the life and times of Johan Ackerblom on pages 16-17. In a cheeky throwaway that wouldn’t survive script-editing Bergman tells us this about another character: “On the other hand, she has haemorrhoids and is also troubled by permanent constipation despite figs, prunes, and a special herbal tea of elderberry and dandelion” (107).

Whereas Pasolini had a filmic sense of time, Bergman’s treatment of time is novelistic because he is unusually concerned to track linear time. Rather than use broad brushstrokes such as DAY/NIGHT he wants us to know at what hour things happen. For example, “They set off at five o’clock” (51); “They arrive at one o’clock” (52); “They set off at about five in the morning” (84).

There are numerous instances in the text where Bergman goes inside the heads of his characters: a break with screenplay convention. He does this in a variety of ways. Henrik is watching Anna talking to Ernst. “See me, just for a moment!” (81). This is Henrik’s inner wish, directed to Anna but unspoken, interpolated into the prose without quote marks. In another scene Anna is retiring to bed and we learn what she

is thinking: “She turns out the paraffin lamp but lies awake for a long time, staring out into the darkness, listening intently. Something’s moving there in the dining room. Sure to be Henrik on his way to that unknown woman” (154). Interiority distinguishes the work from a conventional screenplay.

There is a dinner table scene at pages 80- 84 which is helpful to look at because it is an example of a style of writing which one wouldn’t typically find in either a novel or in a screenplay, and it is also useful because we can later contrast this scene with a dinner table scene in *‘Disquiet’*. Bergman in essence overwrites the scene in every detail. He describes each person sitting at the table and what they are physically doing, one after the other, in a mechanical fashion. He pays cinematic attention to light – “He is outside the circle of light and turns his head toward the darkening landscape and the cold moonlight making the flowers of the pelargoniums take on a pale violet colour” (80). He enters into Henrik’s mind as Henrik watches Anna converse with Ernst. Before the first character speaks Bergman gives specific instructions on delivery: “Mrs Karin’s reading is well articulated, subdued yet dramatic. When she comes to dialogue, she gives her performance a little character, coloring it according to her own judgment, and is fascinating in a simple way, allowing herself also to be captivated by what she is reading...” (81). Dialogue is reported in screenplay fashion. He effectively choreographs the physical movements of each character, especially noting how they leave the table, and this choreography is ‘technical’ rather than literary in its import. Bergman’s concern is squarely directed toward the finished film, the text reads more like a blueprint than a beautiful work of literature. The novel appeared late in his long career. Fortunately, those readers who are familiar with his earlier films can imbue the novel with his film sensibility.

4 'DISQUIET'

In light of the above discussion about adaptation, and in light of the case-studies, let us now turn to 'Disquiet'.

Multiple sources

Extending Peter Lev's suggestion (335) that we study the multiple sources that go into making a film, it is worth noting both the novella and screenplay, simultaneously created, draw upon sources outside of themselves. During the writing I pinned on my notice board small reproductions of paintings by Gerhard Richter and Wilhelm Hammershoi, as well as an etching of a little deer by Kiki Smith; I had seen films such as Bergman's *The Silence* and Andrei Zvyagintsev's *The Return*; years earlier I had read Peter Handke's *The Left-Handed Woman*; I referred to photographs of Courances, an estate with formal gardens, which I never actually visited. These 'sources', as well as the epigraph (from Ingeborg Bachmann's *Malina*, where she paraphrases a line from Flaubert) served as touchstones for the all-important ineffable 'tone' of both works.

Setting

In the same way that Greene's Vienna was visually striking and therefore inherently cinematic, so too the setting of 'Disquiet' is well-suited to a visual medium. The chateau and the surrounding formal gardens are not strictly realistic, there is a heightened sense of otherworldliness once Olivia breaks in through the secret wooden door in the wall. Still, it is a contemporary world, evidenced by almost near-future detailing such as the electronic palm-pad and a subtle reference to cloning. In

