

## **I. *Lolita* as Novel and Film**

This research intends to study the relationship between a novel and its film adaptation. This study probes into the transformation of the novel *Lolita* into the film, bearing the same name. This research not only examines the elements peculiar each of the artistic media, novel and film but also those common features that establish an intimate but enigmatic bond between these two art forms. In short, this study aims at addressing the questions to what extent the film *Lolita* (1997), is faithful to its source novel; the elements that are transferred as exactly as they are in the novel; and the elements that are adopted so as to make them fit in the film medium.

The film and novel evolved from distinct background and different traditions. While the novel emerged from the literary tradition, the film developed from the tradition of plastic arts and photography. Moreover, unlike novel the film is the child of science; it would have never existed unless there were rapid scientific and technological developments in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, owing to the facts of their different origin, these two art forms are distinct.

Similarly, the novel is basically a written work of art whereas the film is visual art. The film communicates through the language of image and sounds. Though verbal language is used in a film, it is of secondary importance. The simultaneous and continuous interplay of image, sound and movement makes the film unique art. The free and constant motion of image is the peculiar property of film. In the same way, unlike novel that is understood through the concept of mental images constructed through written words, the film is understood through the concept of visual images.

Nevertheless, the film and novel have lots of elements such as narrative, point of view, setting, characters and so forth, in common. The difference between these two art forms is largely the way of employing these elements. Along with the advent

of advanced motion picture cameras in the last decade of the 19th century, the Victorian narrative tradition exerted a great influence in the development of film art. The early creative artists of film, like D.H. Griffith adopted a number of techniques from 19th century novels and adopted some other techniques so as to make them fit in the film medium.

*Lolita* is a novel by Vladimir Nabokov, published in September 1955 on Olympia press in Paris. Due to its high scale of controversial subject matter, Nabokov was unable to find an American publisher for *Lolita* after finishing it in 1953. This book is internationally famous for its innovative style and infamous for its controversial subject: the narrator and protagonist, middle aged Humbert. Humbert, becomes obsessed and gets sexually engaged with 12 year- old girl named Dolores Haze.

After its publication, Nabokov's *Lolita* attained a classical status, becoming one of the best- known and most controversial examples of 20th century literatures. The name “Lolita” has entered pop culture to describe a sexually precious young girl. The novel was adapted to film in 1962 and again in 1997. Time magazine included the novel in its *TIME 100 Best English Language Novels from 1923 to 2005*. It is fourth on the *Modern Library's* 1998 list of the 100 Best Novels of the 20th century.

*Lolita* is a 1997 film directed by Adrian Lyne and was the second screen adaptation of the novel by Vladimir Nabokov. The film presents Jeremy Irons as Humbert Humbert and Dominique Swain (15 years old during filming) as Dolores “Lolita” Haze. Supporting roles are played by Melanie Griffith, as Charlotte Haze, and Frank Langella as Clare Quality.

Humbert Humbert, a European Professor of French Literature travels to New Hampshire, in the United States, to take a teaching position. He rents a room in the

home of Widow Charlotte Haze, largely because he sees her adolescent daughter, Dolores (aged 12 in Nabokov's novel but seemingly slightly older in the film and variously called "Dolly" or "Lo"), while touring the house. Obsessed from boyhood with young girls of this age, whom he calls nymphets, partly because of an early sexual experience and tragic loss, Humbert marries Charlotte for the sake of access to her daughter. Charlotte's untimely death, shortly after she discovers his preference for her daughter, frees Humbert to pursue a sexual and emotional relationship with Dolores, whom he nicknames "Lolita". The two travel the country for a few years, staying in various motels but eventually settling in a college town where Humbert takes a teaching job.

However, Lolita's increasing boredom with Humbert, as well as her growing desire for independence, fuels a constant tension between them. Humbert's desperate affections for Lo are also rivaled by a more devious and experienced nymphet lover, the playwright Clare Quilty, who has been pursuing Lo from the beginning. Quilty's name and identity are at first unknown to Humbert and when Lolita runs away to him, Humbert's search for her is unsuccessful. Three years later, after receiving a letter asking for financial help, Humbert visits now 17 year old Lolita, married to another man and pregnant. His love for her remains, in spite of her circumstances but she refuses to return to him. He relents and gives her a substantial amount of money and information about her inheritance from her mother. He also discovers the name of his nemesis, Quilty, whom he hunts down and murders.

Vladimir Vladimirovich Nabokov, most famous as the author of *Lolita*, was born on April 23, 1889 in St. Petersburg, Russia. The eldest of five children, he grew up in a wealthy and aristocratic family. He enjoyed playing tennis and soccer in his youth, but also spent many hours choosing and collecting butterflies, a passion he

apparently learned from his father. Nabokov's first Russian novel, *Mary*, was published in 1925, but received little attention. However, the rise of the Nazis interrupted his growing literary career and forced him to move to Paris. He continued to write, publishing the novels *King, Queen, Knave* in 1929 and *The Defense* in 1930, he soon developed a Russian and French readership that hailed his genius. The eruption of the war soon caused him to flee Paris for New York in 1940. He published his first English novel, *The Real Life of Sebastian Knight*. Nabokov also published in "*The New Yorker*" and other respected magazines, helping him gain a reputation. He lectured at Harvard. Later on he permanently lectured on Cornell University. Nabokov composed his master piece at early 1950s. The book proved initially difficult to sell to publishers, but within decade it was such a success that it allowed Nabokov to give up teaching and concentrate solely on writing fiction. He spent his last years publishing several novels. His work peaked in 1969 with the publication of *Ada or Ardor*. Nabokov remained in Switzerland until his death in 1977 of viral infection, leaving an unfinished manuscript, *The Original of Laura*.

Adrian Lyne, the director of the film *Lolita*, was born in Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, England on 4 March 1941. He is an English film maker, screenwriter and producer. He is best known for his exploitative use in his films of focusing on sexually charged Characters, and Sultry, eroticized atmospheres which he visually creates in his films by use of filming techniques such as machine to create a soft focus. He was educated at High gate School. He got his start in directing television commercials. He also directed the music video for theme song from *Flashdance* called "*Maniac*" by Michael Sembello. He received a nomination for Academy Award for best Direction in 1988 for *Fatal Attraction*.

Nabokov's novel *Lolita* plays with the various major themes such as the power and beauty of language, obsessive desires, Mcfate, Reader as jury, Europe vs. the United States, Parody of Doppelganger tale, Butterflies, Mockery of psychoanalysis and entrapment as metamorphosis. Adrian Lyne's film *Lolita* seems faithful to the themes of the novel; meanwhile it exclusively promotes the theme entrapment as metamorphosis. *Lolita* has been formed twice; the first adaption was made in 1962 by Stanley Kubrick and a second adaption in 1997 by Adrian Lyne. Adrian Lyne's recent version of film adaptation was given mixed review by critics. It was delayed for over a year because of its controversial subject matter and wasn't released in Australia until 1999.

In a film review of *Lolita* (1997) James Berardinelli, dismissing the controversy of the film as pornographic, he comments:

*Lolita* is not a sex film; it's about characters relationship, and consequences of imprudent actions. And those who seek to brand the picture as immoral have missed the point. Both Humbert and Lolita are eventually destroyed -what could be more moral? The only real controversy I can see surrounding this film is why there was ever a controversy in the first place. (12)

Regardless of what the viewer takes from *Lolita*, it remains Lyne's most popular film with viewers and scholar alike. Berardinelli emphasizes this film version is not a sex film. Though, some critics tag this film fully immoral. In his reaction, Berardinelli asks them a question. Both, Humbert and Lolita are eventually destroyed – what could be more moral? For all its hype as sexual film, *Lolita* is less concerned with physical eroticism. It's about characters relationship, and consequences of imprudence.

The film was the *New York Times* “critics Pick” on 31 July 1998, with its critic Cary James Championing it and saying, “Rich beyond what anyone could have expected, the film repays repeated viewings... it turns Humbert madness into art” (13).

Obviously, this film occupies incredible sex appeal. Humbert's lust for his pubescent step- daughter, Lolita shocked viewers; yet the cinema celebrates for its gorgeous, tricky and delightful language. It has ostensibly a mysterious story. It demands a re-reading largely on the basis of its beautiful writing.

Commenting on differences between novel and film. Charles Taylor observes that “For all of their vaunted (and it turns out, false) fidelity to Nabokov, Lyne and Chiff have made a pretty, gauzy *Lolita* that replaces the book's cruelty and comedy with manufactured lyricism and mopey romanticism” (43). Here, Charles Taylor points out that Lyne's pride does not deserve, as his attempt to be fidelity turns into infidelity. He creates a pretty, gauzy *Lolita* that replaces the book's cruelty and comedy with manufactured lyricism and mopey romanticism. So, it's incorrect to expect the exactness in other medium, when different creative artist are involved.

Extending Taylor's observation, Keith Phipps conclude “Lyne doesn't seem to get the novel, failing to incorporate any of Nabokov's black comedy- which is to say, *Lolita* is heart and soul” (9). Keith finds out, why Lyne does not seem to get the novel? Why does he fail to incorporate Nabokov's black comedy? Which expresses, *Lolita* is heart and soul. Humbert's madness into art has been replaced. Because film are more marked by economic consideration than the novel and this constitutes a major reason why the film is not like novel.

