

**UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

**ADAPTING PROSE NARRATIVE INTO FILM NARRATIVE: THE
CASE OF *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY***

MA thesis

LILIAN JÕESAAR

Supervisor:

Lect. Ene-Reet Soovik

TARTU 2007

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a comparative analysis of the contemporary Japanese-British writer Kazuo Ishiguro's novel *The Remains of the Day*, first published in 1989, and the film adaptation of the same title from 1993 directed by James Ivory and Ismail Merchant on the basis of the screenplay by Ruth Praver Jhabvala. The film was nominated for several Academy Awards in 1994. The novel *The Remains of the Day* that won the Booker Prize is considered by many critics to be Ishiguro's highest artistic achievement. The book and the film depict life in Britain between the two World Wars of the 20th century and explore primarily life of an English butler, presenting also the historical, social and political conditions of the era.

The thesis consists of an Introduction, two chapters and a Conclusion. The Introduction gives an overview of narrative theory in prose fiction and visual media, and presents their main differences and similarities. It also introduces the basic literary and cinematic terminology concerning narrative and composition.

The body of the thesis contains two chapters. The first chapter introduces the novel *The Remains of the Day*. The chapter starts by viewing the work in the context of Kazuo Ishiguro's work in general. The chapter presents an analysis of the concept of the narrator-narratee and story-discourse in *The Remains of the Day*. It proceeds with discussing the language usage of the main character and the historical perspective of the novel. The narratological analysis of the novel is based on the work of several literary theorists, such as Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, Robert Stam.

The second chapter presents an analysis of the film version of *The Remains of the Day* exploring similar aspects as viewed in connection with the novel. The thesis observes which aspects pass on the narration in the film as compared to the novel, which elements of the novel's story occur in the film and what are the peculiarities of the film's discourse in

comparison with that of the novel. Also, the question what has been added to the film and the possible effects of and reasons for the additions are discussed. The narratological analysis of the film draws on film theorists such as Brian McFarlane, Dudley Andrew, Andre Bazin, Seymour Chatman, James Naremore, Peeter Torop and others.

The Conclusion gives a summary of the main points of the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER 1. Narrative aspects of the novel	22
1.1 Narrator and narratee in the novel	24
1.2 Analysis of the narrator and narratee in <i>The Remains of the Day</i>	28
1.3 Story and discourse in the novel	32
1.4 Analysis of the story and discourse in <i>The Remains of the Day</i>	33
1.5 Narrator-specific language usage and the historical perspective in <i>The Remains of the Day</i>	37
CHAPTER 2. Film adaptation of <i>The Remians of the Day</i>	43
2.1 Narrator and narratee in film	44
2.2 Analysis of the narrator and narratee in <i>The Remains of the Day</i>	50
2.3 Story and discourse in film	54
2.4 Analysis of the story and discourse in <i>The Remains of the Day</i>	57
2.5 Character functions in <i>The Remains of the Day</i>	65
2.6 Narrative codes in <i>The Remains of the Day</i>	71
CONCLUSION	80
REFERENCES	83
RESÜMEE	89

INTRODUCTION

The film critic David Bordwell (1986: 82) suggests that we make sense of the world through narratives. He states that films, in general, tell us stories and these stories are made up of narratives. So is the case with novels, which also tell us stories via narratives. But these two genres are different in their techniques, methods and presentation of narrative. If a novel is to be adapted into a film, there are aspects and properties the two genres can share and there are those that cannot be treated and presented. A major difference between the novel and the film is that the narrative in one media is presented in words and in the other one in frames. In the thesis we shall look upon the aspects of novel and film taking this difference as a point of departure.

James Monaco (2000: 44), a film theorist and critic, finds that the film and novel stand close in that they share the same narrative capacities and tell stories from narrator's perspective. Peeter Torop, an Estonian scholar, also states that film and prose fiction are close in their narrative mode and therefore comparable. He finds that a literary text in writing is easier to analyse than a cinematographic text, which is presented in a moving series of frames accompanied by sound. Torop points out that to analyse prose fiction and film we should compare the general structural properties that prose and film share (e.g. beginning and ending, narrator, story and discourse) (Torop 1999: 129-132). It is also crucial to compare the differences of novel and film to reach the depths of understanding the aspects of these media.

As one of the essential differences between the novel and film Monaco (2000: 45) proposes that in the novel we can read only what the author wants us to read, but in film we see inevitably also those things that the author/director has maybe not planned to show. If a novelist has to describe things and aspects through his(her) own perspective, then in film we can look and see details ourselves; thus there is a difference in the objectivity of

the presentation. Monaco (2000: 46) finds that watching a film can be a richer experience than reading a novel in the sense that the spectator can himself(herself) be more active in encountering the events on the screen constantly redirecting attention as (s)he follows the images.

On the other hand, Monaco (2000: 46) reveals that film can also be a poorer experience compared to that of the novel, for in film “the persona of the narrator is so much weaker”. He points out one film that has tried to retain the original first-person narrator of the novel: Robert Montgomery’s *Lady in the Lake*, but observes that “the result was a cramped, claustrophobic experience” (Monaco 2000: 46), where the spectator saw only what the narrator saw. The issues of narrator are dealt with in greater details.

Monaco (2000: 158) also asserts that the novel leaves much room for imagination, but the film does not, e.g., the novel’s word “rose” can bring to mind different kinds of roses to different readers, but in a film spectators all see one specific rose from a specific angle. With this example he reaches his next point that “film does not suggest, in this context: it states” (2000: 159). The reader of a novel has to imagine, the spectator of the film has to read the signs and thus both have to undergo the process of interpretation of signs (Monaco 2000: 159).

The film medium makes use of visual images, as compared to the novel which has a vast vocabulary in its disposal. If in a novel the writer has described, for instance, a certain kind of an armchair, then in a film the spectator sees an armchair and for some spectator it can be just an armchair, but for others it could be a unique piece of antique furniture, or as Monaco (2000: 155-159) describes it – different people perceive visual images with different level of sophistication. In such a way spectators can read more into film that actually depicted and readers of a novel have usually the limited information

provided by the author. Thus both media can be equally demanding for the readers and spectators.

Monaco also notes that film is more restricted, because it happens in real time and therefore we usually have only the average of two hours screen time. And in case of such limited narration it is clear that some details of incident are omitted, but as an advantage of the film Monaco (2000: 45) marks pictorial presentation that also allows aspects that cannot be transferred directly “translated into image.”

Another distinction between the novel and the film is the tense form in which the story is told. It is usually held that the novel’s story is told in the past and the film’s story in the present. This fact makes the film more immediate than the novel, as it represents the action *physically*, its spatiality is dominating over linearity. George W. Linden (1977: 157) states that “the essence of film is its immediacy, and this immediacy is grounded in its tenslessness,” and goes on to present Bèla Balàzs’ statement, “They show only the present – they cannot express either a past or a future tense. In a picture itself there is nothing that would compellingly and precisely indicate the reasons for the picture being what it is. In a film scene we see only what is happening before our eyes.”

Linden (1977: 157) points out the fact that in the cinema the “pictures are moving,” which supports the film’s present tense, saying that “through motion there is a kind of spatializing of time and it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to say ‘then’ on film.” Thus, according to Linden the film and novel differ in their orientation – in the novel we see that the basic course of events describes what has already happened in the past, whereas the film exhibits what is happening at the moment of watching. Linden also quotes Ralph Stephenson and Jean R. Debrix who eliminate the tense in film altogether and state that film is “something that is happening – now...” (Linden 1977: 158).

However, there are also scholars who claim that different tenses can be detected in

films. Thus, Joan Dagle argues that literary and film narrative both distinguish between tenses:

In written narrative, the past tense (or future tense) is indicated by a switch in verb form, by a change in a linguistic signifier that readers understand and accept as indicating a shift in tense. In a film narrative, the past tense (or future tense) is indicated by a similar process; a signifier is present in the image which the viewer understands and accepts as indicating a shift in tense. (Dagle 1980: 49)

It cannot be asserted that only written narrative distinguishes between tenses as in the film in flashbacks and flashforwards certain images denote the shift in time. When literary narrative has tense signifiers in linguistic structures then in the film the signifiers are in the image structures. Another indication, in Dagle's view, of film image that challenges the present tense in the film narrative is showing a written letter on the screen. Dagle argues that "the image of the letter is the image of what has been written," (1980: 50) and thus the film depicts an action in the past. Therefore, the novel and the film, at that time when they are presented to readers/spectators, are always happenings in the past (the film is screened before we see it, except the direct broadcasts) and in this sense they both represent stories in the past as these events are actually *re*-produced images, *re*-production of physical reality which we tend to take in a present-tense mode (Dagle 1980: 54). If we argued above whether film narrative can be a past-tense act like the literary narrative can be, then considering the act of reading the literary narrative to be a present-tense act like the presentation of images in the film we can conclude that both narratives include different tense forms (Dagle 1980: 55). Without the past-tense in the film there would be no proper narrative, only a disturbed and ambiguous 'timeless present' as Dagle goes on illustrating her argument. So it might be said that literary narrative does not differ from film narrative in sense of tense forms as they both use present and past tense, but there is a difference in several other aspects.

Rendering the mental states, thoughts and feelings in literary narrative is done via

verbal codes, i.e. words that are already chosen for us, whereas in the film we can only see that characters are thinking, but cannot hear their thoughts, except when voice-over is used or when thoughts are transferred into the dialogue. The mimics of actors' faces reveal certain feelings, but spectators can interpret them differently. Unlike in film, in a novel one always has written words describing the feelings of pain or happiness, but in a film much is left to the spectator's imagination, as suggested also by Monaco (see p. 6 above). In a novel it depends on the writer how well (s)he has managed to describe a certain feeling or a thought, but it is not "a direct presentation of feeling or thought" (Dagle 1980: 55). A film can show these visually as gestures, but as Dagle (1980: 55) argues, these gestures are merely *signs* of feelings and thoughts. Thus we can see a similarity in both the film's and the novel's presentation of the narrative, i.e., a novel passes on a feeling via written words and a film via shown gestures.

Another feature under the discussion of the film's realistic *visual* representation is the aspect of metaphor. Bluestone (2003: 19-20), discussing film metaphor, quotes Rodolph Arnheim who says that abstract things that belong together cannot be shown together on screen and that "the connection between two objects shown on a film simultaneously never seems metaphorical but always at once real." Thus Arnheim claims that in film metaphor is eliminated due to film's realistic representation. Bluestone (2003: 24) himself discussing cinematic trope finds that "if the film is thus severely restricted in rendering linguistic tropes /.../, it has, through the process of editing, discovered a metaphoric quality all its own." Stam (2005: 13), also supports the idea of certain equivalent to literary metaphor in film stating that "from Munsterberg to Metz, film theorists have noted not only the capacity of film represent dreams, but also its analogies with dream in terms of its operating procedures, its metonymic and metaphoric fusions and displacements", which is made possible thanks to the cinema's technology of

representation and montage. So metaphor and metonymy may have lost their literary meaning in the film medium, but these concepts if seen as structures that are combined of certain elements still exist and are realisable in cinematographic narration as well.

The cinematographer and scholar Sol Worth is also among the authors agreeing with the possibility of metaphor in modes other than linguistic, supporting thus Bluestone and Stam. He casts a light on the film metaphor agreeing with and passing on the ideas of Sergei Eisenstein on how film metaphor works,

Film meaning, Eisenstein suggested in 1925, occurs by a collision of filmic ideas. This collision occurs in the form of "shots" (which are, he suggested, the basic units or elements of film form) in opposition. Each shot must correspond to a concept or feeling, so pictured as to present to the audience an idea. The following shot in the sequence presents to the audience another idea, but one in opposition, one designed expressly to create a conflict or collision of ideas. From this collision of ideas comes a synthesis—a new idea, depending upon the previous shots, but not being merely additive. (Worth 1981: 159,160)

Furthermore, Worth (1981: 153) suggests that understanding a visual metaphor depends on montage in case of cinema and thus is the matter of composing,

That is, we would have to arrange the shots in such a way as to make it clear that we weren't meaning (because one shot of a lion followed a shot of a hunter) that "the lion is hunting the hunter," or in a reverse arrangement that "the hunter is hunting the lion." Rather we would have to structure our film so that it was clear that we meant the metaphoric structure, "the hunter is a lion." In further sequences, we could clarify whether we are invoking concepts of nobility, ferocity, and so on.

In those further sequences Worth (1981: 157) refers to it must be made clear that film metaphor is to be interpreted as "the man is to nobility, grace and hunting ability as the lion is to those very qualities" and only in such case is the metaphor understood and qualifies under the phenomenon of 'metaphor'. Thus in a film there is a filmic equivalent to the literary metaphor, but it is not the metaphor of the literary text.

Linearity and spatiality is another major difference between the novel and film, as the novel is linear (read word by word) and film is both linear and spatial (viewed). McFarlane states, "frame-following-frame is not analogous to the word-following-word experience of the novel," (1996: 27) and draws attention to the fact that the frame, unlike

the word, has a spatial impact and thus the information we perceive is visually complex. As the word is a discrete entity we read the novel word by word and the information is perceived differently than “in the form which stresses spatiality [a film] rather than linearity, the eye may not always choose to see next what, in any particular frame, the film-maker wants it to fasten on” (McFarlane 1996: 28).

Another difference between the written form of narrative and the film is the sound effects that play an important role in creating the atmosphere in the film. The sound code is clearly an advantage of the film-maker, as in the novel the author is able only to describe the sounds in words. On the other hand, it is much easier for the writer to set the scene writing that the events take place at a certain time or place, but much of a challenge to a film maker to depict and show a certain era on the screen, where the costumes, the way people look and act has to be taken into account. In the novel the reader has to exploit his or her own imagination to visualise a certain era, but the *cultural* codes in the film have to be understood and employed by a film-maker exactly to show the culture in question to the spectator.

In depicting characters the actors themselves can do much to help the film-maker. As Anthony Hopkins has said quoting James Ivory “actors are supposed to bring on the depth, the essence of their personalities, and directors have to see in width, the whole scene” (Staahl 2001b). Thus the film’s success largely depends on the teamwork compared to the writer’s solitary process of writing a novel.

In the process of development both media have properties borrowed from each other. Monaco (2000: 47) notes that the film has over the decades influenced the novel in the respect that if the novel used to portray people and places then now the “scenic and descriptive character of the novel” has diminished. He adds that novelists now tell their stories “in the smaller units common to film” (Monaco 2000: 47-48).

Theorists have different opinions on whether we should look at a film based on a novel as a new and individual work or as an adaptation of a particular source text. Indeed, cinematographic means are different from the novel's techniques and therefore one might regard the film as an entirely different artefact having a nature different from that of the literary medium. There are also adaptations that have altered the novels' major cardinal functions and some films "stand closer" to the novels than others. Torop (1999: 134) states that direct transfer from prose to film is impossible for the use of camera in the case of film. The camera makes the picture so concrete that it diminishes the number of possible interpretations. He (1999: 129) has brought out the viewpoint of the famous film-maker Federico Fellini who claims that the process of adaptation does not retain much of the original literary text except facts and associations, the reason being that the screen opens up its own new world of imagination. He also presents Thomas Mann's viewpoint who is of the opinion that adaptation does not necessarily destruct the novel, because cinematography uses also a narrative, a visual form of narrative. Torop (1999: 156) finds that reading a novel should really be a reading of an author and watching a film watching a film-maker.

Seymour Chatman observes, "obviously, film cannot reproduce many of the pleasures of reading novels, but it can produce other experiences of parallel value" (1990: 163). He goes on stating, "more sophisticated critics treat novel and film as separate, if analogous, narrative experiences." But there is also the shared story in both media that can complicate taking adaptation as entirely different from the source novel. In this paper adaptation and its source novel are taken to be related, while differences between the novel and the film are not viewed as shortcomings.

Despite the differences the two media share film-makers take continuously the challenge of making films based on novels. As there is still little work done in the field of

novel-to-film adaptation and on the issue of “transposition of novel’s narrational mode to film” (McFarlane 1996: 199), there is no simple way of approaching the matter of adaptation. In order to evaluate how and to which extent the film-maker has preserved in the film the novel’s narrative elements such as “the sequence of events, the functions performed by characters, the overall structural motifs, the relationship of events and episodes to that comprehensive structure, and the psychological and/or mythic patterns which underlie them” (McFarlane 1996: 199), it is necessary to compare the novel’s narrative and literary techniques with the film-maker’s decision to display these narrative elements considering the capacities and possible techniques of the screen work (McFarlane 1996: 199) and take a closer look at the essence and aspects of adaptation.

Not long after the first films appeared on screen it became popular to make movies based on bestsellers or classical masterpieces of literature. James Naremore (2000) gives an overview of the first adaptations in the 20th century and brings out several examples of adaptation throughout history. According to Naremore (2000: 4) the reason for making adaptations can, for example, be better selling numbers of the film through the appeal to middle class audiences who are the main movie-goers and are likely to be familiar with the precursory novel. But the story has two sides, for it is risky to adapt a famous book that in the end may not meet the spectators’ expectations – all the money could go wasted and the novel’s reputation may suffer (Reynolds 1993: 9). There is also the threat that directors of adapted movies could stay in the shadow of the success of the original work and their own talent would remain unnoticed. However, about one third of the produced films that are awarded various prizes are adaptations of well-known books: as Deborah Cartmell (2002: 24) observes “Academy Awards has historically privileged adaptations of texts to screen” adding that adaptations have reaped three-quarters of Best Picture awards. Dudley Andrew supports the statement, “well over half of all commercial films have come from literary

originals...” (2000: 10). The film that won the greatest number (11 awards) of Academy Awards in 2004, *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King* (2003) is one recent example of the case (Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences 2007).

Adaptation is often easily criticised, but it is not often that the complex nature of the relationships between the literary and the cinematographic texts is explored in more detail. In 1975 Louis D. Giannetti (quoted in Ray 2000: 38) stated, “the overwhelming bulk of what’s been written about the relationship of the film and literature is open to serious question” and it still holds true, as Robert B. Ray (2000: 38) insists, “twenty-five years later /.../ even that judgement seems generous.” However, we do have some insightful theoretical works by such authors as James Naremore, Brian McFarlane, André Bazin, Dudley Andrew, Seymour Chatman, James Monaco, Peeter Torop and others whose ideas have been taken into consideration in this thesis.

