

**Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem  
Bölcsészettudományi Kar**

## **DOKTORI DISSZERTÁCIÓ**

**Huszár Erika**

**KARAKTER FUNKCIÓK REGÉNYBEN ÉS FILMEN:  
HÁROM HENRY JAMES REGÉNY ÉS FILMADAPTÁCIÓIK ELEMZÉSE**

**CHARACTER FUNCTIONS IN NOVEL AND FILM:  
AN ANALYSIS OF THREE HENRY JAMES NOVELS AND THEIR FILM  
ADAPTATIONS**

**Irodalomtudományi Doktori Iskola**

A doktori iskola vezetője: Dr. **Kállay Géza** egyetemi tanár

**Modern angol és amerikai irodalom program**

A program vezetője: Dr. **Ferencz Győző** PhD, egyetemi tanár

A bizottság tagjai:

Elnök: Dr. **Péter Ágnes** CSc, professor emerita

Hivatalosan felkért bírálók: Dr. **Henry Edward Bailey** PhD, Dr. **Kenyeres János** CSc

Titkár: Dr. **Farkas Ákos** PhD, habilitált egyetemi docens

További tagok: Dr. **Kovács Ágnes** PhD

Dr. **Friedrich Judit** CSc

Dr. **Péteri Éva** PhD

Témavezető: Dr. **Sarbu Aladár** DSc, professor emeritus

Budapest, 2015

**ADATLAP**  
**a doktori értekezés nyilvánosságra hozatalához**

**I. A doktori értekezés adatai**

**A szerző neve:** Huszár Erika

**MTMT-azonosító:** 10033876

**A doktori értekezés címe és alcíme:** Karakter funkciók regényben és filmen: három Henry James regény és filmadaptációik elemzése

**DOI-azonosító:** 10.15476/ELTE.2015.022

**A doktori iskola neve:** Irodalomtudományi Doktori Iskola

**A doktori iskolán belüli doktori program neve:** Modern angol és amerikai irodalom program

**A témavezető neve és tudományos fokozata:** Dr. Sarbu Aladár DSc, professor emeritus

**Témavezető munkahelye:** ELTE BTK

**II. Nyilatkozatok**

**1. A doktori értekezés szerzőjeként**

a) hozzájárulok, hogy a doktori fokozat megszerzését követően a doktori értekezésem és a tézisek nyilvánosságra kerüljenek az ELTE Digitális Intézményi Tudástárban. Felhatalmazom az ELTE BTK Doktori és Tudományszervezési Hivatal ügyintézőjét, Manhercz Mónikát, hogy az értekezést és a téziseket feltöltse az ELTE Digitális Intézményi Tudástárba, és ennek során kitöltse a feltöltéshez szükséges nyilatkozatokat.

**2. A doktori értekezés szerzőjeként kijelentem, hogy**

a) az ELTE Digitális Intézményi Tudástárba feltöltendő doktori értekezés és a tézisek saját eredeti, önálló szellemi munkám és legjobb tudomásom szerint nem sértem vele senki szerzői jogait;

b) a doktori értekezés és a tézisek nyomtatott változatai és az elektronikus adathordozón benyújtott tartalmak (szöveg és ábrák) mindenben megegyeznek.

**3. A doktori értekezés szerzőjeként hozzájárulok a doktori értekezés és a tézisek szövegének Plágiumkereső adatbázisba helyezéséhez és plágiumellenőrző vizsgálatok lefuttatásához.**

Kelt: Budapest 2015. január 8.

a doktori értekezés szerzőjének aláírása

## Table of Contents

I. Introduction .....	1
II. On the Art of Adaptation .....	3
III. The Heritage Film and Henry James .....	15
IV. <i>The Europeans</i> .....	31
1. <i>The Europeans</i> as a Novel.....	31
2. Characters and their Functions in <i>The Europeans</i> .....	37
3. <i>The Europeans</i> as a Film.....	44
4. The Use of Cinematic Devices in <i>The Europeans</i> .....	54
5. Scenes in the Novel and in the Film.....	70
V. <i>The Portrait of a Lady</i> .....	82
1. The Novel and its Characters.....	82
2. Jane Campion and <i>The Portrait of a Lady</i> .....	100
VI. <i>The Golden Bowl</i> .....	137
1. Critical Approaches to <i>The Golden Bowl</i> as a Novel .....	137
2. Further Remarks on the Interpretation of <i>The Golden Bowl</i> .....	146
3. Post-heritage Films .....	158
4. The Focuses of the Film.....	160
5. The Use of Cinematic Devices.....	188
6. Scenes in the Novel and in the Film.....	192
VII. Conclusion .....	210
Works Cited.....	219
Filmography .....	223

## Acknowledgements

Thanks are primarily due to my supervisor Professor Aladár Sarbu for all the knowledge he shared with me during my years as a PhD student, as well as for his exquisite help in the bureaucratic maze of the doctoral procedure.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Edward Bailey, Dr. Ákos Farkas and Dr. Ferenc Takács for their useful comments on my dissertation and for their professional corrections in the text.

In addition, I appreciate the work of Mr. David Parker for his part in the correction of the dissertation text as a native speaker.

Finally, thanks are also due to my entire family for their support, tolerance, and understanding.

# I. Introduction

Several sources claim that the turn of the millennium saw an unprecedented surge in the demand for Henry James-based films. The simultaneous release of three Henry James films<sup>1</sup> was heralded in with the following words by an often quoted 1997 *The New York Times* article: “Move over Jane Austen: Here comes Henry James” (Smith, “Hollywood Trains Its Lights on a Master of Shadow”).

The new millennium saw further Henry James film premiers: in 2000 Merchant-Ivory’s *The Golden Bowl* went to the big screen and at the beginning of 2001 a new WGBH2/BBC version of *The American* was introduced.

Henry James scholars are likely to be surprised by the phenomenon, since James is reputed to have been an elitist author who never achieved the wide-scale success he was so intensely longing for. Film, however, is known to be a genre that is highly dependent on financing, it is an art form that can also be considered as a form of investment on the producers’ side, consequently the filmmakers are seldom if ever allowed to indulge in the luxury of making films that do not attract a large enough audience.

It becomes apparent on the examination of J. Sarah Koch’s 2002 Henry James filmography that – notwithstanding the undoubted financial risks – this interest in James is not new-found, since Koch’s list contains 125 “screen works” based on 46 different Jamesian texts with issue dates spanning the complete length of film history. A lot of these works, however, are just fragments, and most of them are intended for television with no other aim than educating audiences. The latter intention is especially relevant in case of the BBC’s James series produced between 1968 and 1972. All in all, in the Henry James filmography there are only nine works which can be classified as feature films, i.e. films intended for wide-scale cinema audiences.

If we narrow our focus to feature films, we can indeed observe a growing interest in Henry James material since the advent of the so-called heritage era. The heritage film subgenre’s emblematic film-maker trio, Merchant-Ivory-Jhabvala, released their version of *The Europeans* in 1979, and by 2000 six more full-length movies were produced based on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jane Campion: *The Portrait of a Lady* (1996), Ian Softley: *The Wings of the Dove* (1997), Agnieszka Holland: *Washington Square* (1997).

<sup>2</sup> WGBH-TV, channel 2, is a non-commercial, educational public television station located in Boston, Massachusetts, USA.

texts of Henry James. Prior to 1979 there had only been two attempts at adapting James to the big screen: William Wyler filmed *Washington Square* as early as 1949, and Peter Bogdanovich released his *Daisy Miller* in 1974.

In view of the above it seems reasonable to suppose that it was the heritage film era that brought Henry James into the centre of the film industry's attention.

Several questions arise in connection with this assumption. First and foremost, why did heritage filmmakers consider James's texts such good raw material? In order to answer this question, the heritage film's political and economic background has to be examined, a field in which I have found several comprehensive studies. Secondly, the heritage film's trademark characteristics have to be identified, an issue which has remained controversial despite the high number of works concerned with it. Thirdly, one also has to consider and attempt to identify those characteristics of James's fiction that are likely to have attracted heritage-filmmakers. In this field research is scarce, and the answers given are general and could basically apply to any author.

The most important, and perhaps most original, focus of my work, however, is the examination of the changes that have been carried out during the adaptation process. This task necessitates the thorough examination of the literature on adaptation theories, and, due to the literature's abundance and contradictory nature, the choice and even the development of one's own comparative method. As the title of my work implies, I am examining the characters' original and modified narrative functions to keep track of the effected alterations. I have to emphasise in advance, though, that I am using the word function in a special sense, since I have found Vladimir Propp and Brian McFarlane's terms unsuitable for my purpose.

The seven more recent feature-length films do not all qualify as heritage films. Once brought into the limelight by Merchant-Ivory, James remained in the focus of the film industry's attention for some time. For reasons explained later, Jane Campion's or Agnieszka Holland's works would best qualify as art or crossover films, while Merchant-Ivory's last Henry James film falls within the so-called post-heritage category. This means that the evolution of the period film after the heritage era is quite well illustrated by these further James-based films, as their attitude to the Jamesian texts is quite typical of their subgenres. Last but not least, it is an interesting question how successful these relatively recent James films were in all these subgenres, and to what extent these films came up to the expectations with regard to both profits and critical reception.

## II. On the Art of Adaptation

It has long been known that most films are adaptations of better and lesser known, critically acclaimed or despised works. Before labelling film as an unoriginal genre because of that, we must remember that borrowing seems to be an inherent characteristic of any art form; we just have to think of the infinite number of pieces of art inspired by the Gospels.

Since the beginnings these film adaptations have been compared to the original texts on the basis of fidelity. The culmination of this approach is probably Geoffrey Wagner's often discussed taxonomy in *The Novel and the Cinema* (1975), which divides films into transpositions, commentaries and analogies with transpositions being closest to the original and analogies bearing just slight resemblances. Wagner already makes a strong case that any of these approaches can be artistically valuable (222-6).

It is apparent, however, that fidelity analysis even in its most developed forms fails to provide a scientific *method* for the comparison of films and their literary bases.

George Bluestone in his seminal *Novels into Film* (1957) already implies the need for an exact, reliable method of comparison. "By evolving an exact record of alterations, deletions and additions of characters, events, dialogue, I was able to reduce subjective impressions to a minimum" (XI), he writes, also indicating the centrality of narrative to adaptation analysis. At the same time he emphasises that sheer quantitative analyses have very little to do with qualitative changes: "they provide statistical not critical data" (5).

Brian McFarlane practically opens his *Novel to Film* (1996) by stating that "little systematic attention has been given to the processes of adaptation" (3) so far, and by declaring that he wishes to provide a tool for the comparison of films and literature. The description of his method takes up a significant part of his book-length study, and the rest is film analyses generated by it. As the method is one of the most elaborated ones, and is often used in some form by contemporary critics, it deserves an introduction.

McFarlane's aim is to apply and develop Roland Barthes' narrative theory to make it suitable for the comparison of novels and films. In any narrative Barthes distinguishes two main groups of functions: distributional functions and integrational functions, which are also called functions proper and indices, respectively. By functions proper Barthes and McFarlane mean actions and events in the narrative, while indices comprise, for example, notations of atmosphere, or representations of place (13).

Functions proper can be further divided into cardinal functions (nuclei) and catalysers. Cardinal functions open up alternatives in the story, or, as McFarlane puts it, “the reader recognises the possibility of alternative consequences” (14). Catalysers are small actions, for example, laying a table at which an important conversation is to take place.

Indices can further be divided into indices proper and informants. Indices proper include character and atmosphere, while informants are, for example, the names of characters and places, information on somebody’s age, etc (14).

McFarlane’s ultimate aim with this taxonomy is to determine what elements of a novel are subject to adaptation proper and which ones are transferred directly into film. As for the distinction between transfer and adaptation, he says the following: “the transferable elements of the novel are those that are not tied to one or other semiotic system” (20), while for adaptation he applies Dudley Andrew’s definition: “the matching of the cinematic sign system to a prior achievement in some other system.” (qtd. in McFarlane 21). McFarlane’s view is that cardinal functions are transferable, while indices are more broadly open to adaptation than to the directness of transfer (21).

In *Daisy Miller*, the Henry James work he analyses, and in the Peter Bogdanovich film of the same title, McFarlane identifies 31 cardinal functions, the first six of which are the following:

1. Winterbourne has come from Geneva to Vevey.
2. He meets Daisy Miller.
3. In conversation, he invites her to the Château de Chillon.
4. She considers invitation but is interrupted before accepting.
5. Winterbourne asks his aunt if he may present Daisy to her.
6. She refuses and is shocked at the proposed trip to Chillon. (145)

The question arises whether all these elements can really be transferred into the film without using the cinematic sign system, since the latter process would already qualify as adaptation.

Even if we never watch the film, just take a look at the description of the first cardinal function, it is apparent that in the opening shots we are likely to be offered views of a place that functions as Geneva, and to see an actor playing Winterbourne. The words view and see are in themselves indicative of the use of visual signs, of a filmic sign system, which in itself takes us to the definition of adaptation.

But there are some other, widely known phenomena which also reinforce my suspicion that what is happening is something more than a simple transfer that leaves the affected elements unchanged. When we read the novel, our mind uses our own memories,



experience, etc. for inferring an image of both character and place from the text. When seeing them on the big screen we are confronted with the filmmakers' choice of actor, location, mise-en-scène, etc., and his choices of course reflect what *he* inferred from the story. The film shots will evoke some associations, memories, experiences in the viewer, which will almost certainly differ from the ones educed by the original text. When reading the novel, I might imagine Winterbourne's face similar to that of one of my friends. Even if Bogdanovich is most scrupulous with his casting and chooses someone who fits James's description perfectly, I might just find that the face of the actor playing Winterbourne reminds me of meaningless death, as I know from some magazines that actor Barry Brown committed suicide in his early twenties. Both are Winterbournes, but can we assume that the book and film versions of him, which evoke so different feelings in me, are one and same?

Or, considering the sixth cardinal function, the aunt's shock is unlikely to be declared in a monotonous voice, there are to be some gestures, mimics, special intonation and strength of voice, etc. An enormous amount of visible and audible information is presented to us by actually applying the cinematic sign system, which, according to McFarlane's own definition, is already adaptation. If we look at the film, we can see that Bogdanovich formed the scene even more to his taste; instead of the aunt's apartment the sixth scene is set in some medical bath, where the absurd bathing suits testify to the aunt and nephew's love of form and decorum. This extra twist takes the scene even closer to adaptation in the everyday sense of the word.

Also there is the well-known assumption that film leaves much less to the imagination than literature. James may simply write that Winterbourne is walking in the streets of Geneva. Bogdanovich, however, has to present an actual street with actual buildings, an actual paving, passers-by, shop windows, in one particular hour of the day under particular weather conditions. An enormous amount of extra information is presented to the viewer, most of which is likely to affect us. It has to be noted that many of these details appear on the big screen without the director's deliberate choice, meaning that no active "matching" of any sign systems takes place here. (For example, the ornaments on the facades of houses are a given, the director does not select all of them, still some of them might evoke memories in the viewers.)

It is apparent from the above that I find McFarlane's theory problematic: his cardinal functions apparently do not go intact from the book to the screen, though at first sight it might seem so. These cardinal functions are actually far too complex, and what Barthes calls functions and indices are not properly separated in them. My view is that film can only use

the cinematic sign system, whatever information is inferred by a viewer from a film it was projected through cinematic signs. Seldom if ever can we see on the big screen pages from books without any sound effect, or hear music unaccompanied by any visual representation. The simultaneous use of sound and picture, however, is already to be considered as typical filmic representation. Extending my point, and retaining the semiotic approach, I would say that a genre is exactly an independent genre because it does possess a sign system to express whatever it wishes. All in all, I find the distinction between cardinal function and index, transfer and adaptation problematic and pointless, at least in this form. As for the words “adaptation” and “transfer” I would use them as synonyms from now on.

Still, one has to agree that there is something that moves from novel to film intact, we recognise after all that we are following the story of Daisy Miller, and this something is connected to narration. Having examined the above list of McFarlane’s cardinal functions, I have concluded that either cardinal functions are not transferable or the listed things are not cardinal functions. My use of the word “scene” for the description of the points listed above was not deliberate first, but later on I realised that they indeed represent nothing else but scenes in both book and film. These scenes then are genre-specific representations of some deeper lying common core. This means that the skeleton that is common in them, and indeed can be moved, or rather does move intact from one genre to another, is in a deeper layer. This statement leads us to some earlier theory by Russian formalist Vladimir Propp, and this is no accident, as McFarlane’s major inspiration, Barthes, already acknowledged that his concept of cardinal functions was based on Propp’s theory of narratology (qtd. in McFarlane 24).

Propp’s landmark work, *The Morphology of the Folk Tale* (1928) represented a breakthrough in narratology, and has remained an important stimulating effect also on anthropology, linguistics, and literary criticism ever since. By Propp function is understood as “an act of character, defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of action” (8). Propp identified altogether 31 functions in Russian fairy tales, some of which are the following:

Function V. The villain receives information about his victim. Propp’s shorter definition: delivery.

Function VI: The villain attempts to deceive his victim in order to take possession of him or of his belongings. Short definition: trickery.

Function VII. The victim submits to deception and thereby unwittingly helps his enemy. Definition: complicity (15-16).

I think it is clear from the above examples that Propp's functions are much less concrete than McFarlane's cardinal functions. I would say the acts of characters are completely without context here. There is no time base to refer to, there are no personal names mentioned, there is no reference to geographical locations, to social status, to character traits other than the one necessary for fulfilling the function in the story. As for these functions' transferability, Propp already found them intact in the 100 Russian fairy tales he used as working material. Alan Dundes in his introduction to the second American edition of Propp's work then suggests that these patterns manifest themselves "in a variety of cultural materials" (3) and concludes that they could be useful in analysing the structure of various literary forms or films. My point is that what is actually transferred from novel to film is something similar to these Proppean functions. On the basis of Propp's above definition I would say that in the first six scenes of *Daisy Miller*, both novella and film, the following functions are present:

1. Hero bound by rigid social rules moves to place with less rigorous social standards where he becomes attracted to heroine who represents a more spontaneous, natural way of life.
2. Hero is hindered by (member of) family and friends when trying to liberate himself from some unreasonable constraints that do not allow him to enjoy life.

And the further functions would be:

3. Hero cannot decide whether lack of decorum in heroine is a significant defect or not.
4. Heroine dies a death the hero could have prevented if he had appreciated her qualities better.

McFarlane's other reason for the examination of cardinal functions, apart from their supposed transferability, is that with their help "one could determine whether the film-maker has aimed to preserve the underlying structure of the original or radically to rework it" (25). If some of McFarlane's cardinal functions, however, are changed or omitted we do not necessarily talk of a radical change. What if Winterbourne never mentions his Chillon plan to his aunt? She might become aware of Daisy's spontaneous, unconventional behaviour from gossip. Or what if the whole Chillon excursion is omitted from the film? Daisy's liberating effect on Winterbourne's overdisciplined character might be demonstrated by, for example, drawing him into animated conversations at some formal social occasions. Despite all these

changes the aunt's function as a character hindering Winterbourne's liberation from social restraints would remain unchanged, and so would Daisy's acting as an agent that steers him into the opposite direction. Changes in functions in the Proppean sense, for example, the aunt acting as a donor (helper, Propp's term again) rather than as an obstacle in the way of his development (Propp: a villain), however, would certainly generate a film perceived by most viewers as having no connections with the novella, or at least one seriously deviating from it. If, however, the major character functions, like the ones I have listed, are retained we recognise that we are watching a film related to a certain novel, even if the characters are put into places with completely different time, space and social coordinates. (By major characters I mean characters whose functions could not be omitted from the story without making it meaningless. Of these there are actually just three in *Daisy Miller*: Winterbourne and Daisy, plus the aunt and the members of the Rome set who despise Daisy. In the latter case several characters perform the same function, and these characters could be collapsed into one.)

The above, chronological order of Proppean-like functions can also be arranged into the simple table format below, which illustrates how the characters listed in the first column on the left function with respect to the other main characters listed in the first row. If the function fulfilled changes in the course of the story the relevant cell could be split, the uppermost part representing the function filled first and the one at the very bottom indicating the last one.

**Table 1. Character Functions in *Daisy Miller***

	Daisy Miller	Winterbourne	Aunt Costello
Daisy Miller		Functions as attractive but "uncultivated" young woman who is able to enjoy life without inhibitions.	Vulgar young woman who hooked her nephew.
		Sy. who died because he did not appreciate her good qualities.	
Winterbourne	Acts as attractive young gentleman, who observes social forms excessively and who finds her "substandard".		Inexperienced nephew hooked by common woman.
Aunt Costello	Object of total neglect.	Voice of high society.	

I find it remarkable that though the table does not contain any reference to sequence, chronology, the novella's plot can easily be reconstructed with its help. The tabular form, however, will make the comparison of text and film easier and hopefully more objective: a similar table can of course be constructed for the film as well, and the higher the number of cells with changes is, the fewer functions are transferred intact, consequently the looser the link between film and text is. In my comparisons of novel and film I intend to use this tabular form and use the word function in a modified sense, though maintaining the main elements of Propp's definition. For me, function is made up by the acts of one character, defined from the point of view of another major character and their significance for the course of action.

The difference between the original and my definition is twofold:

1. Acts are considered from all the other major characters' points of view. The reason for the change is that in a fairy tale all actions are viewed from the hero's point of view. As novels tend to be more complex, the characters often fulfil different functions in their different relationships.

2. Instead of a single act of one character I am talking about "acts" of a character – contrary to fairy tales, one function is performed through several acts in a novel. Aunt Costello and the Rome set's machinations against Daisy make up a significant part of the novella, and yet their only function is to make Winterbourne feel how different Daisy is from his own circles.

If one of these functions is changed we certainly have an intense sense of betrayal, sometimes even outrage, we feel we are not treated to the story we were promised by a reference to the book and author. From all this, I think it is already apparent that I find the examination of these Proppean-type functions possible and fruitful, something that should constitute part of the methodology applied when comparing novel to film.

McFarlane also suggests that the identification of mythic patterns in the original text and its film adaptation might be worthwhile, for, according to him, cardinal functions *and* mythic patterns are both transferred and not adapted (25). This I find hardly surprising since myths are constituted by the streamlined, pure functions of the involved characters, and, on the other hand, we will also see how often the identification of functions reveals the mythic patterns behind a narrative.

Another theory that can be used for the analyses of both novel and film is David Bordwell's, outlined in his *Narration in the Fiction Film*, (1985) which also examines film as a narrative art. In his own words, he studies "how film form and style function in relation to narrational strategies and ends" (49).

Bordwell discards both the so-called mimetic and enunciation theories, and borrows from Russian structuralists the *syuzhet* – plot distinction. The mimetic approach, which considers the pro-filmic event as untransformed reality that is just to be recorded by a camera, has long been held faulty, as it completely ignores the importance of *mise-en-scène*, for example (14). Also, despite numerous attempts at their application, Bordwell finds that the long popular enunciation theories, which are traceable to French linguist Benveniste, are unsuitable for describing filmic narration due to film's lack of deictics, for example, person, tense, mode, etc. (21-2).

For Bordwell, *fabula*, which translates roughly into story, is not a speech act at all but a set of inferences; perceivers of narratives create it through assumptions and inferences. He puts the emphasis on examining how the viewer actually builds up the *fabula*, and finds that basically three kinds of so-called schemata, prototype schemata (identifiable types of persons, actions, etc.), template schemata (the canonical story), and procedural schemata (a search for appropriate motivations) are used for *fabula* construction (34-6). The *fabula* is not to be mixed with the pro-filmic event, a film's *fabula* is never materially present, it is something created in the viewer's mind. Bordwell points out that since narration is a process which, in its basic aims, is not specific to any medium, the same *fabula* can be inferred from a novel, a film, a painting, or a play (49-50).

The *syuzhet*, which could be translated into plot, is the actual arrangement and presentation of the *fabula* in the film. (Very often, for example, we are first treated to a glimpse at the story's final outcome, and the preliminaries only unfold subsequently.) In Bordwell's interpretation *syuzhet* patterning is also independent of the medium — the same *syuzhet* patterns can be embodied in a novel, play or film (50).

Bordwell's third filmic-narration – related category is “style”: the systematic use of cinematic devices, for example, shots, sound effects, editing etc. The definition implies that style as such is wholly determined by, is subordinated to the medium. The *syuzhet* embodies film as a dramaturgical process; style embodies it as a technical one. Bordwell notes that in narrative films “*syuzhet* and style coexist and interact in the course of cueing and channelling the spectator's construction of the *fabula*” (53). This process Bordwell calls narration. Thus it is not only when the *syuzhet* arranges *fabula* that the film narrates, style also has a capacity to narrate. This fact had a special relevance for me, since if style has a capacity to narrate it also has a capacity to convey changes in character functions. Since I wanted to delineate all the changes in these functions, I had to examine each scene of each film thoroughly from the point of view of style.

It is easy to accept that images do narrate, film music narrates, the casting narrates, editing narrates, etc. The question that arises is rather if there is anything at all in a film that is not narrational. Bordwell's answer is in the positive; though we try to attribute to everything a "meaning", we try to integrate any information into the fabula with the help of the already mentioned templates, there might be elements that escape unification, and these he calls "excesses". These excessive elements are completely unjustified, even by aesthetic motivation. Bordwell adds that the use of excesses is quite difficult to maintain over a long period as "it offers little perceptual and cognitive payoff" (53).

It is also not difficult to notice that the so far described two theories, McFarlane's theory and Bordwell's theory, bear strong resemblances. In McFarlane's view cinematic narration is created with the help of the cardinal functions plus the cinematic signs that render them visible and audible, while Bordwell says that the fabula is created on the basis of the syuzhet and style. Syuzhet, as we have seen, is viewed by Bordwell as a dramaturgical process, which sounds very similar to McFarlane's cardinal functions, while style is the technical side, the cinematic representation or the use of the cinematic sign system.

In fact, the point of my research, how character functions change during an adaptation process and whether the viewer perceives significant differences between novel and film as a result, can also be expressed with the help of Bordwell's terminology: how does the fabula inferred from the film adaptation relate to the fabula inferred by the reader from the original novel? I believe that in both forms the usual "How faithful is the adaptation?" question can be treated in a more concrete way.

Robert Stam in his *The Theory and Practice of Adaptation* (2005) also states that "many of the questions about adaptations have to do with the modifications and permutations of the story" (32). One of his most important remarks is that what we have to focus on is *why* the changes in the story have actually taken place (34), and I also wish to keep this question in the focus of my work. Let me indicate in advance that the changes fall into two major groups: the story is often simplified to bring it closer to mythic patterns, or, if you like, to simple literary tropes; or that the film wishes to refer directly to some modern (contemporary) circumstances.

Though by searching for the reasons of the changes Stam (and myself) distances himself from traditional fidelity analysis, which is only interested in the enumeration of differences, he also finds it important to state that fidelity analysis itself does raise important questions. He writes: "The notion of fidelity gains its persuasive power from our sense that (a) some adaptations are better than others, and (b) some adaptations fail to "realise" or

substantiate what we most appreciated in the source novels” (14). For the purpose of film-novel comparison Stam suggests the use of comparative narratology, the tools of which are meticulously introduced in his study.

I do not think that any theorist would doubt the usefulness of comparing texts with their film adaptations, or deny that the process can be a source of pleasure in itself, but the term “fidelity analysis” carries an inherent implication, which, as I have remarked, has become obsolete at least since the publication of Wagner’s adaptation theories. This implication is that the more similarities we find between the original text and the related film the more valuable the latter is. If we drop the “fidelity analysis” category we get rid of its negative connotations, but Stam’s above words still serve as the justification of text-film comparison. I believe that to emphasise its difference from fidelity analysis the comparison of the two genres should rather be called comparative adaptation analysis.

Returning to Stam’s comparative method, examining Genette’s term of transtextuality and of its different subtypes (for example, paratextuality, metatextuality), he finds hypertextuality especially relevant for the examination of adaptations (27-31). As it is known, hypertextuality is the relation between a hypertext and a hypotext, the former transforming, elaborating, modifying, or extending the latter.

Hypotexts are transformed by a complex series of operations: selection, amplification, concretisation, actualisation, critique, extrapolation, popularisation, reaccentuation, transculturalisation, etc. Examples of these methods are also present in the films I have examined, and I will refer to them whenever I find any of them relevant. We have to see though that all these changes are also implemented by modifying the thread of narration and narrative functions or by using some cinematic signs, that is, they can be examined at a more basic level. I would also emphasise that the important question here is also the “why”: why has, for example, the actualisation taken place, and why it is actualisation that has taken place and not something else.

Relying further on Gerard Genette’s narration theory, Stam also suggests the analysis of the following aspects of both novel and film:

I. Time. Within that category order, duration and frequency are discussed. By order he means the discussion of linear and non-linear sequence, whether the normal sequence of events is respected or scrambled. Duration invokes the relation of discourse time and the “real” length of the fictional event. Frequency refers to the relationship of how many times an event occurs in the story and how many times it is narrated (32-3).

II. Relationship between events told and the temporal standpoint of the telling.



A story can be narrated after, prior to, or simultaneously with the events in it (32).

III. Narrator types, where he refers to the widely known terms of auto-diegetic (narrator tells and generates his story), homodiegetic (narrator is part of the story but not protagonist) and heterodiegetic (the story is told from outside) narrators. He also points out that changing narrators and unreliable narrators have become popular recently (35-7).

IV. Point of view, focalisation and oculisation.

Point of view in a novel is relatively easy to interpret: it is the angle from which a story is told. In film the situation is more complicated as each and every filmic procedure-camera angle, music, mise-en-scène, performance, etc. can convey a point of view.

As for focalisation, it is also well known that Genette distinguishes between narration (who tells) and focalisation (who sees). He proposes a tripartite system to describe the possible relations: zero focalisation (narrators know much more than any of the characters), internal focalisation (events are shown through one character, an excellent example of which is Henry James's centre of consciousness) and external focalisation (we are denied access to any character's consciousness). Stam also finds Andre Gaedrault and Francois Jost's concept of oculisation useful. Oculisation is the relationship between what the camera shows and what the character is supposed to be seeing. Internal primary oculisation occurs when the film suggests the looking of a character clearly; for example, there is a superimposed image of binoculars. During internal secondary oculisation the act of looking is evoked by point-of-view editing, for example, by shot/countershot sequences. Finally, zero oculisation refers to shots which cannot be linked to any character in the film (38-40).