Writer and director James Toback comments that “*Lolita* is 10 finest films ever made, but he rates the original film by Stanley Kubrick higher” (16). Here, Toback simply narrates that *Lolita* is 10 finest English films ever made in 20<sup>th</sup>

century. The novel was twice adapted into film in 1962 and again in 1997. He rates the original film by Stanley Kubrick higher than later version directed by Adriane Lyne.

This research studies how the film *Lolita* maintains the close affinity with the novel to preserve the peculiar properties of its film medium. Although both of them work on almost the same materials and same themes, their ways of dealing with them widely differ. While the novel *Lolita* exposes Humbert's lust for his pubescent step-daughter, through the written words. The film does the same through visual images, verbal sound and music. Similarly, both of them maintain the power and beauty of language, obsessive desires for sex, mystery and thrilling atmospheres.

## **II. From Novel to Film: Art of Film Adaptation**

### **A Brief Genesis of Film and Novel**

Both art forms, film and novel, are relatively newcomers; if the novel is the youngest of all literary genres, the film youngest of all artistic genres. Despite, sharing some elements, film and novel originated from distinct backgrounds and different historical situations, attributing their own unique features and strange quality. Unlike novel film did not emerge from literary tradition. Rather its seed was planted in the tradition of plastic art and photography.

Film is the outcome of rapid scientific and technological development of 19<sup>th</sup> century. Similarly, pointing such developments in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, David A Cook remarks, “The successive stages of the technological developments throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century whereby simple optical devices used for entertainment grew into the sophisticated machines, which could convincingly represent the empirical reality in motion” (1). Arthur knight, argues that the film is product of science, “If the motion pictures have by this time come to be accepted into the sisterhood of the established arts, there is no denying that it was always the child of science”(4).

Although, the film is the result of the invention of motion picture, the concept of motion picture is not so new. Talking about the basic principle of motion picture photography, Sumner Glimcher and Warren Johnson say:

The entire art and industry of photography is based upon two discoveries. The first was explained by Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) when he described the ‘camera obscura’. Leonardo was the first to show how a tiny hole drilled in the wall of the room would, on a sunny day project an image inside down, on the opposite wall. The second discovery is a simple photochemical reaction: salts undergo a chemical

change when exposed to light strips of various base materials were used as carriers of these chemicals. (1-2)

Thus, according to Glimcher and Johnson, the concept of photography was already discovered. The lens of today's camera corresponds to Da Vinci's hole; the camera body and his room. The camera captures image and the film preserves it. And with the discovery of these silver salts, it was possible to make a permanent record of any given pattern of light and dark.

The technological development of motion picture commenced in 1824 A.D. along with the publication of Peter Mark Roget's theory "The Persistence of Vision with Moving objects". After the emergence of this theory a number of scientists throughout the world began putting this theory into the test. In the same year in France Joseph Niepce was conducting a research on the fundamentals of photography. Eventually, he succeeded in producing a crude and permanent photograph. Then onward many scientists across Europe and America engaged themselves in experimenting new theories on photography and perfecting those already invented. Summing up extraordinary technological achievement towards the developments of motion pictures, David A. Cook Writes:

By 1896, all the basic technological principles of the film recording and projection had been discovered and incorporated into existing machines, which, with certain obvious exceptions like introduction of light-sensitive sound, have remained essentially unchanged from that day to this. (14)

However, mere technology development did not make the film art. The introduction of narrative into the film and inventions of various techniques, such as editing, art of montage, and different types of shots like close up, panoramic shots or middle shots

etc., helped make the film art. Although the great scientists of the 19th century, such as Thomas Alva Edison, Eadweard Muybridge, Etienne Jules Marey, and others contributed a lot in inventing the motion picture camera, it was D.W. Griffith who firmly established the film as the liveliest art so far existed. In the words of Arthur Knight:

Between 1908 and 1912 Griffith took the raw elements of movie making as they had evolved up to that time and, single handed, wrought from them a medium more intimate than theater, more vivid than literature, more affecting than poetry. He created the art film, and its language, its syntax. He refined the elements already present in motion pictures, mastered them to serve his purpose. (24)

Of course, Griffith invented close up, cutting, the camera angle, the way to use his camera angle, and the way to use his camera functionally. Moreover, he developed editing from the crude assembly of unrelated shots into conscious artistic device.

Thus the desire of creating moving pictures as in the real world is realized due to the scientific and technological innovations, and the contributions of various prolific artists and directors. At present film art almost shadows other art forms because of its liveliest and dynamic nature.

Novel, on the other hand, was originated from literary tradition. There is no consensus on the question when the novel exactly began. Prose narratives were in vogue around the second century B.C, which were written in Greek to be enjoyed by the people of wealth and leisure. Later, Renaissance saw the rise of long prose story encouraged by the growing numbers of literate people and the invention of printing press. Novel is also indebted to “romance” of the Middle Ages for its narrative. Actually, the form “novel” in the most European languages is derived from the

medieval form called “romance”. However, the English name for the form is derived from Italian term (novella) which meant a short tale in prose. But these earlier works of narrative lack certain essential qualities we expect in the modern novel: credible characters, some of them drawn round; psychological depth; some attention to the larger fabric of society in which the events take place; and descriptive detail, at least enough to make us feel that we are witnessing the actual. Nevertheless, some of the surviving fragments of *The Satyricon* by first century Roman writer Petronius and Miguel Cervantes’s *Don Quixote* are closer to the modern novel.

The modern novel is said to be emerged in England in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century along with Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). However, this work is only episodic, and lacks the organized plot that is why the credit of being the first modern novel goes to the Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded*. Along with the popularity of Richardson’s *Pamela*, the trend of writing novels increased, and reached its apogee in the Victorian period. And it is equally popular and the most practiced literary genre of 20<sup>th</sup> century. Arguing for the novel’s dynamic quality, and reason for its popularity Michael Bakhtin writes, “The novel, after all, has no canon of its own. It is by its nature, not canonic. It is plasticity itself. It is genre that is ever questing, ever examining itself and subjecting its established forms to review”(855).

### **Film and Novel as Distinct Art Forms**

A film is primarily a visual art and then only aural art, whereas novel is a verbal art. When the film was in its cradle, it was not considered as an art form; it was only sight-seeing tour for audience. Film was originally expected to bring the evolution of photography to satisfy the old age desire to picture the things moving. By 1895 this desire materialized. But the film was far behind to establish itself as an art form. Commenting on the emergence of the film art Erwin Panofsky observes, “It was

not an artistic argue that gave rise to the discovery and gradual perfection of new technique; it is rather technical invention that gave rise to the discovery and gradual perfection of new art” (233).

In spite of sharing some common features, novel and film differ in many points. Both of them are distinct art forms having their own unique features and strange qualities. They differ in their treatment of time and space, in their way to communicate, in their language and so on. In the novel, author is fully responsible for the characters and events because author creates the novel. Unlike novel, author has partially responsible in film. Meanwhile producer, director, screenwriter, editor, artists, musician, cameraperson, make up man, spot boy and light man work together to produce film. That is why; the film is output of mutual co-operation and team work. The novel is composed of words but a motion picture is composed of images which move.

One of the major crucial differences between novel and film, according to George Bluestone is the percept of visual image in cinema and concept of mental image in novel. On his pioneering work in the film- literature field, *Novel into film*, he remarks: “Between the percept of the visual image and concept of mental difference lies the root difference between the two media” (47). In this way, he points to the fundamental difference between the ways images are produced in the two media and how they are received.

Similarly, Andrew Dudley also sees the difference between the novel and film in the way the readers and audiences understand them. In the film, the percept of visual images predominates. The visual depiction of events provoke emotion and this provoking of emotion finally leads to an idea or understanding of the subject. But, in

the novel, the reader withdraw temporally into a private or unreal world, participates in the events being read, and sees imaginatively through mind. He states:

Generally film is found to work from perception towards signification, from external facts to interior motivation and consequences from givenness of a world to meaning of a story cut out of that world. Literary fiction works oppositely. It begins with signs (graphemes and words) building to propositions, which attempts to develop perception. As a product of human language it naturally treats human motivation and values seeking to throw them out onto external world, elaborating a world out of a story. (424)

The film is simply an illusion in which we see the scenes and events moving. In reality they are not moving but they have shown so. It is due to the phenomenon “persistence of vision.” In the words of Glimcher and Johnson:

A motion picture is a series of these captive images taken one after another in continuous manner. Each image on a reel of film is called a frame. The images themselves are no different from still photographs, each recording a moment of action, a fraction of a second after the one preceding it. That still images appear as motion or real action when projected on a screen is due to phenomenon known as “persistence of vision.” (2)

In this way, the moving scenes of the film are just an illusion which is seen real because of phenomenon ‘persistence of vision.’ The moving of the scenes is just the moving of still photographs. The movement of those photographs is in so rapid speed that our eyes cannot differentiate it.