One of such scholars, Imelda Whelehan (2002: 18) has put forward in her discussion of adaptation:

*/.../*cultural assumptions about the relative worth of the literary versus the film medium are still deeply entrenched enough to be likely to influence our approach to adaptation...Perhaps encouraging more flexibility in analyses of literary texts through the study of adaptation will enable the audience to be more self-conscious about their role as critics and about the activities of reading/viewing that they bring to bear in an academic environment.

Therefore it is essential that we reflect on the theoretical aspects of adaptation in order to criticise any form of literary adaptation into film.

Torop (1999:135) draws parallels between translation and adaptation processes in which one has to retain certain parts and aspects of the original, to change or invent others and finds it compelling to look into the literature to film process through the principles of translation studies, getting thus a new approach that allows taking literary and filmic texts as equals. Torop treats literary text and film as original and translation accordingly (Torop 1999: 142).

Torop (1999: 150-156) has based his typology of adaptation on his typology of translation and classifies adaptation into eight categories. Firstly, there is formal adaptation, that is text-centred and includes most classical adaptations, where main elements of narrative (framework, characters, events, etc.) have been retained; e.g. Julian Amyes' *Jane Eyre*. Secondly, adaptation proper, that is content-centred; these adaptations offer as much information from the original as possible, using prologues, titles, voice-over narrator; e.g. Waris Hussein's *Arch of Triumph*. Thirdly, linguistic adaptation, that is character-centred. The focus here is on the psychological aspects of one character and therefore the role of literary text as a whole is diminished; e.g. Ivan Pyryev's *Idiot*. Fourthly, he mentions an adaptation that is motif-centred. Here the link between the film and the original is weaker or several works by the same author have been intertwined; e.g. Akira Kurosawa's *Ran*. The fifth type is thematic adaptation which is theme-centred. Here characters and space-time are presented through and around a theme. The space-time of the narrative can be modernised or set back in time; e.g. Robert Bresson's *Money (L'Argent)*. Descriptive adaptation is conflict-centred; describing the conflict it becomes overstated and generalised; e.g. Larisa Shepitko-Elem Klimov's *Farewell*. The seventh type is genre-centred expressive adaptation – the text of the original is altered to a certain extent, depending on the genre; e.g. the Russian version of *The Three Musketeers* is presented as a musical movie. Eighthly, free adaptation that is interpretation-centred. It presents a certain individual version of the original text and an interpretation based on the film-maker's reading; e.g. Kurosawa's *Idiot*.

Geoffrey Wagner (in Whelehan 2002: 8) presents a more general typology and distinguishes three types of adaptation: *transposition*, *commentary* and *analogy*. Transposition is “a novel directly given on screen” where the literary text is presented on screen as accurately as possible to the original and such adaptations are usually classics

that are “condensed to a love story,” e.g. William Wyler’s *Wuthering Heights*. Commentaries are films that are categorised by Wagner as cases “where an original is taken and either purposely or inadvertently altered in some respect” (in Whelehan 2002: 8), which means that the original is changed to a certain extent. In case of analogy only “a little of the original is identifiable” or as Deborah Cartmell has aptly remarked commenting on Wagner’s categories, “the original is used as a point of departure” (2002: 24).

Dudley Andrew has presented similar points with Wagner, developing a comparable typology of adaptation that includes *borrowing*, *intersection* and *fidelity of transformation* (Andrew 2000: 29). The mode of borrowing corresponds to Wagner’s transposition. Intersection, to use Andre Bazin’s words echoed by Andrew, is “the refraction of the original” or “the novel as seen by cinema” (Andrew 2000: 31). This means that certain fragments of the original are depicted in the film and are presented from a specifically cinematic angle. Intersection corresponds to Wagner’s commentary. The third mode of transforming concerns fidelity, which seems to be the most contradictory and most discussed property of adaptation. It corresponds to Wagner’s analogy in capturing the spirit of the original. Speaking of typologies, in her commentaries about Wagner’s and Andrew’s classification Cartmell finds this is only a basic categorisation and “there are adaptations which cannot be categorised in the ways that Wagner and Andrew suggest” and she remarks that, in fact, categories of adaptation are limitless (Cartmell 2002: 24). Some literary works might demand a wider set of modes and classification of their adaptation, for their complex nature (e.g. *Schindler’s List* from 1993 by Steven Spielberg that is an adaptation of Thomas Keneally’s *Schindler’s Ark* from 1982, with its sense of history).

McFarlane (1996: 13) has also examined Roland Barthes' narrative functions that are divided into two broad categories: *distributional* and *integrational*. Distributional functions, according to Barthes, are concerned with the functionality of doing (*functions proper*) and integrational functions with being (*indices*). Functions proper are subdivided into *cardinal functions* (crucial points in narrative that influence the outcome) and *catalysers* (denote small actions that complement cardinal functions – e.g. laying the table). Integrational functions are divided into *indices proper* (related to a character and atmosphere) and *informants* (pure data – names, ages, etc.).

From the technical point of view of adaptation, McFarlane distinguishes between transferring and adaptation proper. According to McFarlane, distributional functions are transferable and integrational functions require adaptation proper. What is transferable is usually the story of the novel, for “novel and film can share the same story, the same ‘raw materials’” (McFarlane 1996: 23). However, there can be a story and plot distinction between novel and film, because these media use “different plot strategies”, which include, for instance, differences in the sequence of the events or highlighting different emphases, transferring certain elements of the novel, but combining them in a different way. Transferable are these functions of the novel that are crucial to the outcome of the story, also the character functions and mythical or psychological patterns (McFarlane 1996: 23-25).

Adaptation proper is necessary in those cases in which transfer from one medium to another is not possible, these include the prose narrative's *indices* and *enunciation* (writing). The use of adaptation proper is due to the different *signifying systems* of the novel and the film, e.g. visual representations of the places and persons (McFarlane 1996: 26). When the book consists of verbal signs i.e. is passed on conceptually, then cinematic sign that is visual, aural and verbal is passed on perceptually. So it is up to the film-maker

which signs to use when adapting a literary text into a cinematic one representing most important *verbal* signs into *visual* ones. Another reason for adaptation proper is the novel's linearity and film's spatiality; words in the novel are presented linearly whereas frames in the film have spatial impact (McFarlane 1996: 26-27).

McFarlane (1996: 28) further states that the film lacks vocabulary and structuring syntax, alternatively, it makes use of cinematic codes that have meaning attached to them (cuts, fade in/out). He has also paid special attention to 'extra-cinematic' codes (1996: 28-29) without which criticism of a film adaptation remains inadequate. These include *language, visual, non-linguistic sound* and *cultural* codes. Language codes are those "involving response to particular accents or tones of voice." Visual codes mean interpretational aspects of mostly the film-maker's view of verbal codes. Non-linguistic sounds include musical and other aural codes and cultural codes include, for instance, the way people eat, dress and live at certain time period.

Similarly to McFarlane, according to Monaco (2000: 175) "the structure of the cinema is defined by codes". Through these codes the film expresses meaning. Monaco (2000: 175-179) divides codes into *culturally derived codes*, which are outside the film (McFarlane's *cultural codes*). Secondly, codes that are shared with other media, i.e. *shared artistic codes*, e.g. a gesture; and thirdly, *unique cinematic codes*, e.g. montage (although Monaco admits that montage could be used to some extent in novels as well). Monaco also points out in greater details the framing codes (includes lighting, colour, etc.), the codes of shot (distance, focus, angle, point of view, etc.), also sound codes (soundtrack, sound effects, etc.) (Monaco 2000: 179-214). Under the syntax of the film (the codes) Monaco (2000: 172) has also discussed and defined *misé-en-scène* (French for "putting in the scene") and *montage* (from French for "putting together), the former meaning modification of space and the latter modification of time.

Adaptation can be looked upon and treated from the point of fidelity. Andrew (2000: 28) makes a distinction between the modes of adaptation according to their relation to fidelity, “adaptations claiming fidelity bear the original as a *signified*, whereas those inspired by or derived from an earlier text stand in a relation of *referring* to the original”. In both cases Andrew finds that “the film owes something to the tale that was its inspiration” (Andrew 2000: 28). McFarlane (1996) also discusses fidelity of adaptation and presents three categories: *the issue of fidelity*, *the reliance on individual comparison* and the fact that one should look at the *film as an individual piece of work* and not as an adaptation. According to McFarlane, it is arguable to what extent a film-writer should retain the novel’s fundamentals and how to make changes to the original discourse. Whelehan (2002: 9) supports McFarlane’s approach asserting that it is up to the adaptor to skilfully transfer the main parts of narrative into the film. As some literary texts are difficult to adapt, certain alterations must be made to pass on the novel’s story and still maintain the contents and emphases. Some film-makers succeed in this better than others, some have their intentions in showing the original text from a new angle or introduce their own point of view. Since the reading of a novel itself is a subjective process, then it is difficult to define objective points in adaptation and transferring a text from one medium into another. The question of fidelity, therefore, seems to have no definite answer, “since any given film version is able only to aim at reproducing the film-maker’s reading of the original” (McFarlane 1996: 9). Bazin (2000: 20) takes this complex debate further making the concrete statement, “faithfulness to a form /.../ is illusory: what matters is the *equivalence in meaning of the forms*,” as form is a sign of style “which is absolutely inseparable from the narrative content.” Therefore, for Bazin it is the equivalence of the *style* of the work, literary or cinematic form, that determines the issue of fidelity and in this sense it is possible to make a film that is *equal* to the book and not faithful (Bazin 2000:

26).

Stam, however, finds the term 'fidelity' a highly problematic one. He questions the very possibility of strict fidelity, for the reason of different media. He suggests that a literary text is open to different possibilities of reading and thus it raises another question: fidelity to what? If a filmmaker tries to be faithful to every detail of the narrative and its discourse we might get a thirty-hour version of source literary text. So the film-maker, having the average two hour screen time, has to choose in what matters (s)he remains faithful to the original, whether (s)he should be faithful to the author, to the narrator or to the style of the original (Stam 2000: 54-58). Stam (2000: 58) finally points out that "a variation on the theme of fidelity suggests that an adaptation should be faithful not so much to the source text, but rather to the essence of the medium of expression."

George Bluestone (2003: 114) sees the issue from another angle, "The film-makers still talk about 'faithful' and 'unfaithful' adaptations without ever realizing that they are really talking about successful and unsuccessful films" and adds that if a film is successful the issue of fidelity becomes unimportant. In Whelehan's view the success of a film depends on "certain features of novelistic expressions that must be retained"(2002: 7). Those features are mainly the ones that "are deemed essential to a reproduction of its [novel's] core meaning" (Whelehan 2002: 7). In this thesis, however, the adaptation is also viewed from the aspect of fidelity.

Andrew (2000: 31-32) has listed some key elements of adaptation concerning the fidelity to the letter, and those are "the characters and their interrelation, the geographical and sociological and cultural information providing the fiction's context and the basic narrational aspects that determine the point of view of the narrator." Another issue is the fidelity to the original's tone, values, imagery and rhythm. Here the film-makers have a say in their own interpretation – their task is to represent those aspects and the spirit of the

original in general; as Andrew (2000: 32) has stated “the cinéaste presumably must intuit and reproduce the feeling of the original.” If one would write a text based on paintings one would not capture exactly the same feeling, atmosphere and tone as manifested in the original. The same would apply to the novel and film.

However, Andrew (2000: 32) has stated that some scenes and narratives are still commensurable despite the difference in the materials of literature (words and sentences) and film (light, sound, forms). According to Keith Cohen verbal and cinematic signs are alike in that they both are open to connotation (in Andrew 2000: 14). Thus, these signs function on the level of connotation and are therefore comparable.

The characteristic features of adaptation from novel to film enumerated above do not cover all the aspects of adaptation, but these are the central ones brought out by scholars who have studied the field of adaptation and used in this thesis.

Both prose fiction and film share aspects of difference and similarity. They both are narratives, but different narratives with different code systems. Adaptation process takes the elements of literary text and with its special techniques uses these elements to get a different work of art. Despite the various typologies, adaptation seems to be an art form that leaves the film-makers with inexhaustible possibilities of creation and interpretation, and critics with endless dispute over the ways and methods of adaptation.

From here we can proceed with a case study of the novel and film as narratives applying these theories to Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Remains of the Day* and adaptation based on the novel.

CHAPTER 1. NARRATIVE ASPECTS OF KAZUO ISHIGURO'S NOVEL

Kazuo Ishiguro and his novel *The Remains of the Day* serves as a representative of contemporary British writing that is characterised by international roots. Ishiguro stands side by side with such well-known international authors as Salman Rushdie, Timothy Mo, Ben Okri (Bradbury 1994). Ishiguro has won many literary awards, among others the Booker Prize for *The Remains of the Day* (Wong 2000: 3).

Ishiguro is not a native-born Briton and spent his first five years in Japan. In 1960 his family immigrated to Great Britain. Ishiguro's background reveals that he lived with an uncertain future for many years, not knowing whether he and his family would stay in Britain or return to Japan (Wong 2000: 1). This aspect – loss of the past and uncertainty of the future, as well as the feeling of homelessness – are characteristic of Ishiguro's protagonists throughout his novels. His characters have all suffered a loss in their lives and seek consolation.

If Ishiguro's earlier novels *A Pale View of Hills* (1982) and *An Artist of the Floating World* (1986) were concerned with Japan and its people, *The Remains of the Day* (1989) concerns Europe, more specifically England, and that is what makes the novel exceptional in comparison with his previous ones. It is not set at a distance as 'somewhere in Japan' – at least for European readers the action takes place nearby. Lawrence Graver has said in his review for *The New York Times* that "Kazuo Ishiguro's third novel, *The Remains of the Day*, is a dream of a book: a beguiling comedy of manners that evolves almost magically into a profound and heart-rending study of personality, class and culture" (Graver 1989 para 1). Barry Lewis (2000: 74) finds that "the novel *The Remains of the Day* is far more subversive than the film [Ivory 1993], and also indicates the change in the national mood." Moreover, he asserts that the book questions the very concept of

Englishness and its values. Nina King (1989 para 10) has said “though there are political and religious resonances throughout, it is as a human story that *The Remains of the Day* triumphs.” Richard Grenier (1994, para 32) is of the opinion that “*The Remains of the Day*, in both its literary and movie form, tells a highly didactic story. With all the respect due service and loyalty, it is about the humiliation of servitude.” Charles Trueheart (1989 para 7) quotes the judges of the Booker Prize award in 1989 “cunningly structured and beautifully paced performance” that “renders with humour and pathos a memorable character and explores the large, vexed themes of class, tradition and duty.”

The story is told by an English butler Stevens who for the last thirty years has been in service in the great estate of Darlington Hall. He is a son of a butler; from his father he has learned to serve his master with utmost precision, loyalty, self-sacrifice and respect. He refuses to lead a life other than that of a professional butler, he is totally deprived of a personal life. Now that he is aging he starts looking back at his life and the sacrifices he has made, gradually becoming aware and repentant of his self-deception and the mistakes he has made. Stevens’s remembrances take the reader through the era from about a decade before WW II up to some 15 years later. The book gives retrospective insights into the political issues of the time and unveils a hidden romance between Stevens and another member of staff of Darlington Hall, Miss Kenton. The novel examines both an individual memory and national history. Ishiguro does not describe the actions of the war, but presents his readers scenes from the politics of WW II.

In *The Remains of the Day* the political, moral and personal love stories are blended as Ishiguro depicts Stevens’s life through examining the history in the course of daily happenings, masterfully hiding the great events of world history behind the dramatic personal feelings. Ishiguro himself has stated in an interview that in this specific story of an English butler he meant to write a universal story and that the novel is “a story of every

man/.../ we all have a piece of Stevens in us; it would be unnatural to be otherwise” (Buck et al 1993).

To tackle his topic the author has used various narrative techniques, which are analysed in greater detail in the sections below.

1.1 Narrator and narratee in the novel

According to the narrative theorist Slomith Rimmon-Kenan the narrator of the narrative text is an agent who narrates or can in some other way be connected with presenting the narration; e.g. diary, letter writing, etc. Rimmon-Kenan is of the opinion that there is always a narrator in the narrative text (Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 88).

Using terms first proposed by Gerard Genette, Rimmon-Kenan provides a typology of narrators according to their participation in the text, perceptibility of their role and reliability. Firstly, there can be a narrator who is above the story (s)he narrates and is called an extradiegetic narrator. Rimmon-Kenan suggests “Narration is always at a higher narrative level than the story it narrates. Therefore the diegetic level is narrated by an extradiegetic narrator /.../” (2000: 92). Secondly, in case the narrative is told by an extradiegetic narrator and it has in addition a narrator who is a diegetic character, then this character narrator is called an intradiegetic narrator. As a third and fourth category Rimmon-Kenan has mentioned hypodiegetic and hypo-hypodiegetic narrator who are part of consecutive levels of narration.

Both extradiegetic and intradiegetic narrators can be either heterodiegetic, i.e. narrators who do not participate in the story, or homodiegetic, i.e. narrators who are part of the story (Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 94-95). Extradiegetic heterodiegetic narrators have usually the characteristics of omniscient narrators who have the higher knowledge of things and are usually present. According to their perceptibility, narrators can be covert or

overt, to a greater or lesser extent. Some narrators' presence is felt more strongly than others', some narratives may be highly self-conscious, drawing overt attention to the narrator.

Often narratives in prose fiction are divided into two broad categories: first-person narratives and third-person narratives. A narrator in the first-person narrative is an 'I' figure who is usually a character in the story. The narrator in the third-person narrative is an 'observer' and not a character in the story. Such a narrator might be omniscient, "an all-knowing narrator /.../ who can move from place to place and pass back and forth through time, slipping into and out of characters as no human being possibly could in real life. Omniscient narrators can report the thoughts and feelings of the characters," or limited omniscient, restricted "to the single perspective of either a major or minor character" (The Meyer Literature Site).