Stam never suggests that one should analyse all the above aspects when comparing novels and films, but the changes that take place may fall within one of the above categories. If there is an apparent change, for example, in the person of the narrator, the reason for that might be worth examining. My use of the word apparent here is intentional. Bordwell already points out that in watching films "we are seldom aware of being told something by an entity resembling a human being", or more generally, "the analogy to speech fails because of the weak correspondences between verbal deixis and the techniques of cinema" (62). His example is Tolstoy and Vidor's *War and Peace*; in Vidor's film we cannot identify narrators as easily as in the novel. That means that Stam's points of comparison are probably less frequently applicable than he assumed, but when they are, they can be very useful supplementary tools to the examination of narrative functions.

We have seen that the best known representatives of fidelity analysis already recognised the importance of the narrative in novel and film, George Bluestone then found

that the way of examining adaptations objectively is to examine alterations in the story, Bordwell also points out that what film and novel have in common is narration, and as his work's title *Narration in Fiction Film* suggests, his very aim is to seek an account of narrative activity in fiction film. More recently Brian McFarlane has also stated that "The more one considers the phenomenon of adaptation [...] the more one is drawn to consider the central importance of narrative to both" (12). Robert Stam likewise emphasises that "many of the questions about adaptation have to do with the modifications and permutations of the story. Here we enter into the realm of narratology" (32). During my research I have actually found *no* theory that does not admit to the importance of narrative patterns in adaptation analysis. Each of the above scholars, however, offers his own method of narration comparison, which contains significant common elements, the most relevant of which is their reliance on something that is very close to Vladimir Propp's functions.

As I have already noted, my method of examining the Henry James-based films contains elements of all the above theories. Following in McFarlane's footsteps I intend to examine changes in character functions, Bordwell's work has called my attention to the narrative capacity of style, while, relying on Stam, I added further narration-related elements to the list of concepts that are able to change during the adaptation process. I have already indicated that Stam's tools I find of limited use, and wish to emphasise once again that to me the really interesting question is why any change found by any of the above methods has taken place.

Finally, one more theory should be mentioned, though it is not directly related to film adaptations. Christian Metz identified the following five channels of information flow in any film:

1. the visual image, 2. print and other graphics, 3. speech, 4. music, 5. other sound effects (qtd. in Monaco 179). Though he does not use the word communication, conveying information is certainly a good paraphrase of the term. His categories always proved to be useful when trying to enumerate the cinematic devices through which narration takes place in a certain film, and thus I used it as a checklist in the case of all the three works I have examined.

In the forthcoming chapters I will analyse three films with the help of the above tools. In two cases, and the first examined *The Europeans* is such a case, I have found it necessary to include a chapter on the introduction of the subgenre to which the films in my view belong.

### III. The Heritage Film and Henry James

Henry James, Jane Austen and E. M. Forster, all key figures of the English literary canon, became major raw materials of the British film industry during the so-called heritage era, the 1980s, early 90s, which roughly coincide with Margaret Thatcher's premiership. The first Henry James-based film I am to analyse, Merchant-Ivory's *The Europeans*, can also be considered as a prime example of the heritage film subgenre.

What is the heritage film, why did it appear in the 1980s, and what factors led to its popularity? I have found that John Hill's illuminating book, *British Cinema in the 1980s*, gives comprehensive answers to all these questions.

The heritage films' common characteristics are discussed at great length by Hill, and on the basis of his work the following list of quintessential heritage features can be compiled:

1. Most conspicuous is the high quality, one may say elite, literary base, which is held in high esteem, as page-long dialogues are often quoted literally.
2. Heritage films deal with the problems of the top echelons of British society, the upper-middle classes, or, in some cases, of the aristocracy. The representatives of the working class seldom if ever appear in the base novels and consequently in the films.
3. They tend to use well-educated actors with accomplished accents and respectable theatrical backgrounds, though of no star value. (Emma Thompson or Helena Bonham Carter only became famous after acting in the above two films.)
4. Physicality, sex and violence, are avoided or are used very sparingly, the viewer is treated to beautiful sceneries and, very typically and excessively, to pictures of ornate interiors instead (*British Cinema in the 1980s* 73-98).

Such a cocktail is unlikely to attract a large number of consumers, so it is no wonder that many critics devoted time to unravelling the mystery of its success with the audiences.

As for Hill, he treats heritage film-making as part of a heritage industry which is born to mitigate the adverse economic and social effects of Thatcherism. Hill quotes a large number of sources which all claim that the economic neo-liberalism and social neo-conservatism of the Thatcher government led to the polarisation of British society, the divide between the rich and the poor became more marked, while the gain in industrial productivity

was only temporary and not sufficient to mitigate the fear of relegation from the “premier league” of nations. Hill’s sources also indicate that there was a significant growth of interest in heritage in Britain in the 1980s, the number of museums, for example, doubled between 1960 and 1987, and the number of visits to those museums and galleries increased steeply. As the ample references to the economic and political background foreshadow, John Hill finally puts the heritage films’ great appeal down to economic and political factors: the heritage industry helped the British to recall periods of national splendour and offered a feeling of belonging in an era of economic and social destabilisation (3-31). This feeling Hill labels false, since in these works an aristocratic past, way of life, is presented as if it belonged to everyone, which is far from the truth (78).

The Ismail Merchant (Indian-born American producer), James Ivory (American director), Ruth Praver Jhabvala (German-born, University-of-London-educated Jewish scriptwriter married to a Parsee architect) international trio are probably the best-known heritage filmmakers in the world. Two of their works, both regarded as quintessential heritage films, *A Room with a View* (1985) and *Howards End* (1992), achieved something almost unprecedented: simultaneous critical acclaim and box-office success. Quite thought-provokingly, the critical reception of the Merchant-Ivory films has become more mixed with time, the probable reasons for which I will try to sum up later. Besides E. M. Forster, whose *Maurice* they also filmed, Henry James was the team’s favourite author: they adapted three Henry James novels to the big screen: *The Europeans* in 1979, *The Bostonians* in 1984, and *The Golden Bowl* in 2000. These works are also often mentioned when heritage film history is discussed and the subgenre’s classics are listed.

Interestingly, there is one more film which also always figures on the above list, and this is Hugh Hudson’s *Chariots of Fire*, which was shot in 1981. This work, however, apparently differs from the above-mentioned Merchant-Ivory works in significant respects. To start with, it is based on an original screenplay, there is no canonical literary base. Also, shots of ornate interiors are less prominent, since the theme is the British athletic team’s preparation for the 1924 Paris Olympic Games. The question arising here is what this film has in common with either *A Room with a View* or *Howards End*. According to ardent heritage film critic Andrew Higson all these films are engaged in the construction of national identity, and they all promote an upper-class vision of the past (*Waving the Flag: Constructing a National Cinema in Britain* 26). They are also believed to be fascinated by the private property, the values and culture of one particular class. In Higson’s opinion it is apparently all negative traits that connect these films, they are middlebrow products for

middle-aged, middle-class, female-dominated audiences (“Re-representing the Past. Nostalgia and Pastiche in the Heritage Film” 109). Claire Monk, a leading figure of heritage film studies, has recently devoted a significant monograph to the study of heritage film audiences, with the hypothesis that “the real audiences who enjoyed heritage films and other quality period films were more diverse – demographically culturally, politically, and in their broader film tastes – than the narrow, bourgeois, older, heritage audience projected in the founding critiques of heritage cinema (*Heritage Film Audiences: Period Films and Contemporary Audiences in the UK* 33). This first attempt to prove the versatility of heritage film audiences was so successful that Monk has already issued a “2.0” version of her work, in which she examines the online activities of period film audiences (“Heritage Film Audiences 2.0: Period Film Audiences and Online Fan Cultures”).

In one of her earlier studies, “The Heritage-film Debate Revisited”, Monk already points out that it is questionable whether a subgenre (heritage film) can be defined by such ideological and national functions, since such matters are dependent on the interpretative judgement of the viewer. Also, it is not clear how and why all these films could function as vehicles of British national messages, since they were not sponsored by any British government, were prepared by international teams, addressed international audiences, and have been actually just as, if not more, popular in the USA as in Britain. Some of them, for example, Merchant-Ivory’s *Europeans* and *The Bostonians*, are not even set in Britain (“The Heritage-film Debate Revisited” 180-81).

Monk is not the first critic who finds the mainstream criticism of heritage film too one-sided, too biased. Hill already emphasises that the heritage film is not a conservative phenomenon in every respect. The picture it gives of the past is not all rosy; some social criticism – for example, that of the hypocrisy, bigotry of the upper-middle class – is also present in them as it constitutes an organic part of the original novels as well, especially of those of Forster. Hill claims though that this element of criticism provides the more educated viewers with an alibi for focusing on the past (*British Cinema in the 1980s* 84).

The films’ approach to sexuality is also less conventional than it seems at first sight. As I have already indicated, there is no explicit sex scene in any of these films, there is no shocking frontal nudity, which is almost an inevitable part of the contemporary Hollywood films. Male homosexuality, however, is of course the central theme of *Maurice*, and we are also offered the sight of naked male bodies in *A Room with a View* in the much praised bathing scene. (The scene is actually a quite literal adaptation of Chapter Twelve of the novel, in which Mr. Beebe, Freddy Honeychurch and young George Emerson enjoy dipping

into a pond.) Also in “The Heritage-film Debate Revisited” Claire Monk talks of “the pleasures of female looking – at man” (191). This female voyeurism is the reversal of the phenomenon described by Laura Mulvey in her great essay “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema”: classic Hollywood films offer the sight of attractive female bodies to please male audiences (750). The interest in male homosexuality, however, can, at least partly, also be explained with personal motives: Merchant and Ivory were partners in life till Ivory’s death.

Finally, it is again Monk who stresses in the above study that more recent British films set in the present often project a more conservative, idealised picture of Britain than any heritage classic; we only have to think of the idyllic village scenes in the two *Bridget Jones’s Diary* films (“The Heritage-film Debate Revisited” 195).

Monk is so dissatisfied with the prevalent heritage film definitions, or rather with the lack of an explicit definition, that she practically suggests disposing of the whole category. According to her reasoning, with the arrival of Tony Blair and the New Labour movement, the heritage film has lost its ideological substance, and the term has been diluted to such an extent that it has become practically meaningless: any period film with a box-office success is labelled as such. Her example is the blockbuster *Titanic*, which has hardly anything in common either with *A Room with a View* or with *Chariots of Fire* but the fact that the characters wear period costumes. (“The Heritage-film Debate Revisited” 182). In her later works she still uses the category, but, despite carrying out most extensive research in the subgenre, she never attempts to give a definition, and, even more importantly, as the titles of her most recent works’ suggest, she does not treat heritage films separately from other period films.

I believe that the prevalence of the heritage film category in film literature and even in literary criticism cannot be a mere accident, Merchant and Ivory’s *Forster* and some of their Henry James adaptations do possess some common characteristics which make them a peculiar genre or subgenre within film history. I also believe though that, in order to have a better understanding of the heritage film, we do not only have to examine the political, social, and economic environment in which it was born, but also its place in film history.

The pre-1980s period is dominated by the so-called modern film in Europe, most film historians actually put the end of the modern film era just around 1980 (for example, András Bálint Kovács *A modern film irányzatai* 87). This means that the immediate predecessor of the heritage film in film history is the modern film, or, from the reverse perspective, that the heritage film is one of the immediate successors or consequences of the modern film. This implies that heritage film researchers are likely to benefit from studying the major attributes

of the modern film, as some of the heritage film's attributes might be interpreted as a reaction to them.

András Bálint Kovács's *A modern film irányzatai* (2005) identifies several common characteristics of modern films. First and foremost there are three major recurring themes:

- the alienation of the individual from his environment
- the redefinition of reality in relativist, subjectivist terms
- the presentation of the “Nothing” hiding behind the surface (219).

In more abstract aesthetic terms, modern art forms in general are characterised by a high level of abstraction, subjectivity, and self-reflection. Each of these attributes might be detectable in any film, but the coexistence of them is only typical in modern films.

The narrative style of the modern film is also characteristically different from that of the classical Hollywood film as the narrative time, place or the plot itself is often ambiguous. Furthermore, the role of contingency is prominent in the narration – it weakens the sense of causality, and implies the fundamental randomness of life (Kovács 95-6).

Finally, the hero of the modern film is again peculiar, he is an abstract individual who is alienated from his environment. His abstract nature is most conspicuously manifest in the fact that our knowledge in connection with him is never complete: for example, contrary to classical films, we often do not know anything about his occupation. They are usually characters with serious weaknesses, with the well-known term they are “anti-heroes” who are often difficult to associate with (Kovács 93).

As for visual motifs and composition Kovács distinguishes four major modern film styles:

- the minimalist style, in which the number of the in themselves simplistic motifs is very low,
- the naturalist style, which creates the impression of undisturbed every-day reality,
- the ornamentalist style, which operates with a large number of exotic and decorative visual motifs inspired by ancient, folkloristic motifs,
- the theatrical style, which is characterized by an unnatural, expressly theatrical acting style and the use of also expressly theatrical settings, props.

Some of these styles have a tendency to blend, the naturalist style, for example, often leads to a minimalist style, while the theatrical style often results in an ornamentalist world. It is easy to notice that these styles represent two basic tendencies: one is to free the frame of artificial visual effects, while the other, just contrary to that, aims at enriching it with them (188-218).

All in all, Kovács observes that the modern film is not to be seen as an independent film style but rather as the effect of the various modernist movements on the narrative film (31).

In the 1980s the classical art film becomes relevant again in Europe, with major modernist directors like Ingmar Bergman returning to the classical visual and narrative styles, a turn in his case marked by the 1982 release of his *Fanny and Alexander* (Kovács 87)<sup>3</sup>. The classical film's, and within that the classical art film's characteristics are perhaps best identified by Deleuze, according to whom the genre crystallized in Hollywood in the 1930s, is rooted in traditional story-telling, and the unity of action is ensured in it by the continuity of the time frame and by a well-defined space, setting. In classical films perception is always followed by action, and action by reaction (qtd. in Kovács, 66).

It is to be noted here that from the late-1960s Hollywood was also perceptibly influenced by the European art film, especially by the French New Wave, so much so that some speak about an American "New Wave". Todd Berliner in a 2010 study points out that the narrative style of the American films in the seventies put an uncommon emphasis on irresolution in the plot; in the films' climaxes, epilogues the filmmakers, for example, are unlikely to tie up loose ends. The linearity of narration is also often given up. Berliner puts the end of the New Hollywood era around 1980, the year which is also believed to mark the ending of the modern film era (46).

In view of the above the heritage film seems to be less of a local British phenomenon and more of a reaction to the modernist movements, a subtype of the newly classical art films released in the 1980s.

That the filmmakers' aim is to make an art film, not a classical commercial film, is made apparent by the strong reliance on the original plot and dialogues.

Similarly to classical films, the themes in heritage films are fully elaborated, the ending is never missing, the plot's complete mythical pattern is presented, we are embarrassed or entertained by no uncertainty of time, space, let alone plot. The plot in fact is often so close to mythical patterns that it reminds the readers and viewers of fairy tales: Elisabeth Bennet is often associated with Cinderella (Amy K. Levin 45); Gertrude Wentworth's Sleeping Beauty-like existence is also often noted, and is to be discussed in more detail later.

---

<sup>3</sup> The other type of the art film from that period on is the commercial avant-garde film represented, for example, by Peter Greenaway or the Hungarian Béla Tarr. The films of these directors are usually referred to as typical post-modern art films.



The hero/heroine of heritage films is not abstract in the sense that we are provided with plenty of information, for example, on Felix Young's background, but what he/she fights for often is: in films based on Forster novels, or in *The Europeans* the object of the quest is, for example, a Hellenistic, more natural way of life, closeness to nature. The abstractness of the object of the quest represents a huge difference compared to the themes of the classical Hollywood films, and reinforces the films' art film status. Quite untypically of art films the major mythic patterns presented by the heritage films are always comic ones, in other words their heroes/heroines successfully achieve the goals they pursue, and as a result they get more successfully integrated into their society. Elisabeth Bennet or the Dashwood sisters find their partners in life, Margaret Schlegel creates a family around herself that populates *Howards End*, Lucy Honeychurch embarks on a life larger and freer than the one she originally started to live, while Felix Young brings fresh air to New England and finds his partner in life.

Not only is the mythical pattern very conspicuous, the stories also often imply the existence of a quasi mythic force that puts things right. In *Howards End* a house is able to select its inhabitants, "Nature" is able to open up Lucy Honeychurch's eyes, while intelligent, energetic and charming Elisabeth Bennet or Felix Young are very easy to perceive as the embodiments of youth that cannot be resisted, thus they are close to perfection, to a mythic deity status.

Despite the abstract nature of their fabulas, heritage films are well embedded in reality, as I have mentioned, we are provided with plenty of details on the protagonists' personal features, environment, or lifestyle. Also, all these narratives contain some tragic subplots, let me just mention the stories of Charlotte Lucas, Leonard Bast or that of the Baroness Munster. The fates of these latter characters all illustrate the relativism of morality and truth, which is no wonder, as except for Jane Austen's characters they were all born in the modernist period.<sup>4</sup> The abundance of realistic details and the references to relativism together ensure that the fabula does not remain in the sphere of tales, dreams, but gives the reader or the viewer the comfortable feeling that he is not just being entertained but is learning something useful about life.

All in all, these novels and stories seem to address issues, conflicts that are of real interest for most people, especially for middle-class viewers, but are associated with the

---

<sup>4</sup> The relativism of truth and morality was identified by, for example, F.C. McGrath in *The Sensible Spirit: Walter Pater and the Modernist Paradigm* as a major element of the Modernist paradigm. I will devote more attention to the issue when dealing with *The Golden Bowl*.

upper levels of the Maslow pyramid,<sup>5</sup> are connected to the need for belonging, or to self-actualization. The fight for more basic needs falls outside the scope of interest. The base novels and consequently the films offer solutions to the protagonists' problems, but at the same time hint that not everyone is rewarded in accordance with his merits in life. This way the moviegoer is left with the feeling that he has received real artistic value for his money but, simultaneously, his "need for dreams"<sup>6</sup>, for seeing beauty in life, has also been fulfilled. Contrary to the modern films' often troublesome, unsettling aftertaste, at the end of the heritage film the viewer stands up with the reassuring feeling that life, at least somewhere, for some people, can be pleasant.

As Hill indicated, heritage films often present attractive, ornate interiors (80-81), which, at first sight, might raise associations with the theatrical film style. The heritage film's settings, however, are not only beautiful, they are also realistic, natural as the films are shot on location without exception, with props that are also original period pieces, not their papier-mâché replicas. This way the heritage film subgenre successfully combines naturalism and beauty, attractiveness: despite carefully avoiding fakeness, falseness, the frames are saturated with beautiful sight, reinforcing the feeling again that life does have the potential to be as attractive as that. Here I have to refer to a great difference from commercial melodrama: the latter would imply that life is always like that for everyone.

In view of all these details on the emergence, evolution and characteristics of the heritage film, I do believe that heritage film is worth maintaining as an independent subgenre. My list of the subgenre's common features, some of which have already appeared on Hill's list, is the following:

– Heritage films use a highbrow, in James's case right away elitist, literary base, and very often turn it into both critical and box office successes. This is a unique and remarkable phenomenon in itself, which is certainly worthy of attention. The more so, as, contrary, for example, to early Hollywood films<sup>7</sup>, they do not alter any character functions significantly to please the viewers with a joyous happy ending, so the plot the viewer discerns from the film is very much the same as the one discerned by the reader of the novels.

---

<sup>5</sup> Maslow's hierarchy or pyramid of needs is a theory in psychology proposed by Abraham Maslow in his 1943 paper "A Theory of Human Motivation". Maslow used the terms physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization needs to describe the pattern that human motivations generally move through.

<sup>6</sup> Miklós Almási's term, which I will discuss later within this chapter.

<sup>7</sup> For example, Edmund Goulding's 1927 *Anna Karenina* adaptation, released under the title *Love*, is notorious for its happy ending.

– The directors and cinematographers of heritage films use special filmic techniques. The films tend to be shot on location, so many of their props and sets are genuine artefacts. Dialogues are often performed against the backdrop of attractive landscape. In order to present the artefacts and landscapes to their advantage the use of deep focus lenses and wide-angle shots<sup>8</sup> are typical.

From the use of this special technique flows the heritage film's often-criticised attribute, namely that the objects and possessions can be disproportionately important, even to the detriment of characters, or ideas. The camera sometimes lovingly lingers on beautiful sights without any narrative function. As Linda V. Troost puts it: narrative space is transformed into heritage space (81).

Despite the obvious excesses I consider the foregrounding of sight an important and forward-pointing characteristic of heritage films. Till the advent of these films the adaptations of canonical works were more likely to be simple chatty dramatizations of the base novels, and were shot mostly in studios. There are, of course, some earlier examples of significant visualisation, Tony Richardson's 1963 *Tom Jones*, for instance, is a quintessential modern film relying heavily on filmic tools and was also recorded mostly on location. With the heritage film, however, a heavier reliance on the filmic language, on sight and sound, music, becomes the rule and not the exception. The heavier emphasis on filmic means transfers the plot into a new genre. This, as we will see, is well observable in *The Europeans* already, perhaps even more so in the *A Room with a View*. The more recent, non-heritage, adaptations' marked emphasis on filmic means, as we will observe in connection with Jane Campion's *The Portrait of a Lady*, is, I believe, at least partly the result of heritage film influence, which again underlines the latter subgenre's importance in film history.

On the Merchant-Ivory homepage, and in the appendix to the Merchant Ivory Collection DVD edition of *The Europeans*, James Ivory also talks about important changes in connection with the actors and actresses' appearance: "in this film the actresses, as a matter of course, were required to be tightly laced up into corsets with stays [...] and were not allowed to fiddle with their own make-up, or to surreptitiously put on lipstick or eye shadow, etc., or dictate how their hair would be dressed."

The lack of all-covering excessive make-up and perfect hair-do had consequences other than historical verisimilitude. With their less perfect, more human than usual cast these films, I assume, also contributed to the end of the Hollywood diva era. Since the 1980s

---

<sup>8</sup> Angle of view: the angle subtended by the camera lens. Wide-angle lens: a lens with a very broad angle of view, increases the illusion of depth (Monaco 460).

American directors and actors have aimed at more natural looks even in costume films, instead of Greta Garbo or Marilyn Monroe we have Winona Ryder or Glenn Close, in non-historical films Julia Roberts or Jennifer Anniston, who seem to be just slightly improved versions of “the girl next door”. This new look might be easier to sympathise with for a larger number of viewers, and reinforces the viewer’s feeling that what he watches is reality, and not an improved version of it. Even modern films, which, as we noted, are inclined to work with anti-heroes and have everyday characters as protagonists, prefer to show them in their best physical form. By way of example, in Tony Richardson’s just mentioned 1963 *Tom Jones*, which is generally considered to be a quintessential modern work, Mrs. Waters (Joyce Redman) is wearing a most attractive modern make-up in a scene in which they are gobbling up a huge heap of food with Tom, and which consequently could easily be labelled as naturalist. Some of the modern films’ protagonists are actually so far from ordinariness that they become sex symbols: let me just mention Jean-Luc Godard’s favourite actresses Anna Karina or Jean Seberg, or Antonioni’s Monica Vitti. The men also exude much sex appeal: Belmondo, Trintignant are considered to be eminent representatives of manhood even today. In heritage films the actors and actresses are not presented as exceptionally attractive, and consequently they are seldom raised to stardom by these works. The film itself is thus more easily perceived as a coherent piece of art, and not as the means of selling something, someone. This lack of marketing efforts might again have its appeal to educated audiences.

From the above it might already be apparent that I use the heritage film category in a sense somewhat narrower than usual. My typical examples of this subgenre are Merchant-Ivory’s *The Europeans*, *A Room with a View*, or the BBC’s 1995 *Pride and Prejudice* adaptation. It is probably already apparent that contrary to most sources I do not consider the *Chariots of Fire* as such. What is indeed common in it with the above films – the possible strengthening of national cohesion – is not a deliberate feature of heritage films, at least I have found no reference to such intentions in Merchant-Ivory interviews, it is rather a by-product of their dealing with the past. The narrower category, however, is probably worth upholding, since, as we have seen, the so defined films represent a distinct era in the history of adaptation, and have a well describable influence on more recent adaptations as well.

The question, why some of these heritage films could prove popular with wide, international audiences in addition to British ones, has partly been answered by simply listing the subgenre’s attributes, but is certainly worthy of more attention.

First and foremost, we have to mention that apart from the peculiar British economic environment the global environment was also favourable for heritage film-making due to the

phenomenon of post-modern nostalgia. Roland Robertson in his book *Globalization* remarks that the post-modern nostalgia of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century (and of the new millennium) significantly differs from the nostalgia of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, as the former kind of nostalgia is evoked and maintained artificially to increase consumption. Robertson regards heritage films and world tourism as its most striking manifestations (173).

Revenue figures published on their IMDb sites provide ample proof that heritage films were just as, if not more, popular in America as in England. Appeal to national pride, consequently, should be disregarded as a reason for popularity, since American viewers are more likely to turn towards splendid periods of their own history for comfort in less easy times. I find it notable though that the Reagan years were not even perceived as such by most Americans, and still the nineteen-eighties are the heydays of the heritage film in America as well.

Martin A. Hipsky in his great study “Why does America Watch Merchant-Ivory Movies?” attributes a large part of heritage film success to the tensions between America’s baby-boom (post-second-world-war) generation and the so-called generation X, who were in their twenties, early thirties at the time of the heritage films’ release. Representatives of the managerial classes need entertainment that does not add to the stress accumulated in them, so heritage films are perfect for them, Hipsky claims. Aspiring youngsters, however, who find it difficult to land in well-paid positions since those are occupied by the baby-boomers, like heritage films because these prove that their expensive education was not in vain, they are able to enjoy something exquisite, something that is not for the *Rambo* watching masses (102-3). Though Hipsky’s reasoning is definitely convincing, I think that heritage film appeal is also traceable to something less time and society specific. Some of these films, for example, the BBC’s 1995 *Pride and Prejudice* adaptation, were, and are still, popular even with Hungarian working-class audiences, a social class to which none of the above theories apply. I also suspect that, had it been shown on Hungarian television, *The Europeans* would be a hit in Hungary, today, and with less educated audiences as well.

I have already noted that that heritage filmmakers tend to select such elements of the literary canon that are easy to watch as comic myths, much more so than typical modern films. It is a fact generally accepted by literary historians and filmmakers that the less covered the mythical skeleton behind a story is, or, in Northrop Frye’s terminology, the less displaced a myth is, the easier it is to follow, and consequently the wider audience it is able to attract (Frye, 195; or *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 807). It is also widely known and accepted that the immensely popular Hollywood action films, of which

most episodes of the just mentioned *Rambo* series are excellent examples, present nothing but the combat of the pure bad and the pure good. Rambo himself – though presented as a human being – enjoys god-like prowess, an ability to annihilate all his enemies regardless of their also near-supernatural qualities and superior number, and has his own way under any circumstances. Like gods or demigods he is also able to protect more vulnerable beings from the attacks of evil. I will try to demonstrate that some of James's major characters possess similar quasy-supernatural abilities, though those are different in nature from the ones that make Rambo so mighty and omnipotent.

Today Frye's theory is widely considered to be the "fullest and most resourceful" formalist myth theory (*The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 808), so I have opted for sticking to his terminology, outlined mainly in his *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957) when examining the mythic patterns of the James-based films. On the basis of Frye's theory both action films and heritage films qualify as romances – somewhere between undisplaced myth<sup>9</sup> and realism, but much closer to the former.

That Henry James's prose signifies remarkable changes compared to 19<sup>th</sup>-century mainstream realism is apparent to any reader at first sight, and the reasons for this are manifold. Marius Bewley in his seminal *The Complex Fate* is discussing Hawthorne's formidable influence on James. According to Bewley "Hawthorne provided James with a precedent for dealing with American attitudes and material" (55), and the statement is most memorably and convincingly proved by the thorough comparative analysis of *The Blithedale Romance* and *The Bostonians*. Beside the similarity of themes (in the above case: the analysis of the relationship of two New England women) Bewley also calls attention to the two authors' extraordinary interest in difference between appearance and reality. The American critic admits that perhaps all art is concerned with this clash, but opines that American literature, first and foremost Hawthorne, is "inclined to register the shock with peculiar earnestness and simplicity" (79). By way of example, the theme's dominance is easy to recognise in *The Scarlet Letter*, but, in a perhaps more subtle form, as the conflict of benevolent lies and harmful truth, also constitutes the centre of *The Golden Bowl*. Bewley's above views have generally been accepted and, as a result, James is considered to be just as much the part of the American literary tradition as of the British one.

I think, though, that besides the most apparent thematic, even philosophical, influences there is a third type of effect, which I would call structural. I am inclined to think

---

<sup>9</sup> In terms of narrative, myth is the imitation of actions near or at the conceivable limits of desire. Displacement is the device used to make a mythic pattern in a realistic context plausible (Frye 136).

that James's preference for a lesser extent of realism, if we like, for a lesser extent of myth displacement than it is usual with his immediate European predecessors and influences, for example, with George Eliot, is also an important common characteristic with the American tradition and within that with Hawthorne. With Hawthorne, who in his Preface to *The House of the Seven Gables* gives a well-known definition of romance, and calls on his readers to treat his novel as one.<sup>10</sup> Also, in his *Anatomy of Criticism*, Frye again refers to Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun* as a prime example of seemingly low-mimetic literature behind which the archetypal mythical base is remarkably conspicuous (137).

Walter Pater's influence moved James, together with many others, towards Modernism, and the process is thoroughly examined by, for example, Perry Meisel or Aladár Sarbu<sup>11</sup>. I believe that James's American roots, which resulted in a more tolerant attitude towards romance, must have steered him into the same direction: away from realism, towards a more abstract art form both structure- and material-wise. By the higher level of abstraction structure-wise I mean the closeness to myth, and material-wise I mean James's peculiar choice of characters. The two issues are obviously interrelated.

James's fascination with the top echelons of society is apparent in nearly all his works, and has been regarded by many, among others by his brother,<sup>12</sup> as the sign of James's alienation from life, or straight away of his snobbishness. It is also notable though that not only are most of his protagonists moneyed and titled, they are also endowed with the gifts of intelligence, imagination, sensibility, and, last but not least, that of moral sense. They are also all enviably articulate about their impressions. Such a general level of perfection obviously cannot be attributed to James's knowing only this kind of people. Dorothea Krook in *The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James* most convincingly argues that "James's millionaires and heiresses have in his novels the same functions as the kings, queens and princes in Shakespeare's plays. [...] they embody, in short, the dominant (though not necessarily the exclusive) ideal of human possibility in that society..." (13).

A bit later, Krook elaborates on this very point:

---

<sup>10</sup> According to Hawthorne novel writers have to stick to "minute fidelity, not merely to the possible but to the probable"(V), while romance writers have the right to present the "truth of the human heart [...] under circumstances, to a great extent, of the writers own choosing or creation" (V).