The novel and film differ in their relation to time. Most of the novel deals with the past. The novel is a narrative that deploys past events moving towards a present. While the novelists construct the past as present, the director presents the past as present. A novel is closely related to past because the essence of narrative form is the past remembered as history. In this point, George V. Lindon says Henry James was quite right in this definition that “Most novels don’t begin “once upon a now” most film do. Novels are almost invariably written in the past: films are deniably shot in present (qtd in Lindon 32).

Even though a novel may be concerned with the present, it is still written and experienced in the reflected mode and hence never quite reaches to the past. The essence of film is its immediacy, and this immediacy is grounded in its tenselessness. Moving pictures that composed of pictures have no tenses. Bela Balzac stated:

They show only the present—they cannot express either a past or future tense. In a picture itself, there is nothing that would compellingly and precisely indicate the reason for the picture begin what is it. In a film scene we see only what is happening before our eyes. (Qtd in Brain 33)

These lines make it clear that watching a film is to see the present, it has no such relation with past.

Just as the novel and film are alike and different in their relation to time, they are also alike and different in their relation to space. Remarking in this point, George W Lindon writes:

The space of novel is a construct of words; it is a space that is engendered by the imagination of the reader, once he had become moved by description to envision. The space of the film, however, is

Immediately given to the eye by the flickering visual image. Both the novel and film tell the stories but one tells by saying other by presenting. (34)

In the conclusion of those lines, we can say that the reader of the novel must be active to understand the outers' posed word through his/her own active imagination but the moviegoer of the movie is presented a story already given in image and in this sense his/her imagination is more passive.

Likewise the novel is generally on the sequential order but film may not follow this order. The order of the composition of film is from outside in but the composition of the novel is just opposite: from inside out. Similarly, in the novel, the writer is the controller of the text, he/she like God who controls the whole text but the writer of the film is one of the workers among others. So he/she has no control over the story because a film is made out of team work unlike the novel.

If we turn to experience of the reading of the novel, we find that the reader's experience is analogous to that of the writer because the reader is imaginatively engaged in the novel but in film, the audience cannot stop flow of film, its directionality is forced upon up. In the novel, the readers see because they remember but in the film, the audience remembers because they see.

### **Language and Semiotics of Film**

Language is the system of codes/signs. While the language of the novel (i.e. of literature) consists of phonetics or orthographic symbols, film language is made up of verbal as well as non verbal codes. Film speaks in the language of senses, and the dramatic power of image is extremely important in film. Like verbal and literary language, film language is made up of images or sounds arranged in a certain way so

as to generate certain meaning. Charles Eidsvik in his study “Cinema and Literature” explains how the pattern of shots in a film resembles the syntax of verbal language:

The pattern of arranging shots in their “standard” sequence resembles the syntax patterns of speech. A shot establishes the subject; a medium shot conveys the important action, and a close up shows what happened to the “object” in the film sentence. A periodic sentence pattern is achieved by placing the “establishing shot” last in the pattern. The fade-out fade-in signifies a “paragraph” or a chapter division. The break between the shots in sequence means roughly the same thing as comma. Film syntax involves the distribution of images in a sequence; the sequences frequently resemble the distributional system of verbal language of the filmmaker. (44-45)

In the beginning, film language was purely iconic. But the introduction of narrative techniques in the film demanded the development of the various codes to denote narrative progression. The rules and conventions constitute the essence of film language and allow us to explain the procedures by which cinema denotes such narrative phenomena as successively, priority, temporal breaks, and spatial continuity.

A film has complex system of verbal and non-verbal codes. According to Christian Metz:

The cinema is a composite language at the very level of its matter of expression. Not only does it have several codes but also several languages in some way are already contained in it. These languages are distinguished among themselves by their physical definition: moving picture arranged in sequence, phonetic sounds, and musical noise. (Qtd in Stephen 267)

Metz, a best-known film semiotician, is of the view that a film is like a language because it communicates like verbal or written language, using its own codes and conventions. According to Metz, film has no words as some film semioticians claimed. He compares a shot not with a word but with a sentence. Unlike in verbal language where there is a distance between signifier and signified, in film language the signified cannot be disengaged from the signifier. For instance, in a movie sadness is not the concept “sadness”, but a child weeping or a man wailing. That is, in a movie sadness is not a concept but an actual situation or attribute of a specific person.

In the film, language analysis --Ferdinand de Saussure’s formulation of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationship between or among the codes/signs --is applicable. Like verbal language, film language communicates in two ways: syntagmatically and paradigmatically. A syntagma is a unit of actual relationship; thus syntagmatic relationships result when the units in the filmic chain follows each other in order. A paradigm, on the other hand, is unit of potential relationships; thus paradigmatic relationships are associative, not sequential. They are not concerned with order of the link in the chain, but with the meanings we associate with them. Since paradigmatic relationships are independent of the order in which the event occur, they can also exist between scenes taking place at different times within a film.

But it is not easy to analyze film language because it is opposite language, consisting of various types of visual and aural codes. Cautioning us to be careful in the course of film language analysis Bernard F. Dick in his book *Anatomy of Film* writes:

It is not enough for semioticians simply to isolate syntagmas and paradigms; the movie relays its message through codes that the

filmmaker used and that the semiotician must now construct. There are all kinds of codes: codes of dress, color, lighting and so forth. (333)

### **The Bond Between Film and Novel**

Despite, novel and film originated from distinct background, they share some common elements. Both art forms are relatively new comers, having close affinity since the time of film's birth as an art form. First of all, both are narrative works of art; the narrative is the backbone of them. According to Keith Cohen, "Narrative is the most solid median link between novel and cinema, the most pervasive tendency of both verbal and visual language" (qtd. in Dudley425). Giving the momentous status to the fact of merging cinema and narrativity Christian Metz in his essay "Some Points in the semiotics of Cinema" writes, The merging of the cinema and narratively was not a great fact, which was by no means predestined-nor was it strictly fortuitous It was a historical and social fact" (169).

Refuting those critics who claimed that the film and the drama are more similar than the film and novel, Gerald Mast argues.

Indeed, it is not implausible argue, as Bazin and Sontag have, that the film's deepest affinities with the novel, not with the play. The novel is cinematic in its fluid handling of time and space, in its focused narrative control, in its ability to alternate description with dialogue, and even in the privacy and isolation of its audience. (353)

Similarly, Susan Sontag in her study found the affinity between these art forms in terms of their way to manipulate time and control the attention of the reader or viewer in the following excerpts:

Like the novel, the cinema presents us with a view of the action, which is absolutely under the control of director (writer) at every moment.

Our attention cannot wander about the screen, as it does about the stage. When the camera moves, we move, when it remains still we are still. In a similar way, novel presents a selection of the thoughts and descriptions, which are relevant to the writer's conception, and we must follow these serially, as the author leads us; they are not spread out, as a background, for us to contemplate in the order we choose, as in painting or the theater. (243-44)

Next similarity between novel and film lies in the novelistic intention of a writer and the cinematic intention of director. The often –quoted statements of Joseph Conrad and D. W. Griffith are apt to mention to case. Joseph Conrad, stating his novelist intention remarks “My task which I am trying to achieve is, by powers of written words, to make you hear, to make you feel –it is before all to make you see” (qtd. in Brian 4 ). The difference is only in the way of seeing in the words of George Bluestone “between the percept of visual image and the concept of mental image” (1).

In spite of difference in their way of presentation, the languages of film and novel have underlying similarity. That is, the function of every type of language is to communicate, and the both the languages are doing the same. Moreover, film language consists of verbal and/or written language. While language is made up of words, and the words can conjure up anything- image, ideas, feelings, qualities, things etc, the film is made up of any images with some words, sound and music and it is very visual and compelling. Film uses many codes and techniques such as camera, angles, panning, lighting, and the speeds of cuts, color, association of images and so forth-to get its meaning across. However, these are not in the novel.

In this way, film and novel share a number of features like narrative, character, point of view, setting and so forth. For that reason Sergei Eisenstein find cinematic qualities in Charles Dickens's novels:

Perhaps the secret lies in Dickens's (as well as cinema's) creation of an extraordinary plasticity. The observation in the novels is extraordinary- as in their optical quality. Character of Dickens's are rounded with means as plastic and slightly exaggerated, as are screen heroes today.  
(396)

### **Art of Film Adaptation**

Adaptation of literary text into the film is not anymore a new concept but an old tradition that started from 1890s. The first adaptations were of Bibles into two films. In Susan Heyward's word:

Literary adaptation to a film is a long established tradition in cinema starting, for example, with early cinema adaption of bible in 1897 and 1899 by Lumiere brothers (*La vie et passion de Christ*, 1897) and Alice Guy (*La vie de Christ*, 1899). By 1910s, adaption of the established literary canon had become marketing ploy by which producers and exhibitors could legitimize cinema going as a venue of taste and thus attract the middle class to their theaters. Literary adaption gave cinema the respectable cachet of entertainment as art. (3)

For Heyward, literary adaption to film is not new but is a long established tradition. Adapted cinemas could attract the middle class people too. In the past only elite, privilege and high class people used to go the theater. The adaptation made the area of theater or cinema broad. Because of literary adaption, the film became a respectable art.