Stam finds that such grammar-based terms like "first-person narrator" and "third-person narrator" are confusing, stating that "designating a narrator 'third person' actually tells us very little about specific narrational processes in novelistic texts," and finds that it is difficult to define narrator in case of mixed narrators. Stam goes on by stating that "a strictly grammatical approach obscures the fact that a writer can shift person" and brings out the case in Gustave Flaubert *Madame Bovary*, where the writer is "constantly changing the relation between the narrator and fiction, /.../, moving easily from occasional 'I' or a 'we' to a mixed style." Stam describes the narrator in *Madame Bovary* "the variable-distance, infinitely flexible, at once intimate and impersonal, narrator" (Stam 2005: 191). Thus Stam leaves aside the importance of 'person' and stresses the quality of "authorial control of intimacy and distance, the calibration of access to knowledge and consciousness, all issues that function above and beyond and below the issue of grammatical person" (2005:: 192). Stam (2005: 192) suggests that "within 'free indirect discourse', /.../, the

narrator can adopt the voices and attitudes of diverse characters.” And he distinguishes within the same novel between dramatic and limited omniscient narrator; where in case of one character the narrator is dramatic narrator towards the character “showing only what the character says or does” and towards another character the narrator can be limited omniscient narrator.

Wayne C. Booth (1999: 148) classifies narrators as implicit and explicit dramatised narrators. Such a narrator “refers to himself as ‘I/.../ or /.../ ’we’.” Explicit dramatised narrators are often disguised and “are used to tell the audience what it needs to know, while seeming merely to act out their roles” (Booth 1999: 148). He (1999: 149) further divides the dramatised narrators into “observers and narrator-agents.” The latter being describes as narrators “who produce some measurable effect on the course of events.” Here the association with Genette’s (p. 24 above) heterodiegetic and homodiegetic narrators can be made – the observer denotes a heterodiegetic narrator and the narrator-agent an homodiegetic narrator.

If the narrator is an agent who presents events verbally, then a focaliser in a narrative text is an agent whose focus of perception is presented or “whose perception orients the presentation” (Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 74). Rimmon-Kenan distinguishes two types of focalisers, an external and internal focaliser. External focaliser is external to the story and is thus called narrator-focaliser. Internal focaliser represents the perception of some character in the story and is therefore called character-focaliser.

Narrators can be reliable or unreliable, with various degree of unreliability. As it is difficult to judge upon reliability and easier to define unreliability, then Rimmon-Kenan presents the characteristics of unreliability, which are “narrator’s limited knowledge, his personal involvement and his problematic value-scheme” (Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 100), which may result in some narrators telling lies or omitting crucial information. Stam states

that “the challenge of reading, with unreliable narration, consists in ferreting out the narrator’s inconsistencies and neuroses, penetrating the veil set up by the narrators to hide their vices (or even their virtues)” (Stam 2005: 193). And in case of unreliable narrator “it is hard to disentangle the true from the false in what they are saying” (Stam 2005: 194).

Besides the narrator, there is also a narratee in the narrative text, who, according to Rimmon-Kenan, is the agent whom the narrator addresses (Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 104). Gerald Prince (1999: 190) and Rimmon-Kenan both agree that there is always at least one narratee in the narrative text. The narratee may be extradiegetic, when (s)he does not appear as a character present in the scenes and occupies the same position as the reader. We have an intradiegetic narratee who, according to Genette, “is, by definition, situated at the same narrative level as the narrator” (quoted in Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 104). Extradiegetic narratee can be addressed directly, intradiegetic narratee is always addressed directly by a narrator.

According to Rimmon-Kenan, if we have an extradiegetic narrator, his extradiegetic narratee shares the same knowledge as the narrator. In case of the intradiegetic narratee the same applies. An intradiegetic narratee does not overtly take part in the events, but the narrator addresses his narratee directly. One narration can have both, an extradiegetic narratee and an intradiegetic narratee at the same time; the same applies to the narrators.

Narratees can also be overt or covert, like narrators. A covert narratee is silently addressed by narrator, overt narratee, on the other hand, is perceived through his actions, responses or comments to the narrator. Reliability or unreliability is also characteristic of narratee. The extradiegetic narratee is reliable, but the intradiegetic narratee, can be unreliable, when the values of implied reader are in conflict with those of narratees (Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 104).

The presence of a narratee in the novel, where the narrator turns directly to the narratee, creates the effect of immediacy, a property otherwise attributed to the film medium. Thus the narratee is a mediator who brings the events closer to the readers of the novel.

1.2 Analysis of the narrator and narratee in *The Remains of the Day*

As suggested by Torop (p. 5 above) we should analyse the prose fiction and film by comparing the general structural properties of both narratives. Applying the concepts of narratology discussed above to the novel *The Remains of the Day*, we can define Stevens as a narrator who is superior to the story or extradiegetic in the sense that he is the one who narrates the diegetic level – the story of his life. On the first level of diegesis, the extradiegetic level, Stevens possesses the knowledge of past, present and future and a knowledge of what happens in different places, e.g. Stevens is in charge of telling the readers his story the way he chooses to, he comments on things he thinks are relevant etc. Stevens as a character on the diegetic level represents an intradiegetic narrator for he is “a diegetic character in the first narrative” (Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 94). But sometimes it is difficult to differentiate Stevens, the extradiegetic narrator, from Stevens, the intradiegetic narrator, for there is no clear boundary between narrative levels - “the transition is not marked, and the discreteness of levels is transgressed” (Rimmon-Kenan 2000: 93).

On the diegetic level, Stevens’ knowledge is limited, e.g. he does not know what is going on in other character’s minds; thus he cannot be considered omniscient on this level. According to Stam’s theory, Stevens as a narrator is dramatic narrator towards all the other characters, as he shares no access to any other characters’ minds, thoughts or feelings.

As Stevens is a character in the story he narrates he is also a homodiegetic narrator. Thus it can be concluded that Stevens as a narrator is a homo-intradiegetic narrator.

Through Stevens the author has manipulated the way we see the events and other characters. The reason the author has chosen homo-intradiegetic narrator may be the fact that he wants his narrator to participate in the story himself, thus making the reader think that the narrator is more reliable when he stands inside the story. Wong (2000: 53) has commented on Stevens' role as a narrator: "in this homodiegetic role, he hopes to cultivate a listener's sympathy." And it is easier for the reader to identify him(her)self with the protagonist who is the teller of his own tale. Applying Booth's terms, Stevens is a dramatised narrator who is also disguised as he acts out his role rather than tells it. When Stevens narrates of other characters in the narration, he also chooses to speak about them through dialogues or describing their actions.

Stevens as a focaliser is a character-focaliser, for he is a character in the story whose focus of perception is presented. According to O'Neill, a character-focaliser expresses unreliability, because he 'offers us a limited spatial perspective' (Henderson 1995/96 para 11). We as readers have only Steven's viewpoint and he can hardly be reliable in reporting earlier events if his actions prove him wrong in the end, and his views also clash with those of other characters (e.g. on issues concerning love, marriage, dignity, loyalty).

If, according to O'Neill, we have the narrator who is telling the text, and an implied author who is behind the meaning of the text (Henderson 1995/96 para 7), the implied author invites the reader to criticise Stevens' moral views and problematic value-scheme that often give rise to unreliability. Stevens as a narrator is an unreliable narrator for many reasons. Charles Forceville (1992: 3) has pointed out that "in their memories the narrators evade or distort certain issues, and hence that the reader cannot fully trust their stories" (1992: 3). As Stevens is the only narrator, we tend to accept his views and the world presented by him, for we have no other points of view. We can only draw some

conclusions from other characters' responses and behaviour, but this all is "filtered through the narrator's reports" (Forceville 1992: 3). Still, the narrator seems to be less than reliable for the author has made him so attached to the house he has hardly ever been out of and to Lord Darlington that he sees the world only through a butler's eyes. Kaia Norberg (2003: 15) in her analysis of narrator of *The Remains of the Day* supports the idea of unreliability of Stevens as the narrator stating that "the reader constantly gets signals from him [Stevens] that he is concealing things, in some instances memory seems to be playing tricks on Stevens as he at one point recalls something, then confuses it with another instance..."

Stevens' unreliability makes him a narrator who is typical of contemporary writing, for, as Stam (2005: 192) points out, "the modern period has been especially fond of changing narrators and unreliable narrators." The unreliable narrator Stevens pities himself, trying thus to redeem himself constantly repeating throughout the novel that he has tried to act and sound as dignified as possible. In the case of Stevens his idiosyncratic subjectivity allows the reader to doubt his account of events and his memory, e.g., he himself says "I believe it was then..." (Ishiguro 1999: 26), so he is not sure whether his memory does not fail him.

Anthony F. Lang, Jr. and James M. Lang (1998) comment as follows:

As the novel progresses, the reader gradually comes to doubt the veracity of Stevens's glowing appraisals of Lord Darlington's life and character, since he inadvertently reveals certain disturbing facts about Darlington's political activities [e.g. association with Oswald Mosley, the leader of the fascist movement]...These instabilities in Stevens' narrative reflect his self-interested desire to present both himself and Lord Darlington in the most favourable light possible.

Norberg (2003: 16) shares the same view as Lang and Lang regarding Stevens' uncertain opinions and attitudes towards Lord Darlington (his appraisal and several denials of knowing him).

In *The Remains of the Day* we have an extradiegetic narratee to whom Stevens tells his story and intradiegetic narratee to whom he occasionally turns directly, e.g. “As you might expect /.../” (Ishiguro 1999: 4), “You will not dispute, I presume /.../” (Ishiguro 1999: 34) or “/.../ I do not know if you will agree /.../” (Ishiguro 1999: 176). These examples also reveal that the narratee is also an overt narratee whom Stevens openly addresses.

To use Prince’s terms (1999: 196), in *The Remains of the Day* we have a specific narratee, as the narrative is explicitly addressed to the narratee as shown by the examples above. The most “revelatory signals” of the narratee are *over-justifications* as Prince (1999: 196) identifies them “explanations and motivations [of his characters] are situated at the level of meta-language, meta-commentary or meta-narration, they are over-justifications”. In the novel we find an example of this, e.g. in the case when Stevens excuses himself in front of his narratee, saying, “It is hard to explain my feelings /.../” (Ishiguro 1999: 23) as Prince (1999: 196) has explained the over-justification “/.../ when he [the narrator] confesses himself incapable of describing well a certain feeling /.../”

In conclusion it might be said that the first-person homo-intradiegetic narrator figure used in *The Remains of the Day* is, due to its complex nature, understood by a reader with more effort than an extradiegetic narrator in a third-person narrative would be. Ishiguro’s narrator is more challenging to the reader because the narrator’s knowledge is limited to the mind of a single person and this allows the reader to construct his(her) own opinion of the narrator by what he tells and how he acts. Such presentation allows the reader to regard the narrator more than merely a linguistic subject, and enables an individual access to narrator’s complex personality.

1.3 Story and discourse in the novel

Different theorists have used different terms defining the levels of narrative that are commonly known as story and plot (Aristotle's *logos* and *mythos* respectively), their functions and relations within the narrative. In French poetics terms *histoire* and *discours* are used, derived from Russian Formalists' *fabula* and *suzet* (McFarlane 1996: 19). According to Rimmon-Kenan (2000: 39) the story is an abstract entity that is formulated in reader's head after reading the narrative. Seymour Chatman (1990) has used the terms story and discourse and described the phenomena as follows: story is what happens and discourse is how something happens. Richard Walsh (2001) has used the terms 'fabula' and 'sujet' for a story and plot accordingly. In his view "the distinction between fabula and sujet is, according to various commonsensical definitions, the distinction between what happens in a narrative and how it is told." In his view,

/.../ the value of the distinction may still be conceived in terms of a "what" and a "how," but with the terms reversed: sujet is what we come to understand as a given (fictional) narrative, and fabula is how we come to understand it. Our understanding, in other words, is not of "what happened"; it is of the weight and import of the narrative as actually told. (Walsh 2001)

Walsh supports his idea stating, "it merely inverts the logical priority of fabula to sujet" and sujet helps to construct fabula, not deconstruct it. Here Walsh stresses how much the fabula is dependent on the sujet. In Chatman's view the readers learn the story via the discourse and it is only the level of discourse that is directly accessible to the readers.

Furthermore, Peter Brooks, has made yet another point stating that "plot is /.../ the dynamic shaping force of the narrative discourse" (Brooks 1999: 255). He therefore finds that plot is not to be equated with the term 'sujet (sjužet)' or 'discourse' and that it is an aspect of sjužet:

'Plot' in fact seems to me to cut across the *fabula/sjužet* distinction in that to speak of plot is to consider both story elements and their ordering. Plot could be thought of as the

interpretative activity elicited by the distinction between *sjuzet* and *fabula*, the way we use the one against the other. To keep our terms straight without sacrificing the advantages of the semantic range of 'plot,' let us say that we can generally understand plot to be an aspect of *sjuzet* in that it belongs to the narrative discourse, as its active shaping force, but that it makes sense [...] as it is used to reflect on *fabula*, as our understanding of story. (Brooks 1999: 255)

In this thesis the terms 'story' and 'discourse' are used denoting the two different levels of narrative, as in some recent studies such as Brooks' the term 'plot' does not have the meaning of the opposite of the story, but is rather considered as a part of discourse showing causality.

1.4 Analysis of the story and discourse in *The Remains of the Day*

Story and discourse are among the elements to analyse in prose and film narratives as suggested by Torop. In *The Remains of the Day* Ishiguro introduces the narrative with a prologue, where the setting of the scene, the place, Darlington Hall in England, and time, which is 1956, the actual point of narration are given. The novel is written as a journal that reflects a six day long journey to the West Country, but the book speaks mostly about the era before and during the two World Wars. For Stevens it is his first vacation ever outside Darlington Hall. The purpose of his journey is to visit his ex-colleague Miss Kenton and perhaps to regain his lost love.

Ishiguro has presented a movement between several temporal layers. The framework of the story is Stevens' quest to the West Country, in which his remembrances of the 1930s have been embedded. In Ishiguro's novel we learn about history and Stevens's story through a series of flashbacks or analepses, in which Stevens makes the readers realise that his employer was a leading figure in supporting Hitler in the UK prior to WW II and that Stevens and Miss Kenton were in love with each other, but as Stevens never dared to make the first step she eventually married another butler.

Rao (1996) has compared the use of linear and circular time in novels and has found that “active connection between the past and present constructs time cyclically” and circular time has an effect of bringing the past to life. Also *The Remains of the Day* presents time cyclically as the point of narration is 1956; then, in Chapter I, Stevens wanders with his narration off to ‘Lord Darlington’s days’ recalling the visitors of the time when the political meetings took place at Darlington Hall. In Chapter II he is again in the moment of narrative present and then goes back to the 1920s and 1930s to the times of Hayes Society and the question of “What is the great butler?”, introducing his father to the readers. Stevens goes even further back in time to his childhood, about the turn of the 20th century, and to the later years of his early career as a butler when his father was repeatedly telling his favourite story of ‘a great butler’ and several other stories that set his father as an example of a ‘great butler’ or as Ishiguro has put it “personification itself of /.../ dignity in keeping with his position” (Ishiguro 1999: 43). Thus the author, presenting the time cyclically, has created the effect of immediacy bringing the past to life.

Chapter III begins again in 1956; here Stevens introduces Miss Kenton more thoroughly than in the previous chapters where he had only briefly mentioned her. In this chapter Stevens quotes Miss Kenton’s letter and goes back about 30 years, to the mid-1920s, when Stevens, his father and Miss Kenton were all working together in Darlington Hall. Then he goes further back to 1922 – when Miss Kenton and Stevens’s father had arrived at the house, and to the first arguments with the former, concerning mostly Stevens’s father. Stevens occasionally comes back to the time of narration giving accounts of his present journey and then wanders again off to his memories taking the readers again to the decline and death of his father in 1923 during the conference in Darlington Hall which was also a peak of Stevens’s career as a great butler, “the moment when I demonstrated I might have a capacity for such a quality [of dignity]” (Ishiguro 1999: 73).

As an introduction to the conference, Stevens goes back to 1922, shedding light on the political events of the time, then moves back to March 1923 describing the events of the conference intermittently with his father getting sick and gradually passing away.

At the beginning of Chapter IV Stevens again gives an account of his journey in 1956. Here he denies knowing Lord Darlington to the village people and in his flashback also to the visitors of Mr Farraday, the present owner of Darlington Hall, a few months earlier. Chapter V begins with Stevens's account of his present journey intermingled with his memories of the silver-polishing tradition back in his father's days about the turn of the century and smoothly going to the theme of world politics telling about Herr Ribbentrop's, Lord Halifax's and Darlington's meetings at Darlington Hall in 1936 and 1937. Then he occasionally says "But I drift", bringing the reader back to the point of narration and ends the chapter in 1956.

The next chapter begins with Stevens's reminiscence of 1932 and the Jewish issue when two Jewish maids were dismissed from Darlington Hall. Stevens recalls several incidents that occurred during the 1930s when he and Miss Kenton were working together. Then Stevens draws the reader's attention to his current narrative in 1956, describing the events of another day of his trip. After that he dives into his memories and incidents with Miss Kenton again in 1935 and 1936 marking another 'crucial turning point' in Stevens's life when Miss Kenton finds him 'off-duty' reading a book in his pantry. Stevens considers that great butlers should never be found 'off-duty' in presence of others and decides to restore a plain professional relationship with Miss Kenton. In Chapter VII we learn of Dr Carlisle, a character met on the present trip, who discloses Stevens's background and connection with Lord Darlington. Next comes the crucial moment from the past when Stevens, on hearing about Miss Kenton's marriage to Mr Benn, is unable to console Miss Kenton who is crying over Stevens's indifference and loses her forever. But Stevens is

triumphant again for retaining his dignity as a butler, and this realisation also ends the chapter.

The final chapter marks the 'crucial day' in Stevens's present life – it is his last chance to regain his love lost, to bring Miss Kenton back to Darlington Hall. But Miss Kenton has decided not to return to Stevens, indicating, however, that she has imagined them living together. Stevens reacts to this news with a confession that remains known only to himself that his heart is breaking. By the end of the novel Stevens admits that his idea of dignity and keeping strictly to it has turned into a disappointment and he is ready to re-evaluate his views and start learning bantering in which 'lies the key to human warmth' (Ishiguro 1999: 258). This chapter differs from previous chapters in that it presents mainly the events of the time of narration with only few incidents of past inserted into dialogues.