the screenplay this sense of an almost fabled place is bluntly stated: “Olivia leads the children through a wonderland. The lawn is thick and soft. These formal gardens are renowned for their artifice” (3) and then “They continue their long walk through the grounds, following a long line of topiaries” (3). In the novella the term ‘wonderland’ has been dropped as has the direct reference to artifice. Instead, artifice plays out in the syncopated rhythm and ‘artifice’ images in the sentence “They followed the long line of yews clipped into fantastic shapes, into top hats and ice-cream cones and barbells” (3). Another interesting discrepancy in description of place: in the screenplay I say “The trio have reached a long allée lined with trees whose branches vault like buttresses toward the sky” (3), a visual metaphor likening branches to buttresses. But in the novella I draw the reader’s attention to the same allée and employ a non-visual ‘conceptual’ time-saturated turn of phrase, one which echoes the nature/nuture debate about families: “They avoided the rose garden and instead cut into the pebbled allée which was lined with elms whose twigs had not yet sprouted their leaves, so that it was apparent a tree actually grew, that a twig had worked its way out of a branch, that an elm did not arrive in the world elm-shaped” (3). Another example: “On the far side of the lake, a rippling dark forest, and rising beyond the forest, the mountain – impervious to roads, to tunnels, never to be upended” (9). Lake, forest, mountain – broad monumental terms, simple, solid. The conceptual paradox of a tunnel through an ‘impervious’ mountain. And ‘never to be upended’ suggests its opposite – something that can be upended...Olivia’s life has been upended. The screenplay drops mention of the subtle qualities we project onto mountains: their imperviousness, their immutability. Still, the descriptions of place in the novella are generally concise (more concise than Greene’s and Bergman’s) and in their concision they reflect screenplay convention. There is an awareness of that key

filmic quality, a sense of how space is used. There is a deliberate depth of field in the writing. For example, “Ida wheeled Grandmother out to a command position in the middle of a lawn corridor which ran deep between two rows of steel-spun cypress” (56).

The choice of setting reflects the deeper themes of the work: the unashamed artifice of the gardens, their cultivated perfection and mannerism, is mirrored in the masks of politesse worn by the members of the household. To maintain these gardens, to ‘control’ the uncontrollable, that is - nature, is a demanding near impossible task. In the garden the members of the household, each dealing with great loss (their ‘burnt hands’ to paraphrase the epigraph), hold themselves together as they bear toward breaking. On another level, the language of the novella is guided by the artifice and austerity of the gardens, and the muted formality of the chateau. There is little attempt at naturalism, colloquialism.

In a broader sense, the choice of setting is suited to a creative hybrid because a screenplay with a limited number of ‘shooting locations’ is production-friendly; fewer locations keeps the budget down. An arthouse film such as ‘Disquiet’ can’t afford a big budget.

Tense

Simply put, the screenplay is in present tense, in keeping with screenplay convention, while the novella is in the past tense. Given the present tense is a cardinal rule of the

screenplay if there were to be a norm for hybrids it would likely be that the prose is also in present tense – but this is not the case.

Point of view

Unlike the case-studies, the novella does not use any first-person framing device. No “narrator” is identified as such. Instead an omnipresent third-person narrative point of view is used: closer to the camera-eye than first person. I did very subtly make some ‘authorial comments’, colour the prose. For example, in italics for the purposes of this exegesis: “He twisted himself into the floor-length silk curtains, twisted and twisted, disappeared. *It must have been dark in there*, so that he could hardly breathe, so that he listened to his heart beat” (6). Who is thinking, surmising, it must have been dark in there? The author. In this instance the authorial presence is removed from the screenplay, I don’t imagine what can’t be seen on screen, and instead I have: “He twists himself into the curtain and disappears. Long pause” (7). Note the sentence in the novella emphasises the twisting – “twisted and twisted” – the language reflects the action being depicted. That said, elsewhere in the omniscient third-person screenplay there is some authorial presence – and curiously the author of the screenplay has a different personality to the author of the novella. For example, in the screenplay, in keeping with convention, I am more excitable, more breathless (see the early scene where the boy is bashing down the door). At other times I engage directly with the reader, asking rhetorical questions (“Now he is trapped: what can he do?” (7)); I ‘goad’ the reader to move through the story at a quicker pace.

Interiority/ Gaze and Gesture

As Pasolini did in large sections of *Theorem* I have avoided entering directly into the thoughts and feelings of the characters in both the novella and the screenplay. This was a deliberate strategy and the very last paragraph of the novella is exceptional, it was conceived as a breakthrough of *feeling* for Olivia. Some examples in the novella of techniques for creating ‘distance’: describing Grandmother, “Though small and frail, *the impression she gave* was one of dignified resignation” (4). It is an impression only, whether she really is resigned, we can’t be sure. Or “...the wet black macadam reflected the sky *so that she seemed to be* walking on a thin crust over vertiginous depths” (23) instead of “she felt as if she were walking on a thin crust...”. Who feels the vertigo? Olivia does. This visual image of sky reflected in the pavement is not in the screenplay.