<sup>11</sup> Meisel, Perry. *The Myth of the Modern: A Study in British Literature and Criticism after 1850*. Sarbu, Aladár. "The Lure of Lacedaemon: A Note on Pater and Modernism."

<sup>12</sup> "Henry had drifted so far from the vital facts of human character that he could hardly hope to project dramatic tension" (qtd. in Matthiessen 8).

It is in this infinitely encumbered and encrusted condition of life that the fundamental human passions can be exhibited in a way more instructive and more beautiful than they could in any other. For, James argues (or rather, the novels and stories argue, very cogently and persuasively), it is in this condition that both the noble and the destructive passions show with ideal intensity, complexity and completeness... (23)

In plainer words, I think we can say that James is particularly interested in the tragedies that spring from his characters' innermost qualities, and only to the least possible extent from some unfortunate external pressure. He often frees his protagonists from all pecuniary constraints or the limitations imposed by social subordination, so that he can analyse the free play of their mind. We will see that Isabel Archer, Milly Theale, Maggie Verver all enjoy a kind of ethereal freedom, the difficulties they get into all derive from their in themselves highly impressive personalities. As for me, I find James's method resembling that of natural sciences: he disregards most variables so he can examine the play of one as the function of a few others of peculiar interest. That is the way he studies, for example, how Isabel Archer's utmost openness, desire to get acquainted with the world, responds to aestheticism. Such a high level of freedom to act, however, again represents real closeness to myth, after all it is only typical of a deity.

At this point we are to note an important coincidence: I have indicated that it is safe to assume that closeness to myth is one great possibility for film to attract big audiences, and is a major source of heritage film success. As we have just seen, highly respected, canonised Henry James demonstrates the same affinity for myth/not much displaced myth or romance, thus, regarding their set of characters, and what follows from that, their structure (the cause and effect relationship might be just the opposite), his work can be regarded as perfect raw material for heritage filmmakers. We will also see that skilled scriptwriters can easily cope with the difficulties deriving from James peculiar style, and the genre of film in itself does away with a lot of James's sometimes tormenting ambiguity.

According to Frye comic myths and romances represent the world of innocence in literature, and as such, in Frye's terminology again, we can say that instead of the usual demonic imagery of action films or low-mimetic realistic films we are treated to more soothing and eye-pleasing apocalyptic imagery in heritage films. I have already referred to the viewer's pleasure gained from looking at ornate settings and attractive period dresses or at beautiful scenery. Hungarian aesthete Miklós Almási in his work *Antiesztétika* calls this



phenomenon “álomigény” (14), the need for dreams, and claims that such things appeal to our basic instinct to associate with the successful – the rich – in life. The fulfilment of this need he links with popular culture. Strikingly, Henry James’s peculiar character and structure choice leads us into a similar world.

Claire Monk in her survey report *Heritage Film Audiences* finds the enjoyment of *period* films especially widespread among “‘middle-class’ occupational groups with limited economic power or precarious social authority (teachers and other public sector lower professionals)” (62). As the period films included in Monk’s sample are concerned with the problems of British middle or upper-middle classes and often lead us into nice interiors, it is safe to assume that insecure social status generates a particular affinity for soothing, beautiful sight. Monk does not examine the conspicuousness of the mythical patterns in the films, but I suspect that there is a general preference for apocalyptic imagery and myths. Renowned 20<sup>th</sup> century psychologist C.G. Jung writes that unbalanced psyches get strength from drawing or looking at systematically organised mandala patterns<sup>13</sup>, so it seems reasonable to suppose that a similar kind of healing can be gained by watching or listening to stories that strictly follow some archaic patterns. It also seems logical that in times of increasing economic and social insecurity, and we must remember that Hill labelled the 1980s in Britain as such, demand for this kind of narratives increases.

Thus, all in all, I attribute the heritage film’s potential to attract broad audiences to five factors:

1. In line with Hipsky’s theory, the high-brow literary base appeals to educated audiences.
2. The original character functions and thus the narrative substance of the adapted work is retained. (No sense of betrayal is evoked in the viewer.)
3. They are based on texts that are close to undisplaced myths and thus the plot is easy to follow.
4. The myths use apocalyptic imagery, so they fulfil the viewers “need for dreams”.
5. The often tragic but less significant subplots and the filming techniques (filming on location, no artificial props, and natural acting style) successfully connect the films to reality, evoking the feeling that the viewer is learning something useful about life.

---

<sup>13</sup> “This [drawing or observing mandalas] is evidently an attempt at self-healing on the part of Nature, which does not spring from conscious reflection but from an instinctive impulse.” (4)

The latter three points, besides describing one of the probable sources of success, can of course also be considered as further characteristics of heritage films. Moreover, in view of them, one can explain why E. M. Forster or Jane Austen's oeuvre was a favourite hunting ground of heritage filmmakers: they are both authors who often work with dense, mythic structures that are shaded with subplots of negative outcome, and are concerned with the life of the bourgeois middle, and upper-middle classes, which enables the filmmakers to indulge their above-mentioned passion for more eye-pleasing interiors and for the presentation of relatively luxurious life styles.

I wish to emphasise that with the above I do not intend to judge heritage films. It is a commonplace that bad films can be made of very good novels and vice versa; and also that closeness to myth in itself says nothing of a film's artistic value, nor does the fact that this time the films tend to use apocalyptic, i.e. eye-pleasing, soothing, rather than demonic imagery. In all these respects the heritage film is rather a part of a general trend. It seems though that they also played their part in the introduction and popularisation of a more visual, natural adaptation style.

*The Europeans* (and also *The Bostonians*) differ from *A Room with a View* and *Howards End* in one significant respect: they are set in America. We will see though that in all other aspects they are typical heritage films. Through *The Europeans* one can examine what features of heritage films turned some of them into classics of film history. We can also examine their already mentioned double success, and the reasons for the strengthening of negative voices in their criticism. And, most importantly for the Henry James scholar, we can see better why James was really such an ideal material for heritage film-making, and why and how the focus of the novel has been shifted to serve the filmmakers' needs. This latter task provides me with an opportunity to put the "Proppean-like" functions to the test.

## IV. *The Europeans*

### 1. *The Europeans* as a Novel

*The Europeans* is widely regarded as one of James's "series" on the international theme which is also the major topic of *The American* (1876), *Four Meetings* (1877) and of its immediate predecessor, *Daisy Miller* (1878).

Unlike *The American* or *Daisy Miller*, both of which abound in tragic elements, *The Europeans* was intended as a comedy of cultures since the beginnings. The planned work's focal points are summed up to Atlantic editor William Dean Howells in the following manner in an 1877 letter: "a charming youth of a Bohemian pattern converts a dreary New England domestic circle to Epicureanism" (151). Howells welcomes James's plans, but requests a happy ending, and to this request James duly consents. His realism, however, forces him to incorporate a quite tragic line into the novel.

Some elements make *The Europeans* indeed so quintessential a comedy that it could serve as the illustration of Northrop Frye's comedy definition, who, as I have already mentioned, is regarded as the greatest representative of the formalist approach to myth theory. I have also noted that in his *Anatomy of Criticism* Frye distinguishes three organisations of myths and archetypal symbols: one is the undisplaced myth concerned mainly with gods and other supernatural beings. Second, there is the general tendency Frye calls romantic, romance, which "suggests implicit mythical patterns in a world more closely associated with human experience" (140). Third, there is the tendency of realism, which "throws emphasis on content and representation rather than on the shape of the story" (140). Undisplaced myths take the form of two contrasting worlds often identified with the heavens and hells of religions, and using apocalyptic and demonic imagery, respectively. The mode of romance presents an idealised world, a human counterpart of the apocalyptic world, which Frye calls the "analogy of innocence". For the sake of completeness we can also recall that in the low mimetic era we enter a world that can be called the "analogy of experience", the human counterpart of the demonic, while in the high mimetic era the features of the two analogies are mixed. These analogical imageries, however, are not static; there are two types of movements both in the world of innocence and in the world of experience: one upward and one downward. The upward movement is the comic movement from threatening complications to happy ending, while the tragic movement is when the wheel of fortune is

falling toward misfortune or even catastrophe. On this basis Frye distinguishes four pregeneric (pre-genre) elements of literature, which he calls mythoi or generic plots: tragedy, comedy, romance and irony. Comedy contrasts with tragedy, but blends into romance at one extreme (upward movement), and into irony at the other extreme. Tragedy also extends from romance to bitter irony (131-239).

Of comedy Frye gives the following description:

What normally happens is that a young man wants a young woman, that his desire is resisted by some opposition, usually paternal, and that near the end of the play some twist in the plot enables the hero to have his will. In this simple pattern there are several complex elements. In the first place, the movement of the comedy is usually a movement from one kind of society to another. At the beginning of the play the obstructing characters are in charge of the play's society, and the audience recognises that they are usurpers. At the end of the play the plot that brings the hero and heroine together causes a new society to crystallise around the hero [...]

The appearance of this new society is frequently signalled by some kind of a party or festive ritual [...] Weddings are most common... (163)

It is not difficult to recognise the major elements of *The European's* plot in the above, and the typical comic figures are also easy to identify.

According to Frye, the humorous blocking character, the alazon is most frequently represented by the *senex iratus*, or heavy father, and Mr. Wentworth is obviously the representative of this type. Then there is the eiron figure, who usually manifests as the hero or heroine. The dramatist tends to play him down and makes him/her rather neutral and unformed in character. Felix and Gertrude fit this description perfectly. The churls are defined as miserly, snobbish, or priggish characters, whose role is "that of the refuser of festivity, the killjoy who tries to stop the fun..." (176). Mr. Brand, who is initially an obstacle in the way of Gertrude's happiness and a harsh critic of Felix, is as close a representative as any.

Frye's description of comedy therefore can be actualised in the following manner for *The Europeans*:

Felix falls in love with Gertrude Wentworth, but her father, Mr. Wentworth, opposes the match, as he perceives the young man's disapproval of the Puritan way of life. Due to Mr. Brand's transformation (according to Frye quasi miraculous transformations are also part of

the comedy's arsenal) and advice he consents. Gertrude and Felix leave America. Eugenia and Felix, however, are likely to leave their mark on their New England relatives – though their circle is not converted to Epicureanism, they at least become more tolerant of lifestyles less Puritan than their own. This, besides their accepting and even promoting Gertrude's marriage, is also signalled by James's reference to Gertrude and Felix's frequent visits to them.

The ending apparently had to include the elements of escape for historic, realistic reasons: James could not claim that New England society was transformed according to Walter Pater's principles, as it is common knowledge that it was not. To make their happiness credible, Felix and Gertrude had to be removed from America.

The element of escape, however, is not alien from comedy either: as opposed to the above described most typical comedy form Frye distinguishes a subtype where "the hero does not transform a humorous society but simply escapes or runs away from it" (180) – the very case described above. Thus, I would conclude that *The Europeans* is a mixture of Frye's quintessential comedy and of one of his subtypes (subtype four). It was a most pleasant surprise for me to read that Frye considers James as one of the most accomplished masters of the latter comedy form, someone who can most skilfully exploit its potential for irony. Though Frye's example of the latter process is *The Sacred Fount* (180), the ironic treatment of New England Puritanism in *The Europeans* is also apparent.

Though the analogies are striking and the list of elements is complete, the comic mythos only comprises the Gertrude-Felix related plot of the novella, and the equally important events connected with Acton and Eugenia have so far been disregarded. Some of the special beauty of *The Europeans* derives from the very fact that a tragic plot runs parallel with the comic one and receives equal attention; it does not just serve as a subplot that contrasts with the main plot in a didactic manner. I suspect that this plot structure is relatively rare in literature, but George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* or Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* can be mentioned as prime examples. In the first case the comic story is that of the title hero, while the tragic one is that of Gwendolen Harleth. In the second case the tragic story is obviously that of Karenina, while the comic one is that of Levin and Kitty.

As for the tragic plot, it is again easy to identify the typical elements of the mythos in the novella. Relying on Aristotle, Frye states that according to one reductive theory of tragedy the act which sets the tragic process going is the violation of some moral law (210). Eugenia's fibs apparently qualify as serious moral defects in 19<sup>th</sup> century New England, and this leads to the deterioration of her relationship with Acton. The tragic heroes are often also

alazons, impostors in the sense that they are self-deceived or are made dizzy by hybris, and these characteristics are recognisable in Eugenia: she arrives in New England on the assumption that a sophisticated European like herself can do whatever she wants with its unworldly, simple people. It is also notable that Gertrude, with her initial isolation from her immediate environment, functions in this mythos as the tragedy's typical "suppliant" character, who, by calling attention to the environment's inherent insensitivity, strengthens the atmosphere of helplessness. Lizzie Acton acts as the tragic counterpart of the comic refuser of festivity, or chorus character, another usual tragic figure, who many times expresses the social norm against which the hero's hybris must be measured. And, last but not least, Acton is also a tragic hero whose hybris causes him to lose a partner in life that could have helped him to broaden his worldview.

Robert Emmet Long in his *Henry James: The Early Novels* refers to the excessive use of fairy tale elements in this fiction of Henry James. He emphasises how intensely rural the setting is, or that the Wentworth house itself is compared to a "magnified Nuremberg toy" (24). The locality is unnamed, we only know that we are somewhere in the vicinity of Boston. There are also several references to other fairy tales, the earliest and most apparent one of which is that Gertrude is reading the *Arabian Nights*, the story of Prince Camaralzaman and Princess Badoura at the beginning of Chapter II. This tale actually bears strong resemblances to the Gertrude-Felix romance, as the Prince and Princess also reside in distinct parts of the world and yet discover in each other their soul mates. We will also see how striking the plentiful references to Gertrude's Sleeping Beauty nature are – till her Prince Charming Felix awakens her.

Felix and Eugenia's background is also most fairytalelike: Felix is presented as a wanderer while Eugenia as the princess of a non-existent principality. The ending of the novel then is so rich in weddings that for Long it already "suggests a variation on Shakespeare's stage pastorals" (68). Instead of subconscious or conscious borrowings the root of these deep resemblances is likely to be all these art forms' (fairy tale, pastoral and this novella) closeness to undisplaced myth, or romances. I would note here that when, in a letter written to his brother, William James finds the work "thin and empty" (308) he is also likely to mean the conspicuousness of its underlying mythic structure.

Despite the relative bareness of the mythic structure, *The Europeans* is also well-embedded in reality. James himself refers to Mr. Wentworth's figure having been suggested by a real person (qtd. in Long, 68), a frosty New England character. Interestingly, notwithstanding his having a live original, he is still a stock 19<sup>th</sup>-century New England

character, with the likes of whom one's imagination peoples the streets of the contemporary Boston in great numbers. The same will hold true for the other major characters. In this story they are not really furnished with distinctive qualities, we will rather find them to be the representatives of some types. The realism of the piece mostly derives from the amount of detail James provides in fields other than internal characterisation. We know exactly that the story begins on a "certain 12th of May" (33), some thirty years before its publication, or we are left in no doubt about the characters' age: Eugenia is thirty-three years old, Felix is twenty-eight, Gertrude is twenty-two, Mrs. Acton is fifty-five, etc. Typically, instead of the fairy tales' usual "skin white as snow, lips red as blood, and hair black as ebony" idealised depiction we have a quite minute and unflattering description Eugenia's large mouth, uneven teeth, commonly modelled chin, thick nose and low forehead, and are also informed that despite her irregular features she "carries herself like a pretty woman" (35). The account given of another major female character, Gertrude, is also far from being idealised: she is described as "tall and pale, thin and a little awkward [...] her eyes were dark and they had the singularity of seeming at once dull and restless – differing herein [...] fatally from the ideal fine eyes" (46). The account James gives of the Wentworth family's home also testifies to his love of particulars:

The doors and windows of the large square house were all wide open, to admit the purifying sunshine, which lay in generous patches upon the floor of a wide, high, covered piazza adjusted to two sides of the mansion – a piazza on which several straw-bottomed rocking-chairs and half a dozen of those small cylindrical stools in green and blue porcelain, which suggest an affiliation between the residents and the Eastern trade, were symmetrically disposed. It was an ancient house – ancient in the sense of being eighty years old; it was built of wood, painted a clean, clear, faded gray, and adorned along the front, at intervals, with flat wooden pilasters, painted white. These pilasters appeared to support a kind of classic pediment, which was decorated in the middle by a large triple window in a boldly carved frame, and in each of its smaller angles by a glazed circular aperture. A large white door, furnished with a highly-polished brass knocker, presented itself to the rural-looking road, with which it was connected by a spacious pathway, paved with worn and cracked, but very clean, bricks. (46-7)

When we enter Eugenia's newly furnished chalet with the Wentworth girls the realism turns into irony, also in line with Frye's theory that comedy blends into satire on one extreme and into romance on the other one. The textiles scattered by the baroness around her new abode are described meticulously, but while the hostess herself takes pride in them, Charlotte "is on the point of proposing to come and help her put her superfluous draperies away" (79). Another interesting bend to detail, Felix's admiration of his newfound lady friends' high insteps, if not ironic, is surprisingly modern; Hungarian readers perhaps are even reminded of Attila József's *Ode*.

I have already referred to *The Europeans* being regarded as one of James's so-called international novels, which are all concerned with the conflicts of the European and American cultures. I wish to emphasise though that *The Europeans* differs in significant respects from James's other international pieces, which all appear early in his oeuvre. In *Daisy Miller*, *The American* or in *Four Meetings* the American characters are all depositaries of positive values generally associated with Protestantism: of honesty, thrift, and pragmatism. The European contingent at the same time is made up by manipulative, calculating beings with parasitic tendencies who hide their emotional barrenness behind the mask of civilisation. In other words, in these novels we can observe the clash of an old aristocratic civilisation and a new, philistine, but much more democratic one. In each case it is apparent that, because of their moral superiority, James's sympathy lies with the American side. Due to Walter Pater's already mentioned strong influence, he is, however, apt to see that this latter society is conspicuously lacking in one quality: in *joie de vivre*, the ability to live life to the full in a more or less cultured way. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century this ability, since at least Matthew Arnold, is associated with the European aristocracy, referred to as Barbarians due to their love of hunting and field-sports:

The graver self of the Barbarian *likes* honours and consideration; his more relaxed self, field-sports and *pleasure*. The graver self of one kind of Philistine likes business and money-making; his more relaxed self, comfort and tea-meetings.[...] The sterner self of the Populace likes bawling, hustling, and smashing; the lighter self, beer. (108-109, my italics)

As the only social stratum capable of the refined enjoyment of life is the European aristocracy, it is left to this group to introduce this skill to America's middle-class, Philistine bourgeoisies, whose financial power approximates or even exceeds that of the European



ruling class by that time. Felix and Eugenia's lifestyle and values are based on that of the top echelon of European society, no wonder that Eugenia herself many times talks about the importance of name, social standing and "relations". Unlike that of the Bellegardes in *The American*, the primary function of the siblings, as is apparent from James's already cited letter to Howells, is positive: they will try to teach the New Englanders to notice beauty in life without having a sense of guilt.

## **2. Characters and their Functions in *The Europeans***

We have already seen that the comic and tragic mythoi largely determine what kind of functions the various characters perform in this novella, and also that due the presence of both structures some characters, notably Eugenia and Gertrude, fulfil different functions in the two mythoi. What I am making here is some extra comments in connection with the characters' major functions, and also in connection with the further functions that do not flow directly from their places in the mythical patterns.

Eugenia is widely regarded as the most complex figure of the novel. After the failure of her ambitious marriage, which elevated her amongst European aristocracy, she arrives in America to make her fortune. As I have just mentioned, she attaches high importance to status and money, and, with a becoming honesty, is not afraid to articulate her views not only to her brother but also to Robert Acton. One has to note that such realism is not alien from English traditions, we only have to think of Jane Austen's aversion to financially unfounded or socially unequal marriages.

The greatest influences on her figure, however, are undoubtedly the late 19<sup>th</sup>-century philosophical and lifestyle movements, Pater's Epicureanism and the decadent phase of aestheticism that sprang from it.

Most critics of James, from Dorothea Krook to Jonathan Freedman, discuss the impact of aestheticism on his novels, and point out that the "touchstone of taste" is very often the major guiding principle of his protagonists. The relevance of this statement is apparent in the case of Gilbert Osmond, Mme Merle, Charlotte Stant or Prince Amerigo, but Eugenia belonging to this very aesthetic type is not emphasised by secondary literature. She also believes though that one has to live her life first and foremost elegantly, which means according to standards more complex than just simple moral rules. All these characters share the view that if one is capable of that, one deserves some prerogatives – i.e. social status and

also wealth. Aestheticism this way offers a less rigid justification for class division in society than Arnold, who only considers birth as the basis of division. (The issue is known to be a focal point of 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century social science; we only have to think of Marx.)

It is a direct consequence of the above that these aesthetes consider the manipulation of other, supposedly less refined, creatures as a venial sin, and literature refers to this phenomenon as the decadent aesthete's will to power. The above assumption then proves to be the point where all of them fail: they all confront characters who attribute no prime importance to taste (for example, Lizzie and Robert Acton), or if they do they are unable to live in a grand enough way (Maggie Verver) and thus are considered to be inferior. Despite their simplicity from an aesthetic point of view these characters recognise the manipulative attempts and successfully put an end to them. It seems though that the aesthetic type's machinations can only be ended by their removal, extradition, which, besides Eugenia's, is also reflected by Charlotte Verver or Mme Merle's fate.

Maybe it is not superfluous to emphasise that none of these advocates of decadent aestheticism is presented in an unrelieved negative light by James, since he is not interested in false aesthetes who only imitate an interest in art (Gilbert Osmond's famous case will be discussed later). His characters are all at least partially redeemed by their needing money and wealth as the means of something positive, for the achievement of a lifestyle that focuses on "the beautiful". Notwithstanding their will to power, these decadent aesthete characters are never without real elegance and refinement, traits that cannot exist without genuine sensitivity, openness to impressions. The latter, however, proves that they all have retained in themselves the true Epicurean. In Eugenia's case the presence of this earlier phase of aestheticism is probably best described by the following passage: "With her lively perception and her lively imagination she was capable of enjoying anything that was characteristic, anything that was good of its kind" (77).

As content and form seem to blend inseparably in them, their environment also finds it difficult to condemn them: we just have to think of Acton's ordeal when having to let Eugenia go back to Europe – with her go some great ornaments of life that make it worth living: real conversation and music.

Eugenia's brother, Felix Young is very far from being the stock, refined, wicked European of the international novels. As an eiron Felix is not made too "deep" a character, the first and foremost proof of which is that – unlike Gilbert Osmond – he does not suffer due to lack of distinctive artistic talent and recognition. He actually does not languish due to the lack of anything, he rather takes pleasure in whatever is at hand, and thus, if anyone in

James's oeuvre, he can be regarded as the embodiment of the Epicurean who has not degenerated into the Decadent. It is this very spontaneity that endears him to everyone he meets and saves him from corruption: as he does not attach so much importance to the formalities of life he is not in need of a sound financial basis, which saves him from having to make compromises on the moral front. Nowhere in James's lifework can we observe so closely the inherent differences between these two 19<sup>th</sup> century types, the Epicurean and the full-blown aesthete as in these two siblings.

Another major protagonist, Robert Acton seems to be one of the few credible businessman figures of James's oeuvre. There are few attempts: in *The American*, with the figure of Christopher Newman, James made an unsuccessful try to draw a businessman character, and the much later Adam Verver also leaves much to desire. This leading figure of the novella's American set is, however, very much lifelike. Intelligent, a good judge of character, he is too experienced to grant anyone the benefit of his goodwill if there is the slightest reason to deny it: regarding the case from his viewpoint one has to accept that there is indeed no proof of Eugenia's incapability of major lies in addition to her minor fibs. He has presence; his opinion is esteemed highly by his environment – his characterisation sounds as a list of the elements of business acumen. The (skilfully contained) enthusiasm with which he greets the new arrivals suggests that he is even a bit bored by the reverence surrounding him, and, most significantly, that he also welcomes new impressions; similarly to the Europeans he is also of the Epicurean nature. He is certainly among the most versatile characters in James's lifework: besides being successful in his trade and besides his (in James) usual interest in travelling and arts he is even devoted to sciences, first and foremost to mathematics. From my associating Acton with Epicureanism it is clear that he has little to do with classic American Puritanism, which is also supported by James's statement that in the American circle he is the only one "with no sense of oppression" (82). The failure of the Acton – Eugenia relationship is tragic for the very reason that the two have so much in common.

S. Gorley Putt finds that the difference between Gertrude and Acton is that one has the imagination to feel the claims of cultural cousinship and the other has not (103). As it must be apparent from the above, my view is that Acton is imaginative enough to envisage the impact of Eugenia on their little circle and actually welcomes the changes. There is plenty of evidence for that in the text: when, for example, Charlotte worries that the baroness might dislike the chalet because of its simplicity, Acton advises her to leave her alone as she will make it pretty (74). He foresees that Eugenia is not accommodating enough to put up with the

Wentworths in their own house, and as he is also ardent to make the Europeans' influence lasting, he proposes their settling down in the neighbouring chalet. He is also not unreasonably rigid: in Clifford vice, which is a most serious moral defect by New England standards, he recognises the sign of mere immaturity and marries her young sister to him without scruples, before this very irregularity makes irreparable damage to the young man's character.

Last but not least the accord, the understanding between Gertrude and Acton is also emphasised by direct textual references. James alludes to their closeness twice, first just by making Robert say in the most serious manner that "Gertrude is the cleverest girl in the world" (74); while a bit later we can "witness" the following little scene: "Gertrude turned away; then she looked across at Robert Acton. Her cousin Robert was a great friend of hers, she often looked at him this way instead of saying things..." (76).

In the American set Gertrude is the character who is most hungry for new impressions and thus is most stirred by her cousins' arrival. She expects them to differ in every possible respect, and the flights of her imagination are also a major source of the comic atmosphere; for example, when she is musing about Eugenia's lifestyle in her new chalet, envisaging her late breakfasts in bed, or the interior of her boudoir. It is noteworthy that while the others expect complete assimilation from the Europeans, Gertrude and Acton see their arrival as an opportunity to observe something interesting, a lifestyle different from their own. The real difference between them is that Acton is likely to know what to expect, while Gertrude is just slowly getting used to the Epicurean and aesthetic ways of life.

I have already written about the oppressed, half-conscious, if you like Sleeping Beauty side to Gertrude's character. It is notable though that despite starting out as a naïve character Gertrude has special strength, which is manifest in her ability to wait till opportunity comes to see the world and gain experience. James appears to value this skill highly: he makes Felix refer to it explicitly (163), and also, it is the major source of Isabel Archer's vulnerability that she cannot wait for experience to come – she wants to meet it at least half-way, with Ralph's words she is "trying to pull open a rosebud"(206).

Mention also has to be made of Gertrude's development as a result of Felix's effect. In Chapter XI Charlotte is accusing Felix of having too great an influence over her sister. Felix rejects the claim by saying that he might have had some first, but now "it is six of one and half-a-dozen of the other; it is reciprocal. She affects me strongly – for she is so strong" (176). The supposedly innocent and diligent American has grown into a real match of the refined European.

For the 21<sup>st</sup>-century reader Lizzie Acton appears to be a typical American but – quite significantly – again not of the Puritan era. Despite her young age she is a true counterpoint of Eugenia since the very beginnings. They are the two attractive women of their set, but the source of their appeal is very different. As I have already mentioned, Eugenia aspires to manifest the aesthetic era's prominent female figure, the opaque femme fatale. Lizzie, however, instead of trying to be mysterious, is positive and explicit almost to pertness, is in possession of a dangerous energy, and is very pragmatic. There is no trace of the Puritan virtue of humbleness in her, and this lack is underlined by her preference for fresh, Parisian - looking frocks. These two are destined to be adversaries on several fronts: both try to ensure their primacy in Acton's life and are afraid of the other's influence over him, they both also want to keep Clifford Wentworth under their control though one as a lifelong partner while the other just for fun. Lizzie is the only member of the American set who is completely unsusceptible to Eugenia's charms and from their very first meeting till the last sees through the baroness's machinations and condemns them; she voices the moral rules of the society from which the heroine, Eugenia, is gradually isolated. Eugenia feels right away that Lizzie is someone to be reckoned with, and it is a constant source of irritation for her that "it should seem to matter whether a little girl were a trifle less or a trifle more than a nonentity"(108).

It is notable that despite their conflicting interests the novella's Lizzie does not aspire to rivalry. Instead, there is a "kind of laughing, childish-mocking indifference to the result of comparison" (109) in her, she seems to be instinctively aware that Eugenia's aestheticism cannot take root in American soil, probably because it is difficult to reconcile with the dominant cult of money-making and pragmatism. One also has the feeling that the slight contempt with which Lizzie observes Eugenia's manipulations to get a position in life is already very close to the confidence of the 20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> century's career woman who takes pride in being able to provide for herself. This notion is likely to derive from Lizzie's emphasised diligence and talent for housework, which, though within the confines of tradition, is still work, occupation. Doing something useful is the last thought one could imagine filling Eugenia's mind.

Another source of Lizzie's confidence might simply be her youth as opposed to Eugenia's middle-aged maturity (as I noted, she is declared to be thirty-three). If we accept this, the relationship of the two women also invites an interpretation along mythic patterns: Eugenia as the alazon jeopardises the happiness of the young heroine by trying to lure away her lover. As an alazon, she is destined to lose, since youth must triumph over experience and manipulation, and the young heroine must marry her true love. This further, also comic,

mythos is less pronounced than the other two we have discussed so far, but is undoubtedly present, and is perhaps best interpreted as a subplot within the Acton-Eugenia story. This approach is anyway the more interesting as, according to Frye, female alazons are rare (170), so much so that he fails to name any example. Here we can see a possible type: the experienced, middle aged voluptuary twisting her young lover round her finger, but abandoned and ridiculed by the same young man a bit later. In English language literature the type is indeed less frequent, but perhaps less so in, for example, French or even in Russian literatures; we only have to think of Marquise Merteuil in *Dangerous Liaisons*, or Helene Besuhoff in *War and Peace*.

Whichever approach we go for, the two women's relationship is determined by some eternal patterns rather than by the expected innocent, victimised American – wicked, experienced European dichotomy, a theme which could probably only raise the curiosity of James's contemporaries.