Out of eight chapters six begin with the events of the time of narration and five chapters end with the reminiscence of the past, so the overall tendency is that the thread of the narration runs from the present to the past, is then broken and starts all over again with a new chapter. Proportionally, approximately two-thirds of the pages of the novel are dedicated to recollections of the past, so the past has a lot more weight than the present.

Going through his past Stevens is trying to find a justification to his deeds and behaviour, as the narrator is constantly offering the reader his apologetic explanations of his activities. Such shifts in time as described in the sections above might indicate Stevens's unstable nature and reveal that he is probably unsure about his future and is in constant search of his own true self and uneasy of his feelings towards Miss Kenton. Also, this pattern of shifts helps to explore Stevens's character, revealing with another 'new' memory in the discourse the actual story of the novel. Thus, as confirmed by Chatman (in Walsh 2001), the story is approached via discourse, as every single part of discourse added we get closer to the overall story itself.

1.5 Narrator-specific language use and the historical perspective in *The Remains of the Day*

Steven Connor has put forward an interesting view of the narrator's language use in *The Remains of the Day*. Connor's view is that Stevens's language and the mode of presentation of the book are self-consciously interrelated. He suggests that "there is a close equivalence between the kind of temperament that is being displayed by the book, and the book's own manner of displaying it" (Connor 1996: 108). Connor states that "the book does not merely imitate Stevens's language, it also exhibits it for us" (ibid.). He finds it hard to tell apart the serious and ironic language that constitutes Stevens's 'typical' English language, and his further suggestion is that Ishiguro is "imitating the effect of imperfect imitation" (1996: 109), which lends coherence to the book. So the whole book is a vivid imitation of Stevens's language and this technique makes the book enjoyable and open to various interpretations.

The language used by Stevens is very 'English' and the tone has a special dignified quality, and thus the reader will take Stevens to be a professional and reserved 'original' English butler. Ishiguro has created an idiosyncratic narrative voice that at times is rather disturbing in its pomposity, but has added also incidents and internal monologues that the reader, as an observer outside the discourse level, would perceive as comic episodes, e.g. the heated arguments of Stevens and Miss Kenton (Ishiguro 1999: 58-9) or the conversation about 'the facts of life' with Mr Cardinal (Ishiguro 1999: 83).

The following example shows how Stevens's use of language constructs for him the world he inhabits: throughout the novel Stevens is mostly referring to Miss Kenton, who, at the time of Stevens's recalling the events of the past, has for twenty years been actually Mrs Benn. Thus Stevens regards her as an unmarried woman, just as she was in those times they were working together in the Darlington Hall. This illustrates Stevens's

wishful thinking when he, either consciously or unconsciously, is denying her marital status, as the issue is his 'sore spot' and would constantly remind him of his incapability to act according to his feelings of heart.

Both Stevens's speech and the silent activity of his mind revealed through indirect presentation of the character portray certain traits in Stevens's character, e.g. his attitude to dignity and life values. The style of his speech has an important role to play – it is individuated and distinguished from the speech of other characters. According to Rimmon-Kenan (2000: 63-64) the speech of a character indicates a profession, also origin, and social class, but Stevens is an exception. His accent and command of language is not attributed to his origin and social class. Stevens somewhat overacts as he tries to be a dignified butler, for he has acquired Lord Darlington's formal and correct speech patterns, e.g. "When he inquired whether I had dined, I asked him to serve me with a sandwich in my room, which proved to be a perfectly satisfactory option as far as supper was concerned" (Ishiguro 1999: 129) or "As it was, I believe my judgement proved quite sound on the question of timing; the fact [...] is entirely attributable to an error of judgement..." (Ishiguro 1999: 13). So the people in Moscombe even mistake him for a gentleman, a man of the upper classes. However, his imitation is still not absolutely perfect, as he is caught out by Dr Carlisle who fortunately does not reveal Stevens's identity in front of the local folk. This illustrates that externally Stevens could easily be an upper class gentleman, but internally it is too big a challenge for him and he is not capable to bear his role out to the end. Barry Lewis points out that,

Stevens makes a remarkable effort to sound like a 'gentleman's gentleman', but despite his endeavour he sounds ridiculous and unnatural: "/Stevens/ strives too hard to be formal and correct, especially in his vocabulary, /.../ The strain is also there in the syntax, which is alternately stiff and slithery." (Lewis 2000: 94)

Stevens's tragedy lies in that he has chosen to live his life in terms of playing a butler in his personal life as well and not live as an ordinary man acting a butler only in his

professional life. He knows perfectly well how to communicate when serving great men is concerned, but does not know how to communicate with his father or Miss Kenton. When things get emotional he is at loss for appropriate words, because he believes that “the great butlers are great by virtue of their ability to inhabit their professional role and inhabit it to the utmost; they will not be shaken by external events, however surprising, alarming or vexing. They wear their professionalism as a decent gentleman will wear his suit” (Ishiguro 1999: 42-43). These ‘external’ events for Stevens are actually very ‘internal’ and personal. And to ‘inhabit one’s role to utmost’ means going to extreme, but it is not a great virtue nor humane to restrict and deny one’s own self this way.

Due to the fact that Stevens does not reveal his real feelings and his own personal attitudes he is a kind of narrator who does not help the reader to construct the messages in the novel. Stevens’s statements usually require deep critical examination, because Stevens speaks of himself through generalisations and non-personal statements and the reader’s task is to interpret and trace down the hints the implied author is giving through the narrator Stevens and also the moral hidden in the text and make the conclusions, “they [butlers] wear their professionalism as a decent gentleman will wear his suit: he will not let ruffians or circumstances tear it off him in the public gaze; he will discard it when, and only when, he is entirely alone” (Ishiguro 1999: 42).

Stevens’s speech is very impersonal and he does not let the reader into his inner world. He has hidden himself behind a mask as he tries to explain his every move in terms of professional reasons. For example, his excuse to Miss Kenton when she catches Stevens reading a romance is that he is developing better language skills, his trip to West Country is explained to have been taken in order to invite Miss Kenton/Mrs Benn back to work at Darlington Hall, adding that if he wants to be a good butler, he must know his country and surroundings better. But the attentive reader realises Stevens’s ulterior motives being of a

personal kind – reading Miss Kenton’s letter has left him with an impression that she is unhappy with her life and wants to come back to Stevens. The effect of the language used by Stevens makes the reader view him in quite the same way as Stevens regards himself – a professional butler, humble self-contented man, but the nostalgia with which he narrates his story in the beginning turns into regret and self-pity in the end.

Stevens seems to have no language of his own, for he has a constant need to acquire someone else’s manner of speaking. Nothing seems to come to Stevens naturally. With his new master, Mr Farraday, who wishes to keep some British ‘original’ butlers around the house, Stevens feels a need to learn bantering, perhaps to bring his skills more up to date. Stevens contemplates bantering, “But I must say this business of bantering is not a duty I feel I can ever discharge with enthusiasm, /.../ bantering is of another dimension altogether” (Ishiguro 1999: 16), but he is trying his best to become someone he is not and is eager to get rid of his original ‘Englishness’.

Ishiguro being a non-native Englishman has in this sense an advantage of a bystander in describing the English character and temperament. His description of Stevens is commented on by Lewis who draws an interesting parallel between Stevens and the English character by recalling Princess Diana’s funeral in 1997:

Thousands wept and throw flowers at the gun-carriage bearing the body. The ‘stiff upper lip’ was replaced by the ‘trembling lower lip’. Ironically, there was considerable controversy surrounding the reaction of the Royal Family, who behaved with classic British decorum by maintaining an air of dignity and carrying on as if nothing had happened. (Lewis 2000: 73)

This is a vivid example of the Englishness and dignity explored throughout Ishiguro’s book. Stevens never came to ‘show his human face’ any more than the Queen did at Diana’s funeral.

Ivan Del Janik draws a comparison between Ishiguro’s *The Remains of the Day* and Julian Barnes’ *Flaubert’s Parrot* in their overall outline where “through a recounting of

historical events narrators confront their own past and self-revelation” (Janik 1995: 166). Indeed, we see such pattern in *The Remains of the Day*, for the year of the framing story, 1956, was the year of the signal events for the dissolution of The British Empire, the year for the Suez Crisis, when the Suez Canal was nationalised and the British influence as a colonial and imperial power decreased. 1956, when British troops left the Suez Canal zone is described by Lewis (2000: 99) as follows: “perhaps this was the last occasion when dignity was held to be an unquestioned national virtue.” That same year Stevens sits down on the pier bench and realises what role Lord Darlington has played in society and in Stevens’ life as well. The following quote illustrates the collapse of the ‘utmost dignity as virtue’ belief:

Lord Darlington wasn’t a bad man. He wasn’t a bad man at all. And at least he had a privilege of being able to say at the end of his life that he made his own mistakes...He chose a certain path in life, it proved to be a misguided one, but there he chose it, he can say that at least. As for myself, I cannot even claim that. You see, I trusted. I trusted his lordship’s wisdom. All those years I served him, I trusted I was doing something worthwhile. I can’t even say I made my own mistakes. Really – one has to ask oneself – what dignity is there in that? (Ishiguro 1999: 255)

Lang, Jr. and Lang (1998) have stated, “the difficulties Stevens has in identifying those causal sequences in his own life can be broadened to illustrate like difficulties in world history”. The drama of the World Wars that influences, though indirectly, the time period Stevens is telling readers about is significant as well. Horst Steinmetz (1995: 84) points out that “literary works never replace historiographical representations”, because history becomes adapted for the literary purposes. Similarly, Stevens’s story is not an attempt to provide the readers with historical facts; however, these events of the past help to make a statement. Indeed, Stevens’ approval of Lord Darlington and his Anglo-German alliance idea shortly before WW II serves as a vehicle to demonstrate the powerlessness and lack of courage to stand for his own values and beliefs. Forceville (1992: 8) notes commenting on the moral dilemmas of Ishiguro’s narrators that “mistakes, errors and judgements and

ordinary human weaknesses have all /.../ been magnified through this [WW II] war,” which emphasises even more the use of specific time period.

In conclusion it might be said that the narrative elements discussed above, the narrator-narratee traits, the story-discourse relations, narrator-specific language and historical perspective are all combined in such a way that they complement each other forming a whole. With his narrative techniques Ishiguro has masterfully brought into light also the conflict between private and public memories. Stevens’ situation amplified by his parrot-like behaviour and speech, stemming greatly from the class system, has led him to self-destruction and denial and thus the story of the past becomes the tragedy of the present.

After having discussed the novel and its narrative aspects, we can proceed with the analysis of film narrative examining the adaptation of these aspects in the light of the ideas presented in the Introduction.

CHAPTER 2. FILM ADAPTATION OF *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY*

The film version of *The Remains of the Day* was released by Columbia Pictures under the same title in 1993, four years after the novel was published. The film is directed by the American film director James Ivory, who has retained the title, the same pre-established subject, and used world-famous actors – starring Anthony Hopkins as Stevens, Emma Thompson as Miss Kenton, James Fox as Lord Darlington and Christopher Reeve as Mr Lewis. The screenplay is written by Ruth Praver Jhabvala, an Anglo-Indian writer, who began her collaboration with Ivory-Merchant work team in the 1960s (Liukkonen 2003). The film is produced by the late Indian-born film producer Ismail Merchant. This successful team of three, famous also for their long-lasting partnership in filmmaking, has won six Academy Awards (Wikipedia contributors 2007). Merchant-Ivory's films are described best as “tasteful, literate, Anglo-centric, Oscar-worthy costume dramas” (Mohr 2003 para 2). Hopkins-Thompson is also a successful pair of co-stars in another Merchant-Ivory film, *Howards End* from 1992. Several film critics have considered *The Remains of the Day* Merchant-Ivory's masterpiece; however the success of the film certainly owes much to the fact that the literary original was a prize-winning novel. The film was nominated for several Academy Awards in 1993, including Best Picture, Best Actor (Hopkins) and Best Actress (Thompson) (Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences 2007). The success of the film may also depend very much on the scriptwriter, as in the filmmaking process of *The Remains of the Day*, the initial script was written by Harold Pinter, but later Ivory and Merchant invited Jhabvala into their team to write the script and they have admitted that this work of three of them (and many other assistants) led the movie to such a success (Buck et al 1993).

2.1 Narrator and narratee in film

If in the novel we can define a narrator easily, then in a film narrative it is not so obvious who the narrator is, if one exists at all. Stam points out that “In a novel, the narrator controls the only track – the verbal track. In a film, the narrator can partially control the verbal track – through voice over – but that control is subject to innumerable constraints: the pressure to include voiced dialogue, to dramatize, to tell stories visually, and so forth.” (Stam 2005: 232). Celestino Deleyto (1999: 218) states, “the existence of a narrative presupposes the existence of narrator, who performs the activity of narration. No narrator, no narrative. Does this mean that films are only narratives in those cases in which the activity of narration can be clearly ascribed to a narrator’s voice or printed words?” Therefore many theorists find defining a narrator in a film arguable. Films often do not have an *explicit* narrator, especially in case of silent films and sound films without voice-over narrators. Deleyto (1999: 219) finds that “a film narrative does not need the existence of an explicit narrator, as this agent is defined by theories of the novel, for the activity of narration to take place.”

Deleyto makes a distinction between prose and film narratives, stating that in a novel there is narration whereas in a film there is *narration, focalisation and representation*. According to Deleyto, narration includes only explicit narrator (voice-over, onscreen or intertitle) who can be external or character-bound (1999: 218). Deleyto’s view on focalisation is described by the following statement, “just as the activity of reading a novel implies a narrator at textual level, the spectator of a film, apart from reading and listening, *looks* and, therefore, his activity requires a textual agent that produces the signs he is looking at” (Deleyto 1999: 221). He thus separates the narrator and the focaliser and states that, “the role which is performed by the narrator in a novel is, in a film text, carried out by both the narrator and the focaliser” (ibid.). Focalisers can be external (the camera and

editing) or internal (the mind of the character) and can be used simultaneously. Representation includes the elements that cannot be included in the concepts of narrator and focaliser (e.g. *misé-en-scene*) (Deleyto 1999: 221-224).

Wayne C. Booth has stated that “in fiction, as soon as we encounter an ‘I,’ we are conscious of an experiencing mind whose views of the experience will come between us and the event” (Booth 1999: 147). In a film, we do not see this letter ‘I’ in front of our eyes; instead we see images that display the events and therefore the spectator is less aware of the limited perspective of the narrator and, to use Booth’s term, more drawn to the “realism-enhancing effect.”

Many classical theorists (V.S.Pudovkin, Karel Reisz) have suggested that the camera would define the position of narrator in a film: “This invisible but identifiable narrator would be able not only to present, in various ways, the space contained in the frame, but would change from one shot to another when it is necessary for the development of the narrative” (Deleyto 1999: 219). Apart from the camera’s eye there is a group of elements that ‘tell’ or rather ‘show’ the “staging of the events” and that is *misé-en-scene*. Deleyto (1999: 220) argues that *misé-en-scene* is identified outside the narration and the camera cannot be the narrator in the film, because camera’s function is to record the images. As Deleyto separates the narrator and representation, he is against defining a narrator in a film as an action of a camera or with the term *misé-en-scene*, which is a part of representation. Deleyto (1999: 223) finds that the position of the camera is defined by the external focaliser.

The narrative theorist Seymour Chatman has brought out the dual function of cinematic narrator. His understanding of cinematic narrator comes out clearly in his statement, “films, in my view, are always presented – mostly and often exclusively shown, but sometimes partially told – by a narrator or narrators. The overall agent that does the

showing I would call the ‘cinematic narrator’” (Chatman 1990: 133-134). He is critical of the opinion that often a cinematic narrator is limited to the voice-over narrator in the film, where a human voice presents the facts over visual images. He argues that a voice-over is just one part of the whole narration and one device of the cinematic narrator (Chatman 1990: 134). He claims that it is quite usual to use voice-over in the beginning and intermittently during the film. Thus according to Chatman the cinematic narrator both *shows* and occasionally *tells* the film (as voice-over).

George M. Wilson has proposed yet another theory of narration in film. He too agrees with the uncertainty around the concepts of narrators when applied to film. He makes the following statement, which he later on, in the course of his analysis, contradicts:

In analogy with the literary case, it seems as though the very idea of filmic narration must presuppose the existence of visual narrators: if an *activity* of narration is conducted on screen, then there must be a filmic someone who is the *agent* of that activity. It is thought that a fictional figure implicit in the narration must be postulated who *addresses* the audience through the image track and thereby ‘tells’ the film narrative visually. (Wilson 1992: 127)

According to this assumption there is a narrator in a film, as there is one in a novel, who is inside or outside the story and who narrates the events. This would be the “fictional perceiver” who sees and renders the events through camera’s position, the idea introduced also by Deleyto (see p. 45 above). Wilson (1992: 127) adds that “this /.../ would guarantee the existence of some kind of visual narrator in every film.”

Wilson (1992: 127) notes that first-person narration would then be rendered as a character’s visual experiences and “the shots may show certain objects and events as they are remembered, imagined, dreamed, and so forth by the character.” According to Wilson (1992: 127) third-person narration is “all film narration that is not tied directly to the subjectivity of a character in these ways.” Third-person narrator is then “a camera-observer” who is outside the events of the film.

Wilson (1992: 132) presents a detailed comparison of literary and filmic narrative

taking the film as telling a story as a point of departure. He states that “the narrator of a fictional narrative in literature is the fictional or fictionalized *character* who is created” and “who is understood as describing for the reader a sequence of events about which he or she has some mode of knowledge, whether that mode is specified or not,” and adds that this character does not necessarily have to be a character in that story. Then Wilson draws a parallel with filmic narrator, “it would be the concept of a fictional or fictionalized being, presupposed in any viewing of the film narrative, who continuously provides to the audience, from within the general framework of the fiction, the successive views that open unto the action of the film,” but he asserts that “there is no coherent general notion of the function that such a fictional being is supposed to serve” (1992: 132).