As well as this ‘dancing around’ via *impressions*, via *seems*, I have paid particular attention in the novella to gaze and gesture – as did Pasolini and Bergman. Some examples:

“The girl pulled her ‘listening face’, a kind of grotesque where she clamped shut her eyes and clenched her jaw in a maniacal grin.” (9)

“Her eyes darkened, inclement.” (39)

“He examined the scripts and rubbed his eye, an atavistic gesture of pharmacist’s suspicion.” (22) The screenplay does not describe the kind of gesture (atavistic) instead it reads simply: “Steenbohn examines the prescriptions and is reluctant to continue”. (24)

“ ‘Please,’ he said, extending his arm – a monogram, cufflinks. “Won’t you come with me...”” (25). I like this sentence because the gesture of extending an arm is

pictured in the sentence itself, first the monogram pokes out of the sleeve, of the sentence, then the cufflinks. This line is not in the screenplay.

The scene where Olivia and Sophie are engaged in silent brinkmanship over the bassinet is described in terms of gaze and gesture in both the novella (76) and the screenplay (81), albeit in more detail in the novella.

At page 25 of the novella Sophie and Olivia are staring at one other from a distance as it grows dark. “They stayed like this— one the beginning and one the end of a connection made manifest – until, as if she had only just been caught out staring, the woman turned on her heel and snapped the connection, walked away.” It was a gaze so ‘strongly felt’ that it was made manifest – a concept that wouldn’t work in a screenplay.

The focus on gesture has special import. Olivia has broken her arm. Having returned home after a long absence she is burnt through, involved in a deeply private farewell to family, sensation and futurity. So she commits these gestures as if for the first *and last* time. In the novella she *herself* is acutely aware of her gestures, just as the reader is:

The woman warmed her hand on the tea-plunger. Then she lifted the object, very carefully, moved it through the air, this glass-and-silver invention, and slowly poured. She poured the tea right to the golden rim of the teacup. Her left-handedness slowed her down, and each gesture, normally habitual, unnoticed, careless, was now new to her, not entirely new, but was seen in a new light, or was seen as if she had – for the first time in her life – lifted from the root of her being, taken a step aside. And there was an element of wonder in her movements,

that all along she'd had a left-hander inside. She set down the plunger and brought the teacup to her lips, steady, not spilling a drop. She savoured the tea and then at the same glacial pace settled the cup. She picked up the friand. Heard footsteps; Marcus had found her. (12)

In the same scene the screenplay does not afford any room for reflection on gesture and instead simply describes her actions (13).

More than once in the novella I draw attention to Olivia's left-hand - not just her 'hand' - as if the left hand is almost another part of her body. For example, the girl "took her mother's left hand, ferrying it over to the animal, a limp offering. After a moment the woman gently withdrew the hand" (32). That's *the* hand, not *her* hand: a disembodied object that can be ferried. This 'left-hand' effect is stronger in the novella than in the screenplay.

An absence of interiority is not a talking point in a screenplay but in prose such a choice is unconventional. In his novel *The Awkward Age* Henry James eschewed interiority. In a way, that novel is a creative hybrid. Cynthia Ozick's essay, *What Henry James Knew*, looks at the effect of this choice. The essay discusses Henry James' experience at age 52, late in his career, of shame, public humiliation, and literary failure. His play *Guy Domville* was howled off the stage. Afterward he walked home alone, brooding on "the most horrible hours of my life" (qtd. in Ozick 104). Three months after this fall from grace James conceived *The Awkward Age*. In a preface to the New York edition 1908 James stressed that from the start the story and its situation presented itself to him "on absolutely scenic lines, and that each of

these scenes in itself... abides without a moment's deflexion by the principle of the stage-play" (qtd. in Ozick 109). He spoke of the "technical amusement" and "bitter-sweetness" arising from his self-imposed restraints (qtd. in Ozick 109). He chose to write a novel confined to dialogue and scene; to shape the work according to self-limiting rules of suppression and omission. What was James up to? asks Ozick. He straitjacketed his tale with the "few, grave rigid" laws of the stage and resolved not to "go behind" (qtd. in Ozick 110) – but, paradoxically, she says, in the work nothing is left but what is "behind", a "behind" any ordinary novelistic explication would not be equal to and could not touch. And the penalty for going "behind" is an impenetrable blackness, the blankness, where (says James) it is inevitable that one "hears, overhears, guesses, follows, takes in, becomes acquainted with, horrors". What are the horrors? They cannot be named in the work itself; Ozick says it is their very namelessness that defines them as horrors (111). Her final contention is that it is probable *The Awkward Age* is a novel that knows far more than its author knew, and holds more secrets of panic, shame, helplessness and chaos than James could candidly face (133). I like her analysis of the effect of 'not going behind' – it is in keeping with the project of 'Disquiet' – though I suspect James was well-aware of his own 'burnt hand'. Both the novella and the screenplay convey a sense of the hidden, the unspoken, the submerged, but this sense is strongest in the novella where every 'refusal' to go behind is apparent.