Almost all the best-selling novels have been adapted into films. Adaptation does not mean simply to change a novel/play into film. An adaptation is a work in one medium that derives its impulse as well as varying number of its elements from a work in different medium. Sometime adaptations are loose, borrowing a general situation, an episode, a character, or even a title as the inspiration for the work whereas sometimes adaptations try to be 'literal', presenting the original story, characters, and even dialogue as exactly as possible. But, film being a separate medium with its own aesthetic and techniques, the original work must be transformed into what are essentially a different and a unique form. Joseph M. Boggs and Dennis W. Petrie suggest us to keep in mind the following things to judge the film adaptation fairly:

Although a novel, a film, or a play can tell same story, each medium is a work of art in its own right, and despite some properties that all three share, each medium has its own distinctive techniques, conventions, consciousness and view point. (370)

According to them, in the process of adaption there come changes not only in medium but also on creative minds. Therefore they are some kinds of creative shift in almost all kind of adaptations. So, it is incorrect to expect an exact carry-over from one medium to another when different creative artists are involved.

Similarly, some critics and screen writers take adaptation as a creative art. For instance, De Witt Bodeen, a well-known scriptwriter opines in his "*The Adopting Art*", "Adopting literary works to film, without doubt, a creative undertaking but the task requires a kind of selective interpretation, along with the ability with the recreate and sustain an established mood" (349).

The most frequent and most tiresome discussion of adaptation concerns with fidelity issues because in this the original work becomes the standard against which the film version is compared. Fidelity criticism, which makes up a great deal of literary criticism, focuses on the notion of equivalence. Many critics have their own vision about the issue of fidelity. Few writers have specially questioned the possibility of fidelity though some claimed not to embrace it: they still regard it as viable choice for the film-maker and criterion for the critic. Beja, a film critic asks: “what relationship should a film have to the original source? Should it be faithful? Can it be? To what?” (qtd. in Brain 9). So there is not hard and fast rule on it. Christopher Orr has noted: “The concern with the fidelity of the adapted film in letter and spirit to its literary source has questionably dominated the discourse on adaption” (qtd. in Brain 10).

It is not sufficient to show the difference between the texts through the fidelity criticism. Susan Heyward writes:

It does not suffice to do a textual analysis based on a demonstration of how the film renders the language the style of the original through editing, techniques, the symbolic use of images, finally the sound track and music. We need to understand the meaning of these differences within a socio political, economic and historical context. We need to understand the sign of these differences. Adaptations are synergy between the desires for sameness and reproduced on the one hand, and on the other hand, the acknowledgement of difference. (6)

In this way, the difference between film and original text may occur because of the technical aspects and the socio context of the film. So, the exactness is not possible. To advocate on the fidelity of cinema is not so praiseworthy work because the adaptation itself is the acknowledgement of difference.

McFarlane prefers other approaches of adaptation, such as intertextuality, to fidelity approach. For him, “Modern critical notions of intertextuality represent a more sophisticated approach, in relation to adaptation, to the idea of original novel as a resource” (10). In this regard, Christopher Orr remarks, “within the critical context (i.e. of intertextuality), the issue is not whether the adapted film is faithful to its source, but how the choice of specific source and how the approach to that source serves the film’s ideology” (72).

Similarly, Geoffrey Wagner suggests three possible categories, which pose challenge to the hegemony of fidelity approach. The first Wagner’s three categories is transposition “in which a novel is given directly on the screen with a minimum apparent interference” (qtd. in Brain 10). His second category is commentary “where an original is taken and either purposely or inadvertently altered in some respect” (qtd. in Brian 10). And the last one is what he calls analogy “which must represent a fairly considerable departure for the sake of making another work of art” (qtd. in Brain 11).

On the other hand, various kinds of actual relation are existing between film and novel; some of which are amenable to adaptation while some other is not. To analyze the film adaption of novel more clearly, we must examine the specific challenges posed by each medium. So, we should take the various techniques, such as narrative technique, point of views, and the treatment of time and subject matter-of both art forms in consideration.

In the novel, as well as the film, narrative plays a central role. Christian Metz, discussing film narrative, “Film tell us continuous stories; it ‘says’ things that would be conveyed also in languages of words; yet it says them differently. There is a reason for the possibility as well as for necessity of adaptation” (qtd. in Brain 12).

In this regard, we can say that the most striking common feature of novel and film is the potential and propensity for narrative. It is not only the chief transferrable element but the most of the criticisms written about the film adopted from the novels have emerged from the perception of tempering with the original narrative in the opinion of Brian McFarlane:

Such dissatisfaction resonate with complex set of misapprehensions about the workings of narrative in the two media, about the irreducible differences between the two, and from failure to distinguish what can from what cannot be transferred. (12)

By this he means that before discussing about adaptation a distinction should be made between what may be transferred from one narrative medium to another and what necessarily requires adaptation proper.

Ronald Barthes' distinction between distributional functions and integrational functions of narrative is valuable in sorting out what may be transferred (from novel to film) from that which only is adapted. The distributional functions denote to action and events which are strung together throughout the text while the integrational functions refer to more or less diffuse concept which nevertheless necessary to the meaning of the story. The most important kinds of transfer possible from novel to film are located in the distributional functions rather than in the integrational functions.

In the same way, another distinction should be made between various narrative modes that appear in the novel, which are difficult to sustain in the film narrative. The point of view controls and dictates the form and shape of literary work and determines its emphasis, tone, strengths and limitations. Novelistic narratives modes consists of the first person point of view, third person omniscient point of view, third person limited point of view, dramatic or objective point of view and stream of

consciousness. Among these five points of view possible in the novel, the omniscient , the third person limited, the stream of consciousness require the narrator to look inside a character's mind to see what he/she is thinking. They all stress the thoughts, concept or reflections of a character, which are difficult to depict cinematically. These three points of view have no natural cinematic equivalents. George Bluestone discusses this problem in his *Novel into Film*:

The rendition of mental states - memory, dream and imagination – cannot be adequately represented by film as language [...]. The film, by arranging external scenes for our visual perception, or by presenting us with dialogue, can lead us to infer. But it cannot show us thought directly. It can show characters thinking, feeling thought and speaking, but it cannot show us their thought and feeling. A film is not thought, it is perceived. (47-48)

Similarly, three of the novelistic point of view, namely first person, omniscient and third person limited, makes us aware of the narrator. This sense of narrative can be imposed on a film through voice over narration added to the sound track. But it is not natural cinematic element. In film we simply see the story unfold. That is why the dramatic point of view is the only literary point of view that can be directly translated into cinema.

Likewise, due to the limitations imposed on the length of a film and on the amount of material it can successfully treat, a film is forced to suggest pictorially a great many things that a novel can explore in the more depth. Novelist and screen writer William Goldman sums up the problem this way:

When people say, “Is it like a book?” the answer is, “There has never in the history of the world had been a movie that’s really been like a

book.” Everybody says how faithful *Gone with the Wind* was. Well, *Gone with the Wind* was a three and half hour movie, which means you are talking about may be a two hundred-page screen play of a nine hundred-page in which the novel has, say, five hundred words per page; and the screen play has maybe forty, maybe sixty, depending on what’s on the screen, maybe one hundred and fifty words per page. But you are taking a little, teeny slice, you are just extracting little teeny essences of scenes. All you can ever be in an adaptation is faithful in spirit. (qdt. In Boggs and Petrie 380)

To conclude, apart from these elements proper attentions should be given to other novelistic elements, such as summary of the character’s past, literary past tense, descriptive details and so forth, while analyzing film adaptation of novels.

### **Film as Hybrid and Corporate Art**

In the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century a new art form, namely film, rose to prominence. It borrowed from older arts and shared characteristics with them along with its development. Early as 1915 film used to be compared to paintings, but in recent times these comparisons have been extended to all the other arts. In short, like opera, a film is a hybrid art. Like opera that draws on the other arts like theater, painting, music, dance and mime, film can draw on all these; it is also outgrow of another art, photography. Joseph M. Boggs and Dennis W. Petrie have expressed film’s hybrid quality in their book *The Art of Watching Film*:

Film enjoys the compositional elements of the visual arts: line, form, mass, volume and texture. Like painting and photography, film exploits the subtle interplay of the light and shadow. Like sculpture, film manipulates three-dimensional space. But like, pantomime, film

focuses in moving images, and as in dance, the moving images in the film have rhythm. The complex rhythms of film resemble those of music and poetry, and like poetry in particular, film communicates through imagery, metaphor and symbol. Like the drama, film communicates visually and verbally: visually through action and gesture; verbally through dialogue. Finally, like the novel, expands and compresses time and space, travelling back and forth freely within their wide borders. (2)

Unlike novel, film is corporate art and a single person cannot be held responsible for its production. It is a technological art and no other art form interposes technical know-how between the artist and its audience. In other words, film is the collaborative work in that it requires the talents of the vast number of specialists. In this regard, Gerald Mast et. al. *Film Theory and Criticism* write, “Panofsky specially compares the making of a film to a building of cathedral, for the cathedral was built for the greater glory of god and was result of the collective labor of as many specialists as a Hollywood film” (580). Thus, a cinema is a collaborative work of a director, a scriptwriter, a cameraman, a producer and many more people, who give the final shape of a film.