Then he deals with the concept of a “witness to the depicted actions” and with his/her visual experiences that we see on the screen (Wilson 1992: 132). Wilson (1992: 133) holds that a focalising character is not a visual narrator of the film in case of directly subjective narration and proposes the example of the third-person observer who is located outside the narrative, yet perceiving the actions in the film as they take place, then “it will be the perceptions of this meta-narrative observer which fill the frame when the narration is not directly subjective.” But he also finds two objections to this idea, on the one hand, “our model of such a being’s consciousness would be parasitic upon our perception of film and not the other way around,” and on the other, this “interpolated observer blatantly contradicts the transparency of the image track for the viewer” (Wilson 1992: 133). Therefore, according to Wilson, the idea of such an observer falls out.

Finally, Wilson (1992: 133-134) suggests the use of an agent in the role of the narrator in the film who “directs the audience’s attention upon the scenes of the narrative by setting a progression of movie views before them,” and could be named an “implicit cinematic guide.” But Wilson also finds that this kind of narrator corresponds to the

implied author in a novel and that narrators and implied authors cannot be confused and goes on introducing a concept of “implied film maker(s)” in case of films. However, we are not to take this implied film-maker as a narrator in the film, because according to Wilson (1992: 135), “there are no grounds for recognizing in narrative film, a being, personlike or not, who fictionally offers our view of narrative events to us. It is important that the implied film maker (like the implied author) is not a character of the given fiction at all.” And he therefore rejects the existence of a concept of “filmic narrator” altogether.

Bordwell, similarly to Wilson, questions the existence of filmic narrator. Bordwell (1986: 95) defines the narrator in the film by an agent who is telling the story, stating that this agent might be a character in the story or a voice-over commentator who can be more or less restricted. Bordwell points out that character agent does not necessarily mean restricted point-of-view, for (s)he can tell about events (s)he has never witnessed. Also, character agent might hold greater or lesser subjectivity, give us more personal details or stick to surface information. A non-character agent may present information that only one character is aware of or events that are subjective and restricted to the limited point of view. He further associates the process of narration to the concept of construction of the story by the spectator, as stated above, giving thus the main role in narrative process to the spectator and not to the narrator; therefore there is no need for a narrator in a film. But Chatman finds that Bordwell “equates the agent of perception with the act of narration,” and is not concerned with narration at all. Chatman (1990: 127) objects that the spectator does not construct but rather *reconstructs* the narrative “from the set of cues encoded in the film.” Chatman (1990: 128) also argues that there cannot be a mere process of narration, but that narration includes “knowing, presenting, recognizing, and the like” and therefore requires a ‘doer’ – a narrator, who does not necessarily have to be a human voice.

Monaco (2000: 205-210) examines the point of view of film narrative stating that it is relatively easy to duplicate the omniscient third-person point of view of a novel, but this is problematic in case of first-person narration. If in the novel we cannot see what is happening, then in the film we see and if we would see only what one person sees, then the outcome would be, in Monaco's words, a failure, like Montgomery's *Lady in the Lake*, as noted earlier.

Monaco also asserts that in contemporary filmmaking the emphasis is put more on the "individuality of the camera" (2000: 209) when we see an absence of a character in a scene and he calls it a third-person point of view. The omniscient point of view in film is also rendered by the *establishing shot* (introducing place, time, etc.) and the *Hollywood dialogue style* (which leaves an impression that we surround the conversation).

Chatman (1990: 133) introduces the notion of "implied author" (that can be compared to Wilson's "implied film-maker") in film who is the 'inventor' of the story and discourse in the film. He further (1990: 130) states that this implied author is the one who *knows* in the film, as there is one who *knows* in the novel. Implied author provides the narrator with the information to be presented and this 'knowledge' is to be attributed only to the implied author. In Chatman's view, an implied author "invents the narrative, both discourse and story" and "the cinematic narrator presents what the cinematic implied author requires" (1990: 130).

According to Chatman, literature and cinema share also the aspects of unreliability of narration:

Films, like novels, present phenomena that cannot otherwise be accounted for, such as the discrepancy between what the cinematic narrator presents and what the film as a whole implies. "Unreliable narration," though not frequent, exists in cinema as well as in literature. (Chatman 1990: 130-131)

According to Monaco (2000: 208), the screen image is taken to present the truth, and then the problem arises with retaining the unreliability of the narrator of the novel.

Similarly to Monaco, Stam is of opinion that it is more difficult to portray an unreliable character in the film than in the novel. But he does not exclude the very possibility by saying that,

I am not suggesting that it is impossible to relay unreliable first-person narration in the cinema, but only that it would require relentless subjectification on various cinematic registers: uninterrupted voice-over, non-stop point-of-view editing, constantly motivated camera movements, always marked subjective framing, in a way that approximates Pasolini's "cinema of poetry." (Stam 2005: 232)

As the literary and cinematic narratives have similar constituent elements, the film narrative includes also a narratee. As stated by Inez Hedges, "every narrative film has an identifiable narrator and narratee," and she also states that the narratee in a film is as important to the narrative as the narratee in the novel. She distinguishes (using the terms of Genette, see p. 24) between extradiegetic, intradiegetic and metadiegetic narratees. An extradiegetic narratee is always present in a film narrative and is positioned outside the diegesis, intradiegetic narratee is positioned inside the story and is someone who the narrator tells his(her) story to. Metadiegetic narratee would be the one who tells the story only to him(her)self, is the only perceiver and these cases are very rare (Hedges 1980).

Thus, it can be concluded that the views on film narrator might vary considerably, but the idea that there is always a narrator, as opposed to the theories of Wilson and Bordwell, and a narratee in the film is supported in this thesis.

2.2 Analysis of the narrator and narratee in *The Remains of the Day*

If in the novel *The Remains of the Day* the narrator Stevens is defined as unreliable first-person homo-intradiegetic narrator who tells the story, then in the film, according to Daleyto's theory, we have a voice-over narrator, a character narrator, a focaliser and a *misé-en-scène* that can be used simultaneously. Such a concept of the narrator, even when

it depicts the viewpoint of a single character, presents us with a more omniscient perspective than a novel's first-person's viewpoint does (Whelehan 2002: 11).

In a broader sense, as film and novel narratives are comparable, Booth's, Stam's and Genette's theories can be adapted also to a film. In *The Remains of the Day*, both in the novel and film, we are dealing with narrator-agent who interacts in the sequence of events, therefore according to Genette's terms, the film narrator Stevens is also an intra-homodiegetic narrator. If we apply Booth's terminology, Stevens is a disguised dramatised narrator who acts out and rather shows his role. Stam's dramatic narrator can also be used in case of film version of the novel, as Stevens does not have the access to other characters' minds. Although Stevens appears to be the predominant narrator, there are other narrators in the film as well.

Chatman (1990: 131) believes that unreliability of the narrator necessitates the existence and need for implied author, or rather an implied film-maker (not Jhabvala or Ivory) who controls the narrative and is the source of facts. In *The Remains of the Day*, the use of additional material in the film draws attention to the already examined issue of unreliability of the narrator in the novel, illustrated by withholding information. When the novel presents the reader with only Stevens's account of the story, there are scenes in the film that Stevens does not witness, e.g. in the film we see that Miss Kenton permits Mr Benn to kiss her on their date. Such information is not given in the novel, where Stevens does not witness the incident or if he has seen them kissing would conceal the fact sparing himself of the pain. Thus, unlike in the book where Stevens is the only narrator and focaliser, in the film (internal) focalisers and narrators shift, and this shift is, according to Chatman's theory (1990: 132), the 'deed' of the implied author or a film-maker, to use Wilson's term (1992: 135).

Such a shift in narrators (in *The Remains of the Day* only character-bound voice-

over narrators are employed) can be detected already in the opening scene, in which Miss Kenton, a narrator who is not shown on the screen, is introducing herself as an one-time employee in Darlington Hall while reading her letter as a voice-over, “Oh, Mr Stevens, I so often think of the good old days when I was the house-keeper in Darlington Hall.” She also introduces Mr Lewis “could it possible be the same congressman Lewis, who intended his lordship’s congress in 1936?”, thus introducing also Darlington Hall and its current status. Also, Stevens is not present in the scene in which Miss Kenton and Mr Benn meet at a tavern before their marriage, nor at the conversation between Miss Kenton and her husband in the inn and their reconciliation. In these cases the focaliser has changed in the film and Miss Kenton is the one who ‘sees’ and therefore her account of the story is told. This could be explained by the fact that the camera offers the spectators “a sense of an omniscient perspective” (Whelehan 2002: 11) and therefore it knows and shows the account of Miss Kenton’s dilemmas as well.

Stam (2005: 250) has brought out the difference in reliability issue as well as presenting the narrator of the novel and the film stating that,

novels’ (and adaptations’) unreliable approach destabilizes narration, placing in reader’s lap the burden of interpretation, as the reader has to intuit the gap between what the narrator claims has happened and what we suspect might have happened, between what the narrator says things mean and what they might actually mean. Each adaptation deals with this challenge differently.

The unreliable narrator Stevens in *The Remains of the Day* is partly substituted with the change in the focalisers, when the shift from Stevens goes to Miss Kenton who uses such narrative technique as voice-over and whose accounts of the events that Stevens is not aware of are shown (the couple’s meeting in the tavern or the under-butler and maid’s meeting in the garden). At the end of the film focalisation goes over to a pigeon who has flown into one room in Darlington Hall and is released by Mr Lewis. The spectator sees the departure from Darlington Hall as if through the pigeon’s eyes.

Such substitutions of narrator into focalisers or into representation in the film could be explained by Stam's (2005: 232) idea of the role of the narrator in the film: "the narrator/character from the novel is also relativized through contextualization; he now has to compete for attention not only with the other characters but also with the décor, the music, the color, the light."

In addition to Stevens and Miss Kenton as focalisers there are scenes, in which the focaliser remains outside the discourse level, i.e. we have an extradiegetic focaliser. This happens e.g. in the scene in which two staff members, Lizzie and Charlie, are having a conversation behind the hedge without any witnesses, or in the scene of early morning duties of the staff – bringing in the firewood, preparing the breakfast in the kitchen or performing duties prior to the conference. In these cases the focaliser is not a character who could be identified in the film. McFarlane (1996: 19) has stated that the films of "first-person novelistic approach, /.../, include what the protagonist sees but cannot help including a great deal else as well", because it is "...difficult to signify ownership of the gaze through the camera lens..." (Whelehan 2002: 10). Thus, in the film both intradiegetic and extradiegetic types of focalisation are used, which diversifies the film's narrative. To apply Monaco's terms (2000: 208), such a phenomenon would be called a "third-person point of view" in which case there is no narrator or focaliser present in a scene.

In the film *The Remains of the Day* the narratee (as every narration has a narratee and a film is a cinematographic narrative), in contrast to the novel, is not addressed overtly and can be defined as an extradiegetic narratee (as suggested by Hedges). Presumably, the immediacy effect of the second-person address is compensated by the 'present-time' illusion created by the film. There are still the instances in which we can detect the narratee's presence, e.g. the beginning of a flashback is marked showing events through the small window in the door of the servants' quarters and this leaves the impression that

someone is watching the daily activities from aside, i.e. a spectator's existence is implied, as is in the case of the letters that are read out by the voice-over narrator, therefore addressed to someone who is hearing the reading. Another example is that the film begins with the scene presenting someone's point of view who is driving to Darlington Hall and ends with presenting departure from Darlington Hall. This 'someone' could indicate the narratee, who 'arrives' at the beginning of the story and 'departs' in the end. Thus it reveals the text's existence on a meta-level, which according to Prince (1999: 196) signifies a specific narratee's presence in the film. The spectator shares this narratee's position as the reader does.

2.3 Story and discourse in film

Although Bordwell's observations on narrator are not employed in this thesis, his views on story and plot are more useful in our context. Bordwell (1986: 85) draws out the distinction of plot and story in film, approaching the matter from the point of view of narrative mode. He has further defined story as "the set of all events in a narrative, both the ones explicitly presented and those the viewer infers", a total story is film's diegesis. His definition of plot goes as follows "describing everything visibly and audibly present in the film before us." The plot presents elements of story and the story suggests elements the viewer never sees on the screen. Thus plot presents nondiegetic elements (e.g. soundtrack and other aural codes). Plot and story share events and thus overlap (Bordwell 1986: 85). Bordwell suggests that "the filmmaker makes the story into a plot" inserting nondiegetic material or omitting certain elements. From the spectator's side, according to Bordwell the viewer is the one who puts the story together in his(her) mind from the plot he/she receives from the screen. Plot's function is to present story information, revealing or withholding it from the spectators. In this respect we may draw a parallel between Bordwell's 'plot' and the term

‘discourse’ as according to Chatman and Rimmon-Kenan a story is learned via discourse (see p. 32 above).

According to Bordwell (1986: 87) “the plot may present only certain periods of time; the viewer thus infers that some story duration has been skipped over”. It is the viewer who tries to put the events into chronological order to make sense of the story. Plot duration consists of presenting certain sections of story duration. We may have scenes of one and the same character during his(her) childhood or adolescence shown to us in different duration. Bordwell distinguishes between plot duration, story duration and screen duration. For instance, we can have a story of several years, a plot of some days and screen duration of 130 minutes. Furthermore, Bordwell states that plot duration is chosen out of story duration and screen duration out of plot duration. The plot may skip several years of story duration.

Bordwell also looks at the *range* and *depth* of presented story information. The range of knowledge can be unrestricted or restricted. In case of unrestricted narration we know more than characters do, so it is often called an omniscient narration, which can be paralleled with literary omniscient narration. Restricted narration may be limited only to one character’s knowledge creating thus greater suspense and surprise and can be compared to the novel’s first-person and third-person limited narration.

The depth of information involves objectivity and subjectivity. If the film is shown from a character’s point of view (hearing-seeing what the character does and only these things), we have a subjective narration. If we are shown characters’ external behaviour, we have a relatively objective narration. Bordwell introduces an aspect of mental subjectivity, including character’s dreams, memory, fantasy, etc. He states that often objective narration is intertwined with mental subjectivity narration. Plot and story can manipulate *space*,

when we are told about some place, but are never shown one. The spectator, then, must imagine the space.

Edward Branigan analysing film narrative from the spectator's perspective, finds that "narrative in film rests on our ability to create a three-dimensional world out of a two-dimensional wash of light and dark," which means that the spectator has to transform the graphics into solid objects, a texture of noise into speech (Branigan 1999: 234). Therefore, according to Branigan, the spectator perceives the narration in film on two different levels: *the space, time and causality on the screen* and *within the story world*, which he explains as follows:

Changes in light and sound patterns will be perceived in at least two ways: as motion across a screen and as movement among objects in a story world. Causality on a screen will involve patterns of a purely visual, phenomenal logic where, for example, one blob smashes into another but the resulting transformations in motion and color may not be analogous to the interaction of three-dimensional objects like billiard balls; the blobs may even 'pass through' each other on the screen. (Branigan 1999: 236)

Branigan (1999: 236) goes on stating that "one of the tasks of narrative is to reconcile these [two] systems." He finds, similarly to the distinction of story, plot and screen duration pointed out by Bordwell, that "time in the world of the story may be quite different than the time of the projection of the film."

Branigan (1999: 237) further divides the story world into diegetic and nondiegetic:

The diegetic world extends beyond what is seen in a given shot and beyond even what is seen in the entire film, for we do not imagine that a character may only see and hear what we observe him or her seeing and hearing. The diegesis, then, is the implied spatial, temporal, and causal system of a character /.../

There are also those elements that are not heard or seen by the characters and these are in a nondiegetic world (here belong Bordwell's nondiegetic elements of plot). For example, there may be background music or sounds in a film that are meant only for the spectator and which characters themselves do not hear.

Branigan (1999: 238) states that nondiegetic elements “are about the diegetic world of a character and are meant to aid the spectator in organising and interpreting that world and its events.” He concludes that such separation of diegetic and nondiegetic story worlds is essential “in the comprehension of a narrative and in understanding the relationship of story events to our everyday world” (Branigan 1999: 238).

2.4 Analysis of the story and discourse in *The Remains of the Day*

The presentation of the story and plot of *The Remains of the Day* in the film narrative is quite different from that of the novel. The sequence of events in the film in comparison with the novel is altered already starting from the very beginning of the film. The reason might be the fact that the novel contains considerably more events than the film, because of the restrictions set by the screen time, and therefore it is interesting to follow which of the events the film-makers of *The Remains of the Day* have picked out and brought to the screen. At the very beginning of the film there is a scene in which an auction is taking place where Darlington Hall’s property is sold, but in the novel the transactions that “had taken this house out of the hands of the Darlington family...” are only mentioned on page 6. The novel, on the other hand, starts with a conversation between Stevens and Mr Farraday, the new owner of Darlington Hall, introducing the reader first with the journey theme, which is the leading theme of the novel. Therefore the introduction of the film is more concrete than in the novel consisting a soundtrack music and Miss Kenton reading out her letter, as a voice-over narrator, to give the background knowledge to the spectators with minimum time, as films usually are more intense in showing the events that are tightly connected; and also making things more linear when the topic is not presented as a flashback from another time. In the first dialogue in the film Stevens is talking of the faulty staff plan and then refers to the motoring trip. In the novel the theme of the trip comes first

and the talk about staff plan follows, which emphasises the romantic connotation and tone of the film.

Similarly to the previous example of alteration in the sequence of events, in the novel the conversation between Lord Darlington and Stevens about his father's accident in the garden, where Lord Darlington recommends Stevens to "reconsider his [father's] duties" (Ishiguro 1999: 65) takes place first. And on the next page Stevens gives an account of the story of his father's accident with a tray to the readers. In the film the scene of Stevens's father falling comes first and the conversation later. Here the sequence of events may have been changed for the sake of a more logical causal-temporal narrative sequence in the film, as the interference of a narrator telling that the conversation was due to the accident would have been impossible, as the film-makers have not chosen to employ voice-over, except for the letters.