Besides serving as Lizzie's love interest, the figure of Clifford Wentworth allows James to demonstrate how far Eugenia can go with her manipulations. Their relationship is the closest to the manifestation of the evil and the innocent divide, as Eugenia apparently intends to make use of Clifford to arouse Acton's jealousy. There are, however, a few thought-provoking points. Though Eugenia would obviously delight in Clifford's youthful love, and of course has no intention to requite his feelings, she means to give something in exchange for his possible pain, and that is something valued most highly by her: more polished manners. Moreover, one is also inclined to attribute the skewed nature of their relationship to the age difference rather than to the dissimilarity in the place of their upbringing – Eugenia apparently believes that a host of European youth get the introduction to the ways of the world the same way. The innocent, however, has enough commonsense to notice the trap remarkably early, without suffering any serious harm. Like his wife-to-be, Clifford proves to be immune to Europe's aesthetic excesses. Clifford's Harvard drop-out status in itself is also indicative of his being no copybook Puritan either.

Since the more prominent characters fall wide of the mark, it is left for the less relevant figures, Mr. Wentworth, Mr. Brand and Charlotte Wentworth to embody the innocent 19<sup>th</sup> century American. Their characters are the greatest source of comedy, one only has to think of Mr. Wentworth's reaction to Felix's proposal of making his portrait, Mr. Brand's slowness to react to anything out of the common Puritan way, or of Charlotte's occasional oversimplicity, her inability to interpret Eugenia's behaviour correctly, for example, when the latter says that she likes the democratic openness of the Wentworth house

but means quite the opposite. We have already seen that their respective positions in the comedy's structure, that of the alazon (strict father) and a kind of buffoon – predestine them for being the object of ridicule. Due to their ability to accept the possibility of Gertrude and Felix's happiness, which must be considered as a departure from their Puritan standards, they can be saved from humiliation and from serving solely as the source of comedy, and can be allowed to be happy and to remain respectable.

I have already noted that according to Frye quasi miraculous twists and turns are essential tools in the comedy's arsenal (170). It is remarkable though how skilfully James provides a psychologically credible basis for the alteration of Mr. Brand, Charlotte and most importantly, of Mr. Wentworth, by simply making Felix recognise Charlotte's love for Mr. Brand and informing the young minister about it. Henceforth everybody has motivation to promote the development of the Gertrude-Felix relationship: Mr. Brand in order to demonstrate that he no longer cares for Gertrude, Charlotte, because her conscience no longer forces her to promote the union of her sister and Mr. Brand, and Mr. Wentworth, because his community's respected religious leader advises him to do so. Felix's move at the same time highlights one essential merit of Epicureanism: as a result of having experience in the interpretation of impressions he is able to recognise human feelings and affinities, while work-centred Protestantism does not even notice a morally spotless possibility of happiness.

Mention might also be made of Mrs. Acton – though a picture-book Puritan by appearance who is also an avid Emerson reader, her genuine frailty in itself saves her from being merely comic. In Chapter XI, however, further significant details are revealed about her character: by Bostonian standards she is considered very "intense", and "her impressions were apt to be too many for her" (165). One then must remember that intense, according to Jonathan Freedman, is an adjective overused by the aesthetic movement to describe sensitive perceivers (149). Also her imagination is said to be a "marvel". The word impression already calls Pater and his *Renaissance* to one's mind, and the role of sensitivity and imagination in leading a valuable life is also a cornerstone of Pater's Epicurean philosophy. Despite being a true Puritan Mrs. Acton is thus also a true Epicurean in the sense that she is able to open herself up to impressions, albeit according to James's text she mainly collects those impulses from her readings. Thus, quite curiously, she represents a possible blend of the two sets of values the confrontation of which is supposed to be the major theme of this novella. This mixture, however, does not seem to be viable: Mrs. Acton herself is described as a moribund.

Similarly to the American side, where, contrary to expectations, there are hardly any commonplace Puritan characters, we have seen that one of the two major European

protagonists is plainly positive and the other is much more complex than only evoking negative interpretations. If we want to find the expected evil representatives of the old continent we have to think of some minor characters again, of the Ruling Prince of Silberstadt-Schreckenstein and probably also of the Dresden-based old countess who marries off Eugenia to the prince's brother, despite his apparent ninniness.

From the above remarks I would draw the conclusion that *The Europeans* differs significantly from James's other early international novels, as the positive and negative characters are more "evenly distributed" on the two sides of the Atlantic in this novella than in the above-mentioned works. I wish to emphasise once again that this is very much in line with James's original intentions, which in this case was to demonstrate the effect of Epicureanism on a protestant household and *not* the description of the clash between American innocence and European experience.

James's probably less deliberate but conspicuous adherence to the comic mythic pattern also contributes to the blurring of the moral demarcation lines between Europe and America: the hero, a representative of the wanderer eiron who is destined to be the vessel of positive values, is arriving from Europe to America this time, while in the other international novels the direction is the opposite. We could see that the characters' place in the mythic pattern determined their characteristics, and consequently their functions, to an unusually great extent in this novella. Though they fall out of the scope of this study, I believe that the same holds true for the other international novels; the individualisation of characters is not among the strengths of any of them.

### **3. *The Europeans* as a Film**

It is well known among literary historians that *The Europeans* was not a great success on its publication; I have already referred to William James calling the plot "thin and empty" (308). Another contemporary of James, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, found the novel unhistorical, as Eugenia marvels at horse cars in Boston a decade before their introduction. Higginson all in all finds the New Englanders' unsophistication exaggerated, and concludes that James is too foreign to his native land to represent it correctly (qtd. in Long *Henry James: The Early Novels* 67).

The turning point in the novella's reception is F.R. Leavis's *The Great Tradition*, where the critic already calls it a "masterpiece of major quality" (173), and points out that the



work easily lends itself for dramatisation, as it is made up by a series of sharply defined scenes. Long also calls attention to Eugenia's distinct, spectacular entrances and exits, for example, her entering the Wentworth house for the first time, or her saying a final good-bye.

The Merchant-Ivory-Jhabvala trio selected this, initially less successful, novella as the basis of their first Henry James adaptation, and it is considered to be their first heritage film. James Ivory does not use the word "heritage" though; in an interview on the film's 1979 Merchant-Ivory-Production-published DVD, he simply refers to it as "the first state-of-the-art period film that we did". Also there he recalls that he read the novella on Ruth Jhabvala's advice, and they decided to film it because of its atmosphere and charm. Ivory makes no reference to the writing's peculiarly dramatic (filmic) structure.

The film was received favourably in Britain, and a year after its Great Britain opening it also enjoyed considerable box office success in America. It was also appreciated by the film profession as it was nominated for a BAFTA<sup>14</sup> in three categories (costume design, production design and best supporting actress), for a Palme d'Or at Cannes<sup>15</sup>, for an Oscar in the category of best costume design, and for a Golden Globe in the "Best Foreign Film" category.

Also in the above-mentioned interview Ivory is searching for the roots of his film's success. Americans liked the film, he assumes, because after the Watergate years, the Vietnam War and the unsuccessful Carter presidency it reminded them of a Puritan past they could be proud of. While accepting that this layer of meaning might appeal to many in America, one should remember that the Puritan past is shared by an ever decreasing proportion of the American population.

The film was shot in America, but despite the American theme and American-born author no funding was available in the USA; the capital for the project was raised in Britain. The British producers, and later the British audience, are likely to have been pleased to see how important the Puritan roots for the USA are; after all, this is a cultural trait that is believed to link the USA and Britain most strongly. In other words, the British might have been flattered to be reminded that the origins of the American superpower stretch back to their own culture and country.

---

<sup>14</sup> Prize awarded by The British Academy of Film and Television Arts (BAFTA).

<sup>15</sup> The Palme d'Or (English: Golden Palm) is the highest prize awarded at the Cannes Film Festival and is presented to the director of the best feature film of the official competition.

All this is apparently in line with Hill's theory of people's liking to associate with the glorious past in an era of decline, and with my point that the reason behind function changes is very often the willingness to reflect on modern circumstances, to convey a contemporary message to cinema audiences.

Yet, several literary critics, for example, Nicola Bradbury, in his study "Filming James", voice their disappointment in connection with the film, saying that it blurs a conflict which serves as the book's major theme: the conflict of innocent Americans and worldly and calculating Europeans (293). From my previous remarks it must be apparent that I consider the starting point of this criticism faulty. Elisabeth Brake in her study "Marriage, Influence and Deception in Merchant-Ivory's *The Europeans* and *The Bostonians*" also emphasises that the novella presents no "moral chiaroscuro between innocent Americans and deceitful Europeans", and assumes that the character changes in the film are aimed at foregrounding the themes of deceit and influence by making these tendencies more explicit in the New Englanders (148). Though I haven't found Merchant-Ivory's motives behind the effected changes so abstract, Brake's writing is certainly helpful if one wishes to make an inventory of the character changes in this film.

First and foremost, according to Brake, Eugenia is turned into a more likeable character by Merchant-Ivory than her original in the novella. The novella's initial chapter, in which she is presented, in one of her desperate moments, as quite hard and humourless, is indeed right away omitted from the film. (In it, on her arrival in Boston, she blames her brother for his Epicurean temperament and for not having ambitions.) That she herself attributes great importance to wealth and position, however, is made clear for the viewers: in scene 3, when brother and sister are driving to their cousins' home, Eugenia very explicitly inquires about their financial background, social position, and finds Robert Acton's lucrative business past "interesting". Though their dialogue is a near literal borrowing from Chapter III, and thus at first sight is rather linked with that part of the novella, it is easy to realise that both chapters and consequently the scene reflect on the same side of Eugenia's character: her materialism. Similarly to the novella, the baroness never pretends to be beyond pecuniary considerations, or to forget the importance of social position, which she also admits to Robert Acton. Their talk on the topic at the Actons' ball is also an almost literal borrowing of their dialogue in Chapter VI.

Brake also claims that the scene of Eugenia's great manipulative attempt, hiding Clifford Wentworth in Felix's studio to make Robert Acton jealous, is shown from her perspective in the film, while in the novel from Acton's, consequently the film is more

empathic with Eugenia than the novella. The first half of the remark, that whoever's perspective we share in a film is also likely to have our sympathy, is questionable in itself, but one has to disagree even more with its second half, as it is a fact that the scene is made up by a series of shots and countershots. At first, as she hears some noise from the road and prepares to receive her guest, Eugenia serves as a focaliser (we seem to be able to see and hear what she can perceive) a bit later, as he is peeping in through the window while Eugenia is playing the piano, we are joining Acton, and finally, during their conversation, we have the usual series of shots and countershots.

Contrary to Brake's statement, Eugenia is actually made more openly manipulative and thus less likeable in her conversations with Clifford. In the novella she refers to Clifford's relationship with Lizzie but once, asking if he is in love with her as "such things should be known". In the film she raises the issue repeatedly, and is even mocking Clifford for his entanglement. She also seems to toy quite ruthlessly with the young man when hinting at the possibility of their becoming lovers: in scene 32 she suggest Clifford making the "Grand Tour" in Europe under her own guidance so his manners can benefit the most from the trip, adding that people will think them lovers, and that one should learn to ignore such gossip. While James's Eugenia also proposes the trip to Europe, this latter point is apparently an added element. With this her alazon, wicked, status in the Lizzie – Clifford story is strengthened.

Brake also considers the film's ending as a sign of Acton's harsher treatment by the movie-makers: at the final chapter of the novella Robert Acton marries "a nice local girl", while in the film he is eventually left alone looking at happy couples enjoying each other's company. With this the failure of the Eugenia-Acton affair is rather put down to Acton, he is kind of punished for his fastidiousness. One, however, is also inclined to ponder whether the marriage with a nice local girl is not a form of punishment in itself: Acton's initial great interest in the Europeans is likely to be attributable to his boredom with his usual environment. Moreover, the indications are that his closest friendship linked him with Gertrude Wentworth, the least conventional figure of his close circle, who can be labelled anything but a nice local girl, and whose departure makes the place even less challenging intellectually. For these reasons I am inclined to identify a tragic hero in the Acton of both novella and film, but the tragic character of the film's Acton is again emphasised.

Brake also suggests that Lizzie Acton is turned into a more mature, more straightforward character. We have seen, however, that she hardly conforms to "the innocent, inexperienced little American maiden" stereotype in the novella either. There are plenty of

hints indicating that she refuses Eugenia's patronising tone from their very first meeting, and we have seen how James emphasises that Lizzie simply does not get involved in any form of rivalry, fight with Eugenia for primacy in any respect. The most conspicuous change Merchant-Ivory carry out function-wise concerns this side of Lizzie's character: unlike her novella counterpart the film's Lizzie is not at all beyond open rivalry with Eugenia. This is most striking in scene 39 (an added scene) when Lizzie is (successfully) trying to convince her brother that he is not in love with "that" baroness, and even offers to act as a match-maker, promising to find a nice local girl for him. In the same scene she is asking for money in an indirect, roundabout way to buy some clothes. Though she meets no opposition, her dependent position is made apparent. While the novel's pragmatic and confident Lizzie represents an attractive alternative to Eugenia's aestheticism, the film's two figures are both pitiable in the sense that they have to revert to lowly practices to obtain what they want.

Lizzie's relationship with her mother is also brought more into the foreground. In the film the girl is present during Mrs. Acton's preparation for her first meeting with Eugenia, and the daughter gives a brief, very negative and very categorical description of the newcomer before she appears. During the visit Mrs. Acton's love of Emerson comes to light, and the old lady says she finds the author "improving". Lizzie's reply, that her mother is in no need of improvement, is pronounced as if it was a judgement on Eugenia.

All in all, instead of the novella's youthful but confident Lizzie, who voices her disapproval without throwing mud, we have a much more desperate, vulnerable and less elegant being. Probably considering it an issue that can raise the interest of the widest scale of audiences, the filmmakers bring the conflict of the two attractive women into the foreground, which results in the fact that Lizzie's other function, the embodiment of an attractive American female type, is indeed dimmed. Translating it into the language of myth theory, Lizzie's status as a chorus character (a character pronouncing the judgement of the society) in the Eugenia-Acton story is strengthened, and it happens to the detriment of her status as the youthful heroine in the Lizzie-Clifford story. I see this as the reason behind her appearing in a more negative light in the film than in the novel, rather than the deliberate mitigation of any clash presented by the source work's author, or the foregrounding of any abstract theme.

The European Felix again is made more experienced, if you like wicked by Merchant-Ivory, and not less so. In the novel he is "occasionally afraid of her [Eugenia]" (62), she even dominates him: "...where you [Eugenia] are concerned I [Felix] never propose. I execute your commands", says he half-jokingly (156). The film's Felix is less concerned about his sister's mood changes, he even seems patronising when openly smiling at Eugenia's attempt

to deceive him in connection with Acton's intentions in scene 38. (Eugenia tells her brother that Acton has already proposed to her.)

The omission of the opening chapter's dialogue from the film actually has greater consequences on Felix's film character than on Eugenia's. It is there that Eugenia blames Felix for having "no sense of property" (36), and with this statement James carefully acquits him of any dowry-hunting. It is there that she is quite bitterly complaining about his lack of ambitions in general, and even declares his Epicurean ability to find happiness in anything immature, childish. As I have mentioned, Eugenia's cool-headedness is very well reflected, for example, by the dialogues of scene 3, but there is no other occasion where Felix's inherent disinterest in hoarding wealth, which of course does not exclude an ability to be glad of Gertrude's having a remarkable fortune, would so explicitly be emphasised. As a result, Felix seems to be more on par with her sister as far as pecuniary considerations are concerned, he seems less spontaneous, more considerate. It flows from the above that the conflict represented by the novel's siblings – that of decadent aestheticism and Epicureanism – is the thing really blurred by the film. The reason for this is apparent: the difference between the two philosophies is not relevant for the 20<sup>th</sup>-century film viewers, one of them, Epicureanism, is not even likely to be heard of. Still, as Felix's love for Gertrude seems completely genuine, and much of his playfulness is retained (for example, in an added scene he is waltzing with Gertrude to the sounds of a music-box) he successfully embodies the romantic hero, but instead of the simple cheerful young man rather as the charming playboy who, after sowing his wild oats, is now ready to settle down.

The figure of Gertrude is a bit refashioned by turning her into a poetess: once she is seen writing a poem while her father is reading out from the Bible. The change is probably due to the movie-makers fear that the introverted type, a mere melancholic figure without the power of expression, would not do in an American film, and also that Felix's love for her simply would not be justified. This "vitalisation" is not unique; we will see other examples of it in Merchant-Ivory's *The Golden Bowl* as well. This film, however, neglects an important aspect of Gertrude's character: her development. Instead of making her grow into Felix's equal as she does in the novella, Ivory chose to emphasise her naivety even in scene 46, very close to the film's end. In this scene Gertrude is still overwhelmed by some finery Eugenia is handing down to her, as well as by the possibility of going to the Paris Opera, while both Felix and his sister are smiling at her excitement. The divide between the two worlds here again is rather deepened, not blurred.

Despite remaining sufficiently naïve, due to her hunger for new experience, and also to her artistic inclinations Gertrude remains an outsider in New England, so – similarly to the novel – it is still the less prominent characters that embody the quintessential innocent Puritan American type in the film: Mr. Wentworth, Charlotte, Mr. Brand, and Mrs. Acton. (The latter's Epicurean touch is completely missing, though.) Principal characters cannot be simple embodiments of notions, or book and film would turn into satire. (Actually both do when some of these less central characters get into the foreground, for example, when Felix wants to paint Mr. Wentworth's portrait.) By turning to satire, however, the already mentioned need for dreams could not be satisfied, and one of Merchant-Ivory's major charms would disappear.

I have already indicated that Ivory himself identifies the film's references to the Puritan past as a possible source of appeal to both American and British audiences. As I will attempt to prove below, the film even emphasises the Puritan traits a bit, which, however, does not seem to be a deliberate choice, for Ivory says that it is an element identified by critics only when searching for the sources of the film's appeal.

The references mostly appear in the literal adaptations of comic dialogues and scenes. In some of these the topic is raised directly: a good example is scene 4 of the film, in which the Wentworth family and the Actons contemplate the possible effect of their European cousins' visit on their own way of life. Sometimes the tone is more serious, in scene 11 Felix is telling Gertrude that New England people do not get enough pleasure from life, and the theme is further emphasised by recurring in scene 12 during Gertrude's conversation with Mr. Brand. In scene 19 Eugenia and Mrs. Acton are also discussing the differences of the two worlds, Eugenia praising its "naturalness and primitiveness". In addition to these direct references, there are of course several further scenes adopted from the novella which reflect on these very disparities. As I have indicated, these scenes serve as sources of irony: scene 8, which is based on the probably most memorable part of the novella, we can see how differently these two worlds relate to art: for Mr. Wentworth sitting for one's portrait is just another form of idleness.

Merchant-Ivory, however, even create scenes that elaborate on these cultural differences: In scene 40 (an added scene) the Wentworth girls are shown diligently attending to their household duties in the kitchen, while Eugenia's elaborate piano performance (she plays Beethoven) receives special emphasis in climactic scene 33.

The changes in functions discussed so far can be summed up in the following two tables:

**Table 2. Character Functions in *The Europeans* (novel):**

	<b>Eugenia</b>	<b>Felix</b>	<b>Gertrude</b>	<b>Robert Acton</b>	<b>Lizzie Acton</b>	<b>Clifford</b>	<b>Mr. Wentworth</b>
<b>Eugenia</b>		Acts as elder sister he accompanies on her “fortune-hunting” trip and whose moodiness he finds fearful.	Represents European culture for her.	Tries to conquer him. Represents European culture for him.	Wicked elderly woman toying with her lover.	Experienced elderly woman flirting with him.	European niece with unconventional behaviour.
<b>Felix</b>	Younger brother who admires her social skills.		Lover with ability to enjoy life, who also admires her relative freedom of social restrictions.	-	Admires her beauty.	Acts as more mature man, patron.	European nephew with unconventional attitude to life who wants to marry his daughter.
<b>Gertrude</b>	Admires her as the representative of European culture.	Lover, admires his love of life. Grows into his real partner.		A friend, the person closest to him intellectually.	-	-	Unconventional daughter
<b>Acton</b>	Potential partner, who puts her to too hard tests.	-	Acts as friend, as person closest to him intellectually.		Caring brother		Respected neighbour
<b>Lizzie</b>	Young rival whose naturalness and self-confidence is irritating.	Finds him attractive	-	Sheltered younger sister.		Is in love with him.	-
<b>Clifford</b>	Subject of flirt, also pupil of her	-	-	-	Loves her.		Problematic son
<b>Mr. Wentworth</b>	Rich and rigid uncle whose goodwill she wants to earn.	Amusingly rigid uncle, and father of love interest.	Father who cannot tolerate her being different from their circle.	Old, bit rigid but respected neighbour.	-	Father who is dissatisfied with him.	

**Table 3. Character Functions in *The Europeans* (film):**

(Changes in functions are indicated in green.)

	<b>Eugenia</b>	<b>Felix</b>	<b>Gertrude</b>	<b>Acton</b>	<b>Lizzie</b>	<b>Clifford</b>	<b>Mr. Wentworth</b>
<b>Eugenia</b>		Acts as elder sister he accompanies on “fortune-hunting” trip. Sometimes is object of pity.	Represents European culture for her.	Tries to conquer him. Represents European culture for him.	Wicked elderly woman toying with her lover.	Experienced elderly woman flirting with him.	European niece with embarrassingly unconventional behaviour
<b>Felix</b>	Younger brother who admires her social skills. Sometimes pities her.		Lover with ability to enjoy life, who admires her relative freedom of social restrictions.	-	Admirer of her beauty.	Acts as more mature man, patron.	European nephew with unconventional attitude to life who wants to marry his daughter.
<b>Gertrude</b>	Admires her as the representative of European culture.	Lover, admires his love of life. Remains amazed with his worldliness.		-	-	-	Unconventional daughter
<b>Acton</b>	Potential partner, who puts her to too hard tests.	-	-		Caring brother		Respected neighbour
<b>Lizzie</b>	Young rival, manipulates against her.	Finds him attractive	-	Younger sister in dependent position.		Is in love with him.	-
<b>Clifford</b>	Subject of flirt, also pupil of her.	-	-	-	Loves her.		Problematic son
<b>Mr. Wentworth</b>	Rich and rigid uncle whose goodwill she wants to earn.	Amusingly rigid uncle, and father of love interest.	Father who cannot tolerate her being different from their circle.	Old, bit rigid but respected neighbour.	-	Father who is dissatisfied with him.	



For simplicity's sake I have not included Charlotte, Mr. Brand, and Mrs. Acton in the table. All three of course could easily be integrated into it, Charlotte and Brand first act as hindrances in the development of the Gertrude-Felix relationship, later function as their helpers. In relation to each other they act as lovers (Brand first acts as that of Gertrude), and they do not really perform functions towards any other character. The Mrs. Acton of the novella practically only functions in her relationship with Eugenia: she personifies a less energetic, more intellectual aspect of American womanhood for her than Lizzie Acton. The Mrs. Acton of the film, however, also functions as the charge of her daughter, which underlines the latter's inclination to have people under her control.

From the above I think it is apparent that being related members of the same family, or merely being the acquaintance of somebody does not necessarily mean that the two concerned characters perform functions from each other's points of view. To give an example, Gertrude and Clifford are siblings, but they never seem to influence each other's thoughts or deeds.

Compared with *Daisy Miller*, *The Europeans* operates with quite a lot of characters. Theoretically the more functions a character performs, the further up and the further to the left s/he should appear in my table, the more integrated s/he is in the fabula, simply speaking the more important character s/he is. We will see proof of all this in connection with *The Portrait of a Lady*, or *The Golden Bowl*, but the table based on *The Europeans* does not quite verify this statement. The reason for this is that this novella can be split into two narratives of roughly the same weight, both with their own major characters. Still, it is visible from the table that the effected changes are related to Lizzie's character, as well as to Eugenia and Felix's relationship. As I have noted, what is emphasised is Lizzie's chorus character status in the Eugenia-Acton tragic fabula, and Eugenia's alazon status in the Lizzie-Clifford comic fabula with the simple aim of exciting the viewer's curiosity about the two attractive women's rivalry. The comic and the tragic mythoi with their major characters are completely retained, and it is also clear that in neither case do the changes affect the characters' primary functions: Eugenia remains the attractive mature woman who takes her brother to discover a new world, and they remain the representatives of European refinement and love of life. What changes, deserves the name of secondary function perhaps as opposed to cardinal or Proppean

functions: in the novella Eugenia occasionally evokes fear in her brother; in the film she evokes pity. The reason for the above distinction is that a change in secondary functions certainly does not steer the plot and thus the fabula into a new direction. The introduction of these secondary functions is only occasionally necessary, when they enable the delineation of all the changes perceived.

#### **4. The Use of Cinematic Devices in *The Europeans***

As I have already indicated, it has been recognised by F.R. Leavis that the novella lends itself to dramatization very easily, since it is made up of the succession of short scenes written mostly in the form of dialogues, with the characters' very distinct entries and exits. We must remember though that the dialogical or dramatized form is not the only possible analogy between text and film.

By way of example, Sergey Eisenstein in his study "Dickens, Griffith and the Film Today" demonstrates how 19<sup>th</sup>-century realist writers, first and foremost Dickens, make use of the technique of montage when running two storylines parallel with each other, for example, in *Oliver Twist* (218). James is more orthodox in that sense as he likes to present his plot simply in order of chronology: in the novels I have analysed we can never observe any other treatment of time.

What is interesting – and I would call this filmic right away in James's narration technique in this novella – is his use of something analogous with the cinema's depth of field. The depth of field in cinematography is "the range of distances from the camera at which the subject is acceptably sharp" (Monaco 428), and it ranges from the so-called close-ups to extreme long shots<sup>16</sup>. Cinematographers choose from these shot types depending on the message they wish to convey. When reading texts we rarely have the feeling that the physical distance between ourselves as readers and the described things is varying. (Hereby I have to note that when, for example, Gerard Genette writes about the distance between the reader and the narrated event he means the number of narrative

---

<sup>16</sup> Close-up: a shot of the subject's face only. Generally, any close shot.

Extreme long shot: A panoramic view of an exterior location photographed from a considerable distance (Monaco, 431).

levels included, which, this time, is not the case.) In what follows below, I will try to demonstrate that James uses a method that creates this very feeling – that we are directing our gaze alternately at things close and distant, very much similarly to varying depths of field in film. The phenomenon is probably observable in most texts to some extent, but seems to be especially conspicuous in this work.

As Stam has pointed out, the concept of point of view and focalisation is another possible analogy between text and film. It is a well-known fact that James favoured a formalist approach to novel writing, which is considered to be a hallmark of Anglo-American literary tradition (Hale 21). It is also common knowledge that his views on the topic are outlined in the Preface to *The Ambassadors* in their most elaborate form. Jamesians will remember that in the above work – in line with the principles expressed in the Preface – major character Lamberth Strether is practically the only consciousness through whom the whole story is filtered. James's attempt at maintaining Strether in this capacity is so successful that later Gerard Genette himself mentions him as a prime example of internal focalisation in *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (67). The really consistent use of one internal focaliser, however, makes it necessary that this character is not introduced gradually, but is presented as a figure already known from the story's very beginning. Before the 19<sup>th</sup> century such characters are not created by authors, the usual approach being that initially "the character is assumed to be unknown to the reader, [the reader] looks at him from the outside" (Genette 67). Contrary to that, the narrative mood probably first preferred in literary history by the later James "assumes the character to be known and immediately refers to him by his name" (68). Genette locates this turning point of literary history in 1885, and links it to the publication of James's *Casamassima*.

From the above it is already apparent that focalisation in *The Europeans* is not yet consistent, we can observe several shifts in the person of the focaliser. Though at first sight this method seems to run in the face of film's supposed objectivity, this is the very narrative mood that is usually used in film-making. It is well known that Genette's external focalisation, which, simply speaking is the case when the narrator knows less than the characters, is often likened to the camera lens that impassively registers the protagonists' actions and gestures from the outside. In *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, however, Genette himself already seems to liken filming to the use of variable internal

focalisation, saying that the director of a movie – unlike a novelist who might opt for zero focalisation – is always compelled to put his camera somewhere.

That film is actually able to achieve relevant internal focalisation and thus subjectivity has long been recognised by film researchers, and Stam provides a list of filming techniques that can be used in order to achieve this aim. These techniques fall into four major categories: editing, camera movements, framing, and mise-en-scène.

Examples of the first technique can be shots-reverse shots used when recording dialogues, or eyeline matches. As for camera movement, it seems obvious that if the camera follows one character, this character functions as a focaliser; as for frame composition, it is again safe to assume that internal focalisation would lie with the character that is framed closest to the camera, finally within mise-en-scène lighting, colour etc are all able to put a character into focus and make us see the events through him.

If we consider the above list we are also compelled to admit that the consistent use of a single character as a focaliser is not common in film, the above techniques usually put different characters into our own focus. One can even say that the really consistent use of a single focaliser all through a film leads to serious limitations on the genre: the camera will always have to follow this focaliser's moves, or, when filming dialogues countershots (shots from his partner's viewpoints) would not be allowed. At the same time it is also apparent that besides the internal focalisers films practically always use external focalisation: we are usually allowed a glance at the person through the eyes of whom we are then allowed to follow the narrative for some time. In view of all this it is not surprising that according to James Monaco there is only one major film, Robert Montgomery's *Lady in the Lake* from 1947, which tried to duplicate the autodiegetic narration and consistent internal focalisation so useful to the novel; and in it, logically, we can see the protagonist but once: in a mirror.

All this implies that *The Ambassadors*, or *The Golden Bowl*, which uses two focalisers most of the time, requires quite serious dramatisation efforts from the scriptwriters. At the same time, we have to notice that, very much similarly to films, even in *The Ambassadors*, external focalisation through the extradiegetic narrator allows frequent glimpses at the internal focaliser character – the use of the internal focaliser is

far from being exclusive even in this novel where the problem was tackled most consciously.

In the first chapter of *The Europeans* we can observe this very focalisation technique: we are allowed an external look at the person who serves as the internal focaliser for some time, then the person of the focaliser changes. All this, let me repeat, is not specific to this writing only and is much more common in Henry James texts than we tend to believe in the light of James's intentions. The variations in the depth of field, however, are more conspicuous here than in other Jamesian works. What follows hopefully demonstrates that, similarly to the montage technique, these two narrative techniques are also frequently used both in text and film. Let me emphasise that here I am not referring to the existence of focalisation in film as it would mean the reinvention of the wheel. I only claim that the shifts between external and internal focalisation and between the focalisers within internal focalisation are typical phenomena in both text and film, and are well observable here.

Before getting down to the close reading of the novella's first few paragraphs I feel obliged to justify another decision of mine, namely that I am inclined to avoid the use of Jost's already mentioned term – ocularisation. Celestino Deleyto in his study "Focalisation in Film Narrative" convincingly argues that what Jost notices is the fact that in film it is not only words that are able to establish relevant focalisation, as the above discussed cinematic devices are also capable of that. Regardless of the tools used, the phenomenon itself, i.e. that the viewer is able to follow the narrative from a certain point of view, is the same in both text and film, and the different terms only blur the inherent similarities between the two genres, the two forms of communication.