In this way, novel and film, despite sharing a number of elements, are distinct works of art. Both of them are narrative work of art, having characters, plot, setting and dialogue and so on. Both the narrative unfolds essentially in a different ways in these two works of art. While the narrative of novel unfolds through written words (i.e. descriptions and sometimes dialogues), the narrative in the film unfolds through actions and images. The film is basically a visual work of art. Similarly, they treat time and space differently. That is, the novel generally deals with past events and the

film is shot in present. In the same way, the novel is primarily representational medium where as the film is a primarily a presentational medium. Moreover, the film is the unique medium in its constant motion. There is a continuous interplay of sight, sound, and motion in the film. So, while examining the film adaptation of the novel, we should take all these things into consideration. We should consider what elements of the novel can be transferred as they are in the film and what elements should be adapted.

### **III. *Lolita*: From Narrative to Audio-Visual**

#### **The Film Adaption**

The film *Lolita* is an adaption of Vladimir Vladimirovich Nabokov's blockbuster novel *Lolita*. The film was released world widely in September 25, 1997. Meanwhile it was not released in Australia until 1999 because of its controversial subject matter. The starring role of this film has cast the Oscar winner actor Jeremy Irons, and other Hollywood stars Dominique swain, Melanie Griffith, Frank Langella, Suzanne Shepherd, Erin J. Deena, Kathryn Peterson and Keith Reddin. An English, director, Adrian Lyne has directed the film. The screen play for this 1997 version, far more faithful to Nabokov's novel, is credited to Stephen Schiff. Producer Mario Kassar invested hundreds of million dollars. It was cinematography by Howard Atherton and music directed by Ennio Moricone. The protagonist, Humbert's lust for his pubescent step daughter eventually leads him in the path of self destruction. The film adaptation slightly deviates from its source novel, in which it shares the central theme of entrapment as metamorphosis.

The novel *Lolita* and its film adaption revolve around the same theme such as a dark and daring story of obsessive love and transgression between Humbert and his pubescent step-daughter, Lolita. The main spirit of the novel has not been distorted in film. But to make the film commercial, Lyne has modified some characters, scenes, and events etc. so that it could be pattern movie in Hollywood. To shape the film, according to the choice of the viewers and the demand of time, such as modification, distortion, deviation, addition, and deletion are acceptable and it is inevitable regarding the commercial aspects of cinema. Because of two distinct genera such deviation are obvious. Adriane Lyne, as the director of the film, has modified the source novel with the rhythm of its screen play.

The early phase of the novel is set in Europe and remaining phases are set in United States. It begins with the flashback, where Humbert praises his step daughter, “Lolita, light of my life, fire of my loins. My sin, my soul. Lo-le-ta: the tips of the tongue taking a trip of three steps down the palate to trap, at three, on the teeth. Lo.lee.ta. she was lo, plain lo, in the morning, standing four feet ten in one sock. She was Lola in slacks. She was Dolly at school. She was Dolores on the dotted line. But in my arms she was always Lolita”. (7)



Figure 1: Lolita Knelling and turning about her knees on the garden

The story of the novel is based on a middle aged European man’s affair with a 12 year-old American girl. The novel develops from autobiography of Humbert and his immortal childhood love affair. Humbert was born in 1910, in Paris. His father was gentle and easy going person, a salad of racial genes: a Swiss citizen, of mixed French and Austrian descent. His father and two grandfathers had sold wine, jewels and silk respectively. At thirty, father married an English girl Jerome Dunn. Humbert’s very photogenic mother died in a freak accident when he was three. Then, Humbert’s aunt, Sybil served in his immediate family as a kind of unpaid governess and housekeeper. Somebody told him that she had been in love with his father.

Humbert was extremely fond of her, despite the rigidity-the fatal rigidity-of some of her rules. He grew a happy and healthy child in a bright world of illustrated books, clean sand, orange trees, friendly dogs, sea vistas and smiling faces. Around him the splendid hotel Mirana revolved as a kind of private universe, a white washed cosmos within blue greater one that blazed outside. He attended an English day school, a few miles from home, and there he played rackets and fives and got excellent marks, and was perfect terms with schoolmates and teachers alike. In his child hood, Humbert and Annabel Leigh were fastened in deep love affair. Annabel Leigh was the daughter of one of his aunt's friends. She wanted to be a nurse in some famished Asiatic country; Humbert wanted to be a spy. Annabel was some months younger than Humbert. They were madly in love in one summer. They would explore each other's body on the beach. On the last day together, they were interrupted before consummation. Four months later, Annabel died of typhus in Corfu.



Figure 2: Humbert's childhood girlfriend Annabel Leigh

But this early part of the novel is heavily censored in its film adaption. The exclusion is obviously not justice to its original text. Regarding its limited time, length and boundary of the film, the exclusion is justifiable somehow. Unlike the novel, its film

version begins with Humbert disobeying the traffic rules on two lanes highway of hilly region. Where, he praises Lolita in flashback. His driving with bloody hands on steering wheel and careless pistol moving side by side on front seat arouses the clip of violence in the film. Some glimpse of glamorous scene of the beach and store room is shown with lover Humbert and beloved Annabel. Untimely demise of Annabel snatches the happiness of young Humbert. Except, these finger counting scene, Adrian Lyne's film adapts none of the remaining events of source novel. Some characters like Humbert's father, mother, and aunt, Sybil are absent in the film.



Figure 3: Teenage Humbert at Cannes France

In his youth days, Humbert enjoys the company of prostitutes as a college student. He studies in Paris and London. He receives a degree in English literature and teaches English to a group of adults in Auteuil. He coins a word “nymphet,” which is a girl between nine to fourteen, who possesses some “fantastic power”. Humbert gives us a closer look at his unremitting, ecstatic desire. He meets a French nymphet prostitute named Monique and fulfils his sensual desire. However, soon she loses her nymphet qualities and he stops hunting her. Monique's rapid change from a nymphet into a woman suggests that metamorphosis, Humbert tries to make his nymphets

resists. “Never grow up,” but maturation of nymphets is out of Humbert’ control. Soon, after his encounter with other prostitutes, Humbert marries to Valeria, hoping it would cure him of his illicit desire. His exception looks and a small inheritance makes acquisition of polish doctor’s daughter very easy. However, Humbert realizes that his choice was disastrous, which shows how “stupid” he is in “matters of sex”. Valeria, Humbert’s wife, initially reminds him of a little girl. The sheen quickly wears off after their wedding night, and she turns into a “brainless woman”. Her only asset is muted nature which does help to produce an odd sense of comfort in their small squalid flat. In 1939, after four years of their marriage, she informs him, she is seeing another man, a Russian taxi driver to whom she introduces Humbert. Humbert, deeply hurt, suggestes she lives with man and contemplates killing or hurting Valeria when they are alone. He never gets a chance, since the Russian stays by her side. Later, Humbert divorces Valeria, divorce proceeding delays his voyage to United States. In New York, he eagerly accepts the soft job fate offers him: it consists of thinking up and editing perfume ads. On the other hand, he was urged by a war time university in New York to complete his comparative history of French literature for English speaking students. Unlike this part of the novel, viewers of its film adaptation get hardly any chance to watch the resembling scene. Because, novel’s characters like Monique, Valera and Russian taxi driver are excluded from the film. His college life in Paris and London is not mentioned, Humbert’s voyage from Europe to United States is not string into the film too. Humbert’s sexual relationship with many prostitutes is clueless in it. Meanwhile, his luxurious and sophisticated journey by train to New England is added into the film. In this circumstance, director, Adrian Lyne seems disloyal toward the source novel.



Figure 4: Humbert's Luxurious journey by train to New England

Surprisingly, nobody meets Humbert at the railway station. Mc Coe manages Humbert to accommodate at Mrs. Haze of 342 Lawn Street. As Humbert narrates:

Nobody met me at the toy station where I alighted with my new expensive bag, and nobody answered the telephone; eventually, however, a distraught Mc Coe in wet clothes turned up at the only hotel of green- and- pink Ramsdale with the news that his house had just burned down-possibly owing to the synchronous conflagration that had been raging all night in my veins. His family, he said, had fled to a farm he owned, and had taken the car, but a friend of his wife's, a grand person, Mrs. Haze of 342 Lawn Street, offered to accommodate me. (37)

Humbert is angry disappointed and bored for being replaced from Mc Coe's home to Mrs. Haze. En route, he swears to himself he will not staying at Mrs. Charlotte Haze's home. Reluctantly he follows her downstairs; through the kitchen at the end of the hall, on the right side of the house, the side where also the dining room and parlor are. They pass on to a small pantry and enter the dining room, parallel to the parlor they have already admired. He notices a white sock on the floor. He gropes for the time

table; he has in his pocket and surreptitiously fish it out to look as soon as possible for a train. So he will not compel to live at the lawn street. Knowing the psychology of Humbert, Mrs. Haze tries to convince him to stay. Finally, a blue wave swells under his heart, when he sees Lolita, half naked, knelling, and turning about on her knees on the garden. After seeing Lolita, Humbert nods his head to stay on Mrs. Haze family as a paying guest. From here the real story begins. It is supposed to be turning point of the film. In the film, Humbert's expression of being bored and angry for replacement is not screened. His vow of not staying at Mrs. Haze home is off screened too. Humbert finds Lolita as a prototype of Annabel in the film.