An alteration of events themselves can be exemplified by a scene in the film in which Stevens is heading to the West Country with an old Daimler and Mr Lewis is seeing him off and taking a picture. In the novel, during Stevens's trip Mr Farraday is going to America and that makes Stevens's trip to West Country possible. In the film Mr Lewis is away in London during Stevens's planned trip and Mr Lewis's presence in the scene of Stevens starting his trip in the film stresses the trip's importance and Mr Lewis's wholehearted support of it. The film proceeds with the scene in which Miss Kenton goes to pick up the letter from Stevens – a scene that is not witnessed by Stevens himself and indicates the shift of focaliser and is not depicted in the novel at all. Then Stevens is introducing, through letter-reading, Miss Kenton's first appearance to Darlington Hall, mixed with the scenes of introduction of Lord Darlington and description of his personality through the letter of Stevens to Miss Kenton.

After introducing Miss Kenton, Stevens lets his father meet the audience. Differently from the novel, in the film the main characters are all introduced in a row at the beginning of the film, whereas in the novel they appear later in the discourse. Immediately after the characters have been introduced comes the scene in Stevens's pantry that Miss Kenton tries to lighten up with flowers, denoting the start of their closer relationship and their first row that will prove to be characteristic of their whole relationship. Many internal monologues of Stevens pondering upon the past that are intermingled between the events in the book are left out in the film, which in most part depicts only the events that are presented in the form of a dialogue in the novel.

The dialogue in which Stevens introduces Miss Kenton and his father to Lord Darlington as new employees, is not present in the book at all. The film has compressed several issues presented in the book in different dialogues into a single dialogue. As to the arguments and conversations between Stevens and Miss Kenton the dialogues are in most part worded in the same way as in the novel, but with considerable cuts to make the scenes shorter. In parts, the film has some additional remarks in the dialogues, e.g. in the scene of Miss Kenton's arrival and interview with Stevens the film-makers have added a remark as Miss Kenton replies to Stevens, "I know from my own experiences how houses set at sixes and sevens once the staff starts marrying each other." These additions are very characteristic of the period passing on the local flavour in the film.

The film begins in 1958, which makes a two-year shift in time in comparison with the novel that begins in 1956. As the year 1956 was a year of crisis for England and signifies the fall of the Empire, then the film might have been relocated to more peaceful period in history, when the turmoil has faded. There is also a shift in the year the conference was held – in the film it takes place in 1936 and in the novel in 1923. In the novel in 1936 meetings of a lesser scale were held in Darlington Hall, but 'the' conference

took place 13 years earlier. Reasons for the shift may be the wish of the film-makers to bring the conference closer to WW II, leaving only three years in between the events, which indicates that the congress was of great importance in history, maybe even one of the initiative factors as by 1935 it was clear that Hitler would become a threat to Europe.

As Branigan and Bordwell both pointed out that there is a difference between the story, plot and screen time, then, indeed, we see that the screen time in *The Remains of the Day* is 126 minutes, the story covers six days of Stevens' life, and during these six days Stevens covers randomly the events that took place during past thirty or forty years.

Due to the time limits of the film time, the film is less fragmented than the novel, where the shifts from present to the past take place more frequently. Due to the restriction to the screen time, the time spent on one time period is shorter, also much can be shown by *misé-en-scene* and with the help of montage in the film, e.g. when in the beginning of the film we see a scene from the past – Stevens opening the windows of Darlington Hall and some other butlers of visiting gentleman sitting in the hall – then when he walks into that hall these men simply dissolve from the screen during a split-second denoting a shift into the present (illustrating also the shift between external (dissolve) and internal (Stevens') focalisers, as suggested by Deleyto). Another important difference between the film and the novel is that the journey time has been diminished in the film in comparison with the novel. If in the novel approximately 83 pages of 258 (about 30%) deal with the present journey to the West Country, then only about 24 minutes out of 126 minutes (about 19%) of the total film duration deal with the journey in the film. The shift between the present and the past takes place in the film 8 times in the ratio of: 9 minutes present – 47 minutes past – 2 minutes present – 12 minutes past – 4 minutes present – 2 minutes past – 4 minutes present – 31 minutes past – and final 15 minutes of present. The film begins with an account of the present day events and also ends with depicting the present time as does

the book, but the difference lies in that the book ends on the pier at Weymouth and the film in Darlington Hall. Hence it appears that the film-makers have prolonged and altered the end of the story, while also making a neat closure by using a symmetrical beginning and ending. The novel's ending on the pier is more open.

The main shifts into the past in the film take place four times, first major shift happens simultaneously with Stevens' letter-reading when we see him on the screen leaving Darlington Hall with a car at the present time of narration, the reading proceeds and we see Miss Kenton picking up this letter that Stevens is reading out loud (also a present time action) and then there is a shift into the past and a scene in which Miss Kenton first arrives Darlington Hall during a foxhunt. At the same time when these past events are shown we hear also randomly Stevens' letter-reading in which he is recalling the past times as if leading the spectators into the past and finally the letter-reading stops and only the actions of past are presented. Next shift takes also place during a letter-reading and the voice-over narrator and a focaliser are presented simultaneously. The third shift is introduced by depicting Stevens sitting in the room in Moscombe where he stayed overnight and falling into deep thought. The final shift into the past does not have this kind of 'introduction' as the earlier shifts had and starts promptly with the scene from the past in which Stevens is ironing the newspaper. All shifts into the present time are accompanied with soundtrack music.

These data show that the overall *structural motif* of the journey does not come out as well in the film as it does in the novel, as it has considerably less screen time spent on it as is in the novel the proportion of pages. While in the novel things happen at a steady pace then in the film there is so little of the journey itself shown that the spectator, being captivated by the hustle and bustle of 'great' things going on in Darlington Hall, might even forget that it is a story about Stevens's journey to the West Country. In the film the

visual medium passes on events very vividly and the action moves very fast on the screen, unlike in the book, where the reading might seem a slow process, even more so when the reader does not read the novel in one sitting.

The *relationships of events and episodes*, also the shift in focalisers leave an impression, though subjective, that not only Stevens's story is told in the film, but rather Stevens's and Miss Kenton's, as Stevens's search for his own identity is overshadowed by the search and expectation for romance between them. The book, however, stresses less the romantic side and more the life story of Stevens where Miss Kenton is just another character, although a major one, through whom the readers learn additionally about Stevens. The key question of Stevens's life "What is a great butler" has received much less attention in the film than in the novel, where Stevens goes on for pages to meditate upon the issue. The film shows simply some relevant episodes and the illustrative 'tiger story' (in which even a tiger under a dinner table could not startle a 'great butler') told by Stevens's father, who is an embodiment of dignity for Stevens, especially in the film, as in the novel Stevens refers also to other persons as examples of dignity (Mr Marshall, Mr Lane). Yet, Stevens's lack of courage in expressing intimate emotions is brought out masterfully in the film by making him talk about work every time he should talk about his feelings, e.g. when his father dies, when Miss Kenton is crying in her room, for she has decided to marry someone else and even this piece of news does not 'shake' professional Stevens and force him into a fight for his love.

Another topic that illustrates a shift in emphasis is the theme of the Jews. Lord Darlington reads using voice-over from the book about the attitudes towards Jews and decides to dismiss the two Jewish girls employed in Darlington Hall. The weight of the situation is different in the novel and film. In the novel Lord Darlington stresses that although he has given the matter of Jews a great deal of thinking, the Jewish girls have to

be dismissed. Also, the maids have been working in Darlington Hall for over six years already; their arrival has not been presented in the novel. When they are dismissed Stevens promises to provide them with good references (Ishiguro 1999:158). The film shows that for Lord Darlington the importance of the matter is trivial, but for the girls it means a lot more: when Lord Darlington upon their arrival is practicing his language skills by talking to them in German, the girls reply to him in English, stressing how grateful they are, and not answering to Lord Darlington question about insignificant thing such as weather. In the film they apparently arrive as refugees from Germany, and are dismissed soon after and probably be sent back to Germany, a fact not mentioned in the novel. In the film dismissing the girls could mean a threat to their lives if sent back to Germany where they could be placed in a concentration camp and thus the issue delivers a more emphatic message. The novel tells only about the Jewish girls who have been serving Lord Darlington without problems for six years and are to be dismissed on the grounds that they are Jews, which is unfair, but presents no risk to their lives. The film, therefore, shows Lord Darlington in a darker light than depicted in the novel.

This increased stress might also be due to the fact that the screenwriter Ruth Praver Jhabvala is of a German Jewish extraction herself. An interesting fact is also that in the novel the girls are named Ruth and Sarah, which are Jewish names from the Bible, while in film they are named Elsa and Irma, as if to stress their origin as Germans, for biblical names were otherwise rather common also elsewhere, e.g. Miss Kenton's first name was also Sarah.

The time of narration can be analysed via the aspect of tense as presented and explained in the Introduction above. In *The Remains of the Day*, most of the novel is told in the past tense, while in the film the action takes place in front of the spectator's eye at the moment of watching. In the film in one scene we have an image of a door with a glass

hole that indicates the flashback and thus denotes a shift in time from the present into the past. The correspondence of Stevens and Miss Kenton is depicted in the film differently from the novel, where Stevens recalls and quotes the contents of Miss Kenton's letters. Those reminiscences of her letters are merged into the text throughout the novel and are presented in the past tense; therefore do not differ in tense forms. In the film there are only three readings of the letters from Miss Kenton: one at the beginning, one in the middle and reiteration of the first letter at the end of film; one letter from Stevens to Miss Kenton is also presented. The contents of the letters are not shown, but read out loud by the senders as a voice-over depicting at the same time another action on the screen. The person whose thoughts we hear has written the letter in a certain moment of time in the past. Thus, the presentation of the letters differs from the presentation of other actions in respect of the tense form. But still the question remains whether the act of reading by the sender that actually denotes the act of writing that took place in the past, is at the same time the present reading of the person who has received the letter. Thus the reading of the receiver denotes a present-tense action but the writing depicted as a voice-over action in the past (Dagle 1980: 54), while we hear the voice-over letter-reading, we see the focaliser's point of view.

We should also look at the beginning and end of the narrative as suggested by Torop (p. 5 above). As already mentioned the film begins with a scene presenting approach to Darlington Hall and ends with presenting departure from Darlington Hall. The novel does not have corresponding scenes. While the novel ends on the pier at Weymouth the film continues from that point with Stevens's return to Darlington Hall and is followed by the scene where a pigeon falls through the chimney to the fireplace in one of the rooms of Darlington Hall and is released by Mr Lewis. The pigeon in the film might stress the freedom that Stevens gains by sitting on the pier at Weymouth in the novel. The final scene

of the film shows that Stevens together with Mr Lewis release the bird from the room, in the novel a parallel might be that Stevens decides sitting on a bench in the pier to start afresh in his service of Mr Farraday and leave behind his past errors and wrong judgements. The change in Stevens in film is detected also in his saying to Mr Lewis who releases the pigeon “Well done”, without even adding ‘sir’. Now it is Stevens who assesses his employer – something he would never have done with Lord Darlington.

These examples illustrate the different presentation of literary and cinematic narratives, and also show that both media need to be treated individually due to the differences in the two signifying systems.

2.5 Character functions in *The Remains of the Day*

Transferable elements from novel into film include “the chief character functions of the original” (McFarlane 1996: 25). Bordwell (1986: 86) states that a character is not a real person, but a set of character traits. Some characters may have a whole collection of traits, some just a few. Bordwell further suggests that these character traits are attached to the character so that the character could function causally in the narrative, as in his view the character is usually an agent of cause and effect in a narrative. According to Bordwell these traits can include attitudes, appearance, skills and other qualities that are needed for a specific film.

Stam (2005: 206), in another context, describes the differences of character functions on the level of perception in a film and a novel, drawing attention to the fact that “in the novel we as readers imagined [the character’s] voice and gestures and facial expressions on the inner stages of our mind, now they are realized for us by a performer, filtered through [the actor’s] acting style, with its grimaces, mannerisms, twitches, frowns.” Thus the characters in the film are always presented at least subtly differently

compared to the source novel, in case of which the reader “has to take an active role, in the film this work is partly performed for us, pre-digested /.../” (Stam 2005: 206).

When we analyse the character functions in *The Remains of the Day* and observe to what extent these are retained in the film, then in case of Stevens his main characteristics are preserved. His professionalism is acted out to the utmost, but as to his ‘Englishness’ the film version offers a very limited view of Stevens’s identifying himself with England on his trip as described in the novel. Stevens’s functions showing his relationship with and attitude toward Miss Kenton are also retained in the film. Hopkins, starring as Stevens, could be considered a perfect actor for the part as he bears the role, depicting the conservative butler Stevens and his high morals, out to the perfection.

Miss Kenton, who is the second major character after Stevens has more weight as a character in the film than in the novel. The extension of her role is, perhaps, justified to some extent by the fact that in the novel Stevens tells the readers about her in the past, and we perceive Miss Kenton via the first-person narrator’s account, which leaves the somewhat distant impression that she is a person in *his* life and not so much an independent character. But still, Miss Kenton plays a major role in Stevens’s life and his realisation of his self. In the film Miss Kenton appears as the person who is constantly challenging Stevens’s values and makes him reevaluate his life and the way he has lived so far, but Stevens realises it only too late. For instance, the scene in which Stevens’s father is waiting at a table and a large drop falls from his nose into the soup bowl is witnessed by Stevens in the film, but in the novel it is Miss Kenton who mentions the incident to Stevens during argument. In the novel Stevens comes to realise the errors in his life himself sitting on the pier with a stranger at the end of the novel, whereas the same scene in the film highlights the importance and influence of Miss Kenton in Stevens’s life instead of becoming a stranger.

Stevens is so sure that his function in life is only to serve his master and perform his task to the utmost. This function, a crucial one to the narrative, runs powerfully through both literary and cinematic texts, emphasised at the end of the film by Miss Kenton. She re-establishes the novel's theme of Stevens's professionalism, asking him what he expects most and Stevens replies, "I always have thought about work and it will always continue to be so." Thus the film has brought out Miss Kenton's role more powerfully than the novel. However, when Miss Kenton appears in most scenes in the film, her role has different weight, for the film-makers have attributed Stevens the tasks of Miss Kenton in the book. Thus, Miss Kenton's activities at work have been cut and are of lesser importance in the film than in the novel stressing the importance of the romantic side, thus the character's function and stress has been moved from professional to romantic. For instance, when the maid Lisa runs away with a man servant: in the novel Miss Kenton is upset and repeats how foolish Lisa was and that she is to be let down soon afterwards, but in the film it seems as though Miss Kenton sympathises with Lisa and is even jealous that the girl has the courage to run away with her lover with no money or job for the future, stressing the importance of romance in the film. The reason, clearly, lies in the fact that the theme of romance will attract more audience to the cinema as "tragic love stories often hit with the hardest impact" (Berardinelly 1993).

Ismail Merchant, the producer of the film, has said that the scene in which Miss Kenton finds Stevens reading a 'sentimental love story' in his pantry "says in the most minimal way so much about the characters and feelings." (Staahl 2001b). This is indeed the most powerful scene in the film as Miss Kenton and Stevens reveal, though still covertly, their emotions and feelings and these are shown in their voices and facial expressions. That is one major difference of the written text and film, for in the case of the latter no words may be presented or spoken, and the spectator is simply left with the

process of watching and perceiving that does the job. Chatman (1990: 162) has stated that “though the visual imagination may be less stimulated by a film than by a novel, the conceptual imagination may be very much stimulated by, say, a face filled with emotion that goes unexplained by a dialogue or diegetic context.” Emma Thompson’s has remarked about Miss Kenton’s and Stevens’ relationship, “there’re so many things going on, but they’re never going on in the words. Camera will tell the audience what you are thinking and show what you are feeling; at the same time they can enjoy that you are not saying it.” (Buck et al 1993).

In case of a novel the reader can never experience the advantage of a visual movement. In the novel this episode is described with the lines “then she was standing before me, and suddenly the atmosphere underwent a peculiar change – almost as though the two of us had been suddenly thrust on to some other plane of being altogether. I am afraid it is not easy to describe clearly what I mean here.” (Ishiguro 1999: 175). Stevens clearly is lost for words here, he finds it hard to describe his feeling and the situation in general, but in the film the scene depicts the depths of the situation perfectly. It is the mood and the atmosphere that the film-makers have to transfer here, but the book does not give much in words, so it is up to the film-makers to depict the scene and one of the producers John Calley believes that it is the genius of the actors that sometimes makes things work and has even admitted that “you have to pray for something like that, you cannot make it happen” (Buck et al 1993).

The new owner of Darlington Hall, Mr Farraday, has in the film been substituted by the congressman Lewis in the novel, “a former American senator who cares not a fig for decorum” (Howe 1993 para 4), but does feel compassion for Stevens talking him into undertaking a vacation. Mr Lewis in the film may buy Darlington Hall out of nostalgia – it is, after all, a house where history was made and Lewis has been a witness to this – and for

the sake of saving and ‘maintaining’ the great butler whose excellence of service was known to him from earlier times. In the novel there is no connection between Mr Farraday and Lord Darlington, Mr Farraday has not visited Darlington Hall before buying it, but in the film Mr Lewis has met Lord Darlington in person and knows a lot about the man. The novel depicts Mr Farraday as a quite remote and unimportant figure. The American of the film is attributed the knowledge of the congressman Lewis of the novel and therefore has gained greater influence and significance in the eyes of the spectators. While in the novel Mr Farraday is ‘the American’ who bought the ‘whole package’ – “a genuine grand old English house” with “a genuine old-fashioned English butler” (Ishiguro 1999: 131) to show off, then in the film Mr Lewis is shown in a more positive light – he is the one who tries to ‘bring sense’ to Lord Darlington and save the world from WW II. A possible reason for such presentation (ignoring the irony in the novel) of an American character may be the fact that the film is orientated to the US audience, where the film market is much wider than in Europe, which definitely affects the sales figures.