Time

Within the walls of the estate there is, in both the novella and the screenplay, a strange sense of time or timelessness. On a story level, the waking and sleeping rhythms of Olivia and the children have been thrown out by jet lag. In the novella

there is mention of the strange nature of sleep – how it is encountered rather than revisited (28) – but this observation doesn't translate to the screenplay. The chateau itself seems timeless – even though we know the story takes place in the present day or perhaps even near future. Grief – as a human experience – destroys time: Sophie is beyond time. Olivia is in a liminal space, between life and death, outside of regular time. That said, it is time that drives the narrative – a special time anchored to the natural process of bodily decay: the baby is stillborn and unburied, we are presented with measures to manage to decay (the refrigerator), of decay itself (moulting, gas), we ask ourselves – When on earth will the baby be buried? How long can this go on for? In the novella many scenes at the chateau are presented with a deliberate ambiguity as to the exact day and time (just as Pasolini did in *Theorem*). For example, “Days later...” (58) and the number of days is not specified. Or “This time it was Josette...” (61) where again the amount of time lapsing between scenes isn't specified. Or “One afternoon...” (62). Within each day there is a loose sense of time. For example, “Not long after...” (7) does not specify the hours. Marcus wakes up after a daytime sleep (abnormal): “the light was pinkening, so that it could have been dusk or dawn: penumbral” (53). On the physical page of the text the scenes are marked by empty line space; so one scene dissolves into space, ellipsis, another scene arises. Peter Handke's *The Left-Handed Woman* also uses ellipsis to great effect – but it is beyond the scope of this exegesis to explore that work in detail. When I received the first page proofs from the Australian publisher I was dismayed to see they had run all the paragraphs together, thereby losing the elliptical effect. These proofs were corrected. Unfortunately these corrections were not able to be made to the French edition. In the case of the screenplay, the ‘cut’ in the edit room obviates any need for emphasis on ellipsis, for carefully crafted time-bridges (although there are film time-

bridges such as “Fade out” which is an instruction for the screen to fade to black and perhaps denote time – a technique I didn’t use in ‘Disquiet’). Scenes in the screenplay proceed with a uniformly spaced lay-out.

Omissions and Additions

Nothing was cut from any draft of the novella. The laundry scene with Marcus and twins was a late addition to the screenplay that also was worked into a late draft of the novella.

New scenes were worked into the later drafts of the screenplay. For example, there is a new scene between Olivia and Andrew as they make their respective preparations for leavetaking (70). It enhances, deepens, brings to the fore their bond, the difficult task each faces. Olivia’s second trip to the village appears in the screenplay but not the novella: this was added to a late draft of the screenplay. In the screenplay at pages 62-63 Olivia makes this second trip to see Josette. She insists Josette keep a copy of her will on file and they discuss the provision in which she names Marcus and Sophie as guardians of the children. This has the function of underlying, emphasising, reminding us of Olivia’s plans to leave one way or another: it makes the story ‘more clear’. Returning to the chateau Olivia learns there is a rose named after her, that in this way she has always been present at her forsaken home: another new touch.

There is another scene – or an extension of a scene – where Marcus and Sophie speak about their loss and Sophie explicitly refers to the prospect of Marcus leaving her for his girlfriend (57). It adds another dimension to their relationship: in the screenplay Sophie definitely knows about Marcus’ affair – as we always suspected in the novella.

Where the plot is enriched in the novella is in the frequent presence of unrepresentable back-story. As with Bergman's *The Best Intentions* a knowledge of what has happened to the characters in the past, off-screen, is squarely within the realm of prose. For example, to describe the boy as "a veteran" (28) is to suggest a past unknowable in a screenplay. The backstory of Josette – that she knew Olivia in childhood – does not feature in the screenplay at all.

In story terms the greatest difference between the two works is the ending. In the novella's ending, as previously mentioned, we go inside Olivia's head for the first time, we are with her as she is *feeling*, as she makes a *wish* for the boy. This passage of the rise and falling away of feeling, of making an unspoken wish, would be almost impossible to achieve on screen and so it is ill-suited for a screenplay. Maybe you could do it with a special effect, with the garden faintly lighting up, scarcely moving, subtly energised...and then that light falling away. Instead, the screenplay extends the story – in much the same way as Greene's screenplay lifts the ending of *The Third Man*. There is a substantial shift in meaning, a clearer sense of resolution. After a long period of tense ambiguity where Olivia physically baits her son, Andrew forgives his mother; mother and children are reconciled.