Figure 5: Mrs. Haze's Home at Lawn Street 342

One Sunday morning, Mary rose Hamilton is sick and unable to go to lake, Haze calls off the trip. Upset Lolita does not attend the church with her mother. Left alone with her, Humbert has her sit on his lap while she eats a red delicious apple. Humbert jokes around and sings a song while covertly, rubbing against her in ecstasy. Unlike novel, the role of Mary Rose Hamilton is excluded in the film. Similarly, Humbert and lolita's marry making action at the absence of Mrs. Haze is deleted too. Fidelity is found only in conversation between Lolita and her mother, whether to go

church or not. Where daughter denies her mother and stays at home instead to attend the church. Lyne artistically adds Humbert's lustful behavior for his pubescent step-daughter, which enriches the glamorous portion of the film. The drive in scene is followed by hand holding game that resembles "grab the bat": Lolita grabs the Humbert's hand, Humbert grabs the Lolita's hand and Charlotte captures the Humbert's hand in a sequence which serves as a visual correlation for love triangle which Lyne has so carefully constructed.



Figure 6: Humbert Lolita and Mrs. Haze sit together

Lolita's troublesome but innocent childish behavior makes headache to Mrs. Haze, but Humbert feels pleasure in same behavior. Humbert's love to Annabel Leigh of 1920s revives soon after his first glimpse to Lolita. Humbert's dual activity of reading newspaper and mysteriously observing to Lolita evokes his unfulfilled teenage passion with nymphet. In film, Humbert always welcome to Lolita's childish behavior. One evening, Humbert types on typewriter and listens music, which disturbs Lolita, so she wakes up and complains to Humber. Then, she takes off her trouser on his behalf and enters the toilet. Lo and her mother's oral dispute for minor subject matters in film remind to its viewer that how generation gape creates problem even in

nuclear family. Lolita sticks chewing gum on Humbert's dairy. She wears odd shoe, she dances on music with high volume, which really irritates to Mrs. Haze. To maintain discipline and control Lolita's naughty behavior, Mrs. Haze decides to admit her in good boarding school. Before, her admission open, Mum sends her in summer camp. At the beginning, Lolita objects her mother's decision later she obeys. A moment, before her departure, Lolita bade farewell to colored housemaid then she sits on jeep, immediately she remembers Humbert, who was looking her from the window, without delay she comes out from the vehicle and runs into the house and up to Humbert's room, where she kisses him. Soon after Haze has left with Lolita on summer camp, housemaid, Louise, hands Humbert a letter from Mrs. Haze. In it, Mrs. Haze confesses her sincere love for Humbert and tells him to leave her; otherwise, if he stays it means he wants marry her. The confession Letter of Mrs. Haze is so long in novel. But the same letter transpose into the smallest size in the film. In novel, the letter not only confesses her love, but also gives order as land lady to dismissing a lodger, if he doesn't accept her proposal. She conceals her hidden love. She has loved him from the minute. She saw him. She also mentions about her tragic past. Mr. Haze, her dead husband, who was a splendid person, a sterling soul, but he happened to be twenty years her senior. Unlike novel, the letters in film simply narrates her love to Humbert and purposes him to marry. No further details of early letter are available in film.

Humbert admits to the jury that he has toyed with the idea of marrying a widow to have his way with her child, even Mrs. Haze. He considers the idea more and thinks about giving sleeping pills to Haze and Lolita. So, he can fondle Lolita at night. He calls at summer camp, hoping to reach Haze but gets Lolita instead. He informs her, he is marrying to her mum; she already seems to have forgotten

Humbert, but he does not mind. Humbert drinks his favorite mixture of gin and pineapple juice. To keep himself busy, he makes big hedge to little. In the film, Humbert's address to the jury is excluded. His telephone calls at summer camp, conversation with Lo and conveying the information about his marries with her mum, these all scene are mercilessly deleted into the film. Meanwhile, the film includes an additional scene; the national flag of United States are seen like mushroom on each houses of Ramsdale. This additional scene evokes patriotic feelings and nationalism. It also memories the 1940s era of Second World War. However, the much narrative sequence may have changed; the sub-structure of the work remains the same in both the novel and the film.

After marriage, Humbert is surprised by Haze's adamant stance that if he did not believe in "Christian God," she would commit suicide. Haze tries to integrate herself and Humbert into Ramsdale society. Humbert successfully avoids his husbandly night duty. They spend time with John and Jean Forlow. Mrs. Haze redecorates the house. We can see her redecoration in these lines in novel:

She never got as far as that, thank god, but she did use up a tremendous amount of energy in washing window shades, waxing the slats of venetian blinds, returning them to the store, replacing them by others.....she changed the colors of sofa-the sacred sofa where a bubble of paradise had once burst in slow motion within me. She rearranged the furniture.....she developed the hatred for little lean chairs and spindle tables. She believed that a room having a generous expanse of glass, and lots of rich wood paneling was an example of the masculine type of room, whereas the feminine type was

characterized by lighter looking windows and frailer woodwork. (86-87)

So, the newly married bride's redecoration of the house symbolizes her faithful and dutiful nature. Meanwhile, Lyne does not convince, the additional worth of house redecoration, thus he disconnects this scene from the film. Humbert's steel himself for his night duty is shown in the film, which serves the fidelity toward the original text. Indeed, the only couple, John and Jean Forlow with whom Haze had relation of real cordiality, had attended her wedding. Ironically, the role of Mr. and Mrs. Forlow is not string into the film

One day, Haze goes into Humbert's study room and asks questions. Why does he lock up the drawer of small table? What is inside it? Where is the key? Humbert answers, the key is hidden, there is locked up love letters inside the drawer. This scene is added into the film. From doctor, Humbert acquires some strong, purple sleeping pills, supposedly for his own insomnia, to drug Haze and Lolita. He comes home by driving and finds Haze tearfully writing a letter. She has read his personal diary, which was kept secretly into the drawer. The secret dairy has written "The Haze woman, the big bitch, the old cat, the obnoxious mamma, the-the old stupid Haze woman is no longer your dupe. She has-she has..." This conflict promoter scene is exactly screened into the film too. After reading the diary, Mrs. Haze accuses Humbert, a monster, a detestable abominable, criminal fraud. Humbert tries to calm her down. Humbert says her that it was co-incidentally matched the name with Mrs. Haze and Lolita. Actually, the diary was just the fragment of his unfinished novel. And he fixes the drink. After he does this, he receives a telephone call informing him Mrs. Haze been run over by a car. Humbert rushes out and find that a Packard automobile driven by a Frederick Beale, Jr. has run over Haze as she was about to

mail three letters. In this part of the novel, viewers get entertainment to watch the maximum events resembling to its source. Aftermath, the accident, a little girl with dirty clothes give Humbert three letters of diseased Haze. Unlike novel, the nice little girl with beautiful clothe gives humbert the letters in the film.



Figure 7: Mrs. Haze's dead body after car accident

Both in novel and its film adaptation, Humbert is afraid if Lolita has been informed of her mother's death and realizes that he has not become her legal guardian. He plans to camp and learn Lolita will not be back from a hike for two more days. He buys a great deal of clothing for Lolita, this act does not occupy into the film. Remembering Haze's mention of Enchanted Hunter Inn, he wires a double room for next night. Humbert arrives at the summer camp and Lolita soon meets him. As they drive away, he tells her, Haze is in the hospital in another town and that they will make it tomorrow. At Lolita's suggestion, they pull over and kiss; it is the second kiss between them, and this scene is available both in novel and film. A patrol car stops and asks if they saw a blue car up a head, they continue. Lolita alternates between flirting and mocking. Lyne gives much more space of flirting in novel. Unlike other

parts of novel, Lyne seems much more generous to this part, because this part of novel has not been distorted in the film.



Figure 8: Lolita returns from summer camp

After some difficulty, they locate the Enchanted Hunter and park, though a red convertible takes a shelter space before they can. They receive a room, number 342, with a double bed. Co-incidentally, the room number 342 is similar with house no 342 at Ramsdale. so that, Lo says, it's our house number. Here, the transposed passage describes the motel room, where Humbert and Lolita stayed. About this room, there is a short description given below:

There was a double bed, a mirror, a double bed in mirror, a closet door with mirror, a bathroom door ditto, a blue-dark window, a reflected bed there, the same in closet mirror, two chairs, a glass-topped table, two bed-tables, a double bed: a big panel bed, to be exact, with a Tuscan rose chenille spread, and two frilled, pink-shaded night lamps, left and right. (134)

Alfred Appel Jr. calls this room a “prison of mirrors”-the kind of prison, one might add, Northrop Frye identifies as central symbol of entrapment or decent. What is

interesting here is the emphasis on mirroring and doubling. Surprisingly, Lyne has filmed the scene with fewer mirrors, possibly because of difficulty on shooting under these very restricting conditions. Instead, he used the shadow of venetian blinds to suggest the bar of cage, another emblem of imprisonment. The upside-down shot of Humbert invokes the theme of metamorphosis: turning the hunter into an animal, as in a fairy tale.