However, there is a scene in the film in which Stevens drives off to West Country with a Daimler instead of a Ford in the novel and Mr Lewis is seeing him off and taking a picture of a genuine English butler wheeling a genuine English car. Moreover, prior to the trip Mr Lewis says, “You and that Daimler belong together, Stevens. You were made for each other” (Ivory 1993). Thus Mr Lewis has also bought a genuine old English automobile to complete ‘the whole package’ and finds the scene so ‘genuine’ that he simply must take a picture. One possible hypothesis here could be that the screenwriter has still, though quite covertly, passed on the novel’s ridicule of the American character.

The role of Mr Graham, a valet of some visitor to Darlington Hall, with whom Stevens has long conversations about their profession and dignity in the novel, has been merged into the role of Mr Benn who visits Darlington Hall and Stevens with whom he has

a conversation in Stevens's pantry in the film. In the novel, Mr Benn never visits Darlington Hall nor meets Stevens. His on-screen presentation brings the character of Mr Benn closer to the spectators, as after all he is the one who 'steals' Miss Kenton away from Stevens and therefore has greater importance in the film, for it stresses again the theme of romance.

There are several other condensations in the film, e.g. the scene in which Mr Stevens senior is telling the tiger story to other servants is in the novel originally told to the servants of the quests of the household Stevens's father had been working in earlier, but in the film he is telling the story to the servants of Darlington Hall. This replacement is probably due to the fact that the film is a condensed version of the novel there is no point in introducing new characters into film who would have such a minor part as shown only once. Also, the present solution is less costly and time-consuming as these criteria are quite essential to the film making process.

If the reader can imagine Stevens in the novel and make his(her) own mental picture of him, then in the film we already have an actor in the role of Stevens and therefore it is harder for the spectator to identify with the protagonist or any other character, which in turn might distance the spectator from the character, as Stam (2005: 206) comments "the actor in the film, does not necessarily look like us, so we have more trouble in seeing him as a man like ourselves, or the man we imagined." Moreover, as Stevens is not physically described in the novel, it is the film-makers' own free choice to depict Stevens and his looks in the film. On the other hand, it makes the film-makers' choice even more difficult, as he has to make the decision about Stevens' character, his nature and behaviour.

2.6 Narrative codes in *The Remains of the Day*

When we are to consider the faithfulness of adaptation we can proceed from the various views stated on pages 7-9 above. According to Andrew the key elements of the fidelity of adaptation include fidelity to the *tone*, *values*, *imagery* and *rhythm*. The *tone* of the novel, including the *values* characters hold stressing ‘dignity, professionalism, suppressed feelings’ is preserved also in the film. The *imagery* of the film is different, considering the fact that in the film the spectator sees the images and in the novel the reader can only create the image in his or her own mind. But the overall impression of the imagery of the film compared to that of the novel could be claimed to be equivalent to the style of the novel. The style is passed on in the film via codes discussed in the following passages that can be considered equivalent to the codes in the novel. As to the *rhythm* the pattern of the narrative in the film is somewhat different from that of the novel due to more frequent shifts in time in the novel and the novel progressing at a steadier pace than the film, which is due to the condensation of the latter.

Under fidelity to the letter, Andrew (2000: 31-32) has discussed also *geographical*, *sociological* and *cultural* information, which is limited in the film, e.g. when in Chapter II in the novel Stevens admires and praises the English landscape, the scene does not occur in the film at all. The theme of the Hayes Society that is discussed in the novel for several pages, while the issue comes up several times during the narration, has been left out of the film.

The language codes “involving response to particular accents or tones of voice” (McFarlane 1996: 29) and their meaning in *The Remains of the Day* are well formulated in the accent of the characters’ speech and the tone with which they speak. Stevens’s speech, like that of his father, reveals his temperament and the attitude of ‘the stiff upper lip’ most clearly. As Norberg (2003: 30) has observed, “A peculiar aspect about Stevens’s speech is

its constancy, i.e. his language remains unchanged regardless of his addressee or the situation he is in; even his private meditations are examples of elaborate language use and careful construction.” If in the novel Stevens thinks of Miss Kenton, who is actually been married for 20 years prior to his telling the story, still as Miss Kenton and not Mrs Benn, then such wishful thinking does not come out from the film, for the scenes involving Miss Kenton are presented in flashbacks depicting the time when Miss Kenton was not yet married. There is a scene at the beginning of the film where Mr Lewis and Stevens have a conversation while Mr Lewis is having a breakfast that shows how much Mr Lewis is enjoying having a ‘genuine’ English butler around. To Stevens’ words “the world used to come to this house, in a manner of speaking, if a may say so, Sir,” Mr Lewis replies, “You may say so” (Ivory 1993), ridiculing Stevens’s manner of speaking. This is a vivid example making explicit the exaggerated tone and accent of Stevens’s language presented throughout the novel that has fewer opportunities for exposure in the film.

An aspect in which the film version of *The Remains of the Day* remains faithful to its literary precursor is that many dialogues in the film are worded exactly in the same way as in the novel with only some lines left out so as to shorten the episodes. This happens, e.g. the scene in which Miss Kenton brings flowers to Stevens and they have a little argument over addressing his father by his first name, or Mr Stevens senior telling the tiger story to other servants. After watching the film one might hear the tone and intonation of the actors’ voices echo in one’s head when reading the passages in the novel over again. Thus the film seems a sequence of highlights from the novel that in the film-makers’ point of view build up the very essence of the novel’s story. Language codes in the film follow most closely the pattern of the novel’s language.

The psychological or mythic pattern illustrated in the book by the ‘stiff upper lip’ that is commonly believed to characterise the English temperament is also transferred to

the film – on the evening of his father’s death or Miss Kenton’s news of her marriage, Stevens remains calm, self-controlled and impassive to the news and carries on his duties.

As pointed out in Introduction above, according to McFarlane, different signifying systems of film and novel require adaptation proper. The film takes Stevens’s account of the setting as a departure in depicting it in aural-visual signs, but Stevens has given very restricted description of the surrounding space in the novel, therefore the film-makers have had to decide much as concerns depicting the surroundings. The casting and depicting the characters has been even more challenging for the film-makers have been, as no description of people is given by Stevens in the novel, but if in the novel the reader creates the image of characters’ appearance in his or her own mind, then the film has to *physically* have characters for presentation to the audience, and the same applies to the space.

The *visual codes* that include interpretational aspects are mostly the film-maker’s view of verbal codes as, according to Monaco (p. 6 above), film does not suggest, it states. Thus if the novel lacks the detailed description of things or events, it is the film-makers’ choice and a matter of free interpretation to decide how to show, for instance, the misplaced Chinaman that causes so much trouble in the story. Or how to pass on the preparation works prior to the conference or the flowers Miss Kenton brings to Stevens’ pantry or how to show ‘crying of Miss Kenton’ – is it sobbing, crying loud or into the pillow, the look on her face – the film-makers have to decide how to show verbal aspects of the novel “all of which is /.../ in the spirit of the novel but not literally in the written text” (Stam 2005: 56).

When Stevens starts telling the readers about the incidents of the past through a series of flashbacks then in the film, to signify the phenomenon of recalling, events of the past are brought to the spectators by presenting and introducing the scenes through the small glass window in the door in the servant quarters denoting the flashbacks.

Costumes and clothes that the characters wear in the film can be also very informative as concerns creating the right mood, environment and especially time and location. It is also the film-makers' challenge to depict the same character in a film as maybe 30-40 years older. To make such an effect the actor can, for instance, wear darker shades and colours that would suit his(her) age; the same applies to the hairstyle. The costume designer of *The Remains of the Day* Jenny Beavan believes that the story can be told through clothes, and the actor Christopher Reeve (Mr Lewis) has stated that "having the right clothes, the right place with the right props does 90% of the work." (Stahl 2001b); whereas in the novel the writer does not usually bother with costumes in such depths.

The scene in which Lord Darlington's guests gather for the foxhunt at Darlington Hall has brought out the grandeur of the moment and of Lord Darlington – down the green hill gallop the finest horses and in front of the grand old estate wine is served to the guests. This scene passes on the image of the novel's 'genuine grand old English house' with its traditions put into visual codes. In the novel prior to Miss Kenton's and Mr Benn's meeting Miss Kenton says to Stevens that she will look into the matter of Mr Cardinal's room before leaving and Stevens asks, "You are going out this evening, Miss Kenton?" and Miss Kenton replies, "I am indeed, Mr Stevens." (Ishiguro 1999: 225). The scene is very laconic in the novel and does not say anything about the circumstances. Chatman (1990: 40) explains that in a film certain details should be added describing events or actions, e.g. in the film Miss Kenton goes to meet Mr Benn at a tavern riding a bicycle to get there, thus new information has been inevitably added. In the novel Mr Stevens senior's arrival is described: "he was now in his seventies and much ravaged in arthritis and other ailments" (Ishiguro 1999: 54). In the corresponding film scene Stevens is carrying his father's suitcase, Mr Stevens senior goes up the stairs taking very tired steps and we hear him

gasping for air, thus it is understood that Mr Stevens senior is probably old and sick. Here, verbal information has been forwarded by visual and aural means in the film.

The professionalism that Stevens so often talks about in the film is presented visually in the scene where, during the foxhunting, Stevens is standing next to a gentleman on the horse, pouring him a drink, holding his arm stretched out and waiting for the gentleman to take it. However, the gentleman either does not see the drink or does not care about Stevens offering it, yet Stevens is waiting humbly nevertheless, as a ‘true professional’, while the irony of his blind belief in such professionalism is obvious for the spectator. On the other hand, this scene demonstrates the essence of the butler – staying invisible, or as former steward of the Queen’s household Cyril Dickman, an adviser on butlering in the film making process, has been quoted by Hopkins “when the butler is in the room, the room must feel even more empty” (Staahl 2001b).

Non-linguistic sound codes, which are nondiegetic elements of the film narrative, are in *The Remains of the Day* represented, for instance, by the soundtrack music that is heard simultaneously with the voice-over narrator, and a focaliser, adding emotion to the visual moving images that are presented at the same time as the ‘narrating’ of the letters. Music or other aural codes suggest the emotional effects, i.e., tell the spectators what feeling should be dominant. Usually the sound supports what we perceive from the visual action. Watching the same frames without the sound has a different effect and does not bring out the depth of the frame or even the intentions of the film-maker. The sound can thus be an indicator of the extradiegetic narration, when the characters themselves do not hear the sound or music and therefore the soundtrack is addressed to the narratee as is the case with the letter reading scenes. We would not grasp the condition of Stevens father’s health and his age fully if we did not *hear* him gasping for air climbing up the staircase. This latter case illustrates also diegetic *sound code* in which case the characters in the film

may also hear the sounds, as in the scene in which Stevens listens to the gramophone in his pantry together with Mr Benn. We can hear the German music that Stevens seems to enjoy, which allows us to conclude that he supports the views of Lord Darlington towards Germany; moreover, Lord Darlington has as a guest also a German singer who performs live in the conference. There are also scenes in which the nondiegetic and diegetic sound codes are used simultaneously, e.g. in the foxhunting scene we hear the soundtrack music and the sound of the horse hoofs at the same time. Most frames with an omniscient extradiegetic focaliser who is observing and the scenes depicting present time events are accompanied by the nondiegetic music illustrative of the scene and situation.

Cultural codes, depicting a certain era, as Roland Barthes has said "...will emigrate to other texts, there is no lack of hosts" (quoted in Ray 2000: 39). In order to film the era from 1920 to 60 the film-makers of *The Remains of the Day* had to look for special manors over all England and in Ireland to find the suitable ones that would be typical of the era (Stahl 2001b). The clothes, the manners of behaviour parallel the novel's presentation of a character through the use of objects, "whose meaning has become coded through repeated similar uses in other movies, popular fiction, advertising..." (Ray 2000: 40). The scene where Stevens is seated in his pantry and lecturing Miss Kenton about addressing his father, Stevens is smoking his cigar and drinking and smiling quite arrogantly. Such objects – cigar, whisky glass, and arrogant smile – show that he is a self-contented man triumphant in the given situation, feeling good while drinking his whiskey. A cigar or a whiskey glass would still mean the same in another movie or in fiction.

Clothes, architecture, design of the physical surroundings contribute much to the perception of the focaliser as well as the style of the novel and film. Stevens's spotless butler's suit, his tone of voice and his judgements in life portray well his dignity. Miss Kenton's revolt to Stevens' behaviour mark her self-determination, but her silence about

her feelings for Stevens show her “exemplary professionalism” (Ishiguro 1999: 10). When Miss Kenton first arrives to Darlington Hall, the humble look on her face shows her modesty. She is a woman of style and elegance, characteristics deduced from the clothes she wears - a hat and a coat, the style of which indicate her taste, although she does not belong to the middle class.

Linearity versus spatiality in adaptation from one medium into another could be illustrated in the film in the scene where the pier lights are switched on and the crowd is responding to it. This can be shown in one frame, by one instant, but in the novel it takes several lines and many words to recount this event. When in the novel we read about the light being lit and then about Stevens sitting on the bench then in the film spectator might never notice the lights, while another notices only the figure of Stevens: the spectator who is shown many things simultaneously might grasp different things in different order or miss some at all, especially those that are not shown by close-up.

Thoughts and feelings in *The Remains of the Day* that do not come to us through gestures and mimics, as typical of film, are the readings of letters, where Miss Kenton and Stevens speak their thoughts out loud. In the novel it is Stevens who is contemplating upon the letters of Miss Kenton and we are not shown the letters, but just some lines that are not even in a letter format. Therefore the visual effects in the novel are limited to the minimum, mainly suggesting a diary entries that the novel is presented by. Not everything Stevens thinks about in the novel, his internal monologues, is presented in the film, but adapted into conversations. The first dialogue in the film is compiled from several dialogues from Chapter I in the novel and this one dialogue covers the whole first chapter of the novel, where there are several reminiscences from the past in between the dialogues. The topic in the *dialogue* between Stevens and Miss Kenton in the film at Miss Kenton’s

arrival is told by Stevens as a *narration* in the novel and there he is not speaking directly to Miss Kenton.

In *The Remains of the Day* the final lines of the novel where Stevens decides to move on and acquire the ways of the new era and learn bantering is transferred to the film using film metaphor of turning on the lights on the pier at Weymouth (denoting the start of the best part of the day – evening) or of pigeon releasing scene in the end of the film (scene described also earlier). These examples support also Bluestone (2003: 27) who finds that “By selecting and combining, by comparing and contrasting, by linking disparate spatial entities, photographed images of ‘the deeply embedded detail’ allow the film-maker, through editing, to achieve a uniquely cinematic equivalent of the literary trope.”

Rather than being just an ‘escapist’ film, expressing a nostalgic yearning of the past that most films based on 18th and 19th-century novels usually are (Cartmell 2002: 26), *The Remains of the Day* brings not only the ‘English Country House’, but also the political history of the 20th century to screen. But the adaptation presents the history shifting the stress from the profound issues of Europe’s historical past to depicting America as a saviour and ‘a smarter older brother’. The reasons for this, as in case of stressing the romance, could be commercialisation and orientation to the American film market.

The features examined in this chapter show the difference between the two media – literary and cinematic; and the alterations made in the film indicate that *The Remains of the Day* is not an exact film version of a novel nor a radical adaptation. It can hardly afford to be the latter, as it is not a marginal, but a mainstream film, orientated to wide audiences and general film market. According to Wagner’s typology of adaptation *The Remains of the Day* may be classified as a commentary, as the original is altered to some extent. To follow Andrew’s typology *The Remains of the Day* can be classified as an intersection, for there are remarkable changes in film compared to the original as discussed above. In case

of Torop's typology, *The Remains of the Day* could be classified as an adaptation proper, for the strong similarity in content and information of the original and the use of voice-over as means of informing the spectator.

In the film the stress has shifted from the narrator-centred self-reflective theme to a romance between two main characters, although, as discussed above, the film at the same time bears a high similarity to the original text. Ishiguro has said in a short feature film that the scriptwriter Jhabvala has decided to take so much of the original book into the film and that she "captures that very subtle comic term very well" (Buck et al 1993). Ishiguro himself has commented that while watching the film version of his novel there are moments when he is "leaving the world of the book and entering the world of the movie" (Staahl 2001b). Linden (1977: 169-170) has remarked, "A successful film adaptation of a novel should not *be* the book. Nor should it be a substitute for the book. If it is truly successful, it should be a work of art in its own right, which excites the reader to go reexperience that world in another medium: the novel." Thus different media affect our perception differently and even the author of the source novel regards the adaptation as entirely different art form.

CONCLUSION

Kazuo Ishiguro's novel *The Remains of the Day* and Merchant-Ivory's adaptation of the novel are both masterpieces in their own right. Much of the novel's uniqueness owes to the use of a first person narrator with his idiosyncratic voice through which we perceive the novel's description of characters, space, time and history. The main difference as regards the narrators in both media is that when the novel has an intradiegetic first person narration then, in turning Ishiguro's novel into film, James Ivory has introduced both intradiegetic as well as extradiegetic focalisation, and also employed different intradiegetic focalisers, such as Miss Kenton in addition to Stevens. The overall effect resembles omniscience, which is typical of the film medium. Film presentation of the activity of the mind of a first person narrator would otherwise require a voice-over technique; in Ivory's adaptation the narrator is represented mostly through visual text that has often required shifts in focalisation. In the novel the narratee is addressed directly in the second person, whereas in the film the narratee's presence is indicated more covertly, employing meta-level techniques.

The analysis shows that the sequence of events is changed in the film as compared to the novel. While the novel is more fragmentary, the film offers a more linear and systematic presentation of the events, favouring a logical causal-temporal narrative sequence. The proportion of the journey time in the novel has been reduced in the film narrative, which indicates that the importance of the trip is lessened in the film: the structural motif of the journey is less strongly felt, while the film's stress is on the romance between Miss Kenton and Stevens.

The difference between the two media has resulted in the dialogues being condensed and diminished. Miss Kenton's and Mr Lewis's roles are expanded, but a number of characters as well as scenes are cut. The emphases on situations and incidents in the film have been altered and re-orientated. As a result, the film touches upon the issues of

Germany and Nazism more intensely and overtly than the novel. The irony of ridiculing the American character in the novel has been softened in the film or shown more covertly. The film presents several changes in the time of action – Stevens's trip has been transferred to a later years, as has the conference in Darlington Hall, some episodes are added, but the changes have not come to play down the importance of the social and moral issues rendered in the novel. Ishiguro's rich dialogue is transposed to the screen by Ruth Praver Jhabvala with ease and relative precision, as is his humour.