James's extradiegetic narrator first narrates the events from Eugenia's point of view, using her as the focaliser of the events. The sentence in italics is a clear indication of this:

A narrow grave-yard in the heart of a bustling, indifferent city, seen from the windows of a gloomy-looking inn, is at no time an object of enlivening suggestion; and the spectacle is not at its best when the mouldy tombstones and funereal umbrage have received the ineffectual refreshment of a dull, moist

snow-fall. If, while the air is thickened by this frosty drizzle, the calendar should happen to indicate that the blessed vernal season is already six weeks old, it will be admitted that no depressing influence is absent from the scene. *This fact was keenly felt on a certain 12th of May, upwards of thirty years since, by a lady who stood looking out of one of the windows of the best hotel in the ancient city of Boston.* (33, my italics)

This description of the Boston environment resembles Hollywood's frequently used establishing shot: it helps the viewer or reader determine where the protagonists are. As for the depth of field, we perceive the ones typical of establishing shots: long shots<sup>17</sup>, and extreme long shots.

After our looking out of a window with Eugenia we are looking at Eugenia's room and herself with an external focaliser. In the language of cinematography we can say that after the establishing shots' usual extreme long shot the camera uses medium shots<sup>18</sup> to introduce the character's immediate environment more closely, and is finally zooming at her. All this is again a quite usual method practiced by cinematographers:

She had stood there for half an hour – stood there, that is, at intervals; for from time to time she turned back into the room and measured its length with a restless step. In the chimney-place was a red-hot fire which emitted a small blue flame; and in front of the fire, at a table, sat a young man who was busily plying a pencil. He had a number of sheets of paper cut into small equal squares, and he was apparently covering them with pictorial designs – strange-looking figures. He worked rapidly and attentively, sometimes threw back his head and held out his drawing at arm's-length, and kept up a soft, gay-sounding humming and whistling. The lady brushed past him in her walk; her much-trimmed skirts were voluminous. She never dropped her eyes upon his work; she only turned them, occasionally, as she passed, to a mirror suspended above the toilet-table on the other side of the room. Here she paused a moment, gave a pinch to her waist

---

<sup>17</sup> A long shot includes at least the full figures of subjects, usually more (Monaco 438).

<sup>18</sup> A shot intermediate between a close-up and a fullshot. The latter is a shot of a subject that includes the entire body and not much else (Monaco 434).

with her two hands, or raised these members – they were very plump and pretty – to the multifold braids of her hair, with a movement half caressing, half corrective. (33)

In the next paragraph, as the clause in italics indicates, James emphasises the externality of the focaliser and his narrator also remains extradiegetic, this way creating a feeling of objectivity. The depth of field this time resembles that of long shots:

*An attentive observer might have fancied that* during these periods of desultory self-inspection her face forgot its melancholy; but as soon as she neared the window again it began to proclaim that she was a very ill-pleased woman. And indeed, in what met her eyes there was little to be pleased with. The window-panes were battered by the sleet; the head-stones in the grave-yard beneath seemed to be holding themselves askance to keep it out of their faces. A tall iron railing protected them from the street, and on the other side of the railing an assemblage of Bostonians were trampling about in the liquid snow. Many of them were looking up and down; they appeared to be waiting for something. (33-4)

With the following sentence, however, Eugenia's focaliser status is renewed, and this fact is reinforced by a second reference. Shots are long shots or extreme long shots that give a realistic description of her less close environment:

From time to time a strange vehicle drew near to the place where they stood, such a vehicle as *the lady at the window*, in spite of a considerable acquaintance with human inventions, had never seen before: a huge, low omnibus, painted in brilliant colours, and decorated apparently with jangling bells, attached to a species of groove in the pavement, through which it was dragged, with a great deal of rumbling, bouncing and scratching, by a couple of remarkably small horses. When it reached a certain point the people in front of the grave-yard, of whom much the greater number were women, carrying satchels and parcels,

projected themselves upon it in a compact body – a movement suggesting the scramble for places in a life-boat at sea and were engulfed in its large interior. Then the life-boat – or the life-car, as the lady at the window of the hotel vaguely designated it – went bumping and jingling away upon its invisible wheels, with the helmsman (the man at the wheel) guiding its course incongruously from the prow. This phenomenon was repeated every three minutes, and the supply of eagerly-moving women in cloaks, bearing reticules and bundles, renewed itself in the most liberal manner. On the other side of the grave-yard was a row of small red brick houses, showing a series of homely, domestic-looking backs; at the end opposite the hotel a tall wooden church-spire, painted white, rose high into the vagueness of the snow-flakes. *The lady at the window looked at it* for some time; for reasons of her own she thought it the ugliest thing she had ever seen. She hated it, she despised it; it threw her into a state of irritation that was quite out of proportion to any sensible motive. She had never known herself to care so much about church-spires. (34)

After these long shots from her angle, we get once again a close-up of our female protagonist from an external point of view:

She was not pretty; but even when it expressed perplexed irritation her face was most interesting and agreeable. Neither was she in her first youth; yet, though slender, with a great deal of extremely well-fashioned roundness of contour – a suggestion both of maturity and flexibility – she carried her three and thirty years as a light-wristed Hebe might have carried a brimming wine-cup. Her complexion was fatigued, as the French say; her mouth was large, her lips too full, her teeth uneven, her chin rather commonly modeled; she had a thick nose, and when she smiled – she was constantly smiling – the lines beside it rose too high, toward her eyes. But these eyes were charming: gray in color, brilliant, quickly glancing, gently resting, full of intelligence. Her forehead was very low – it was her only handsome feature; and she had a great abundance of crisp dark hair, finely frizzled, which was always braided in a manner that suggested some



Southern or Eastern, some remotely foreign, woman. She had a large collection of ear-rings, and wore them in alternation; and they seemed to give a point to her Oriental or exotic aspect. (34-5)

The close-up is relaxed into a fullshot and we have a conversation between the two major characters. The point of view remains external, while focalisation is alternating between external and internal, as the word in italics indicate:

She turned away from the window at last, pressing her hands to her eyes. "It's too horrible!" she exclaimed. "I shall go back – I shall go back!" And she flung herself into a chair before the fire.

"Wait a little, dear child," said the young man softly, sketching away at his little scraps of paper. The lady put out her foot; it was very small, and there was an immense rosette on her slipper. *She fixed her eyes* for a while *on* this ornament, and then *she looked at* the glowing bed of anthracite coal in the grate. "Did you ever see anything so hideous as that fire?" she demanded. "Did you ever see anything so – so affreux as – as everything?" She spoke English with perfect purity; but she brought out this French epithet in a manner that indicated that she was accustomed to using French epithets. (35)

This passage is followed by a more lengthy dialogue between the two on Felix's - according to Eugenia - too charming nature, which one imagines as the sequence of midshots or fullshots and their countershots.<sup>19</sup> After having excited our curiosity in Felix we finally get a close-up of this male protagonist. Focalisation is external:

And he came back to the table quickly, and picked up his utensils – a small sketching-board, a sheet of paper, and three or four crayons. He took his place at the window with these things, and stood there glancing out, plying his pencil with an air of easy skill. While he worked he wore a brilliant smile. Brilliant is indeed the word at this moment for his strongly-lighted face. He was eight and twenty years old; he had a short, slight, well-made figure. Though he bore a

---

<sup>19</sup> Countershot or reverse shot: in a dialogue scene a shot of the second participant (Monaco 450).

noticeable resemblance to his sister, he was a better favored person: fair-haired, clear-faced, witty-looking, with a delicate finish of feature and an expression at once urbane and not at all serious, a warm blue eye, an eyebrow finely drawn and excessively arched – an eyebrow which, if ladies wrote sonnets to those of their lovers, might have been made the subject of such a piece of verse – and a light moustache that flourished upwards as if blown that way by the breath of a constant smile. There was something in his physiognomy at once benevolent and picturesque. But, as I have hinted, it was not at all serious. The young man's face was, in this respect, singular; it was not at all serious, and yet it inspired the liveliest confidence. (37-8)

After some further conversation on their ambitions and the possible status of their relatives the two decide to go out to get a glimpse of the city. What follows is a series of extreme long shots first through an external focaliser, and then, from the italics on, through Felix:

And after a while they went out. The air had grown warm as well as brilliant; the sunshine had dried the pavements. They walked about the streets at hazard, looking at the people and the houses, the shops and the vehicles, the blazing blue sky and the muddy crossings, the hurrying men and the slow-strolling maidens, the fresh red bricks and the bright green trees, the extraordinary mixture of smartness and shabbiness. From one hour to another the day had grown vernal; even in the bustling streets there was an odor of earth and blossom. *Felix* was immensely entertained. He had called it a comical country, and he went about laughing at everything he saw. You would have said that American civilization expressed itself to his sense in a tissue of capital jokes. The jokes were certainly excellent, and the young man's merriment was joyous and genial. He possessed what is called the pictorial sense; and this first glimpse of democratic manners stirred the same sort of attention that he would have given to the movements of a lively young person with a bright complexion. Such attention would have been demonstrative and complimentary; and in the present case Felix might have

passed for an undispirited young exile revisiting the haunts of his childhood. He kept looking at the violent blue of the sky, at the scintillating air, at the scattered and multiplied patches of color. (41)

It also has to be emphasised that it is these very “extreme long shots” that provide ample details of the environment, which, as I have indicated, embed the story in realism.

The above narrative method, inviting the reader to look at things from varying distances, and also the presentation of some view through a focaliser, then focusing on the focaliser himself from an external point of view, then doing the same with another focaliser, is very dynamic, filmic. Let me repeat that this narrative method is very far from the one idealised by James in the Preface to *The Ambassadors*, which favours presenting the plot through a single centre of consciousness.

This alternation of depths of field and focalisation prevails all through the novella, in some respects even more conspicuously. As we have just seen, the first chapter contains three scenes, one inside the hotel, a second one taking place in the streets of Boston, and a third, also internal scene in the hotel room, and all of them operate with the same characters. The further chapters are even more dynamic in the sense that each comprises several scenes with a changing set of participants. James’s narrative method, however, is the same all through – we have an (compared again to his late phase) unusually large amount of dialogue (shots-countershots of mid- and full depth, external focalisation) and then are allowed access into the mind of one of the participants to “see” some reflections on what has been said (midshots, close-ups, internal focalisation). Very often, when a new setting appears, we have long and extreme long “shots” through external and internal focalisers.

Remarkably, and contrary to its text base, *The Europeans* as a film does not operate with the change of focalisation too much; apart from the dialogues’ usual shot-countershot structure, which implies that we are looking at the speaker from the listener’s perspective, there are just a few cases when we are obviously sharing the viewpoint of one particular character, when internal focalisation is established. One example is when Felix enters the Wentworth estate and so do we together with him (scene 2); the other one is when Eugenia is dragged into a packed ballroom by Lizzie (scene 12) and despite all

her social skills she is looking around in bewilderment; or when Robert Acton is gazing into Eugenia's living room through the window and is musing over her piano playing. In the first two cases we are treated to somebody's impressions of a new environment, in the third case we are looking at a character with the eyes of another and kind of perceive the latter's impressions. I would say that these are two such cases when film typically applies the method. To make the list complete, we also have to mention Eugenia's searching for the signs of age on her face in a mirror in scene 47.

The Merchant-Ivory duo does not rely much on variations of the depth of field either in this film. Most shots range from long shots to a few extreme long shots, and this indeed gives the film a kind of picture book character. There are few fullshots, and only two close-ups: in scene 31 the camera focuses on Acton's face as he is gazing at a crystal object intended for Eugenia, while in just-mentioned scene 47 Eugenia is scrutinising her own face. Both scenes are added scenes, they have no apparent counterpart in the novel. It seems that the filmmakers do not rely on the original texts in the above two respects, they do not take advantage of the clues offered by the author, and are only likely to consult the film's screenplay, not the original text, when trying to find the optimal camera positions.

Camera angles are also traditionally used. Practically everything is recorded from mid position, except for the commonplace cases when during a conversation we are looking down at somebody sitting from the perspective somebody standing. Mention might be made of the use of the flashback technique in scene 45, when Robert Acton's daydreaming about Eugenia is visualised.

In view of all this one might conclude that Merchant-Ivory do not make full use of the technical possibilities offered by film, but this relative technical simplicity is not to be confused with the lack of sight. The historical verisimilitude of costumes and interiors is a source of pleasure in itself. Even more striking, however, is the high number of outdoor scenes, which was also not at all typical of earlier James adaptations. The BBC's 1968 *The Portrait of a Lady*, for example, was shot in a studio from the beginning to the end. Mention has to be made of the composition of both in- and outdoors frames: many of them can be regarded as pieces of art in themselves. The natural colours of all the beautiful sceneries are another major attraction. Quite interestingly, instead of James's

spring, the film was shot in early autumn, but the vibrant reds, browns, yellows, greens still exude joie de vivre rather than the sense of decay. Though in the DVD interview Ivory claims that this timing was not deliberate, the warm autumn images are undoubtedly more in line with the plot's tragic-romantic dichotomy than spring images could ever be, as spring is typically associated with romances and comedies only. All this certainly proves that *The Europeans* represents a forward step in the history of adaptations: the filmmakers left the studio and did put more emphasis on visuality than it had been usual before. To demonstrate the significance of the progress made let me quote here how Lee Clark Mitchell, who is generally sympathetic towards Cellan Jones's 1972 *The Golden Bowl* adaptation, described the latter production as "bare-bones [...] with restrained costumes, uncluttered rooms, shot in under-stated studio sets" (297).

If we have a look at the table of scenes, we will find that, as Leavis indicated, the original dialogues indeed lent themselves for filming, making dramatisation nearly superfluous many times. Notwithstanding Jhabvala's literal borrowings, there are, however, some notable changes as well.

Some scenes obviously had to be right away omitted because of time limitations, while some extra ones are added. Of the first case the omission of Chapter I is an important example, and I have already indicated how the information it provides about Felix's past is partly transferred to later scenes. Other scenes are lost without a trace, for example, the brief scene of Chapter XII, in which Eugenia says farewell to Felix already on board of her ship, and implies that she does not intend to keep in close touch with him. As scene 47, in which Eugenia is observing her wrinkles in a mirror, expresses her disillusionment with life just as well, the omission does not have far reaching consequences.

As for additions, the most relevant is the invented ball scene, a great opportunity to bring people together, since a mere succession of lengthy visits (which actually make up the book's plot) would not do so well on the big screen. I would name it an umbrella scene, since there are as many as six crucial conversations, shorter scenes (if we like sub-scenes) take place at this social function: Felix talks to Mr. Wentworth on Clifford's vice, Eugenia tells Acton the story of her marriage, Eugenia is introduced to Mrs. Acton, the Lizzie-Eugenia conflict is made apparent by Lizzie deliberately introducing Eugenia to

circles which she would not fit in, Felix and Gertrude converse on their future, and Charlotte and Mr. Brand practically do the same. These dialogues are cut into 12 scenes, which, technically, are parallel syntagmas<sup>20</sup>. All this is quite opposite to James's usual linearity in the presentation of events. This succession of parallel syntagmas against the backdrop of ball music lends rhythm and pace, as well as spectacle and splendour to the film. I suspect that this clustering of events is a typical filmic method: like drama, film seems to be in favour, if not of time unity, at least of more dense plots with a greater capacity to keep the viewers' attention. It is also apparent, though, that in film and stage drama the indication of the lapse of time is simply more complicated than in novels where it is enough to drop a half-sentence and the reader is aware that a whole year has passed.

Another not yet mentioned extra scene, in which Gertrude throws herself on her bed and screams that she loves Felix, apparently takes the place of a sex scene in this film. Instead of the usual nudity, which appears so incompatible with Henry James, we are to witness suppressed sexual desire. This scene calls attention to an important difference between added scenes: there are some to which there is no reference at all in the novella, and of this type it is an excellent example, while there are others which I will call "unfoldings" of certain brief references.

It is relevant, however, that despite having no equivalent in the text at all, the above scene does not change anybody's function in the story: Gertrude is attracted to Felix both in novel and film in every sense of the word. It is obvious, though, that added scenes also carry a great potential for indicating changes in functions. In another already mentioned added scene Lizzie is asking her brother for money in a quite roundabout way and is openly dissuading him from attaching himself to Eugenia. The scene is also Jhabvala's invention, but represents a more radical change in the sense that it repositions Lizzie's character: we have seen how her function changes and the focus of the novel shifts a bit as result of its inclusion. Notwithstanding the difference, I would say that these are both added scenes in the classical sense, by which, once again, I mean their having no textual equivalent.

---

<sup>20</sup> "Parallel montage or parallel syntagmas allow the filmmaker to alternate between two stories that may or may not be interrelated, cross-cutting between them" (Monaco, 185).

A further type of added scenes can be when the germ of the scene, a reference, is present in the text, but it is not fully elaborated, and thus one is not inclined to regard it as an independent scene. The following passage and the scene based on it are an important case in point:

She [Eugenia] passed her last evening at her uncle's, where she had never been more charming, and in parting with Clifford Wentworth's affianced bride she drew from her own finger a curious old ring and presented it to her with the prettiest speech and kiss. Gertrude, *who as an affianced bride was also indebted to her gracious bounty*, admired this little incident extremely. (193, my italics)

This half sentence in italics is all that we have in connection with Gertrude receiving presents from her in-law-to-be on her departure, but it is turned into a whole scene in the film. This quite common adaptation practice I would christen "unfolding", and would regard it as a subtype of dramatization to distinguish it from another frequent type, which perhaps could be called "dialogisation". In the case of unfoldings the filmmaker decides on the exact details of the scene, i.e. on the set, on the expressions used, sometimes even on the characters involved, whereas in the case of dialogisation there is information about all these details in the text in the form of description.

Returning to unfoldings, it is also possible to distinguish between ones that represent changes in functions, and ones that do not. The above example is of the former type, as besides being another demonstration of Eugenia's worldliness and social polish, of her ability to save face in difficult situations, the scene overemphasises Gertrude's naivety, which is not quite in line with James's intentions.

It seems logical that the number of added scenes in a film and their type is also indicative of the extent of transformation that has taken place, as they apparently have a strong effect on character functions. In *The Europeans* the number of added scenes is relatively low (according to my table only 10, all types included), and, more importantly, there are only two which can be supposed to result in a change of the above mentioned secondary functions (scenes 38 and 39). It is also notable that the changes in Eugenia's and Lizzie's functions implied by these scenes are not reinforced or elaborated by further

scenes; there is no other occasion on which we could observe Felix's condescension towards his sister, or Lizzie's dependence on her brother. The functions are presented through a single act, and this fact in itself can be regarded as an indication of their secondary nature.

The inclusion of the "umbrella scene" calls attention to another possible change: change in location. We have seen how several scenes of the novella were moved to a ball that never appears in James's text. I believe that in this case the change of location itself does not carry any special message, does not result in changes in functions, as it is nearly the same whether Felix and Mr. Wentworth discuss Felix's vice in the latter's studio or at a party. However, it is presumably a matter of importance whether a declaration of love is made in a ballroom or in a cemetery – our anticipations with regard to the relationship's future will probably be different.

In addition to the accelerating power of parallel syntagmas, music also lends rhythm and pace to this film. The scores were written by Merchant-Ivory's household composer Richard Robbins on the basis of Clara Schumann's romantic themes, which can be regarded as another echo of romance. Music in this film primarily strengthens the atmosphere of cheerfulness, even exhilaration, especially in Eugenia and Acton's outdoor scenes, for example, in scenes 7 and 9. It also reflects the differences between the tastes of the Americans and Europeans: Eugenia plays complicated Beethoven tunes on her piano while the Americans dance to simple, catchy melodies at the Actons' ball.

Finally, mention should be made of the actors cast in the major roles. In line with Hill, Lisa Eichhorn (Gertrude), Wesley Addy (Mr. Wentworth) or Robin Ellis (Robert Acton) have never been household names, but were and are esteemed by film experts for their cultured airs. They had also all had a theatrical background before getting in touch with Merchant-Ivory. Tim Woodward (Felix) is the scion of a well-known British acting dynasty. Lee Remick, however, was an American film actress of star value in the seventies. It will be typical with the trio's later films as well that they smuggle one well-known name into the cast, though generally into less prominent roles, to whet the audience's curiosity.

Critical and public interest in *The Europeans* only became more intense after the success of *A Room with a View* (1985) and *Howards End* (1992). At the time of its



production this Merchant-Ivory work was only screened in the cinemas of six countries,<sup>21</sup> implying that at that time the film had no real attraction outside the Anglo-Saxon world.

On the pages to come I am to describe the cinematic devices applied in each scene of the film and the changes their use entailed in the narrative substance. At the identification of scenes I have relied on Christian Metz's definition of the term: a scene is any sequence in which the succession of events is continuous (*Film Language: A Semiotics of Cinema* 189).

---

<sup>21</sup> IMDb data. The Internet Movie Database (IMDb) is an online database of information related to films, television programmes and video games.

## 5. Scenes in the Novel and in the Film

Scenes in the film	Cinematic devices Relevant changes compared to text
1. Autumn scenery. Gertrude is in the garden. She tells Mr. Brand she is not to go to church because the “sky is blue”. She also says she has just puzzled her sister on purpose. Mr. Brand says he wants to tell her something but Gertrude asks him “not to say it now”.	Dialogue is literal borrowing from novella. Fullshots, midshots, closed frame compositions.
2. Felix appears, Gertrude is reading <i>The Arabian Nights</i> in the garden. The girl invites him into the house. Felix, who walked from Boston, sums up his family’s history. Gertrude offers him cake. When the others are back from church she tells them this is the Prince of Silberstadt-Schreckenstein.	Internal point of view is prominent – we are entering the house with Felix. Literal borrowing from novella. Gertrude’s ‘Sleeping Beauty’ nature is implied.
3. Eugenia and Felix are driving to Mr. Wentworth in beautiful autumn scenery. Felix gives an account of their New England relatives and the Actons. They arrive in front of impressive but puritanical country house. Eugenia is introduced to everyone. “I should like to stay here”, says she, crying. Acton turns away.	Dialogues are literal borrowings from novella. In novella Felix gives his account in the hotel – the road in the film provides a more spectacular, mobile backdrop. Verisimilitude is important.
4. The Wentworths and the Actons are together. Acton proposes Mr. Wentworth	Literal borrowing.

<p>giving the visitors the small house.</p> <p>Gertrude agrees, she would like a foreign house in the neighbourhood, a place to go to. Her father asks her not to get excited.</p> <p>Gertrude says she already is, Charlotte also says they had better go to other house.</p>	<p>Only difference is that in novella Charlotte wants them to stay in north-east room.</p>
<p>5. Eugenia is happily unpacking in small house. Meanwhile Gertrude and Charlotte are on their way to take her some food.</p> <p>Turn back from doorsteps as Gertrude says she might not like uninvited visitors.</p>	<p>Lively music underlines her happiness.</p> <p>Parallel syntagmas, but Eugenia only appears briefly.</p>
<p>6. Eugenia is still unpacking. Mr. Brand and Acton are talking on the road in front of her house. What the devil has brought her here? – asks Acton.</p>	<p>Still parallel syntagmas, but images of Eugenia appear briefly only again.</p> <p>In novel: What has brought Madame Recamier to live in that place? Less sophisticated language than in novella.</p>
<p>7. Acton and Eugenia are driving out together in colourful autumn scenery.</p>	<p>Colours and music are especially important.</p>
<p>8. Gertrude and Felix are together in Felix's studio. Felix is painting her portrait. Mr. Wentworth appears and Felix tells him he also wants "to make his head." For Mr. Wentworth, sitting for one's portrait is a form of idleness.</p>	<p>Felix preferring Gertrude to the other two girls is apparent from the beginning. In novella he is amazed by all three for a considerable length of time – European Epicurean is impressed by becoming simplicity and confidence of American women. Film's Felix is more straightforward, pragmatic.</p>
<p>9. Robert Acton and Eugenia at the pond. She says her motive to come was that she only had artificial relations in Europe. Acton suggests making their relationship</p>	<p>Dialogue is literal borrowing.</p> <p>As we have seen their trip to outdoors in scene 7, this scene functions as parallel syntagma with scene 8. The development</p>

more natural.	of the two romantic relationships is simultaneous.
10. Felix and Gertrude in Felix's studio. You are very beautiful, he says. They waltz to sounds of music box.	Added scene. The courting process is made more explicit than in novel.
11. Felix and Gertrude are walking around chalet. Felix says New England people do not get any pleasure out of life. He says Gertrude is different from rest of her family.	Literal borrowing.
12. Gertrude is walking home from chalet through the meadows. She meets Mr. Brand who confesses his love to her. He claims his influence on her makes her family happy. Gertrude says nothing makes them happy. Mr. Brand: You have changed.	Outdoor scene again.  In novel his remark that she will get back to him – more envious and threatening – creates real tension.
12. Lizzie Acton shows Eugenia around – first to married ladies, and then to dancing youngsters – Eugenia does not like either company. Lizzie is apparently happy at her despair.	Ball at the Actons Several short scenes take place, which are practically all parallel syntagmas. Added scene. Eugenia is never put in such a situation in novel. Lizzie confronts Eugenia with fact that her usual practices do not work in America.
13. Robert Acton offers Eugenia his arm. She tells him the history of her marriage while looking at bric-à-brac. Lizzie turns up, saying she dusts all of them herself but sometimes feels like dropping them. Kind	Acton appears as savior of Eugenia. In novella conversation takes place during their excursions.

<p>of scaring Eugenia by pretending to drop sg.</p> <p>Eugenia calls her a little household fairy.</p>	<p>James does refer to Lizzie's affinity for housework in Chapter VI. She is never trying to poke fun at Eugenia in this adolescent manner.</p>
<p>14. During the ball Lizzie in her mother's room. They are preparing for Eugenia's visit. Mother asks what she is like; Lizzie says she has her nose in the air. She likes Robert though, she adds.</p>	<p>Eugenia visits Mrs. Acton in novel as well, but not during a ball.</p> <p>In novella Lizzie only blames Eugenia on the one significant point: that she is telling lies.</p>
<p>15. Eugenia and Acton again. She tells him about a divorce document in the drawer of her writing desk which she just has to sign to free herself. Lizzie interrupts them saying her mother is to see them.</p>	<p>Lizzie seems to be pleased to interrupt.</p>
<p>16. Felix and Gertrude talk about Felix going away. Felix says she can write to him, he will be discrete and burn the letters.</p>	<p>Conversation itself appears in novel but not at ball.</p>
<p>17. Mr. Brand and Charlotte in the staircase. Brand complains about Gertrude's indifference, and praises Charlotte's "sense, soundness and fine understanding".</p>	<p>Added scene.</p> <p>His pining after Gertrude while just as pretty Charlotte is standing beside him is source of comedy.</p>
<p>18. Gertrude and Felix again. Gertrude: I shall never write, I do not know how to. Felix notices Charlotte's admiration for Mr. Brand. Gertrude reveals that Charlotte wants her to marry Mr. Brand. Felix suggests marrying Charlotte and Mr. Brand</p>	<p>Conversation is borrowing from novel.</p>

off, as that would make everybody happy.	
<p>19. Eugenia in Mrs. Acton's room. Lizzie and Robert Acton are also present.</p> <p>Eugenia praises the American way of life, its naturalness, "primitiveness". Mrs. Acton seems to be puzzled by her remarks.</p>	<p>Visit does take place in novella.</p> <p>Mrs. Acton's non-worldliness is referred to by James at the end of Chapter VI. She is never subject of comedy though – in film her bewildered facial expressions are funny.</p>
<p>20. Mr. Wentworth and Felix are conversing. Mr. Wentworth admits that Clifford has a vice – he drinks. He says Mr. Brand has already talked to him. Felix recommends the company of clever agreeable women like his sister.</p>	<p>Conversation is borrowing.</p> <p>Midshots instead of usual fullshots – tension.</p>
<p>21. In Mrs. Acton's room. Eugenia talks of her intention to hire a cook, to have more couleur locale. Mrs. Acton is still puzzled. She reads Emerson whom she finds "improving". Lizzie remarks that she does not need much improvement. Eugenia takes leave as she is afraid of tiring Mrs. Acton.</p>	<p>Added phrase, with it Lizzie pronounces moral judgement on Eugenia.</p>
<p>22. Eugenia and Acton in corridor. Eugenia wants to leave ball. She feels "out of tune". Lizzie calls: their mother wants Robert. Eugenia says she likes old Mrs. Acton. She also says she is on the verge of signing divorce documents. Acton says he hopes she will let him know when she actually has signed them.</p>	<p>In novel Eugenia handles American society quite successfully, she is visited by all relevant Boston ladies.</p> <p>Borrowing from novella.</p> <p>In novel Eugenia's visit to the Actons ends on same note.</p>

23. Mr. Wentworth and Felix. Felix repeats his proposal that Clifford should spend more time with Eugenia. Mr. Wentworth is shocked by idea.	Borrowing from novella. Return to scene 20 emphasises the parallelism of montages.
24. Eugenia tells Clifford to call her carriage. She wants to leave the ball – she has migraine. Felix is tipsy, tells her to stay longer, Eugenia coquettishly asks him what for.	Added scene. Eugenia's coquettish side is emphasised. End of ball scenes.
25. Felix and Eugenia are dining in the small house. Felix says she should encourage Clifford to come more often. Eugenia jokingly asks if she is to offer herself as a superior form of intoxication. Also she asks her brother if he wants to offer her a "second string to her boat."	In novel Felix is found to call on Eugenia without any intervention.  Phrase is borrowing from novella.  Added phrase. Steering one's boat is one of James's favourite metaphors for leading one's life, for example, he uses it in connection with Mme de Vionnet – Jhabvala might have been influenced by this fact. Intertextuality appears in film.
26. Gertrude and Charlotte are going to bed. Gertrude blackmails Charlotte: if she still wants Gertrude to marry Mr. Brand she will tell him that it is actually Charlotte who loves him.	In Chapter VIII Gertrude blackmails Charlotte the same way. Pastoral music.
27. Mr. Brand and Gertrude are walking in the meadows. Mr. Brand asks if he is really losing Gertrude. Gertrude says she cares for pleasure; it is Charlotte who cares for	Conversation is borrowing, with the exception that in novella Gertrude does not refer to Charlotte.

the great questions of life.	
28. Acton is to take leave for apparently longer journey in front of Eugenia's house. Lizzie Action and Clifford also appear in the foreground sometimes. Lizzie does not believe Clifford claiming that the Baroness likes her. She rather believes everything Eugenia says is to be taken the opposite way.	<p>Unfolding. Leave-taking itself is not detailed in novella, there is only reference to Acton leaving to visit a sick friend.</p> <p>Borrowing from the end of Chapter VIII. Lizzie – as the chorus character of tragedies – pronounces moral judgement on tragic heroine.</p>
29. Clifford visits Eugenia with bouquet. Eugenia's changing apparel indicates he goes several times. They talk of Clifford having to make the "Grand Tour" in Europe to get some manners.	There is reference to Clifford's <i>frequent</i> visits to Eugenia in novel – her appearance in different frocks is excellent filmic tool conveying the same message.
30. Customs house. Acton has ordered something presumably from Europe. Some people are checking contents of crates.	Added scene.
31. Acton is seen in close-up examining crystal object.	<p>Added scene. One of two close-ups of considerable duration in the whole film.</p> <p>In novel there is no reference to his bringing any gifts for Eugenia from his trip.</p>
32. Clifford and Eugenia having tea at Eugenia's. Eugenia offers to educate Clifford. She also asks if Clifford is in love with his cousin as such things ought to be known. She says Clifford should come to Europe to make the Grand Tour. People will think he is Eugenia's lover and she will show how little one may mind that. I	<p>Dialogue is borrowing from novel.</p> <p>At this point film is much more explicit than novel – that Eugenia is toying with</p>



would mind that a great deal, says Clifford.	Clifford is apparent.
32. Acton on his way home visualizes Eugenia accepting and admiring crystal object.	Added scene. Effect is achieved by quickly changing medium shots of Eugenia admiring the crystal object, and medium shots of Robert Acton sitting in his barouche (parallel syntagmas).
33. Clifford in Eugenia's salon. Eugenia is playing the piano. Eugenia brings up his relationship with Lizzie again. Clifford tells her he does not want anyone to arrange his marriage.	Eugenia only touches on the topic once in the novella.
34. Robert Acton arrives home late at night. Rings bell of big house, finds Mr. Wentworth all alone. The Baroness has not honoured them for three days, he says. Acton decides to call on her right away. "If we ever had any virtue among us we should hold to it now."	Literal borrowing from novella.  Jhabvala uses literal phrase to express Mr. Wentworth's formality.
35. Meanwhile Clifford and Eugenia are talking of Lizzie. She is the most charming girl, says Clifford. You are entangled, says Eugenia. Noise from garden: there is someone. That's your father, says baroness, and hides Clifford in Felix's studio. Resumes playing the piano. Acton looks in through the window, and seems to be moved by her seeming loneliness. Eugenia notices him, lets him in, from now on she speaks very fast. Clifford makes some noise in studio, Eugenia says it's just her maid. Acton asks if she had sent the	Rivalry, conflict of two women is much more explicit than in novel. Eugenia and Felix are joint focalisers.  Very good acting out of his strengthening tenderness towards Eugenia. Acton is the apparent focaliser.