Choreography

In the case-study of Bergman's *The Best Intentions* we discussed a long scene where Bergman choreographs the characters at dinner in great detail. Such choreography in prose is a watermark of hybridity. There is a comparable scene in the 'Disquiet' novella and screenplay at the family lunch. What distinguishes the versions are

numerous parts of the novella which are outside the mechanics of the scene. (Bergman did not much digress from his mechanics). For example, Sophie “still wore her hospital bracelet *as if at any minute something could go horribly wrong*” (14). This “as if” future-oriented concept cannot be shown on screen. Metaphors and similes in the novella scene are cut from the screenplay, for example, “like a scientist taking an infinitesimal measure” (15), “as if there were a mountain range between her hand and the glass that could only be negotiated with the utmost concentration” (16). Conceptual language imagery that brings to the fore the sense of *remove* between the grieving married couple works in the novella but doesn’t appear in the screenplay: Sophie “who had died every time her husband found words – ‘boat’, ‘canoe’ – sailing away from her on this ‘boat’, ‘this canoe’, so soon, leaving her with their baby” (18). In contrast, the screenplay reads “She is simmering with fury” (19). It has no room for the root cause of her anger. In both versions the interlude within the lunch scene, where Olivia destroys the telephone socket, is choreographed in each physical detail, almost identically. On a vocabulary level, I simplified the vocabulary in the screenplay and removed the word “interlocutor”: I perceive a different reading audience for each work. This lunch scene is just one scene in ‘Disquiet’ where I as author am also choreographer (another that springs to mind is the scene where Olivia is pushing Grandmother’s wheelchair in the Japanese Garden): my focus on physical choreography indicates the hybrid nature of ‘Disquiet’.

Dialogue/Monologue

My treatment of dialogue in the novella is in keeping with a traditional novelistic style. In this regard it is closer to Greene’s style than to Bergman’s ‘dramatic’ style. Between versions there is hardly any difference in the dialogue (except, of course, in

the additional scenes in the screenplay). It's more or less word for word. I did add a few lines here and there to the screenplay, chiefly for clarity. In the opening scene of the screenplay, where Olivia and the children are making their way through the garden toward the chateau, I introduced some dialogue between Andrew and Lucy. I did this because I thought that while a novella could tolerate a silent journey there was some sort of limit on an audience's patience with a silent opening to a contemporary arthouse film. That said, I love silence in films (and in literature!) and Pasolini's *Theorem* is an excellent example of compelling, largely silent films. Working with silence – an intense charged silence – was a major concern of the project 'Disquiet'.

There are three long monologues in 'Disquiet', both the novella and the screenplay. The first is Grandmother's address to Sophie. Sophie is 'off-screen' in the screenplay, and off-the-page in the novella: in the novella we only know the monologue is addressed to Sophie because of an indication within the monologue – “ ‘To begin, Sophie,’ said Grandmother...” (56). In the screenplay this is made even clearer: “She addresses the camera (but is speaking to an unseen Sophie)” (59). The monologue is a direct address to the film audience, to the reader: a passing of wisdom intended not only for the character to whom it is ostensibly addressed, but also for the listener. The monologue has its roots in the theatre (Woods 107) – an actor at the top of the stage addressing the audience – which shows that hybrid works aren't just two-way prose-screenplay affairs. A theatrical component can creep into the hybrid mix.

Language

There are two particular ‘language’ aspects of the novella which the screenplay cannot carry. One is the repeated use of the verb ‘to hold’. Michel Tournier’s *The Ogre* was instructive in this regard: it was the first time I’d come across a verb – in that case, to bear up, to carry – as a guiding theme in a work of fiction. Another aspect is the use of ‘O’. This old-fashioned formulation of intensity has no place in a screenplay – it is the kind of poetic indulgence Denise Faithfull frowns upon.

Light

Just as Bergman frequently described the light in his hybrid, so too the novella ‘Disquiet’ describes the light often enough, and in more detail than the screenplay, belying its filmic hybridity. For example, “The illuminated drinks refrigerator next to her threw a blue light” (24) – this remains as is in the screenplay (25); “It was that time of day when the last of the light has been absorbed into the sky and darkness has begun to settle on all solid things below, turning the tops of the trees into iron filings drawn starward” (25) – this becomes “At twilight” in the screenplay (26); “At first light the sky turned a deep orange, a smoky grey, a tallow white, and then grey once more until – annealed – the day broke powdery blue. A long dark scratch against the sky turned to cloudbank” (72) – in the screenplay the same scene simply reads “At first light Olivia is pulling...” (77).