As concerns the structure of literary and cinematic works, the novel and the film have used different extra- and intradiegetic narrative codes. If the abundant number of flashbacks in the novel compared to that of the film is reduced, then the dominance of the past is still strongly felt throughout the film, partly with the help of the visual codes in the film. Visual codes also help to present physical characters and the space to the audience. The film-makers have had to provide their own interpretation of the surrounding space and people as the narrator Stevens has not shared such information or descriptions in the novel. The verbal information of the novel has been presented in the film by visual and aural means. Sound codes contribute considerably to the emotional effects in the film as do cultural codes regarding the understanding of the era, its atmosphere and conditions. Stevens's idiosyncratic voice, his use of language and his speech manners characteristic of a dignified butler are preserved in the film through the dialogue or rendered through visual codes, e.g. his impeccable clothes.

Another important observation is that the novel is more open-ended than the film that provides the spectator with a final scene in Darlington Hall, while the novel ends metaphorically on the pier in West Country.

It can be concluded that, proceeding from the typologies offered by Torop, Wagner and Andrew, the film adaptation of *The Remains of the Day* can be classified as an

adaptation proper, commentary and intersection, respectively.

The changes in the film that are due to the differences in media and also mainstream orientation and American film market do not suggest the film's failure, however; we should rather regard adaptation as an individual and unique work of art in its own world – an opinion shared also by the author of the source novel Kazuo Ishiguro himself.

REFERENCES

Primary sources:

Ishiguro, Kazuo. 1999. *The Remains of the Day*. London: Faber and Faber.

Ivory, James (Director). 1993. *The Remains of the Day* [Motion Picture]. United States: Columbia Pictures Industries.

Secondary sources:

Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. 2007. Awards Database. Available at <http://www.oscars.org/awardsdatabase/>, accessed May 20, 2007.

Andrew, Dudley. 2000. Adaptation. In James Naremore (ed). *Film Adaptation*, 28-37. New York: Rutgers University Press.

Bal, Mieke. 1999. Focalization. In Susana Onega and José Angel Garcia Landa (eds). *Narratology: An Introduction*, 115-128. London and New York: Longman.

Bazin, Andre. 2000. Adaptation, or the Cinema as Digest. In James Naremore (ed). *Film Adaptation*, 19-27. New York: Rutgers University Press.

Berardinelli, James. 1993. The Remains of the Day. Available at <http://movie-reviews.colossus.net/movies/r/remains.html>, accessed March 03, 2004.

Bluestone, George. 2003. *Novels into Film*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bordwell, David. 1986. *Film Art: An Introduction*. New York: Knopf.

Booth, Wayne C. 1999. Types of Narration. In Susana Onega and José Angel Garcia Landa (eds). *Narratology: An Introduction*, 145-154. London and New York: Longman.

Bradbury, Malcolm. 1994 (1993). *The Modern British Novel*. London: Penguin.

Branigan, Edward. 1999. Story World and Screen. In Susana Onega and José Angel Garcia Landa (eds). *Narratology: An Introduction*, 234-248. London and New York: Longman.

Brooks, Peter. 1999. Reading for the Plot. In Susana Onega and José Angel Garcia Landa (eds). *Narratology: An Introduction*, 251-261. London and New York: Longman.

Buck, Craig; Buck, Karina Friend and Murray, Sandra. 1993. *Love and Loyalty: The Making of The Remains of The Day* [Feature Film]. United States: Eye To Eye Production.

Cartmell, Deborah. 2002. Introduction. In Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan (eds). *Adaptations from Text to Screen, Screen to Text*, 23-28. New York: Routledge.

Chatman, Seymour. 1990. *Coming to Terms. The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Connor, Steven. 1996. *The English Novel in History. 1950-1995*. London and New York: Routledge.

Dagle, Joan. 1980. Narrative Discourse in Film and Fiction: The Question of the Present Tense. In Syndy M. Conger and Janice R. Welsch (eds). *Narrative Strategies. Original Essays in Film and Prose Fiction*, 47-59. United States: Western Illinois University Press.

Deleyto, Celestino. 1999. Focalisation in Film Narrative. In Susana Onega and José Angel Garcia Landa (eds). *Narratology: An Introduction*, 217-233. London and New York: Longman.

Forceville, Charles. 1992. Kazuo Ishiguro. In Hans Bertens (ed). *Post-war Literatures in English*, 1-9. Wolter-Noordhoff: Groningen.

Graver, Lawrence. 1989. What the butler saw. *The New York Times*, October 8. Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/books/98/12/06/specials/ishiguro-remains.html>, accessed May 27, 2007.

Grenier, Richard. 1994. Servants, masters, and the art of bantering. *The National Interest*, March 22. Available at <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-15353285.html>, accessed May 28, 2007.

Hedges, Inez. 1980. Form and Meaning in the French Film, II: Narration and Point of View. *The French Review*, 54: 2, 288-298. Available at <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0016-111X%28198012%2954%3A2%3C288%3AFAMITF%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A>, accessed June 13, 2007.

Henderson, Greig. 1995/96. Fictions of Discourse: Reading Narrative Theory. *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 65: 1. Available at <http://www.utpjournals.com/product/utq/651/discourse4.html>, accessed November 10, 2003.

Howe, Desson. 1993. The Remains of the Day (PG). *The Washington Post*, November 05. Available at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/style/longterm/movies/videos/theremainsofthedaypghowe_a0b009.htm, accessed March 01, 2004.

Janik, Ivan Del. 1995. No End of History: Evidence from the Contemporary English Novel. *Twentieth Century Literature*. 41: 1 ,160-189.

King, Nina. 1989. The ever subtler butler. *The Washington Post*, October 2. Available at <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-1214967.html>, accessed May 27, 2007.

Lang, Anthony F. Jr., and Lang, James M. 1998. Between theory and history: The Remains of the Day in the International Relations classroom. *Political Science & Politics*. Available at http://www.findarticles.com/cf_0/m2139/n2_v31/20852320/p1/article.jhtml, accessed March 01, 2004.

- Lewis, Barry.** 2000. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Linden, George W.** 1977. The Storied World. In John Harrington (ed). *Film and/as Literature*, 156-170. Englewood Cliffs (New Jersey): Prentice-Hall.
- Liukkonen, Petri.** 2003. Ruth Praver Jhabvala (1927-). Available at <http://www.kirjasto.sci.fi/jhab.htm>, accessed May 12, 2007.
- McFarlane, Brian.** 1996. *Novel to Film. An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mohr, Ian.** 2003. Merchant Ivory seeking new “Heights” of success. *The Hollywood Reporter*, October 31. Available at http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/thr/search/search_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=2015238, accessed May 10, 2004.
- Monaco, James.** 2000. *How to Read a Film. The World of Movies, Media, and Multimedia. Language, History, Theory*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Naremore, James.** 2000. Introduction: Film and the Reign of Adaptation. *Film Adaptation*, 1-16. New York: Rutgers University Press.
- Norberg, Kaia.** 2003. Some Issues of Translation of Prose Narrative in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Remains of the Day* [Unpublished graduation thesis]. Tartu: Department of English, University of Tartu.
- Prince, Gerald.** 1999. Introduction to the Study of Narratee. In Susana Onega and José Angel Garcia Landa (eds). *Narratology: An Introduction*, 190-202. London and New York: Longman.
- Rao, Maya.** 1996. The Construction of Cyclical Time in *Waterland*. Available at <http://www.victorianweb.org/post/uk/gswift/wl/swift3.html>, accessed November 10, 2003.

- Ray, Robert, B.** 2000. The Field of "Literature and Film." In James Naremore (ed). *Film Adaptation*, 38-53. New York: Rutgers University Press.
- Reynolds, Peter** (ed). 1993. Introduction. *Novel Images. Literature in Performance*, 1-16. London: Routledge.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith.** 2000. *Narrative Fiction. Contemporary Poetics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Staahl, Meg** (Producer and Editor). 2001a. *Blind Loyalty, Hollow Honor: England's Fatal Flaw*. [Feature Film]. United States: Columbia Tristar Home Entertainment.
- Staahl, Meg** (Producer and Editor). 2001b. *The Filmmakers' Journey*. [Documentary]. United States: Columbia Tristar Home Entertainment.
- Stam, Robert.** 2000. Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation. In James Naremore. *Film Adaptation*. New York: Rutgers University Press.
- Stam, Robert.** 2005. *Literature Through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaptation*. Malden; Oxford; Carlton: Blackwell.
- Steinmetz, Horst.** 1995. History in Fiction – History as Fiction. In Theo D'Haen and Hans Bertens (eds). *Postmodern Studies 11: Minor Genres and Narrative Turns in Postmodernism*, 81-103. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- The Meyer Literature Site.** N.d. Narrator. *Glossary of Literary Terms*. Available at http://www.bedfordstmartins.com/literature/bedlit/glossary_1.htm, accessed May 20, 2007.
- Torop, Peeter.** 1999. *Kultuurimärgid*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Trueheart, Charles.** 1989. England's Top Fiction Prize to Ishiguro: *Remains of the Day* Wins Booker Award. *The Washington Post*, October 27. Available at <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-1219667.html>, accessed May 27, 2007.

Walsh, Richard. 2001. Fabula and Fictionality in Narrative Theory. *Style*, winter. Available at http://www.findarticles.com/cf_0/m2342/4_35/97114240/p1/article.jhtml, accessed March 11, 2004.

Whelehan, Imelda. 2002. Adaptations. The contemporary dilemmas. In Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan (eds). *Adaptations from Text to Screen, Screen to Text*, 1-19. New York: Routledge.

Wikipedia contributors. 2007. Ismail Merchant. *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ismail_Merchant&oldid=133922396, accessed May 27, 2007.

Wilson, George M. 1992. *Narration in Light: Studies in Cinematic Point of View*. Baltimore; London: John Hopkins University Press.

Wong, Cynthia. 2000. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. Devon: Northcote House Publishers.

Worth, Sol. 1981. Seeing Metaphor as Caricature. In Larry Gross (ed). *Studying Visual Communication*, 148-161. Available at <http://astro.temple.edu/~ruby/wava/worth/svscom.html#tblc>, accessed December 13, 2005.
<http://www.anglistik.uni-freiburg.de/intranet/englishbasics/Home01.htm>

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
INGLISE FILOLOOGIA ÕPPETOOL

Lilian Jõesaar

**Adapting Prose Narrative into Film Narrative: The Case of *The Remains of the Day*
Proosajutustuse filmijutustuseks adapteerimisest *The Remains of the Day* näitel.**

Magistritöö

2007

Lehekülgede arv: 92

Annotatsioon:

Käesoleva lõputöö eesmärgiks on kõrvutada ja analüüsida Kazuo Ishiguro romaani *The Remains of The Day* (*Päeva riismed*, 1989), ning James Ivory, Ismail Merchanti ja Ruth Praver Jhabvala ekraniseeringut *The Remains of the Day* (*Elu kuldsed hetked*, 1993) Romaani ja filmi analüüs, mis eeldab teadmisi nii filmi- kui ka kirjandusteooriast, annab ülevaate ekraniseeringust kui sama jutustuse vahendamisest teistsuguses esitusvormis. Töös on rakendatud mitmete teoreetikute vaateid kirjandus- ja filmiteooriale ja -kriitikale.

Teoreetikud (nt James Monaco, Peeter Torop) on leidnud, et nii proosa- kui filmijutustust saab omavahel võrrelda, sest mõlemad jutustused on sarnased struktuurielementide poolest ning mõlemad on esitatud lähtuvalt jutustaja vaatepunktist. Üheks erinevuseks romaani ja filmi vahel on esitusviis: kui romaani puhul on jäetud palju ruumi lugeja kujutlusvõimele, siis filmi esitus toimub reaalses ja tänu filmi visuaalsusele on detailid filmitegija poolt vaatajale juba eelnevalt tõlgendatud ja füüsiliselt pildis esitatud. Töös on lükatud ümber väide, et kui romaan on esitatud minevikuvormis, siis film toimib ainult olevikuvormis. Ka filmijutustuse puhul saab rääkida mineviku kasutamisest, n. t. varem mingil ajahetkel kirjutatud kirjade või ajalise tagasivaate puhul. Samas on filmi eripäraks ruumilisus ning romaanil lineaarsus. Üks suurimaid erinevusi on ka heli

kasutamine filmis, mis annab filmitegijale eelise teatud detailide ja sündmuste emotsionaalse kujutamise osas.

Mitmed teoreetikud tõlgendavad kirjandusteose ekraniseerimise protsessi erinevalt. Kui ühed leiavad, et kirjandusteost ja ekraniseeringut tuleb vaadata kui individuaalseid kunstivorme, siis teised võtavad kirjandusteost kui originaali või lähtepunkti ja ekraniseeringut kui tõlget filmikeelde või originaalset lähtuvat teost, mistõttu ekraniseering vajab nii kirjanduslikku kui ka filmilikku analüüsi. Antud töös on kirjandusteost ja ekraniseeringut käsitletud kui erinevaid kunstivorme, mis on omavahel siiski seotud.

Samuti on vaieldud ka ekraniseeringu originaaltruu esituse üle ning siit lähtuvalt tulebki arvesse võtta kirjanduse ja filmi erinevustest ja sarnasustest tulenevaid kahe erineva meedia esitusvõtteid ja –tehnikaid. Mitmed kriitikud on originaaltruu esituse vaidluste asemel keskendunud ekraniseeringu edukusele või mitteedukusele. Erinevates tüpoloogiatest lähtudes võiks antud ekraniseeringut liigitada Geoffrey Wagneri põhjal kui kommentaari, Dudley Andrew põhjal kui interseksiooni (refraktsioon) ning Toropi põhjal kui täpset ekraniseeringut.

Töös vaadeldakse jutustaja käsitlust erinevate kirjandus- ja filmitheoreetikute vaadetest lähtuvalt, keelekasutust ning sündmustiku esitust mõlemas meedias. Tulenevalt visuaalse meedia eripäradest on filmijutustaja kindlaks määramine proosajutustajaga võrreldes tunduvalt keerulisem. Mõnede filmide puhul on kasutatud kaadritagust jutustajat või tiitreid, kuid nende kasutusvõimalus on siiski vaid osaline. On ka väidetud, et filmi puhul on jutustajaks kaamera, kuid kaamera funktsioon on esitada filmi kaadreid, mis omakorda ei ole jutustaja funktsioon ning asub väljaspool jutustust. Erinevalt proosateosest on jutustamisele filmis kõrvale toodud lisaks ka fokaliseerimine ja esitus, mis aitavad filmijutustaja kõrval moodustada filmijutustuse ühtset tervikut. Antud filmis on jutustaja kohandamise käigus teinud läbi muutusi, mille tulemusena on filmi jutustuse edasiandjaks

romaani jutustaja Stevensi asemel mitmed erinevad, nii ekstra- kui intradiegeetilised fokaliseerijad, ja kaadritagune jutustaja. Tulemuseks on kõiketeadva jutustuse efekt, mis ongi filmijutustusele iseloomulik. Kui jutustuse adressaadi poole on romaanis pöördutud otseselt teises isikus, siis filmijutustuses on viidatud adressaadi olemasolule kaudselt, kasutades metatasandi võtteid: nii näidatakse filmi alguskaadris kellegi lähenemist ning lõpus kaugenemist Darlington Hallist, mis võib viidata adressaadi saabumisele ning lahkumisele.

Analüüsitud on loo ja tegevustiku/sündmustiku sarnasusi ja erinevusi romaanis ja filmis, samuti lisandusi ja kärpeid filmis. Võrreldes romaaniga on filmis muudetud ka sündmuste esituse järjekorda. Et film on võrreldes romaaniga kondenseeritum ning filmis ekraaniaeg vaid kaks tundi ja üheksa minutit, siis on osade sündmuste ja tegevuste kärpimine filmis vältimatu. Vaadeldavas filmis on olevikusündmustel proportsionaalselt väiksem osa ning film on ka vähem fragmenteeritud. Samuti esineb kärpeid ka dialoogides, mille sisu, seevastu, on stsenaarist Jhabvala poolt ekraanile toodud võimalikult täpselt, säilitades Ishigurole omast sõna- ja väljendusrikkust ning romaani iseloomustavat huumorit.

Ekraniseerimise käigus on filmi autorid pidanud kasutama palju omapoolset tõlgendust ümbritseva ruumi ja inimeste kujutamisel, sest romaani jutustaja Stevens ei ole edastanud piisavalt kirjeldavat informatsiooni. Romaani verbaalsete koodide tõlgendamisel abiks visuaalsed ja helilised vahendid, mis aitavad kaasa ajastu, olustiku ja õhustiku kujutamisele, näiteks rebasejaht või ajastuomane muusika. Filmiversioonis on säilitatud Stevensi isikupärane väljenduslaad, mida antakse edasi tema keelekasutusega dialoogides või visuaalselt, n. t. tema silmapaistvalt korrektse riietumisstiili abil.

Võrreldes romaaniga on ekraniseeringu lõpetus konkreetsem ja jätab vähem võimalusi erinevatele lõpuversioonidele: film lõpeb stseeniga Stevensist ja tema uuest tööandjast Mr Lewisest Darlington Hallis, aga romaan läänemaakonna sadamasillal.

Filmis on kohati muudetud faktide esitust ja tegelaste rolli tähtsust. Esile on tõstetud eelkõige Stevensi ja Miss Kentoni vahelised tunded, samuti on romaanist erinevalt käsitletud juudi-ning saksatemaatikat ja suhtumist ameeriklastesse. Kajastatud muudatused on põhjustatud kahe meedia erinevusest, aga ka asjaolust, et filmi tegemisel lähtutakse paljus just ärielistest eesmärkidest, s.h sihtturust, mis hõlmab suures jaos Ameerikat ning soosib romantilisi ja konkreetse lõpuga lugusid.

Märksõnad: Briti nüüdiskirjandus, kirjandusteooria, kirjanduskriitika, narratoloogia, adapteeringud, filmiteooria, filmikriitika.