<p>divorce document to Germany. Eugenia gives no straight answer, just says she has told him too much. Acton asks her to let him amuse her, and offers to take her to Niagara. Eugenia pretends to be insulted and asks if it is the extent of what he is offering to her. Acton asks back if she has sent the divorce documents. Clifford comes out of his hiding place. Baroness sends him home. She tells Acton Clifford is violently in love with her, and sends Acton home as well.</p>	<p>In novel there is no reference to divorce documents at this point.</p> <p>Eugenia's question is more direct than anything in novel.</p> <p>Rest is literal borrowing.</p>
<p>36. Lizzie and Clifford chasing each other playfully in the Actons' garden. They are making fun of Eugenia's mannerisms. Robert looks down on them from window then goes down, and asks Clifford what he was doing at the baroness last night. Clifford asks him about Eugenia's story. Acton also invents a story and says that Eugenia thinks Clifford has taken a dislike to her and whenever he goes there he hides himself in Felix's studio. Felix says he has seen her telling a lot of lies. Also adds that she knows everything. To Acton's question he claims he is not at all sweet on the Baroness.</p>	<p>The initial part of the scene is added. In novel they are not seen poking fun at Eugenia. The young couple and Eugenia's conflict is made more apparent.</p> <p>Rest is near literal borrowing.</p>
<p>37. People going to church in rain. Gertrude and Felix run away, hide under tree and umbrella. Felix says it is not correct that they are alone together –</p>	<p>At beginning of Chapter X there is reference to people going to church in rain. Felix there, however, does accompany Gertrude to church. Film sharpens conflict</p>

because he loves her more and more.	of Epicureanism and Puritanism. Felix's remark also appears in text but there it is uttered during an ordinary walk.
38. Baroness covering herself with blankets in her salon. Felix steps in and asks who Eugenia was expecting as she seems disappointed. Her answer is pointed: Hope you do not think I am reduced to waiting for a Mr. Robert Acton. She also says that Acton has actually proposed to her. Felix looks at her with condescending smile. To Eugenia's question he announces his intention to marry Gertrude Wentworth.	Novella also describes a cold rainy afternoon – tragic storyline unfolds in less pleasant weather than the romantic one.  In novella he believes Eugenia. Felix here seems more mature and critical.
39. Lizzie enters Robert's room and says she is to go to a party. In an indirect, roundabout way she asks for money and receives what she wants. Robert has just been observing crystal ornament and Lizzie asks what it is. She adds she hopes it is not something for "that" Baroness. She declares he is certainly not in love with her. Says she will find the prettiest and best little girl for Acton. Acton gives the crystal ornament to her. Lizzie thanks him meaningfully.	Added scene. Lizzie is also forced to get what she wants through some machinations.  Another example of making the Eugenia – Lizzie conflict more apparent.  Novella's Lizzie never interferes openly.  Scene represents Lizzie's complete victory over Eugenia.
40. Gertrude and Charlotte in their kitchen. Charlotte working diligently, Gertrude is just playing with eggs and tells Charlotte about Felix's adventures in Europe. Then, saying she wants to scream, she runs upstairs and throws herself on her bed.	Added scene. Frames are in line with "diligent Puritan girl" stereotype.  Suppressed desire – takes place of sex

	scene.
41. Felix invites Mr. Brand into her studio to tell him something delicate. He reveals that Charlotte is in love with him, which apparently shocks Mr. Brand. Felix says he should not let her languish.	Literal borrowing.  A few close-ups of Mr. Brand's face – better opportunity to observe reactions.
42. Charlotte is sewing peacefully. Felix drops in and tells her he is in love with Gertrude. Charlotte is sorry for Mr. Brand. Felix says he is not at all sorry for him, for it should be enough for any man that Charlotte is in love with him. Asks Charlotte to help him persuade Mr. Wentworth to consent to their marriage with Gertrude.	Literal borrowing
43. Charlotte and Mr. Wentworth in his study. Mr. Wentworth is reading out sg, Charlotte is very tense, apparently wants to say sg. Felix storms in and asks for Gertrude's hand. Gertrude enters and claims his father has never had any confidence in her. Mr. Brand also enters and suggests that Mr. Wentworth should consent. He also wishes to marry the young couple. Charlotte urges her father to consent. On Mr. Brand's recommendation Mr. Wentworth finally consents.	Literal borrowing from novella.
44. Eugenia pays farewell visit to Mrs. Acton. Old lady says her son will miss the Baroness, and urges her to stay in her beautiful little house. Eugenia says she	Literal borrowing.

cannot stay for her son, and also that though her house is beautiful it is not to be compared with Mrs. Acton's.	
45. Acton lounging on a bench in his garden, thinking of Eugenia. His thoughts are visualized. Meanwhile Eugenia leaves house through garden and notices Acton. Tells him she is to go back to Europe, and asks why he has not gone to see her recently. He asks if she has sent the divorce documents to Germany. Also he asks what could be said to detain her. She asks for a reason to stay but Acton fails to provide any.	Visualisation of thoughts is typical tool used in connection with Acton. Effect is achieved with flashbacks.  All the rest is very literal borrowing.
46. Eugenia is showering presents on amazed Gertrude, and tells her that extraordinary women are valued in Europe. Acton also appears and offers his carriage for Eugenia for travelling to the port. Eugenia says it gives her great pleasure to accept the offer.	Unfolding.    Last, added sentence is great source of irony.
47. Eugenia examining her face in mirror. Soon after she is packing things, also shutting her piano.	Added scene.  Good filmic metaphor of her machinations being over.
48. Charlotte and Mr. Brand happily practicing his sermon in open air. Soon Lizzie and Clifford are also driving around happily. A pensive Acton is riding away alone.	Religion and pleasure in nature are connected – impact of Epicureanism.  Failure of Acton-Eugenia relationship is Youth and love triumphs.

## ***V. The Portrait of a Lady***

### **1. The Novel and its Characters**

Characters in a psychologising Henry James novel obviously tend to be more complicated than in a fairy tale, and are probably more complicated than in most films. As we have already seen, the functions they fulfil tend to be different in their various relationships and in a novel that encompasses a considerable length of time they are also likely to change, to develop. The latter phenomenon will gain special importance in connection with this novel.

Osmond's character in *The Portrait of a Lady* has attracted a surprising number of studies in recent times as well, indicating that criticism failed to reach a consensus on its interpretation, or that the consensus found is not really satisfying.

The latter case seems more probable. If any character in the Jamesian lifework is seen as one fulfilling just a single function, which anyway happens to coincide with Vladimir Propp's villain, it is Gilbert Osmond: in almost all the analyses he stands before us as the totally negative character, someone impossible to sympathise with. For the interpretations that consider Osmond in an unrelieved negative light I have coined an umbrella term: "diabolisation" approaches. The term is based on a profound relatively recent study to be credited to Robert Weisbuch (1998), in which the author establishes a link between Osmond's devilish figure and the Hawthornian tradition. (As I have already noted, Hawthorne's formidable influence on James was analysed by Marius Bewley in *The Complex Fate*.)

I have always found Osmond's "diabolisation" somehow irreconcilable with James's complexity, and have been looking for works offering a less simplistic interpretation of him. Jonathan Freedman in his *Professions of Taste* (1990) treats Osmond as the quintessential 19<sup>th</sup> century aesthete, a highly satirised figure. The satirisation puts the aesthete in quite a negative context, so I had inclined to identify his approach as one of the "diabolisation" approaches till I read the following:

That the novel also invites us to view Osmond satirically has consequences not otherwise graspable [...] for it brings Osmond into a recognizably social world. Instead of asking us to view Osmond and Osmondism as representing a nearly supernatural form of evil [...] it invites us to understand the social dimensions of such behaviour: to understand its role in the power games of the human community...(152)

Not much later Freedman also emphasises that “...[he] does not mean to stress the satirised side of Osmond’s character at the expense of its other components, particularly that aspect critics have tended to focus on: his massive egotism, his manipulative coldness” (152).

While I fully agree with Freedman’s proposal to examine Osmond and Osmondism in a social context to avoid one-sidedness, I would also suggest looking at him in his development, for James’s text does allow such a treatment. I believe that the character most critics analyse, and which is indeed close to the manifestation of the evil and thus can be regarded as a link with Hawthorne, is just one phase in this development process. I have also found that dropping the “static, changeless character”, if you like one-functional or “flat character”, approach allows a better understanding of the novel’s notoriously problematic ending.

When reading the story of Osmond’s life there is one word that probably most frequently penetrates the reader’s mind: offended. This man is apparently hurt, is angry with the world as it does not appreciate him to the extent he thinks he would deserve. There are plenty of hints to that effect in the novel, for example, “he had never forgiven Providence for not making him an English duke” (280), or he is said to be disappointed because of not having things from the Uffizi and the Pitti, etc. Most striking, however, is his pose of “not caring”, which can easily be interpreted as the reaction of the hurt person to an environment he cannot influence.

“The desire to succeed greatly – in something or other – had been the dream of his youth” (281), we read of him not much before his marriage takes place. But what could be a more natural ambition of any young man? And why does not he succeed then? Osmond obviously does have intelligence, good understanding (though, significantly, no

explicit talent), which should enable him to distinguish himself. Of this we will see ample proof, let me just mention one here: during her frequently analysed vigil in Chapter 42 a most disillusioned Isabel still admits that “she had not been mistaken about the beauty of [Osmond’s] mind [...] A mind more ingenious, more subtle, more cultivated, more trained to admirable exercises she had not encountered” (394). Ralph recognises the danger in marrying someone with so much unfulfilled ambition and does call Osmond “narrow” (319), but it is most probably narrow in the sense of self-important, selfish, not in the sense of narrow-minded.

James gives an interesting explanation for Osmond’s failure in life: “...as the years went on, the conditions attached to success became so various and repulsive that the idea of making an effort gradually lost its charm” (281). The conditions of success are *repulsive* to someone who is generally regarded as one of the shrewdest egotists or go-getters in world literature? Yes, for initially his unquestionable intellectual strength and above-the-average artistic sensitivity must have been supposed to guarantee distinction by themselves, without having to turn to means beneath his dignity.

Here I also have to refer to the fact that James in *The Golden Bowl* establishes a very firm link between morality and intellect, stating that it is only people of intelligence that are able to recognise the immorality of an act. (I will discuss this issue in more detail in the next chapter of this work.) Applying the idea to Osmond’s case this means that his disgust at lowly careerist practices must spring from a strong intellect as well as from a well developed moral sense, which sheds positive light on his character.

Isabel, during her very first visit to Osmond’s Florence house, not only does notice her host’s isolation but also identifies its reasons: “His sensibility had governed him – had governed him too much; it had made him impatient of vulgar troubles and had led him to live by himself” (242). She also notices that his sensitivity results in shyness: “...her host was a shy personage; [...] such shyness as his – the shyness of ticklish nerves and fine perceptions – was perfectly consistent with the best breeding” (243).

Thus, being oversensitive and, one may say, over-intelligent to integrate in society and to fill public positions, Osmond is forced to modify his ambition. “Success, for Gilbert Osmond, would be to make himself felt; that was the only success to which he could now pretend” (283). In his early forties he already clearly sees that he is never to be



the leader of masses, in the best case he will be admired by a select few for his understanding and taste. This is the part – the part of the admirer – that Isabel plays in his life initially. Since the girl is the embodiment of all things Osmond himself appreciates, of intelligence, beauty, vitality, as well as of wealth and position, Osmond at last feels that in Isabel's love he receives his due from the world. No wonder that during their courtship and engagement we see him at his best: "His good humour was imperturbable, his knowledge universal, his manners were the gentlest in the world. [...] He was pleased with everything; he had never been pleased with so many things at once" (280), says James's narrator.

With the deepening of their relationship Osmond's deity status inevitably gives place to more complex feelings, and his wife's no longer treating him as her superior immensely irritates him. To this Isabel seems to refer during her Chapter 42 vigils again, when thinking that she has also kind of misled Osmond. Interestingly, Isabel's sobering is not described in the novel – when we first see the couple after their wedding they are already barely on speaking terms. The process, however, is not difficult to interpolate: after losing Isabel's unconditional admiration, Osmond is once again to find the means of "being felt", and now, in possession of the necessary financial means, he seeks the admiration of Roman high society. He sets about punishing if not the whole world, then at least this circle by becoming more and more exclusive. This just repels Isabel even more – and the two are trapped in a vicious circle. The process culminates in Osmond's beginning to hate Isabel – the inevitable consequence of his losing face before her, of his having to give up his pose of not trying to succeed. This happens when he is forced to reveal his earnest desire to catch an English peer for his daughter.

Power relations between Osmond and Isabel change once and for all with Lord Warburton's surrender as Pansy's suitor. Isabel is no longer afraid of him: "...his insulting her [...] suddenly ceased to be a pain" (444). The "development" of Osmond's character enters a new phase: he now does not even attempt to save the remains of Isabel's respect, only the remains of her fear, a far cry from his original objective of impressing the whole of mankind with some great achievement. The means he chooses to demonstrate his power is no less lowly than his aim: his daughter's imprisonment in the convent is a desperate attempt that already borders on the disgusting. Isabel, however,

seems to recognise that Osmond has lost his head, is beside himself due to his humiliation, at least I am inclined to interpret the following words in this manner: “He [Osmond] was going down, down; the vision of such a fall made her [Isabel] almost giddy. He was too strange, too different; he did not touch her” (444). Isabel’s awareness of her husband’s being in a peculiar, vulnerable mental state is most important with regard to the possibility of a common future.

It is remarkable that till we see the couple in the Palazzo Roccanera we never have the narrator’s negative judgement on Osmond. At first sight it might appear a dramaturgical tool, his true personality is kept under wraps to enable his marriage. One must notice, though, that his figure is treated with some understanding, he is endowed with some explicitly positive characteristics. Freedman points out that he is good at talking in paradoxes, which indicates a well-developed sense of humour. He has a sarcastic tongue, but if he is critical of others he is almost equally so of himself: on their very first meeting he already warns Isabel that he is not a genius, later on he honestly confesses that he is happy about her having money. Osmond also clearly sees his own self-centredness, knows himself to be an egotist: “I care greatly for myself” (220), he claims once, and one is inclined to construe such a high a level of self-knowledge as a sign of intelligence again. But is this egotism really an evil, supernatural, intolerable trait in him? Cannot it be the usual self-centredness of the sensitive, introverted type? James acquits Osmond of extraordinary selfishness, at least at the time of his introduction to Isabel:

...the reader may have gathered a suspicion that Gilbert Osmond was not untainted of selfishness. This is rather a coarse imputation to put upon a man of his refinement; and it behoves us at all times to remember the familiar proverb about those who live in glass houses. If Mr. Osmond was more selfish than most of his fellows, the fact will still establish itself. Lest it should fail to do so, I must decline to commit myself to an accusation so gross; the more *especially as several of the items of our story would seem to point the other way.* (282, my italics)

As Osmond's more and more questionable attempts to earn respect, then just to "make himself felt", fail one after the other, James can give over the floor to Isabel, Mme Merle, the Countess Gemini, etc. to make ever harsher judgements on him.

As his character disintegrates and declines, so does his relationship to art. His reserve and shyness excluded politics or public service as the means of earning distinction, so art and collectorship, which originally might have been intended for a hobby, remained there as second best alternatives to express his exquisiteness. That political power, political prominence are the things he valued most highly in his youth is proved by his words to Isabel: "There were two or three people in the world I envied – the Emperor of Russia, for instance, and the Sultan of Turkey. [...] I envied the Pope of Rome. [...] I did not care for anything less" (245).

Though the second best alternative, arts is the field in which he is closest to success, and thus that is where failure must be most painful. Blessed with so much sensitivity, such openness to impressions that Walter Pater would be most happy with him, he does not come up to the standard as an artist, he is only able to produce pictures that are good but not outstanding, or to copy pieces of art. He does not even have the comfort of being able to blame others for his failure, as he is artistic enough to see his own limitations: "...I was not a man of genius. I had no talents even; I took my measure early in life" (245), he tells Isabel.

I believe that this is the very point where his tragedy lies: he has no talent but is an excellent perceiver; he does have a refined eye and refined taste. I find it important to emphasise the above, for advocates of the "diabolisation" approaches put even this fact into doubt. Weisbuch claims that "his taste in art is itself poor" (114) while Freedman says that "it is only the naïve characters who see Osmond's taste as rich, rare and extraordinary" (150), and adds that Warburton and Rosier, both of whom he apparently considers to fall outside the naïve category, think otherwise. (I am actually not certain that in Rosier's case the exclusion is justified.) Mme Merle, however, seems to qualify as the paragon of naivety on these grounds, for she is of the following opinion, for example, in connection with Osmond's Florence home: "Your rooms, at least, are perfect. [...] I am struck with that afresh, whenever I come back. I know none better anywhere. You understand this sort of thing as no one else does" (224).

As for Rosier's remark on Osmond having bad taste ("He had a good deal [of taste] but some of it was very bad" [343]), I find it a mistake to take it at face value. It cannot be forgotten that the remark is made right after Osmond treating Rosier in a most appalling manner. To be insulted by one's host as Rosier is insulted by Osmond indeed justifies it, but all this has nothing to do with Osmond's relationship with fine arts. Also, when, on the same occasion, Rosier calls a room in the Palazzo "very ugly" (343) we probably had better substitute "cold" or "unfriendly" to be close to reality.

Freedman, however, differs from Weisbuch at one significant point: unlike Weisbuch, he does not deny Osmond ever having any artistic sensibility, he rather calls attention to a disintegration process: "As the novel progresses, Osmond's taste becomes progressively, even incrementally, diminished" (151), he writes. Though good taste, I believe, is something one cannot lose, Osmond does indeed seem to lose his passion for art along the way: his attitude to art parallels his attitude to life. In his youth, when his interest in both is genuine, he is capable of discovering a Coreggio, paints landscapes and, as we have just seen, furnishes his Florence hill house to perfection. By the time of Isabel's appearance on the scene, however, Osmond is already "very sick of it" (224), the major reason for which is probably the fact that collectorship is the fad of the time, almost everybody collects something, and as such it is unable to express intellectual superiority. His marriage, which brings new meaning to his life, also leads to a reconciliation with arts after a period of disillusionment. The newly married couple chooses the Palazzo Roccanera as their abode and Isabel is obliged to confess to Lord Warburton that "it was nothing when we came", and that its being a "good house" is solely her husband's merit (356). Houses, however, in *The Portrait* always reflect their inhabitants' state of mind (Chandler 95) and the Palazzo Roccanera is no exception. At the time of Warburton's visit it is grand but cold, and in accordance with Osmond's then preferences it contains objects the major function of which is to testify to the owners' wealth and social prominence (for example, the empire clock) and not to their taste.

As Osmond's hatred for his wife grows, so does his aversion to arts. Seeing that real good taste does not guarantee social distinction, he devotes himself to the task of matchmaking, to ensuring an outstanding social position for his daughter and through this, for himself. Being fully immersed in catching a first-rate husband for Pansy he is

honest when saying to Rosier that “I don’t care a fig for Capo di Monte” (339), and that he is losing his interest in old pots and plates. After having to admit defeat before Isabel we see him mechanically copying an antique coin, an act unlikely to give him much pleasure or to make any sense.

What has been, or, for that matter, will be said of Osmond holds true for Mme Merle as well. To see her as a one-function, stationary figure, someone habitually calculating and manipulative is a simplification. This mistake, however, is much less common in connection with Mme Merle, as Osmond’s apparent neglect, verging on contempt, earns sympathy for her. Significantly, late in the novel Isabel herself also expresses her sorrow for her former friend, and, even more relevantly, calls her a “great artist” (478). Referring to Isabel’s remark Freedman confirms that “Madame Merle possesses in abundance the positive qualities James habitually associated with the artist” (160). From this he draws an important conclusion:

As a result of this identification, Madame Merle’s status seems to increase. We are led to view her, along with Isabel, as someone who has been trapped and betrayed by circumstance and convention, and who has therefore been forced to employ even (especially) her most positive qualities for mere manipulation – and failed manipulation at that. (160)

To these lines I can only add that the above interpretation – as I have tried to show – can and has to be extended to Osmond as well. Osmond’s dislike of Mme Merle can actually be supposed to root in the fact that the lady’s personality and fate resembles his own to such a great extent.

Similarly to Osmond, in her youth Mme Merle must also find manipulation a repulsive weapon, something beneath her. There are important textual references to that effect: the Countess Gemini, the character who is familiar with most of the details of Merle and Osmond’s lives, tells Isabel that “the *only* tangible result she has ever achieved [...] has been her bringing you and Osmond together” (502, my italics). Also, we can see her greatly shocked by the effect of her manipulations when, in Chapter 49, after meeting Isabel, she tells Osmond that “You have dried up my soul” (481) and that “you have

made me bad” (482). Surely, a serial manipulator would never get in a rage just because of seeing one of her victims in despair. Even in Chapter 49, when Isabel realises that her marriage is Mme Merle’s creation, she admits that “There were people who had the match-making passion [...] but Madame Merle [...] was scarcely one of these” (478).

My interpretation is that her Gardencourt encounter with Isabel awakens Mme Merle to the fact that her heydays are over. She is likely to discover her young self in the interesting and intelligent girl. (It is notable that Freedman also draws a parallel between the two characters with the lines quoted above.) Merle is forced to realise that what she thought to be a natural reward of her extraordinary qualities, of her cleverness, of her exquisite taste, the marriage offer of a worthy and distinguished man, is now never to come; it is much more likely to be made to her next generation counterpart: Isabel. (Also lacking in creative artistic talents, Mme Merle does not have any other way to distinguish herself in the given age but by marriage.) This recognition is expressed by Merle in a surprisingly modern context: “I am old and stale and faded. [...] You have the great thing – you have actuality” (181). Offended too by not being rewarded by life for what she is, Mme Merle is kind of forced to use the commonplace weapon of match-making to help her child at least. I would also like to emphasise once again that when she introduces Isabel to Osmond he is not what he is at the end of the novel, and Merle bitterly refers to this when saying later to Osmond that “...it is only since your marriage that I have understood you” (483).

Literature has piled up ample evidence that to be born with a sensitive, subtle character is no simple challenge, and James is certainly not unaware of this. In 1870, on Minnie Temple’s death, he already writes to his brother about the hardships intelligent but unpractical beings have to face:

Her [Temple’s] character may be almost literally said to have been without practical application to life. She seems a sort of experiment of nature – an attempt, a specimen or example – a mere subject without an object. She was at any rate the helpless victim and toy of her own intelligence. [...] What a vast amount of truth appears now in all the common-places that she used to provoke – that she was restless – that she was helpless – that she was unpractical. (76)

Minnie is the personification, and is probably also a major inspiration behind James's favourite type: "those on whom nothing is lost"<sup>22</sup>. By listing proofs of their intelligence, of their taste in arts as well as of their sensitivity I tried to verify my decision to regard Osmond, and also Madame Merle, as representatives of this type. If we accept that unpractical is a close synonym of shy and oversensitive we are also bound to recognise that everything written above also applies to Osmond, and to a lesser extent to Mme Merle as well. (Hereby I wish to emphasise that the way the couple arranged Pansy's life at her birth is no proof of practicality. As the Countess Gemini points out, there was no serious hurdle to overcome, "the little fable was easily set going" [501].) Dorothea Krook already calls attention to the fact that the category includes both "good" and "bad" characters and that both subclasses are "morally earnest" (17). Osmond meets even this criterion, for similarly to Kate Croy, Prince Amerigo and Charlotte Stant, etc., he is able to consider his moral obligations and abuses them. It is this very skill that enables him to confuse Isabel in connection with the propriety of her travel to Ralph's deathbed. Mme Merle shares this moral sensitivity; again we only have to think of her despair at having meddled in Isabel's fate.

The "full vessel of consciousness" type also lives by bread and needs the respect of society to gain and maintain self-respect. But if – due to the lack real creativity and explicit talents – s/he cannot support her/himself as an artist, neither of these can be earned. No wonder that the healthier-minded representatives of the type, Ralph and Isabel, are wealthy and thus powerful. And here we get back to James's already discussed preoccupation with the top echelons of society, which must be attributable to his interest in the above-mentioned type that has to be freed from financial and social constraints if its true potentials are to be examined really thoroughly.

I have already noted that Jonathan Freedman considers Osmond as James's quintessential aesthete, and his obsession with objects and objectification, which, as I have tried to prove, is not such an inherent feature of his as it is generally thought to be, must have been common with this type. Freedman also points out that his being a parvenu, someone dreaming of social elevation, is again typical of the aesthete. He also

---

<sup>22</sup> James's description of the sensitive, artistic type in "The Art of Fiction".

proves that some of Osmond's expressions and even his physical attributes were borrowed from well-known aesthetes and aesthete caricatures of the time. Though accepting his arguments, I still have the feeling that Osmond is too much of a personage, his intelligence and sensitivity is too far above the average to allow him to be typical of anything.

In my view the archetypal aesthete is personified by Edmund Rosier in this novel. For him collecting bric-à-brac is a fashionable hobby and not a desperate attempt at self-expression. His taste is good, but is not so special as to alienate him from ordinary people and everyday, practical life. He knows what is good, or at least, is intelligent enough to accept good advice, but will never know what is best. His choice of his love-interest proves this clearly, and, by the same token, the ultimate evidence of Osmond's and Mme Merle's superiority is their recognising Isabel's exquisiteness at first sight.

It is certainly not James's only Osmond-related achievement that some of the 19th-century aesthete's characteristics are eternalised in the figure. Perhaps just as significantly but less deliberately he gives us an appendix to Walter Pater's Epicureanism: sensitivity and receptiveness paired with considerable intelligence but without any explicit talent (and a fortune) might result in a tragic fate instead of guaranteeing a full and meaningful life.

I also believe that the inability to excel in anything, to rise above the masses is likely to have been even more painful in the aesthetic era than in most other periods of human history.

The aesthete's obsession with the best representative of a type is an often recurring theme of James, and in connection with *The Europeans* I have already noted that he himself shares this obsession, often describing something, somebody as a perfect specimen of its/his type. It is a consequence of this approach that the piece of art one creates also has to be of the best order or its existence and thus its creation is not justified, is futile.

While the craving for real achievement, appreciation is an important incentive in life, the urge to become the very best can easily become paralysing and daunting. I believe Osmond questions the justification of his own very existence on these grounds: as he is not talented enough, is not the best in anything, he is superfluous.



Similar fears are detectable in James himself, Matthiessen, for example, quotes the following remark from his notebook:

“I shall be 40 years old April next [...] I must make some great efforts during the next few years, however, if I wish not to have been a failure. I shall have been a failure unless I do something *great*.” (qtd. in Matthiessen 17, James’s italics)

It seems that if taken literally, aestheticism’s perhaps most characteristic principle, that it is only the very best of something that is valuable, renders the existence of most people meaningless. Most probably, however, it will only be the more sensitive that apply the doctrine to themselves. Leon Edel feels that in Osmond’s figure James draws someone he himself could have become under less fortunate circumstances (Edel, 426-27). Many find Edel’s analogy exaggerated, but the above quote supports the assumption that James could only accept himself as an artist of the first rank, and could only see tragic alternatives.

The “diabolisation” of Osmond’s character, which is the result of disregarding his development, has serious consequences: it makes Isabel’s choice of husband absurd, and it renders the ending of the *The Portrait* very difficult to interpret. *The Portrait*, however, is a realistic novel, and Isabel’s motives behind her marriage can and have to be found: she wants to be the means of Osmond’s elevation to the social position he – in her opinion – deserves on grounds of his taste and intelligence. Here we should also notice one important aspect of Isabel’s choice: like most other characters of this novel she also acts as an aesthete when selecting her husband since she collects him as a rare piece of art the value of which is only recognised by herself.

As for the ending of the novel, there is probably one point on which most readers would agree: Isabel will always try to act in accordance with what she considers her moral obligation. Notwithstanding the fluidity of notions on marriage, no human being with a healthy psyche can accept a moral law which attaches a lively, innocent young woman to the devil. (Even very sensitive analysts, for example, Dorothea Krook, explain

Isabel's return to an inherently wicked Osmond with moral obligations: she has made her choice and marriage is marriage.)