There is another filmic or more particularly, photographic, or even ‘special visual effects’ moment in the novella and screenplay. The novella reads: “They held one another’s gaze and held and held. In her mother’s face the woman saw all her mothers, countless faces of her mother, each fractionally different, one face streaming

forward out of the next in the ghostly way of early stop-motion photography. Ghostly, milky with light” (54). Unusually, this time the screenplay elaborates on the concept, provides more detail (which shows there are no rules written in stone when it comes to adaptation). The screenplay reads: “Grandmother’s face, compassionate, is transmitted to the camera: one face streaming forward out of the next, ghostly stop-motion photography in the way of the early chronographers who captured successive images of one person in a single image. Ghostly, milky with light” (58). As well as conveying the Muybridge stop-motion photography effect the screenplay references compassionate transmission direct to camera, transmission being a Buddhist way of directly transferring understanding.

Camera

When writing ‘Disquiet’ I ‘saw it’ in my mind’s eye. And that eye was not dissimilar to a camera-eye. It is not a huge leap (though it makes me uncomfortable to interpret my own prose in this way) to say the novella opens with an establishing shot of Olivia and the children before the great gateway (1); that there is a tracking shot as they make their way along the wall that borders the estate (1); that we go in on a close-up toward her left-hand trailing through the greenery (1); that later when Grandmother ‘crowns the staircase’ we view her from a low-angle shot (4); that when Olivia is lying on the bed we pan down her bruised torso (7); that later when Ida looks down to Sophie on the lawn we do so from a high-angle shot (40); when Andrew spies on Marcus as he talks on the phone we almost know where the camera would be positioned in the scene: the camera would adopt Andrew’s point of view and peer through the crack in the door (34).

The screenplay employs another filmic technique – this time one absent from the prose. To increase suspense and drama in the screenplay I intercut Andrew and Olivia’s preparations – unfolding at the same time – as they ready their escapes (69-70). It’s plainly more manipulative.

CONCLUSION

This exegesis has led me to several conclusions. The first is that ‘Disquiet’, as both novella and screenplay, does not readily fit within traditional adaptation studies which have focussed on book-to-film adaptations. It also does not readily fit within the small under-examined area of novelisations, or film-to-book adaptations, a subset of adaptation studies.

Within the existing adaptation frameworks we can say that ‘Disquiet’, as novella, sits at what Jans Baetens referred to as the experimental end of the novelisation continuum (48). Both the screenplay and the novella are literary works in their own right and while they are not intended to be read side-by-side they are nonetheless mutually illuminating. But my finding is that once we are at this experimental end of novelisation the very term ‘novelisation’ becomes awkward. This is in part because the actual process of creation is not as simple as ‘first there was a screenplay and then there was the prose’: the standard *modus operandi* of mainstream novelisation.

Neither ‘Disquiet’ nor any of the case-studies arose as a result of direct screenplay-to-prose adaptation so strictly speaking no primary work was ‘novelised’. I have proposed that a better term is ‘creative hybrid’ rather than novelisation.

Acknowledging the fluid nature of hybrids, and their many varied ways of coming

into being, I have said that a prose work is a hybrid when a film is inherent in the prose.

This avenue of exploration proved responsive to current calls for new directions in adaptation studies. As a starting point, I found I needed to study the screenplay as a valuable text in its own right. I found that the process of creation can be influenced by broader sociological concerns outside aesthetic choices made by the author, especially in the case of Greene's *The Third Man*. I found we needed to devise new ways of speaking about adaptation over and above hierarchical models. I found that consideration of writing techniques and choices was useful in deepening an understanding of the practice of adaptation.

How do creative hybrids reframe traditional issues of adaptation studies?

Fidelity is one such traditional issue. First, the study of hybrids is focussed on prose-screenplay comparison, so we are not considering whether a finished film measures up to a book. With Ingmar Bergman's *The Best Intentions* we can see that the question of fidelity becomes moot when there is only one text to consider. With other creative hybrids – 'Disquiet', *Theorem*, *The Third Man* – the question of fidelity is confounded by three things: first, we can rightly ask that if the author of the prose is the same person as the author of the screenplay, then what does it matter if the works are different? Can an author be unfaithful to herself? Second, as we have seen in our study of the creative process, very often there is no definitive source text, the works are created simultaneously, and in these cases it becomes difficult to establish a source to which one could be faithful. I found that we need to revise our ideas of 'source text' and, on the same tack, embrace the possibility of multiple sources.