At dinner, Lolita points out that a diner there looks exactly like Clare Quilty, the playwright from a cigarette ad. Humbert lures her into trying one of the purple pills. But this pill is not mentioned into the film. She is soon sleepy, and he takes her off to a bed. Inside the hunter hall, Humbert looks a naked picture of women on the wall, which is an additional scene presented in the film. Humbert asks at the front desk if his wife called. He musters his courage on the porch outside. On the darkness, next to Humbert, there was somebody sitting in a chair, asks Humbert some questions that are full of suspicion about Lolita. Who is the lassie? Where is her mother? By the way, why do not you two lunches with me tomorrow. Humbert answers that the lassie is my daughter, and her mother is dead. The above passage of novel is exactly transposed in the film.

Humbert enters his hotel room. He changes into pajama. Lolita is deliriously half-awake in bed. He climbs into bed but is too afraid to make move. He gets a drink of water from the bathroom for his heart burn, and when he returns Lolita gets up and ask for drink, too. She drinks it and quickly falls asleep again. He stays the whole night. He informs the jury that by six o' clock in the morning, she was awake, and that by 6:15 were lovers and that Lolita seduced him. This segment of novel is depicted exactly into the film, because it is the maiden intercourse between Humbert and his nymphet, step daughter, Lolita. This scene is bond with the theme of obsessive love

and transgression. As a part of his phantasmal nature, Quilty hides his face from Humbert: during their conversation at the enchanted hunter, his back is turned; Humbert cannot recognize him at the filling station, and Quilty remains a faceless driver of pursuing car. Thus, Quilty's mysterious and phantasmal nature arouses thrilling suspense simultaneously in novel and film.

Humbert and Lolita drive across the U.S. for one year. Humbert threatens to put Lolita in an orphanage if she does not comply with his sexual demands, but this scene of threatening excluded in the film. Humbert gets a job at Beardsley College and enrolls Lolita in girls school there. Lolita's desires to socialize with boys' strain her relationship with Humbert, he agrees to let her participate in a school play called "The Enchanted Hunters". The Enchanted Hunters either it's the name of motel or play, both of them create odd atmosphere simultaneously in novel and film.



Figure 9: Lolita's girls' school at Beardsley

Humbert suspects Lolita of infidelity, and they leave for another road trip. A man who resembles a relative of Humbert's named Trapp seems to be following them, and Lolita appears to be in contact with him. When Lolita gets sick, and is admitted in a hospital, she is taken away by Trapp. Humbert starts the thousand mile stretch to

Kasbeam, checking the register of the 342 hotels and motels at which he and Lolita stayed. He discovers the Trapp stayed under aliases at nearby places. Humbert returns to Beardsley and suspects a professor of being Trapp, but realizes he is wrong. Hiring a private detective also proves futile. In the film Lyne excludes Humbert's returning to Beardsley and hiring a private detective. Humbert's odd and exhausting long journey of the script transposes into short journey. Obviously, the viewers get bore if long journey screened again and again.



Figure: 10: Humbert fights with Doctor after Lolita is being kidnapped from Hospital

In the novel, Humbert composes a poem to Lolita, Which is solely dedicated to her. Surprisingly, this poem doesn't get space in its film adaption. The 52 lines in poem link 52 weeks he and Lolita spent on the road, as well as the year 1952 and 52 playing cards in deck. About this poem, there are some abstract taken from the novel:

Wanted, wanted: Dolores Haze.

Hair: brown. Lips: scarlet.

Age: five thousand three hundred days.

Profession: none, or "starlet."

Where are you hiding, Dolores Haze?

Why are you hiding, darling?

(I talk in a daze, I walk in a maze,

I can't get out, said the starling)

My dolly, my folly! Her eyes were vair,

And never closed when I kissed her.

Know an old perfume called Soleil Vert?

Are you from Paris, mister?

Officer, officer, there they are-

Dolores Haze and her lover!

Whip out your gun and follow that car.

Now tumble out, and take cover. (291-292)

Humbert picks up Rita, a kind, slight divorcee near his age, at a bar one night, and soon becomes his constant companion as they drive around from 1950 to 1952, still searching for Lolita's kidnaper. An odd adventure brings no more happiness in his life. Humbert receives a letter from John Farlow, informing him that Jean Farlow has died, he is living in South America, and since he is in charge of the Haze estate, he has learned that Lolita is missing. He suggests Humbert to find Lolita. Unlike novel, characters like Rita, John Farlow, and Jean Farlow are excluded in to the film.

Similarly, Humbert's long journey with Rita and letter receiving from Mr. Farlow is deleted too. But, the letter from Lolita to Humbert is presented on both genera, with slight deviation from source novel. Lolita's letter to Humbert is in this way in the novel:

DEAR DAD

How's everything? I'm married. I'm going to have a baby. I guess he is going to be a big one. I guess he will come right for Christmas. This is a hard letter to write. I'm going nuts because we don't have enough to pay our debts and get out of here. Dick is promised a big job in Alaska in his very specialized corner of the mechanical field, that's all I know about it but it's really grand. Pardon me for withholding our home address but you may still be mad at me, and Dick must not know. This town is something. You can't see the morons for the smog. Please do send us a check, Dad. We could manage with three or four hundred or even less, anything is welcome, you might sell old things, because once we get there the dough will just start rolling in. write please. I have gone through much sadness and hardship.

Yours expecting,

DOLLY (MRS. RICHARD F. SCHILLER).....

(303-304)

Humbert plans to kill Lolita's husband Dick Schiller with his gun, because he suspects Dick was the kidnaper of Lolita. Humbert leaves Rita and drives to the small town, where Lolita lives in. when he reaches the small town and eventually finds their dilapidated home. He discovers that her kidnapper was actually Clare Quilty, whose nick name is "Cue". Her husband is naïve young man, who does not know about Lolita's early history. Then, Humbert meets the friendly Dick and does not harbor a grudge against him. After short conversation with Lolita, Humbert gives her an envelope with four hundred dollars in cash and a check for three thousand more. Unlike novel, Humbert hands four thousand dollars cash in film. The role of Rita is

not included, thus leaving Rita by Humbert is automatically cut off in the film. The friendly conversation between Humbert and Dick Schiller is absent in the film.



Figure 11: Lolita is being pregnant sitting inside her dilapidated home

Humbert still loves Lolita and asks her to leave with him. The momentous conversation between them touches anyone's heart; either it is an individual reader or mass viewers. This conversation brings many things into the surface. Such as Humbert's unconditional help to Lolita, and Lolita's loyalty upon her naïve husband. This very heart touching conversation is given equal space simultaneously in novel and film. This is in this way in novel:

“Lolita,” Humbert said, “this may be neither here nor there but I have to say it. Life is very short. From here to that old car you know so well there is a stretch of twenty, twenty-five paces. It is a very short walk. Make these twenty-five steps. Now. Right now. Come just as you are. And we shall live happily ever after”.

“you mean,” Lolita said opening her eyes and raising herself slightly, the snake that may strike, “you mean you will give us [us] that money only after if I go with you to a motel. Is that what you mean?”

“No,” Humbert said, you got it all wrong. I want you to leave your incidental Dick, and this awful hole, and come live with me, and die with me and everything with me. (Words to that effect).

“You’re crazy,” Lolita said, her features working. “Think it over, Lolita. There are no strings to attached. Except, perhaps-well, no matter.” (A reprieve, I wanted to say you but did not.) Anyway, if you refuse you will still get your.....trousseau.” (317-318)

Humbert comes at the Quilty’s manor on Grimm road to take revenge of kidnapping Lolita. He searches Quilty with no answer at the unlocked door, he inspects several rooms upstairs and take the keys from their locks. Quilty emerges from a bathroom from a purple bathrobe and walks past Humbert without seeming to notice him. Humbert readies his gun and confronts Quilty, who is in daze. Humbert tells him reason behind taking revenge. Humbert reminds Quilty about his kidnapping to Lolita. Quilty says that it was he who saved her from a beastly pervert. He did not force the little protégée to join him. It was she made him to remove her to a happier home. He further says he had no fun with dolly. He was practically impotent. Then, they confront, they fall to wrestling, they roll all over for the floor, in each other’s arm, like two helpless children. Quilty is naked and goatish under his robe, and Humberter feels suffocate as Quilty rolls over him. Humbert rolls over him. Eventually, Humbert gets pistol and crushes the trigger. The bullet enters the thick pink rug with a ridiculously feeble and juvenile sound. Pistol gets its target when Quilty sits down before the piano. His bullet caught him somewhere inside and he rose from his chair higher and higher. Humbert follows him through the hall, with a kind of double, triple kangaroo jump. He fires three or four times in quick succession, wounded him at every blaze. Quilty trudges from room to room and retired to the

master bedroom, where Humbert hits him at very close range through the blankets, then after Quilty dies. Like novel, its film adoption strings almost scene of its source novel. The climax scene of both genera, novel and film resemble with each other. Only the trifle change has been occurred in the film. After, death of Quilty, Humbert holds one of Quilty's shoes instead of the pistol-he was sitting on the pistol. Meanwhile, Humbert holds a slipper in the novel. The film gives an additional information duo Humbert and Lolita's death. According to the source available in the film, Humbert dies in prison of a coronary thrombosis on November 16, 1950 and Lolita dies in childbirth on Christmas Day, 1950.