Freedman and Weisbuch actually feel the incompatibility of the "moral obligation" and "diabolisation" interpretations and try to offer some reconciliation. Freedman says that the ending's ambiguity prevents Isabel's commoditisation, while Weisbuch claims that by rejecting thinking in black and white, good and evil dichotomies and by not taking revenge Isabel avoids "a reduction of experience that would rob the self" (119). As for ambiguity, it has to be emphasised that *The Portrait's* ending is actually pretty clear-cut in the sense that we do know what happens to Isabel: she goes back to Rome, to her husband. As for Weisbuch's interpretation, the above lines show that eventually he quits the "evil- non evil", or, if you like, Biblical context in which he originally moves. Notwithstanding this inconsistency, we still do not really see Isabel's reasons for her return, for a mere human being with no inclination for sainthood is more likely to perish meaninglessly in the vicinity of evil than to gain experience. And Weisbuch himself does state that "Isabel is no goodie" (118). She is no saint; we only have to think of the fact that she unscrupulously banishes Mme Merle from Europe.

During most of her second Gardencourt visit Isabel is at a loss about her moral duties, which would be determined by the nature of her relationship to Osmond. A sudden revelation is to take place in the Gardencourt Park during her tête-à-tête with Gaspar Goodwood, so it seems logical that something Goodwood says or does decides the matter.

What is Goodwood speaking about on that occasion? He practically offers protection against a devilish husband, and ensures her of his love once again. Isabel, overwhelmed by Goodwood's intensive presence (not by his kiss, as it is yet to come), "had an immense desire to appear to resist" (543). Many critics explain this feeling with a physical repulsion, a kind of frigidity, but there are actually several sentences which imply that the case is just the contrary. In this final Gardencourt garden scene Isabel also thinks that "no one had ever been so close to her as that" (540), and that "to let him take her in his arms would be the next best thing to dying" (543). Here we must not forget that this desire for death is to be taken literally, for death is something Isabel thinks to be close to during this visit. On her way to Gardencourt "... she envied Ralph his dying, for

if one were thinking of rest, that was the most perfect of all” (516). The sentence’s sexual overtones are also hard to miss – it is common knowledge that renaissance writers, for example, used the word “death” as the synonym of orgasm.

Isabel thus is on the verge of submission, but with a final effort begs Goodwood to leave her. She apparently recognises that her fate with Goodwood would be the same as it was with Osmond: to be ruled by a dominant male, for being in the state of protection implies a very apparent power relation. If she is to remain an independent personality all her life, which she considers her most important task, she has to learn to handle attempts of domination such as Osmond’s and Goodwood’s. Paul B. Armstrong refers to the same when stating that by fleeing with Goodwood Isabel would only change masters (130). And this is the very point where I find Isabel’s moral obligation: not to escape the first real threat, represented by Osmond, to her independence, but to face it and to overcome it. To overcome, without herself becoming domineering, is only possible by accepting Osmond as he is, by showing him that he is likable and unique enough without being a success in any sense. (Hereby we have turned back to one of aestheticism’s major problems once again.) In one word, it is possible by loving him, and here I am talking about simple, accepting human love. In all this I see a liveable future for Isabel and also the germs of James’s late phase, namely of such novels and heroines as *The Golden Bowl* and Maggie Verver.

Importantly, as I have argued, Isabel is sent back not to the devil but to an insecure husband, whose self-confidence – against all appearances – had already been in ruin before her Gardencourt visit and is further reduced by her trip which is made against his explicit will. In consequence, Isabel’s chance of gaining Osmond back to normal life cannot be declared non-existent, the less so as she herself has just been reassured at Ralph’s deathbed that she can be loved – which must strengthen her emotional reserves.

What I have been trying to say about Osmond so far can also be expressed with the terminology of near-contemporary philosopher Peter Strawson. When we diabolise Osmond we regard him as psychologically abnormal. According to Strawson we have a so-called “objective attitude” towards such beings, as opposed to the usual “participant reactive attitudes” we adopt towards people we regard as normal (238-239).

When we cannot accept Isabel's return to Osmond, we wish for her taking an objective non-participant attitude towards him, we want her to give him up as eternally hopeless. Isabel, however, does allow for Osmond having acted under special circumstances when psychologically abusing her in Rome, and does not accept that his character is beyond change, beyond salvation. (Here we have again arrived at a term frequently used in connection with *The Golden Bowl*.) Instead of merely accepting the role of determinism she opts for adapting a participant reactive attitude, the preference for which, according to Strawson, is anyway an inherent human characteristic (238).

The fact that Isabel has already successfully defied Mme Merle also has some important implications: Isabel must have become aware that if she wishes she is able to make her adversaries harmless. It is also notable that James carefully avoids making his heroine revengeful in this relationship: not much after Mme Merle's decision to return to America Isabel already feels sorry that her former friend has to leave the part of the world where the only people she has anything to do with live. The resemblances to the Maggie Verver-Charlotte relationship are again striking.

In his *The Phenomenology of Henry James* Paul B. Armstrong also talks about Isabel having a Heideggerian moment of vision or Augenblick during her tête-à-tête with Goodwood. Armstrong describes Isabel's development process as her accepting the "paradox of the servile will", Ricoeur's term for the state when freedom "has grounded

itself in the necessary” (103)<sup>23</sup>. Initially Isabel assumes that limits can only signify an oppressive, even tyrannical threat to her possibilities (105). For this reason she rejects the marriage proposals of both Warburton and Goodwood, as these matches would tie her to a certain form of life and thus would limit her possibilities to explore the world. During her aimless travels with Mme Merle Isabel, however, realises that she actually forfeits everything by not choosing at all, and on her return to Florence she gives her hand to Osmond. She marries him because she realises that one has to accept a limiting necessity, or life remains a set of empty possibilities.

All this could serve as a perfect illustration of one’s recognising and accepting Ricoeur’s paradox, but Armstrong points out that with her marriage Isabel “is attempting to defy limitation in the guise of accepting it” (112). Isabel sees her marriage as the expansion of her possibilities: as I have also referred to it, one of the main attractions of the marriage is that she can *give* to Osmond, she is the one who comes “with charged hands”. To be in the position to give is of course synonymous with being in a dominant position – by marrying Osmond Isabel believes to sacrifice as little of her freedom as

---

<sup>23</sup> I am indebted to Aladár Sarbu for pointing out that Ricoeur is not original here: the idea is Hegel’s, who writes the following, for example, in *The Philosophy of Mind*:

§483.[...]The free will finds itself immediately confronted by differences which arise from the circumstance that freedom is its <sup>inward</sup> function and aim, and is in relation to an external and already subsisting objectivity, which splits up into different heads: viz. anthropological data (i.e. private and personal needs), external things of nature which exist for consciousness, and the ties of relation between individual wills which are conscious of their own diversity and particularity. These aspects constitute the external material for the embodiment of the will.)

§484. But the purposive action of this will is to realise its concept, Liberty, in these externally-objective aspects, making the latter a world moulded by the former, which in it is thus at home with itself, locked together with it: the concept accordingly perfected to the Idea. Liberty, shaped into the actuality of a world, receives the *form of Necessity* the deeper substantial nexus of which is the system or organisation of the principles of liberty, whilst its phenomenal nexus is power or authority, and the sentiment of obedience awakened in consciousness. (241)

The idea was adopted by Emerson as well; it also appears in Frederick Engels’s *Anti-Dühring* and becomes a central doctrine of Marxism:

Freedom of the will therefore means nothing but the capacity to make decisions with knowledge of the subject. Therefore the *freer* a man’s judgment is in relation to a definite question, the greater is the *necessity* with which the content of this judgment will be determined; while the uncertainty, founded on ignorance, which seems to make an arbitrary choice among many different and conflicting possible decisions, shows precisely by this that it is not free, that it is controlled by the very object it should itself control. Freedom therefore consists in the control over ourselves and over external nature, a control founded on knowledge of natural necessity; it is therefore necessarily a product of historical development. (130-1)

possible. Isabel is also impressed by the way Osmond and Merle seem to defy the limitations of life by being so artistic. Armstrong's greatest insight in connection with Ricoeur's paradox is perhaps the recognition that art is the field that benefits the most by imposing limitations on itself: one only has to remember how much poetry gains by observing sometimes very strict formal bonds. He, however, also points out that "neither he [Osmond] nor Madame Merle show that serious engagement of artistic freedom with the limits of structure without which art's transcendent powers lapse and only banal conventions remain..." (114).

With this Armstrong refers to Mme Merle and Osmond's inability to move within the limits of art and of their lives really creatively – they are conventional, or, as I expressed earlier, they have no explicit talent. Their life is thus not a genuine piece of art, just a copy – in Merle's case that of the successful society woman, in Osmond's that of the artist who suffices for himself. Several other critics also argue that Merle and Osmond – in line with the slogan of aestheticism – try to turn their lives into perfect pieces of art and this sends a chill down the spine. Their aim, however, is a direct consequence of the aesthetic doctrine I have many times referred to – that only the best of anything, only perfect pieces of art are valuable. It is plain to see that this principle is irreconcilable with Ricoeur's paradox – which emphasises the necessity of self-imposed restraints that are difficult to interpret otherwise than compromises. From their unwillingness to accept their limitations flow their morally degrading machinations that already border on plain sins. In the language of Ricoeur and Armstrong, just like the early Isabel they do not accept the paradox of the servile will, and I believe that the worst that flows from this is not conventionalism, but moral disintegration.

With her return to Rome Isabel, however, consents to the limiting necessities of her life. Though stating this, Armstrong calls attention to the fact that, unlike the contemporary Ibsen's Nora, James's heroine never attacks the institutional arrangement that justifies Osmond's power over her, and remarks that "we have here a rare instance where James's political conservatism limits his novelistic imagination" (132). In none of his works does James show any interest in rearranging social institutions (*The Princess Casamassima* is not convincing as a case in point), and I hope I could indicate why I find

the task that lies ahead of Isabel on her return to Rome as interesting as any social activism.

Perhaps more thought-provokingly, in the final passage of his writing, Armstrong also claims that by repressing her libidinal desires aroused by Goodwood, Isabel increases her bondage to them (132). At the interpretation of this point I think Campion's film is of great help, as it contributes to the dispelling of another centuries-old female-related misconception in art. While males are widely allowed to be involved in several amorous relationships – here I am talking about relationships that deserve the name of love and not of liaisons – respectable female characters are generally believed to be tied by such emotional experience for good. Few authors, for example, Tolstoy and Jane Austen, dare to introduce the vacillation of their really “deep” heroines between two men, or just the change of their love interests in the course of their story (Kitty Shcherbatskaya, Marianne Dashwood can serve as examples); less outstanding authors are probably afraid of their heroines' being perceived as wayward. Even more unorthodoxly Campion presents her young, mentally stable heroine as someone showing sexual interest in three men at the same time in scene 12 of her film, which depicts a sexually charged phantasm of Isabel's: the girl, who is lying on her bed, is being kissed by Warburton and Goodwood, while Ralph is looking on. This phantasm, however, does have its preliminaries in the text: the mixed feelings of Isabel at having so many suitors, potential partners (Warburton, Goodwood, even Ralph) described at the very beginning of Chapter 17 can be interpreted as the sign of disappointment at not having clear cues for which man to prefer. There can be no doubt that Isabel's curiosity is raised – among others – by Osmond as well. What she tells Ralph prior to her marriage (“one should choose a corner and cultivate that” [316]) implies that she can imagine being in a relationship with any of these men, she considers all of them as possible life partners, and believes that only after some time does the chosen one grow into her one and only soul-mate. It is another question that it is probably Osmond who needs her most.

If we accept this perhaps less conventional approach to Isabel's sexuality we can accept her return to Osmond in this respect as well: Isabel grows aware that her strong reaction to Goodwood's physical closeness is no sure sign of a fatal, eternal entanglement that she has to suppress, but is a feeling other men have already awakened in her.

## 2. Jane Campion and *The Portrait of a Lady*

Jane Campion (1954- ) is a New Zealand-born filmmaker. She first gained attention with her biographical and psychological portrayal of the New Zealand writer and poetess Janet Frame. Frame's oversensitivity and reserve was misdiagnosed as a form of schizophrenia and she was forced to undergo painful treatment at a mental hospital through most of her adolescence and early adulthood. After much suffering she managed to establish herself as one of New Zealand's most prominent writers.

Campion's artistic breakthrough came with *The Piano* in 1993, which was a commercial and critical success, grossing more than \$40 million against its \$7 million budget. At the 66th Academy Awards, *The Piano* won three prizes: Best Actress for Holly Hunter, Best Supporting Actress for Anna Paquin, and Best Original Screenplay. The film is the story of a 19<sup>th</sup> century Scotswoman who has an illegitimate daughter and is deported to New Zealand by her middle-class family in an arranged marriage. In this colonial backwater the selective-mute woman is still able to find consolation in her piano playing and successfully defies her conventional husband's attempts of domination. Eventually, she is also able to find love.

Film theorists have recently begun to attribute importance to *The Piano* in film history, and regard it as the film that exemplified the development of art cinema in the 1990s, and also as a prime example of "crossover" film. The "crossover" film is defined by Stephen Crofts as a low-budget film "that moves from art house openings to embrace much larger audiences than most art movies"(136). Crofts adds that Campion was concerned from the outset that *The Piano* should be positioned as such a film.

The double success of *The Piano* was reminiscent of that of *A Room with a View* and *Howards End*, and Campion's next project, *The Portrait of a Lady*, was surrounded by great expectations. As we see from the above, Campion's interest in the novel is kind of natural as it – similarly to her early films – also portrays the development of one particular young woman who values independence above everything. We also have to note that Merchant-Ivory brought the British literary canon, first of all James and Forster, into vogue. Everybody, herself probably included, expected Campion to repeat her



double feat, but *The Portrait* has received lukewarm reviews and has never become a box office success.

It is worth recalling that James himself was also known to long for popularity with the general public, but was never so lucky as Merchant-Ivory or Campion. As Mark Eaton puts it: “when it had become clear that he was not destined for commercial success he began to forge a compensatory reputation as a Master who treasured a more discriminatory readership” (158). It cannot be a mere accident that Osmond follows the same practice: realising that he is unable to succeed, he pretends not to be interested in success, leaving one to believe that such an attitude is more natural a reaction for James than we usually think.

As for the other, for us much more important common characteristic of Campion and James, their interest in feminine independence, may be in feminism in general, the issue is more complex than it seems to be at first sight. For anyone familiar with James’s oeuvre it is apparent that he very often puts female figures into the centre of his work, and describes how they are searching for their identity or just for a liveable life. In addition to prime example Isabel Archer we can also think of Kate Croy, Milly Theale, Verena Tarrant, even Olive Chancellor, Nanda Brookenham, Fleda Vetch, etc. These female figures are so well-written that, in Alfred Habegger’s words “Very few of those who have thought about James’s female characters have questioned his authority in writing about women” (*Henry James and the “Woman Business”* 7).

The above women are all described as appealingly intelligent, interesting “vessels of consciousness”, more so than most of the male figures in their environment. One consequently might easily hasten to the conclusion that James is a latent supporter of feminism, a qualification Campion readily accepts for herself. Habegger, however, convincingly points out that James – at least till his mid-forties – was contemptuous of general suffrage and women’s entry into the professions. His views on women were largely influenced by those of his father’s which can only be described as contradictory, to say the least (11).

The prevailing image of Henry James Senior has been that of the liberal eccentric, a friend of any egalitarian movement, among others that of the women’s movement. Habegger, however, calls attention to the fact that at some point in the revolutionary

1880s James Sr. began to philosophise about perfecting sexual relations in a utopian society, arguing that in the future monogamy will be replaced by several types of marriage, the scenario when some men have multiple partners included. From time to time James Sr. appeared to be an advocate of free love, but did not dare to undertake the charge, so forged a characteristic compromising theory on male-female relationships instead. According to this theory man has to learn to transcend his brutish egotism within marriage. Marriage is a life-long spiritual discipline for man, who first desires one particular woman, later grows apart from her, but in the last phase of the relationship he has to learn from her how to overcome his selfish carnality. The women in this whole process act as self-sacrificing non-intellectual angels – the mere means of the male's spiritual development. Later in his life James senior still insisted that the two sexes were more or less separate species with completely different roles in life (10-1).

Habegger also points out that Henry James Jr. does refer in his letters home to the distinction of sexes. More explicitly, also in a letter but to a friend, he praises the essay of a Mrs. Sutherland Orr, who writes that with emancipation women will not become improved women, they merely become inferior men, and declares that intellectual differences between the sexes are inherent (qtd. in Habegger 7).

James' identification with his father's views, however, was not complete. Since the publication of Leon Edel's seminal biography it has been well-known how important an influence Milly Temple was on James: the figures of Isabel Archer and Milly Theale are widely supposed to memorialise her intrepidity and charm. Habegger, however, also calls attention to the fact that Temple did openly challenge James Senior's opinions on women – at least there is reference to that in her correspondence. She rejected any form of subordination, oppression and also marrying elderly men, something her two sisters did. With all this she earned the dislike of not only the James parents but also that of William and Alice James (11-2).

Notwithstanding his controversial relationship to females and female independence, James's description of Isabel's quest for her identity is undoubtedly most sympathetic. So much so that Habegger actually suspects James to have had regrets for presenting the Temple-type in so favourable a light in *The Portrait*, and he sees this as

the main reason behind the emancipation movement's rather harsh, unfeeling treatment in the subsequent *The Bostonians* (Habegger 12).

Campion's film has drawn much criticism from James fans. James-expert Janet Maslin, for example, calls one of the film's most memorable scenes a "Freudian fever dream" as it seems to be totally irreconcilable with James's shrinking from carnality. In the already discussed scene Isabel phantasms about all her suitors kissing her at the same time. "This is *The Portrait of a Lady*, filtered through the acute feminist vision of Jane Campion", Maslin concludes (Maslin "Not too Literally"). Nancy Bentley also remarks that Campion significantly alters the story's narrative substance: "her film recasts Isabel Archer's crisis as sexual, much more than the crisis of consciousness and social agency that Isabel suffers in the novel" (128). Bentley, however, simply explains the shift with the change in the medium: the former conflict can much more easily be represented by filmic means than the latter.

Campion herself never denies the charge of sexualisation, on the contrary, she regards it is one of the focal points of her adaptation. As she puts it: "I wanted to show that Isabel was a woman with very strong sexual aspirations, who wants to be loved and who feels frustrated. Even though she speaks of completely different things, of starting a career, etc, at her core she is looking for passion" (*Interviews* 180).

Campion's approach to Isabel's character is certainly a plausible one. The question, however, arises, whether this shift from the crisis of consciousness, as Bentley puts it, to sexuality allows Isabel to perform the same function in the film as in the novel. If not, once again the viewer would watch the piece as the story of a different character, and would consequently infer a different fabula from the film. Very plainly, one would ask whether the film has anything to do with the novel at all.

James makes it quite apparent that Isabel's primary function in the novel is self-discovery, to find her task in life, and to live life to the full within the inevitable limits. In the given historic era the act that would most significantly influence her fate is undoubtedly her marriage. This way her marital choice is apparently a cardinal question of the novel; in fact James's work can be summarised as the story of Isabel's choosing a partner in life, and of her other choice to give their relationship a second go. If we see this, we are just one step away from recognising that Isabel must become aware where

her instincts lead her, and this feat – according to several schools of psychology and perhaps also according to common sense – can be achieved by analysing her intuitions, phantasies, and sexually-charged dreams. Thus, here I feel inclined to call attention to one general aspect of adaptations: if one of the novel's major themes is abstract enough, as it is in this case (self-seeking, or the search for one's duty in life) it is possible to show different aspects of it without making the viewer infer a different character and a different plot from the film.

Thought-provokingly, and contrary to literary and filmic conventions, neither James nor Campion presents one apparent life-partner for his heroine, suggesting that with all of them Isabel should make compromises. Campion is just more direct, outspoken in this respect: even very close to the film's ending there are two "alternative sex scenes", in one of them Isabel is kissing with Ralph on his deathbed, while not much later we can see her respond to Goodwood's kiss.

In addition to her sexualisation, another frequent critique concerning Isabel's character is that she is simply not a 19<sup>th</sup>-century character; she is not lady-like enough. By way of example, I could mention Philip Horne's study titled *Varieties of Cinematic Experience*, in which the author finds it irreconcilable with James's spirit that after a tiring London walk Isabel is sniffing out her boots.

When discussing female voyeurism in connection with heritage films I already quoted Laura Mulvey's germinal essay *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema*. The main point of the essay, that the classic Hollywood narrative films all represent a masculine point of view is also relevant here. According to Mulvey in the narrative film the female is an object which is being gazed at by the film's male target group amid pleasant feelings (750). It is a consequence of this voyeurism that the heroines have to be ideal women both in- and externally, with perfect looks and with a tender character. We must remember though that this fetish-like treatment of women is not a Hollywood invention, it only gained reinforcement there, but has actually been present in art at least since the High Middle Ages, as it is proved by the poetry of Minnesingers and Troubadours. That this treatment is the means of female subordination is a commonplace in feminist literary criticism: the woman is viewed as a deity, someone beyond the treadmill of everyday life and is consequently excluded from decision-making. With the demystification of Nicole

Kidman, a real Hollywood goddess, Campion emphasises the general human side of women: observed closely even this (in most of her films) faultless female specimen leaves much to desire; her eyes are red and circled (scene 2), her hair is unruly, after a long walk her feet smell, horrible dictu she sometimes might even suffer from diarrhoea. One must see that Campion here works on the dissolution of a centuries-old, often harmful cultural tradition.

As for the irreconcilability of these scenes with a highbrow 19<sup>th</sup>-century text I disagree with the above sources. It is common knowledge that novels are more selective with regards to the information they present than films: in a text we are only allowed to know what the author explicitly puts down in writing. What the film presents is a continuum from which we have to select the relevant pieces of information; consequently the film's presenting Isabel in her unguarded moments can simply be regarded as the result of our watching her continuously. The process takes nothing away from her image as a refined creature, with James's word, as a refined "consciousness".

I also have to note that the heritage film's preference for more natural, everyday look is also a likely influence here.

Isabel's less collected appearance and behaviour is anyway only conspicuous before her marriage, and the Rome scenes represent a harsh contrast in that respect. Her rigid posture at all the receptions, balls, the artistically arranged hair-do and the overexquisite clothes all symbolise the restrictions she is subjected to, and speak volumes about the souring of the relationship between herself and her husband. The above-mentioned scenes in the first half of the film do not intend to shock without purpose; Isabel's natural look and behaviour, her simple garments all reflect on her carefree mental state; what is exuded by these scenes is the sense of freedom and youth rather than that of commonness.

If I am unwilling to admit to any significant changes affecting Isabel's functions, I certainly cannot do the same in connection with Osmond's figure. In fact, nearly all the critiques refer to the one-sidedness of Malkovich's performance: "...too overwhelmingly only an evil figure. Campion's film does not make it clear why Osmond attracts Isabel, writes Dale M. Bauer (246), for example. Michael Anesko practically says the same: "The rather bald vulgarisation of Osmond makes her decision to marry him simply

inexplicable” (182). To this consequence of Osmond’s “diabolisation” I have referred when analysing the novel.

Jane Campion is, however, known as a psychologising director, someone who is willing and able to introduce the motivations of her characters in full detail when she wishes so. We must accept though that in this case she is not keen on shading Osmond’s incentives; actually, as the quotes I have included prove, she presents a quite one-sided Osmond, who first seems to be just enigmatic, then the incarnation of evil. The character’s mystical nature, negativity is reinforced by casting John Malkovich into the role, an actor famous for playing evil characters. He played, for example, Vicomte Valmont in Stephen Frear’s 1988 *Dangerous Liaisons*, or Doctor Jekyll / Edward Hyde in his 1996 *Mary Reilly*. Contrary to the novel, there is practically no reference, let alone scene, in the whole film that would emphasise Osmond’s human side. Campion does not even make him likable in the wake of his engagement: although in scene 37 he confesses his happiness to his fiancée and talks about his satisfaction with life in general, Malkovich’s shrill voice ruins the effect of the words.

James’s Osmond is a master of psychological warfare, but there is never any hint of physical abuse. Campion’s Osmond does not even refrain from this form of violence in a later Rome scene (scene 55): deliberately stepping on her train he makes his wife fall over when she wants to leave the room, or, on the same occasion, he repeatedly hits her hands and crunches her temples. Campion might simply feel that Osmond’s intense irritation with his wife can only be demonstrated in film by turning the feeling into something physical, which means that the director once again applies filmic, visual means to treat one of the novel’s focal points. Interestingly, the above scene is more easily construed as a sign of Osmond having lost his head than as a sign of his power over Isabel, the more so as the last word is uttered by Isabel in the scene. The loss of self-control, however, is a motif that appears in the novel as well.

In view of the thorough “diabolisation” of Osmond’s figure one might hasten to the conclusion that Campion is simply another advocate of this simplistic approach. Thinking of Laura Mulvey’s *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* (1975) again, one recognises one more possible reason for making Osmond’s aggression visible. According to Mulvey the fetishisation (presenting them as perfect, as angelic) of the female

characters in film is primarily due to the male director and viewer's fear of women, which derives from their castration anxiety (753). By the same token, in Campion's film the Malkovich-Osmond can be regarded as an excellent manifestation of the young female's curiosity and fear of males in general: the *male* is mysterious, scary, and even evil. It can be assumed that the same fetishisation process is likely to be going on in Isabel as in the director and viewer of the Hollywood classics, but with the opposite sign, into a negative direction. Michael Anesko perhaps refers to this when saying that "Campion bestows on Osmond an overwhelming, tactile magnetism", for example, from her first visit to Osmond's Florence hill house " ... James's heroine comes away [...] impressed with Osmond's remarkable success in preserving his worldly independence, [while] Campion focuses on her latent sexual curiosity" (184). It has to be noted that Campion is masterful when presenting this curiosity in this scene: it is Pansy the daughter who is sitting on Osmond's lap and whom he strokes, while Isabel is looking on tensely (scene 25). Campion presents an interesting change of functions: the viewer of her film follows the events from a young woman's point of view, while the subject of fetishisation is the male. The scene is also an excellent example of the importance of point of view in film.

The fetishlike characters do not tend to be complex; they just function as the object of the hero's (heroine's) desire or curiosity, and by distracting his attention originally also act as an obstacle in the way of the hero's performing his major task, which, in classic Hollywood films, is the annihilation of the villain. Quite similarly the evil Malkovich-Osmond also acts as a major obstacle in the way of Isabel's maturation, and her gaining intellectual independence. Such a simplification of Osmond's functions in itself does not render the film simplistic; it only means that Campion drops one aspect of Osmond's character – the layer which can be described as the disintegration of the intellectual who does not find useful employment due to the lack of obvious talent. As his other major function, trying to dominate his wife, is duly performed, Isabel can learn through him how to regain and maintain independence when it is threatened by someone of great intellectual potential – as she also does in the book. As I have already noted, this reduction of functions must be a widespread phenomenon in film adaptations, and in most cases it is apparently primarily due to the limitations of time.

Judged by her previous films, Campion likes to bestow unqualified victory on her self-seeking heroines. In this case, however, such an outcome would not be in line with James's ending, and the director apparently respects her source too much to effect significant changes in the plot. As she did not elaborate the vulnerable side of Osmond's character, it would be equally unacceptable for the viewer if she simply sent Isabel back to Rome, as James does. To resolve the emerging contradiction she finishes her film in the barren and bleak Gardencourt park right after Isabel flight's from Goodwood. In the final frames Isabel is looking back from the doorstep of the lit hall at the darkening, wintery garden. We do not know if she enters the house or remains outside, we are not told if she remains in Britain or goes back to Rome – the streamlining of Osmond's functions necessitated the shortening, the alteration of the plot. This solution also calls attention to the relative clarity of James's ending: he does make it obvious that Isabel finds it necessary to go back to Rome.

As for the further characters, I only have to mention two significant changes. The perhaps more relevant one concerns Mrs. Touchett's figure. Having read Habegger's study on the Jameses' attitude towards women and feminism, I am inclined to think that her major function in the novel is to represent the negative side of female emancipation. Though she is successful in fields traditionally ruled by males (for example, investment activities), her apparent unwillingness to perform usual feminine tasks, i.e. those of the mother and wife, border on the extreme; for example, she travels to America when her only child goes into the final phase of his terminal illness. At the same time there is a conventional side to her: she is the one who warns Isabel that it is not possible to stay up with two young men after her aunt retires, or that she cannot travel to London with Henrietta without a proper chaperon. The members of Mrs. Touchett's family, however, consider her neglect of them as a pose, and on several occasions speak forgivingly of her excesses, making one think that they see her as a victim of times.

Notwithstanding the slightly patronising tone James applies to describe his character, we must note that with Mrs. Touchett James practically achieves something he is generally considered to be incapable of: he draws the figure of a successful business(woman), for Mrs. Touchett is undoubtedly most credible as a smart investor character. Her sharp commonsense, dry logic, her ability to recognise other people's



interests and her aversion to anything abstract or sentimental all give credence to James's remark that her investments, businesses are very much lucrative. Let me quote one short passage that I consider as a good illustration of most of the above qualities besides also serving as a subtle source of humour. In the short scene Mrs. Touchett tries to remember Mme Merle's place of birth:

"I always forget where you were born."

"It is hardly worth-while I should tell you then."

"On the contrary," said Mrs. Touchett, who rarely missed a logical point; "if I remembered, your telling me would be quite superfluous." (162)

Similarly to Osmond, Mrs. Touchett does not perform multiple functions in Campion's film, she only acts as the superficially caring aunt of her niece. She is a commonplace woman who light-heartedly chit-chats with the doctor summoned to her husband's deathbed (scene 15), there is no mention of her financial independence or of her living separately from her husband. This means that in scene 42 Warburton's reference to her leaving for America when her only child is terminally ill is quite without context, is rather construed as a sign of scare and not as that of her independence or indifference. Conventional women, however, are unlikely to escape from their children's deathbed. This phenomenon is a typical malaise of adaptations: well-sounding sentences are retained from the original novel, but due to some already established changes in functions they are difficult to interpret, or sometimes simply cannot be interpreted. The discussion of the negative side of emancipation is anyway likely to be left out from the film for at least two reasons: the issue is out of the scope of Campion's interest, and also due to time limits.