Third, at least in the case of ‘Disquiet’, where two narrative forms were created hand-in-hand, and where some but not all screenplay conventions were melded into prose, it is arguable that some measure of fidelity or *close resonance* may in fact be desirable. This makes for a contrast with the disparagement typically levelled at ‘faithful’ screen adaptations. ‘Disquiet’, the novella, is largely faithful to ‘Disquiet’, the screenplay, and vice versa: this choice of close resonance, with an occasional dissonant harmonic, was deliberate. I want to say that there may be a measure of resonance in the basic notion of hybridity.

The project of categorising adaptations, another traditional issue in adaptation studies, is instructive when it comes to hybrids. If we ask ‘What kinds of hybrids are there?’ we quickly find (as evidenced by the case-studies) that beyond mainstream novelisation it is difficult, if not impossible, to establish any definitive norms – other than the broad premise that a film is inherent in the prose. Instead of comparing works against one another we can look within each work for signs or watermarks of hybridity. While noting there is no single definitive criterion for proof of hybridity, I propose we can ask the following questions about a work of prose in order to determine its hybrid (or otherwise) nature:

- What was the creative process, in its broadest context? Did one author write two texts based on the story (or one hybrid a la Bergman)? Did the author imagine a film inherent in the prose?
- Is the setting highly visual, well-suited to screen?
- Is it written in the present tense in accordance with screenplay convention?
- From whose point of view is the story told?

- Is there an absence of interiority in the prose and a concurrent focus on gaze and gesture?
- What level of description is there? Is there a surplus of selected detail, that is, all types of detail, including non-visual details?
- How does time unfold in the prose?
- Has the author paid a lot of attention to how people and objects move through space, are choreographed?
- Is dialogue presented in the ‘dramatic’ style?
- On a story level, are there many differences (omissions/additions) between each version? If so, do these differences change the meaning of the story?
- Is there much back-story in the prose?
- Are there any particular language choices (for example, the repeated use of a verb) which cannot be contained in a conventional screenplay?
- Does the author pay special attention to descriptions of light and of space (foreground, background, depth of field)?
- Can a reader visualise a scene as if viewed through a camera-eye?

These questions point the way forward for ongoing discussions about hybrid works. They sharpen our awareness of the different ways readers can engage with related texts for differently resonant experiences. Above all, they remind us that adaptation is a curious writing practice which affords great possibilities for creative expression.

Works Cited

Allison, Deborah. "Film/Print: Novelisations and Capricorn One." *M/C Journal* 10.2 (2007). 04.Jun.2008

<<http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0705/07-allison.php>>

Andrew, Dudley. "Adaptation." [1984] *Film Adaptation*. Ed James Naremore. London: Athlone, 2000. 28 –37.

August, Bille. Interview. "Euroscreenwriters". 18 Jun. 2008.

<http://zakka.dk/euroscreenwriters/interviews/bille_august_511.htm>

Australian Film Commission. *What is a Synopsis? An Outline? A Treatment?* 18.Jul.2008

<www.afc.gov.au/downloads/pubs/whatissynopsis.pdf>

Azlant, Edward. *The History, Theory and Practice of Screenwriting, 1897 – 1920*. Diss. University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1980.

Baetens, Jan. "Novelization, a Contaminated Genre?". *Critical Inquiry* 32 (Autumn 2005). 43-60.

Baskin, Ellen. *Enser's filmed books and plays: a list of books and plays from which films have been made, 1928-1991*. Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate, 1993.

Beau Travail. Dir. Claire Denis. La Sept-Arte, S.M. Films, Tanaïs Production, 1999.

Bergman, Ingmar. *The Best Intentions*. Trans. Joan Tate. New York: Arcade Publishing, 1993.

Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1957.

Boon, Kevin Alexander. *Script Culture and the American Screenplay*. Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 2008.

Cahir, Linda Costanzo. *Literature into Film: Theory and Practical Approaches*. Jefferson: McFarland, 2006.

Connor, J.D. "The Persistence of Fidelity: Adaptation Theory Today." *M/C Journal* 10.2 (2007). 17 Apr. 2008

<<http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0705/15-connor.php>>.

Cartmell, Deborah and Imelda Whelehan, Eds. 1999. *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Dahlberg, Ingrid. "Re: Best Intentions Query". E-mail to the author. 18 Jun. 2008.

Drazin, Charles. *In Search of the Third Man*. New York: Limelight Editions, 2000.

Drew's Script-O-Rama. 18 Jul. 2008.

<<http://www.script-o-rama.com/>>.

Duras, Marguerite. *The North China Lover*. Trans. Leigh Hafrey. New York: New Press, 1992.

Elliott, Kamilla. "Novels, Films, and the Word/Image Wars". Ed. Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo. *A Companion to Literature and Film*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004. 1-22.