When a text (of novel) transposes to the screenplay, the film attempts to maintain the fidelity with source novel. But, to make the film prototype of the novel is not possible, at least in Hollywood. Nabokov's first draft of screenplay was about four hundred pages long and would have taken seven hours to run. Lyne reduced the story, to a two hours and 17 minutes screen version. Thus, it can easily be speculate, how far the merciless censorship is working. Obviously, the film adaption of *Lolita* is heavily censored but shares the same theme, structure, setting and dialogue, which are similar to the source novel. Thus, the narrative sequence may have changed; the sub-structure of the work remains the same both in novel and film.

### **The Creativity in Film Adaption**

The film adaption is an art, it requires creativity to props the entire film. Generally, the director makes the film adaption with the purpose of commercially hit and all time box office-success. However, this succession of the film is not possible, if a part of creativity is being neglected in it. Lyne carefully articulates ample creativities in *Lolita*.

The novel is cyclic in structure: it begins “Lolita, light of my life...” (*Lolita* 7) and ends with “And this only immortality you and I may share, my Lolita” (352). Similarly, the film version ends as it began: with the killing of Quilty. Here, the sequence of events in the novel and film differ, but shares a common substructure. Just as Humbert drugs Lolita with sleeping pills, Nabokov drugs his reader with narcotic description of his nymphet’s brown skin and musky tomboy odor. Lyne drugs his viewer with a pretty, gauzy “Lolita” that replaces the book’s cruelty and comedy with manufactured lyricism and romanticism. The detective scene, phantasmal nature of Quilty and new variant in classic chase: Quilty as Humbert’s walking paranoia, the madness that chases Humbert and is chased by him. This creative scene, nature and action obviously enrich the film adaption. Similarly, the film’s additional scene; the national flag of United States are seen like mushroom on each houses of Ramsdale gives double meaning. First, it arouses nationalism among the American people. Second, it memorizes us the 1940s era of 2<sup>nd</sup> world war. This very scene sticks with motion picture suggests, how a profitable director inserts creativity into the film. Though, Humbert confesses that he has successfully avoided his husbandly night duty, but Lyne presents him as a dutiful husband at the day. He makes the big hedge to little and washes the dish on basin. The untimely death of Mrs. Haze, in a car accident unfolds Humbert’s illicit love affair with Lolita. The house number 342 of Ramsdale matches with room in The Enchanted Hunter Inn. This double number is related with a double bed too. Where double person (father and daughter) sleep together and develop incestuous relationship. Quilty’s manor on Grimm Road suggests an allusion to the Brother Grimm, the prolific authors of fairy tales. Nabokov adores fairy tales. Whereas, Lyne captures the old manor through his lens to visualize and create circumstances of fairy tales in the film.

At last, the climax of the film is not only visualized the wrestling between Humbert and Quilty, but also conveys an additional information duo Humbert and Lolita's death on same year 1950. As a whole, these entire creative additional scenes are supportive, which keeps the film in balance.

#### IV. Conclusion

This research paper studies the relationship between the novel and its film adaptation with special reference to Vladimir Nabokov's novel *Lolita* and its film adaptation directed by Adrian Lyne. The researcher comes up with the conclusion that it is rather difficult to comprehend a film completely without observing the novelistic elements embedded in it. Being the adaptation, the film violates many scenes and events of its original source but keeps its fidelity in its thematic aspects. Despite sharing a number of elements, the novel and film are two distinct and autonomous works of art, having their inherently unique properties.

The research paper makes it clear that the novelistic tradition of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century helped a lot to establish the film as an art form. Before the introduction of narrative in the film, it was only a sightseeing tour; it was not considered as work of art at all. It was D.W. Griffith who first borrowed the techniques of the novel and introduced them into films.

Thus, this research paper, on the one hand, exposes the close affinity that the film and the novel have. On the other hand, it succinctly observes those properties that make them unique artistic media. Both the art forms have in common a number of elements, such as story, characters, setting, plot, imaginative qualities and so on. But these elements are presented necessarily in a different mode. That is, novel emerged from the traditions of written language and essentially is a literary genre. But the film emerged from the tradition of visual arts such as painting and photography. A reader must imaginatively construct a fictional world out of the written words while reading novel. However, in a film the viewers only perceive the already created fictional world through the visual images and sound. Thus, the film and the novel are autonomous works of art though they share many things.

The main issue in adaptation is the issue of fidelity. There is not any clear cut rule on this issue but most of the critics agree in one point that the adaptation should keep its fidelity to the spirit or theme of the source. Film, being a separate medium with its own codes and conventions, the original work must be transformed into what is essentially a different and unique form. There is more economic consideration in the film than in novel.

This thesis comparatively studies Vladimir Nabokov's blockbuster novel *Lolita* and its film adaptation. It analyzes them thematically and finds the film version as not presenting Humbert a soulless monster or an evil predator, as most motion picture pedophiles are. Ironically, Lyne and his screen writer, Stephen Schiff, have made *Lolita*, in an odd but crucial way, feels right at home in this climate. For all of their vaunted (and, it turns out false) fidelity to Nabokov, Lyne and Schiff have made a pretty, gauzy and comedy with manufactured lyricism and romanticism. But the other themes are presented as rigorously as in novel. So, the researcher finds that the film *Lolita* follows the theme or spirit of the novel but violates many scenes and events simultaneously.

Similarly, this research paper observes the elements that are transferred to the film as they are in novel and those that are adapted so as to make them fit to the film medium. It finds that in the adaptation of the novel *Lolita* all the characters, themes, plot, narrative technique and setting are transferred as they are in the novel. But, since the novel and the film are inherently different works of art, they are transformed from the linguistic mode of novel to the visual mode of film.

As the film is more dramatic work of art it avoids the descriptive passage of the novel. It presents rather than describes. With the help of visual image it can tell us much more than the novel can. That is how it becomes possible to transform the 346

pages novel *Lolita* into only two hours and 17 minutes long film. Since the visual images and the actions instead of description and narration are dominant in the film, the narrative unfolds through images and actions. While in the novel the story is told from a particular points of view and it is consistent all over the novel, a film contains various points of view within a single film or even in a single scene. Cinematic points of view are quite different from novelistic point of view in that the cinematic viewpoints are imposed on the images themselves with the help of camera lenses. The research paper also includes some figures from the film *Lolita* so as to support the basic argument.

Thus, this research paper, observes the distinctive artistic features of novel and film, and the same time it examines the common features they share with reference to the novel *Lolita* and its film adaptation bearing the same name. The researcher comes up with the conclusion that the film adaptation of the novel *Lolita* is truly faithful to the novel in respect to themes, plot, narrative style, setting, characters and even to dialogue. But it is inherently different work of art, having dramatic, visual and aural qualities that the novel lacks.

## Works Cited

- Andrew, Dudley. "Adaptation." Mast, 420-28.
- Bakhtin, Mikhael M. "Epic and Novel: Toward A Methodology for the Study of the Novel." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992. 839-55.
- Berardinelli, James. "Lolita (1997): A Film Review." *Colossus.net/movies*, 1998. 4 Sep. 2009 <[www.movie-review.colossus.net/movies/lolita.html](http://www.movie-review.colossus.net/movies/lolita.html) >.
- Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.
- Boggs, Joseph M., and Dennis W. Petrie. *The Art of Watching Films*. California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 2000.
- Caryn, James. "Television Review: Revisiting a Dangerous Obsession." *New York Times*  
31 July, 1999. <[www.wikipedia.org/wiki/lolita/](http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/lolita/)>
- Chatman, Seymour. "What Novels Can Do That Film Can't (And Vice Versa)." Mast, 403-19.
- Cook, David A. *A History of Narrative Film*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1990.
- Dick, Bernard F. *Anatomy of Film*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Bedford /St. Martins, 2005.
- Eisenstein, Sergei. "The Film Today." Mast, 395-402.
- Hitchens, Christophers. "Hurricane Lolita." *Atlantic Monthly* 296.5 (Dec 2005): 131-35.  
*Literary Reference Center*. EBSCO. 4 Sep. 2009.  
<<http://search.ebscohost.com/>>.

- Knight, Arthur. *The Liveliest Art*. New York: The Macmillan, 1957.
- Kracauer, Siegfried. "Basic Concepts." *Mast*, 9-20.
- . "The Establishment of Physical Existence." *Mast*, 249-59.
- Lindon, George W. *Reflection on The Screen*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1970.
- Mast, Gerald et al. eds. *Film Theory and Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Metz, Christian. "Some Points in the Semiotic of the Cinema." *Mast*, 168-78.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lolita*. Victoria: Penguin Books, 2008.
- Orr, Christopher. "The Discourse on Adaptation." *Wide Angle* 6.2 (1984): 72.
- Taylor, Charles. "Recent Movies: Home Movies." *Salon* 29 May, 1998.
- < <http://www.salon.com/ent/movies/reviews/1998>>.