---. *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Faithfull, Denise, and Brian Hannant. *Adaptations: A Guide to Adapting Literature to Film*. Sydney: Currency Press, 2007.

Field, Syd. *Screenplay—The Foundations of Screenwriting* (2 ed.) New York:

Delacorte Press. 1982

Gomez, Joseph A., "The Third Man: Capturing the Visual Essence of Literary Conception". *Literature/Film Quarterly*. 2.4 (1974). 332 - 341

Greene, Graham. *The Lost Childhood and Other Essays*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1962.

---. *The Third Man*. Screenplay. London: Faber and Faber, 1988.

---. *The Third Man/The Fallen Idol*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1985.

Handke, Peter. *The Left-Handed Woman*. Trans. Ralph Manheim. London: Methuen, 1980.

Hazzard, Shirley. *Greene on Capri*. London: Virago, 2006.

Hoder-Salmon, Marilyn. *Kate Chopin's The Awakening: Screenplay as Interpretation*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1992.

History of the World: Part 1. Dir. Mel Brooks. 20th Century Fox, 1981.

Hood, Stuart. Introduction. *Theorem*. By Pier Paolo Pasolini. London: Quartet Encounters, 1992. viii-x.

Kranz, David. "Trying Harder: Probability, Objectivity, and Rationality in Adaptation Studies." *The Literature/Film Reader*. Ed. James Welsh and Peter Lev. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2007. 77 –104.

Larson, Randall D. *Films into Books: An Analytical bibliography of Film Novelizations, Movie, and TV Tie-Ins*. London: Scarecrow Press, 1995.

Leigh, Julia. *Disquiet*. Camberwell, Vic: Penguin Books, 2008.

Leitch, Thomas. *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents: from Gone with the Wind to The Passion of the Christ*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

---. "Where Are We Going? Where Have We Been?". *The Literature/Film Reader*. Ed. James Welsh and Peter Lev. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2007. 327–334.

Lethem, Jonathan. *Girl in Landscape*. New York: Vintage, 1999.

Lev, Peter. "The Future of Adaptation Studies." *The Literature/Film Reader*. Ed. James Welsh and Peter Lev. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2007. 335–338.

McFarlane, Brian. "It Wasn't Like That In The Book...". *The Literature/Film Reader*. Ed. James Welsh and Peter Lev. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2007. 3-14.

---. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

McKee, Robert. *Story: Substance, Structure, Style, and the Principles of Screenwriting*. London: Methuen 1997.

Melville, Herman. *Billy Budd, Sailor*. 1924. London: Penguin Classics 1986.

Meyer, Andrea. "NYFF '99: The Dangers of Intuition, the Poetry of Claire Denis." *Indiewire*. 14 Nov. 2007.
<http://www.indiewire.com/ots/fes_99NYFF_990928_denis.html>.

Murray, Simone. "Materializing Adaptation Theory: The Adaptation Industry". *Literature/Film Quarterly* 36. 1 (2008). 4 – 21.

Ozick, Cynthia. *What Henry James Knew*. London: Vintage, 1994

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *Theorem*. Trans. Stuart Hood. London: Quartet Encounters, 1992.

Rivera, Jose. Interview. 18 Jul.2008.

<<http://www.thenitmustbetrue.com/rivera/rivera1.html>>.

Ross, Harris. *Film as Literature, Literature as Film*.

Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1987

Sansweet, Stephen. *Star Wars Encyclopedia*. New York: Del Rey, 1998.

Seeger, L. *Making a Good Script Great*. Hollywood: Samuel French, 1994

Sinclair, Andrew. Introduction. *The Third Man*. By Graham Greene. London: Faber and Faber, 1988. 5-6.

Stam, Robert. *Literature Through Film: Realism, Magic and the Art of Adaptation*. Maiden and Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

Stam, Robert, and Alessandra Raengo, eds. *A Companion to Literature and Film*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

The Best Intentions. Dir. Bille August. 182 min. Samuel Goldwyn, 1992.

The Third Man. Dir. Carol Reed. British Lion Films, 1949.

Theorem (Teorema). Dir. Pier Paolo Pasolini. Koch Lorber, 1968.

Tibbetts, John and James Welsh, eds. *Novels into Films: The Encyclopedia of Movies Adapted from Books*. New York: Checkmark Books, 1999.

Thompson, Bob. "Writing Under The Influence". *Washington Post* 16 May 2007: C01

Tournier, Michel. *The Ogre*. Trans. Barbara Bray. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Wood, James. *How Fiction Works*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2008.

Woolf, Virginia. "On Cinema". *Collected Essays*. Vol. 2. London: Hogarth, 1966