The other notable change does not so much concern Mme Merle's functions, rather the way they are presented. Her despair at herself and her machinations is also turned into something visual when she throws things at Osmond in scene 59, instead of just hiding her head in her palms, as we "see" her doing in the novel. Due to the genre's requirements her despair is again turned into something more picturesque, and, as a result, Merle appears to be more temperamental. There is no noticeable simplification of her functions, however: we are still obliged to see her as the middle-aged woman forced to give up all her dreams and moved by Isabel's youth and fragility, as the abandoned

(but also abandoning) lover of Osmond, as well as the mother with no chance to establish proper bonds with her only child.

Having examined the changes in functions it is now possible to arrange these functions into tabular forms. The following table of functions can be compiled on the basis of *The Portrait of a Lady* as a novel:

**Table 4. Character Functions in *The Portrait of a Lady* (novel)**

	<b>Isabel</b>	<b>Osmond</b>	<b>Ralph Touchett</b>	<b>Mme Merle</b>	<b>Lord Warburton</b>	<b>Gaspar Goodwood</b>	<b>Henrietta Stackpole</b>
<b>Isabel</b>		Functions as reward of his exceptional qualities.	Ideal woman with the potential to live life to the full in the best sense. Out of his reach because of his illness.	Functions as embodiment of her young self, also as embodiment of the perfect young woman.	Love interest	Love interest	Friend who is not pragmatic enough and thus needs her guidance
		Functions as source of irritation because of apparent intention to maintain intellectual independence, and also as sy. who is aware of his vices.	Someone most valuable in need of protection.				
<b>Osmond</b>	Functions as perfect gentleman she has to protect from the cruelty of the world.		Sy. of excessively refined taste and manners, who is dangerous because of frustrated ambition.	Ex-lover and father of daughter whose life she has to solve.	-	His successful rival for Isabel's hand	-
	Functions as someone with serious faults, who unreasonably						

	hates her, and whose psychological warfare she cannot defy.						
	Functions as someone pitiable?						
<b>Ralph Touchett</b>	Voice of reason she is deaf to till almost the very end.	Functions as his wife's more and more irritating link with her original self. Also someone who senses the danger deriving from the frustration of his ambitions.		Someone who sees through her frustrated ambitions.	Friend	-	Lazy and rich European
							Someone in need of her protection
<b>Mme Merle</b>	Perfect woman	More and more burdensome ex-lover	Seemingly perfect woman soured by frustrated ambition.		-	-	-
	Scapegoat-turned-manipulator						
<b>Lord Warburton</b>	Quintessential British peer seeking her hand in marriage	English peer his wife rejected.	Friend	Ideal husband for her daughter		-	-
		Sy to be caught for his daughter					
<b>Gaspar Goodwood</b>	American suitor	-	-	-	-		Ideal husband for her impractical friend.

<b>Henrietta Stackpole</b>	Friend she appreciates for her practicality.	-	Irritating busybody	-	-	Helper in the pursuit of I's hand	
			Pragmatic helper				
<b>Pansy Osmond</b>	Paragon of well-educated child	Means of securing stronger social position	-	Daughter she had to give up.	Means of getting into Isabel's vicinity	-	-
	Stepdaughter she has to defend from Osmond's tyranny.						
<b>Rosier</b>	Nice young man in love with her stepdaughter	Not rich enough love interest of daughter	-	Possible match for daughter	-	-	-
<b>Mrs. Touchett</b>	Aunt who wishes to widen the scope of her life, but also expects her to adhere to conventions.	-	Mother with a strong dislike for emotionality	Amusing rich friend	-	-	-
<b>Mr. Touchett</b>	Helper, extender of her freedom by leaving her a fortune	-	Father and friend	-	Friend	-	-

For simplicity's sake again I have not included how the various characters function in the lives of Pansy Osmond and Mr. and Mrs. Touchett. Pansy could easily be included: Isabel is her helper, her parents and Warburton intend to use her as the means of social elevation, while Rosier functions as her love interest. Mr. and Mrs. Touchett are practically not influenced by anybody, perhaps Mme Merle's functioning as the latter's deceiver is worth mentioning.

Similarly to *The Europeans*, *The Portrait of a Lady* operates with quite a lot of characters. Though it is possible to include all of them in the table of functions, there are only four figures, Isabel, Osmond, Merle and Ralph, that all perform some functions from all the other three's point of view. I find this a pretty good definition of major character; without them the story could not be told or would certainly be perceived as a different narrative.

As for the functions in film; it would be superfluous to compile the whole table as the only significant changes affect Osmond's character:

**Table 5. Functions performed by Osmond in *The Portrait of a Lady* (film)**

Isabel	Osmond	Ralph Touchett	Mme Merle
Functions as most mystic male she has to decipher.		Sy. with seemingly refined taste and manners but with an inherent tendency to become violent and aggressive.	Ex-lover and father of daughter whom she fears and who despises her.
Functions as evil husband who unreasonably hates her, and whose psychological and also physical terror she cannot defy.			

Mrs. Touchett's only appearing as the conventional aunt in relation to Isabel is the only other function change. As the table based on the novel indicates, Mrs. Touchett is relatively loosely integrated into the plot, she performs functions in relation to few characters, implying that the change does not have significant consequences on the plot and on the fabula. I have already noted that what we lose is the description of the insensitivity, masculinisation that, James seems to suggest, accompanies emancipation.

The above changes in functions are primarily achieved by shifting the emphasis of some scenes, and omitting some information about Osmond's character.

In the whole film there is practically no added scene that would present an apparent change in primary functions. It is only the two initial scenes that have no

equivalents in the novel, but they are rather to be regarded as bracket syntagmas. They are not linked directly to the film's main plot but foreshadow its main theme: young women's search for love and for their identity.

The above mentioned shift of emphasis is achieved by several means, the most interesting one of which is when scriptwriter Laura Jones borrows dialogues from the novel literally, but while saying their lines the characters do something that would be unimaginable in the novel. These frames never result in the modification of functions, as, contrary to the popular belief, they are perfectly reconcilable with the original character features. Examples can be Isabel smelling her boots, or balancing a candlestick on the top of her head in scene 9, both testifying to her youthful playfulness. Or, when in scene 25 Merle visits Osmond to call his attention to Isabel, the words uttered are literal borrowings, but Campion, very much credibly, also refers to the remnants of passion that once linked these two people by making them lounge beside each other, or by getting Osmond to touch Merle.

Cynthia Ozick, who not only is a renowned author and literary historian but is equally well-known as a film critic, accuses Campion of forced modernisation, as well as of the falsification of James's spirit, whatever is meant by it: "what gets lost is exactly what film has no use for: acute, minute examination of motives; the most gossamer vibrations of inner life, and above all something atmospheric... something what we might call a philosophy of the soul" (Ozick 22).

Contrary to Ozick, I have already argued that the driving forces behind the main character's actions, which determine her functions, do not change significantly in Campion's work. In Osmond's case the number of functions is indeed reduced to one – he personifies the "male" as it is perceived by young inexperienced women of vivid imagination. As it does not give cues to the understanding of Osmond's "diabolisation", the film's plot becomes more focused than that of the novel: we witness Isabel's development from a naïve romantic into a young woman who begins to learn how to tackle the domination attempts of more experienced individuals. I have already emphasised that this streamlining of the plot should not be regarded in itself as the sign of reduced artistic value.

As for the “vibrations of inner life”, the genre of film indeed does not allow the use of such long internal monologues as Isabel’s famous vigil in Chapter 42. Campion and her cinematographer, Stuart Dryburgh, however, excel at the use of visual imagery. Their masterly use of close-ups, for example, is able to speak volumes about the photographed individual’s state of mind. (The informative power of close-ups is a widely accepted fact, James Monaco, for example, calls attention to the power of these shots, in which the in itself extremely expressive human face is magnified considerably [33].) By way of example, the first image we have of Isabel in scene 3 is a close-up. Nicole Kidman’s wide-open clear blue eyes, snub nose and undisciplined curls say more about her eagerness and capability to explore the world than any lengthy chapter. If we examine the table of scenes, we will have to notice that most scenes are presented in the form of close-ups and midshots in this film. Midshots, however, can be just as informative: in scene 38 when Isabel appears in the doorway at their Rome palace we see right away that her playfulness and openness are lost, she is intimidated and is being forced to obey some conventions against her nature.

The above lines already indicate that Campion’s team make very conscious use of cinematic devices. As the table of scenes indicates, attention is called very early to the fact that we are invited to watch a film: initially we can hear some young women talking of love and kissing, but the screen remains completely black. No other tool could call one’s attention to the importance of sight as effectively as this sequence of empty frames.

Quite interestingly the role of the added scenes in this film is often to reflect on something just said, or on the state of mind of the protagonist. In scene 9 Isabel, for example, talks to Ralph in a comfortable and elegantly-furnished environment about her plans to learn more about the world. In the subsequent added scene we can see Goodwood trying to make his way through a noisy street gathering, reminding one of the violence and rudeness of life, of which – in view of her own shelter-like environment – Isabel is apparently unaware. Another example can be when in scene 45 Ralph and Lord Warburton drop just one sentence about Osmond’s influence on Isabel, and in the next scene Isabel passes by some beggars. Since in a previous scene, during their Asian tour, Mme Merle has to help Isabel to get rid of some aggressive beggars, one cannot fail to notice how reserved she became, and how indifferent she is to her environment because



of being lost in her own thoughts, troubles. We recognise without hearing a word how the best part of Isabel – which can also be described with James's word as her being a full vessel of consciousness, someone on whom no impression is lost – becomes dormant due to the disastrous state of her marriage. Or, after having heard of the news of Isabel's inheritance from Mrs. Touchett, Mme Merle is travelling to Florence amid very bleak scenery, which can easily be interpreted as a metaphor of the state of her mind, of her intentions. The second of these "scene pairs" or twin scenes is always an added one, and their real meaning only unfolds if they are interpreted together. In this sense they are similar to montages, where two subsequent images synthesize to generate a new meaning; with Eisenstein's famous example: the subsequent images of eye and water signify to weeping and sorrow ("The Cinematographic Image and the Ideogram" 128).

Similarly to the simplification of functions, the inclusion of these "interpreting" scenes can be regarded as a general method of shortening in film adaptations; Isabel's or Merle's state of mind would be very difficult to describe otherwise. Scene 3 presents one more, I believe quite common, method of "condensing" the plot. The scene is actually the first one taken over from the novel, and it presents the final phase of Lord Warburton's proposal of marriage to Isabel. While in the novel we can read their conversation from beginning to end, in the film we only join the couple when Warburton is already to leave, and with his final words he assures Isabel that his family seat is a perfectly healthy place to live in. Notwithstanding the liberating effect of the postmodern movement, I assume we expect more continuous forms of narration when reading novels, while in the case of films the above, fragmental form seems quite natural. Perhaps it just creates the impression that we arrive somewhere a bit late, and thus simply miss the initial words of a conversation.

The initial black frames of the film called our attention to the importance of sight, and to the fact that we are watching a film, and not a piece of literature. It is noteworthy that the interfilmic (a word I am coining here by analogy of intertextual) references also strengthen the feeling that we are enjoying a film, the product of an independent medium, and not thumbing a picture book containing illustrations of the novel. The most conspicuous interfilmic reference is scene 34, in which, during her travels with Mme Merle, Isabel recalls Osmond's confession of love, and the memories appear in Louis

Buñuel's surrealistic film style: mouth-shaped beans echo Osmond's words on Isabel's plate in monochromatic bluish frames. In the same scene some other frames evoke memories of silent films by presenting black and white images of the protagonists tottering clumsily on the board of a steamship. Another possible interfilmic reference is when in scene 32 a few minutes before his declaration of love, Osmond is twirling Isabel's striped parasol. The sight fills the whole screen, creating a sense of dizziness in the viewer and calling back memories of Hitchcock's *Vertigo*.

Cinematographer Stuart Dryburgh varies camera positions much more frequently and consciously than heritage filmmakers generally tend to. High camera positions are, for instance, frequently used in the film: they mostly serve as establishing shots: this happens, for example, in scene 37 when Isabel, Osmond and Pansy are taking a walk in a park. Another frequently used cinematographic tool is the slanting of the camera axis. Sometimes it is done for a reason, for example, at the beginning of scene 27 we can see Osmond's house in this manner, implying that we are likely to find something distorted inside; or in scene 4 when an apparently confused and unbalanced Isabel enters the Gardencourt mansion after having listened to Warburton's proposal. In other cases the reason for the use of this technique seems to be less obvious, for example, when we are presented a slanted image of the Coliseum in scene 63.

Diagonal frame compositions also recur in the film: in these cases the camera axis itself is not slanted, it is the content of the frame that is arranged diagonally. In scene 4 Ralph is leaning back in a rocking chair, and his body is stretching out along the frame's diagonal. Or, in scene 16, when we have a close-up of Isabel's profile, her nose serves as the diagonal. In these cases the conspicuous diagonal composition seems to be more of a play with sight than the means of conveying any message.

L'art pour l'art photography, however, is not at all typical in this film. Even when cinematographer Stuart Dryburgh presents very decorative pictures it is usually easy to associate some narrative functions with them. In ball scene 49, for example, the dancers reach out and connect their hands in the shape of a giant flower, and the scene is taken from a very high camera position so that we can have a perfect view of the emerging pattern. The sight is undoubtedly attractive, but one also thinks of the intricate net of relations that must interweave Roman high society.

The above mentioned diagonally composed image of Isabel is also typical in the sense that parts of her face, for example, the top of her head, are hanging out from the frame. As well as the peculiar camera positions, these “unclosed” compositions are known to be a hallmark of modern art films and connect this work to this subgenre. Sometimes the fragmented part can be regarded as a visual synecdoche, especially in sequences that describe fast movements: instead of the whole carriage we can only see its wheels in scene 23, or instead of her whole figure only Isabel’s fast-moving legs and train in scene 64.

Other added images can easily be interpreted as metaphors. In scene 14, for example, when Henrietta is talking to Ralph about Isabel making a fatal mistake by marrying in Europe, the young man is observing a fly entrapped in a sugar bowl, and shakes it back when it is on the verge of escape. Or, in scene 8, while chatting about Gaspar Goodwood, the two girls examine huge stone sarcophagi of some medieval warriors – i.e. they are repeatedly trying to touch giant male bodies made of stone, but are prevented to do so by the museum warden. The scene again can be interpreted as the metaphor of what I identified as one of the film’s major themes: a young female’s desire to learn more about and to comprehend males. Bleak scenery as a metaphor of Mme Merle’s soul has already been mentioned. This film language is much more complex than that of *The Europeans*, which never aims at such abstractness, and is miles away from the studio world of the BBC’s 1968 *The Portrait* adaptation.

Altogether I consider seven scenes as added scenes without change of functions in this film: scenes 8, 10, 12, 23, 46, 52, and 56. As I argued, scene 12 can be regarded as an unfolding within that group. This relatively low figure is in itself indicative of the filmmakers’ adherence to the original fabula.

Campion and Dryburgh carefully avoided the integrating conventions of heritage films, there are, for example, very few wide shots presenting attractive scenery. Also, the use of long lenses and unusual backlighting frequently reduces the movie’s depth of field (Bentley, 137), thus, instead of the ornate interiors or beautiful background we have to focus on faces, feelings.

One can conclude that sight is of overall importance in Campion’s film, so much so, that the director wishes to emphasise this fact with the opening frames of her film.

Significantly though, sight with Campion, with very few brief exceptions, is subordinated to narrative purposes, which makes her work markedly different from quintessential heritage films. At the same time, due to the nature of the Jamesian raw material, the viewer is allowed to remain in an aesthetically attractive environment, which distinguishes her work from most independent art films.

The soundtrack of *The Portrait of a Lady* bears interesting resemblances to that of *The Europeans*. In both, we can find extracts from the works of some renowned classical composers, in this case of Schubert, J.S. Bach, and Johann Strauss. These are linked with the work of contemporary composer Wojciech Kilar, a music representing quality (Kilar is a Nadia Boulanger<sup>24</sup> pupil), but perhaps closer to the 21st century audiences' taste. The intention to combine quality and appeal to larger audiences is well observable here, as it was in case of heritage films.

The above lines reinforce our assumption that Campion did aim at success both with mass audiences and with critics, but box office figures show that the attempt this time was not successful. The reasons for that are probably manifold. Despite the Jamesian critics pouting at the film, I maintain that Isabel's development is presented skilfully and thought-provokingly in this work. However, the description of how a young woman steps on the track that is likely to lead to her maturation and individualisation is perhaps too abstract a theme for many cinemagoers. It is thus exactly the filmmaker's maintaining Isabel's original function that is likely to repel most viewers: they would much rather see the young woman abandon the evil lover and live happily ever after with another one. In this case Isabel's quest myth would be complete, round, while the more fragmental form presented by James and the film practically forces the viewer to come up with interpretation attempts. Also, the interfilmic references and the visualisations of phantasies, the several monochromic frames, in one word, the quite complex filmic language, do not make this film an easy treat.

As I tried to prove, the critics at the same time reject changes that in my opinion represent a step forward in the history of film adaptations: what they oppose is a more

---

<sup>24</sup> Nadia Boulanger (1887-1979). A French composer, conductor and teacher who taught many of the leading composers and musicians of the 20th century. She also performed as a pianist and organist.

natural representation of females, a heavier reliance on filmic language, and a creative streamlining of character functions.

To demonstrate that I am not alone with my good opinion on Campion's interpretation of James, let me quote here a part of Hungarian film and literary critic Ferenc Takács's review of the film <sup>25</sup>:

The filmmakers – fully aware of and even carefully indicating their modern viewpoints – still manage to repaint Isabel's portrait, and with that also the fate pattern of 19<sup>th</sup>-century individuality and womanhood, and they do so without recourse to any postcolonial or feminist daubing. In this sensitive and love-permeated portrait the heroine of the hundred-something-old classic becomes a contemporary message despite always keeping the distance that separates her from us, no-free-no-captive postindividuums. (58, my translation)

With no intention to go into details in connection with the film's Hungarian reception I find it possible that critics outside the English-speaking cultures are less protective, or, if you like, possessive, of the canonised Jamesian text, and tolerate a less orthodox interpretation of it better than those who have been taught to consider it as a revered part of their cultural heritage.

Finally, a table follows that again delineates the cinematic devices applied in each scene, as well as the more significant differences between text and film.

---

<sup>25</sup> Az alkotók mai szempontjaik teljes tudatában, sőt gondos jelzésével, ám mindennemű sematikus posztkoloniális és feminista pacsmagolástól és átmázolástól tartózkodva festik újra Isabel „arcképét”, egyéniség és asszonyiség XIX. századi sorsképletét, s ezen az érzékeny és szeretetteljes képen a százegynéhány éves klasszikus mű hősnője úgy válik kortársi üzenetté, hogy közben mindvégig tartja a távolságot, amely elválasztja őt mitőlünk, se-szabad-se-rab posztindividuumoktól.

### 3. Scenes in the Novel and in the Film

Scenes in the film	Cinematic devices Relevant changes compared to text
1. Young female voices are talking about kisses and love.	Added scene. Bracket syntagma. Screen is dark – one becomes aware of the importance of sight.
2. Young women (of various races) dance to romantic music. Opening credits are running.	Added scene. Bracket syntagma. Implies that the film is to present an eternal story about young women. Camera angles vary – some shots are from very high positions.
3. Isabel appears in a garden with eyes wet, hair unruly. Warburton also comes into the picture, apparently finishing his proposal for marriage.	Unusually natural look. Extreme close-up of her eyes.  We only see W's legs when he approaches: filmic metonymy.
4. Isabel on his way to enter house. Ralph and two other ladies (Warburton's sisters?) look on. An apparently tense Isabel is playing with a dog.	I's figure appears diagonally in frame – unbalanced state of mind. Ralph in rocking chair bends into other direction – play with sight.
Intertitle: Gardencourt-England 1872 5. Isabel visits Mr. Touchett in his room, and tells him about Lord Warburton's proposal. Without being pressing, Mr. Touchett lists advantages of the marriage. I says what she wants is a general view of life.	The dialogue is filmed in shots-countershots of close-ups.
6. Isabel and Mrs. Touchett discuss I's London trip.	Mrs. Touchett is much less original than in book – we are never told that she does

Mrs. T says she and Henrietta cannot travel by themselves, they also have to take Ralph with them.	not live with her husband.
7. Ralph and Isabel on their way to pick Henrietta up on her arrival in London. I says H will never mind if Ralph likes her or not.	London traffic is filmed very skilfully. Carriages moving into opposite directions – tension.
8. Henrietta and Isabel in museum examining giant sarcophagi. H tells I she recently talked to Gaspar Goodwood about her – he is also in England. I is distressed. H blames Ralph for his idleness.	Midshots. Words are borrowed from novel but setting and activity is the filmmakers' invention, which is typical in this film. (There is reference though to the three going to museums – scene can also be regarded as its unfolding.) Warden blows whistle whenever the girls are to touch the giant marble (male) bodies. Metaphor of limitations imposed by society.
9. In London house Isabel and Ralph discuss I's rejection of Warburton. I finds him too perfect, and says she cannot escape from her fate. Her fate is not to sacrifice.	Meanwhile I is sniffing her boots ruining image of "perfect female". Midshots remain.
10. Goodwood enters pension in which Isabel stays. He has to make his way through a street gathering watching an escape "artist".	Added scene. Attention is called to the crudeness of life.
11. Goodwood begs Isabel to listen to him. I would not see him – for two years. Says she does not plan to marry as she is no sheep in a flock.	Campion states I's major aim in modern, common language.

12. Isabel's fantasy with Warburton, Goodwood, and Ralph. At the end she stands up, which seems to scare them away.	Added scene. Unfolding. Music – intensive, romantic.
13. Isabel and Henrietta are breakfasting in pension. They are discussing Goodwood. H says I does not know where she is going, I says that's what she likes best.	Midshots with some close-ups – tension.
14. Ralph and Henrietta talk about Goodwood and Isabel. H says I has been cruel with Goodwood and that she is worried about her friend.	Close-up – when topic is more dramatic they are typical in this film. Image of a fly trapped in a sugar bowl – Ralph doesn't let it escape. Metaphor.
15. Sir Matthew arrives at Gardencourt to treat terminally ill Mr. Touchett. Mrs. Touchett chit-chats with him. Isabel is looking on from gallery.	Mrs. Touchett's shallowness is emphasised.  Low camera position.
16. Mme Merle plays Schubert in Gardencourt. Isabel emerges and, delighted by Merle's play, asks her to continue.	As I is descending stairs, her profile is shown in diagonally composed frame. Frames are mostly not closed – sometimes top of her head is missing.
17. Mr. Touchett on his deathbed. He advises Ralph to marry Isabel. R rather suggests his father leaving a fortune to the girl so her wishes and possibilities can coincide.	Extreme close-up of Mr. Touchett's face: when smoking only mouth is shown.
18. Isabel and Ralph discuss Mme Merle. R mockingly declares her perfect. I notices her dislike.	Midshots during intimate talk. When Merle finally joins them, fullshots.
19. Isabel and Mme Merle walking in Gardencourt gardens in rain.	First we only see the top of their umbrellas to move – playfulness.



Merle remarks that Americans always make bad Europeans; women always have to “crawl”, and that Ralph does not like her.	Midshots.
20. Isabel – Mme Merle conversation continues indoors. Merle complains about not having anything valuable: husband, children, or fortune, not even a home. Presents a drawing to I and tells her she really likes her.	Conversations are brought closer in time – plot is condensed. Midshots – when tells I that she likes her, close-ups.
21 Isabel visits Mr. Touchett in his room, the old man is already in agony and cannot speak.	Close-up
22. Mrs. Touchett and Mme Merle chatting after Mr. Touchett’s death. Mrs. T says she will move to her Florence house, while Ralph remains in Gardencourt. Expresses her surprise that her husband left a fortune to Isabel. Mme Merle calls I clever.	Right before their talk diagonal composition – coffin is carried down on stairs. Again no reference to the Touchett’s ever living separately. Close-up.
Intertitle: Florence 23. Mme Merle is shown to leave for Florence amid very bleak scenery.	Added scene. Can be interpreted as a reference to the barrenness of her soul. Close-up. Carriage is photographed from underneath.
24. Osmond’s house. Nuns have just brought Pansy home. O tells the nuns Pansy’s fate is not yet decided.	House first shown diagonally. Pansy is first shown from high camera position – emphasis on her youth and fragility. Due to his sudden moves and quite fast

	speech O appears to be restless, capricious, and even infantile.
<p>25. Mme Merle arrives. Shows affection for Pansy.</p> <p>When Pansy leaves Osmond calls Merle attractive and lying beside her on a double bed kisses and strokes various parts of her body.</p> <p>Merle talks of Isabel.</p> <p>She criticises O's artwork but praises the perfection of his home.</p>	<p>Added scene, unfolding – no reference to it in novel. Merle's apparent willingness to arrange her daughter's fate makes it credible.</p> <p>Campion presents the remnants of passion between the two.</p> <p>Merle's description of Isabel is quite literal borrowing.</p>
<p>26. Isabel and Ralph discuss I's heritage. R says I should listen to her instincts – they will lead her into a good direction. I asks if he knows what he advises.</p>	<p>Meanwhile Isabel is drying her hair with a towel. She ruffles R's hair – her playfulness is emphasised.</p> <p>Words of novel are often accompanied by deeds that would not appear in novel.</p>
<p>27. Isabel – with Mme Merle – visits Osmond in his house. The Countess Gemini is also present.</p> <p>I nearly falls behind when sitting down on a sofa.</p> <p>I and O are left tête-à-tête on Merle's initiative.</p>	<p>On their way to O some buildings are shown in diagonal frames (turned by 45 degrees).</p> <p>O's environment seems to be full of unexpected traps.</p>
<p>28. Countess Gemini and Mme Merle walking together.</p> <p>CG: Osmond and You are dangerous.</p> <p>Merle says Isabel is equally so.</p>	<p>Midshots.</p>
<p>29. Isabel tells Osmond about her plans to travel, but is afraid that he will find her plans silly.</p>	<p>Parallel syntagma with previous scene.</p> <p>Close-ups.</p>

O says until recently he only had one plan: to be quiet, not to struggle.	
30. Mrs. Touchett and Mme Merle in a confectionery. Mrs. T tells Merle Osmond might be in love with Isabel. Merle promises to find out the truth from O.	Confectionery serves as place that connects several scenes.
31. Osmond and Mme Merle (in the same confectionery as above?) discuss Isabel. Merle tells O it is not because she told her so that O visits Mrs. Touchett's house so frequently. O: Isabel's fault is that she has (false) ideas, which she will have to sacrifice. Merle is shocked, and says the affair is solely O's business from that point on.	Location and time become uncertain. (It seems R and I are also passing by, which is unlikely.) Merle suspects genuine attraction – just like in novel.  Merle's shock is less credible than in novel because of recent "love" scene (scene 25).
32. Isabel, Henrietta and Ralph are looking at statues and murals in an old palazzo. I leaves them apparently in search of sy. Meets Osmond nearby who is twirling the parasol she left behind. O confesses his love and, forcefully, kisses the quite scared Isabel. H and R reappear – O does not return R's greeting.	Music is significant. So is image of twirling striped parasol, which recalls images of Hitchcock's <i>Vertigo</i> . Interfilmic reference.
33. On Osmond's request I visits Pansy while he is away in Rome. In the garden P does not dare to walk beyond a line indicated by her father. I is puzzled but says she should obey her	High camera positions – both girls seem tiny puppets in a game.

father.	
<p>34. Isabel on African journey with Mme Merle.</p> <p>It is mostly Isabel's thoughts that we can see visualised.</p> <p>Nude Isabel fleeing from sg., possibly from Osmond's voice.</p>	<p>Added scene. Black and white frames, reminiscent of silent films (journey on steamship, characters' moves.)</p> <p>Also surrealistic images: we can see O's mouth enlarged, beans on plate saying I love you.</p>
<p>Intertitle: Florence, a year later</p> <p>35. Goodwood visits Isabel, with the aim of verifying the news that she is to get married.</p>	<p>I is focaliser as Goodwood is crossing the well-kept lawn before the house.</p> <p>Fullshots of I from G's perspective – distance between the two is emphasised.</p>
<p>36. Ralph and Isabel are discussing her decision to marry.</p> <p>R considers O a sterile dilettante, and a selfish one.</p>	<p>Setting is the stables of the palazzo I is staying in. Foreshadows negative outcome of marriage as horse boxes and railings serve as background. Settings sometimes are also deliberately changed: in novel it is a garden!</p> <p>Mostly close-ups and midshots, except for ending, where full figures fade away, indicating a growing gap between the two protagonists.</p>
<p>37. Isabel and Osmond walking in park with Pansy. O says he would never regret I's having money. I also says she is most grateful to her uncle.</p> <p>O says it will be a pleasure to introduce Pansy to the society.</p>	<p>Park is first shown from high camera position.</p> <p>Midshots of I and O.</p> <p>Osmond's cold voice contradicts his words while in novel his good mood springs from genuine happiness.</p>
<p>Intertitle: Rome, three years later.</p> <p>38. Mme Merle and Rosier discussing his prospects of marrying Pansy. She seems to consider the case as sg. worthy of</p>	<p>Before Rosier's entry we can see the sky with confused groups of birds flying into opposing directions. Heavy rain. Images indicate that things have turned for the</p>

<p>attention.</p> <p>She asks not to involve I to avoid further conflicts between O and I.</p>	<p>worse.</p> <p>Ceiling with a mural of an embracing couple – theme of love introduced.</p> <p>Midshots and close-ups during conversation – beautiful objects, ornaments are shown but they are never in focus.</p>
<p>39. The Osmonds are preparing to receive their guests.</p> <p>While preparing, I strokes sculpture of tiny hand.</p> <p>O is apparently in charge of preparations, and enjoys being in command.</p> <p>Dryly and forcefully inquires about P's whereabouts.</p> <p>I, looking scared, answers.</p>	<p>Reference to lost son. I's appearance is very much changed: hair is artfully braided, dress looks elaborate and artistic, her posture is rigid.</p> <p>Intonation is clear sign of soured relations.</p>
<p>40. During the reception, Osmond and Mme Merle discuss Rosier's offer.</p> <p>Mme Merle suggests careful consideration as he is a gentleman and better offers may not come, but O reveals that he already rudely rejected his proposal.</p>	<p>Guests are first shown from high camera position.</p> <p>Close-ups of Merle and O imply tension and intimacy.</p>
<p>41. Isabel and Rosier during the reception.</p> <p>I tells R that O does not find him rich enough, and he does care about money.</p> <p>Also that she would like to help him but cannot.</p>	<p>Close-ups reveal fear, tension, as if the two of them were threatened by sg.</p> <p>Another sign of I not having things under control.</p>
<p>42. Lord Warburton appears at reception.</p> <p>I is surprised. W says Ralph is also in</p>	<p>Midshots –reveal his reserve.</p>

Rome, and is very sick. Refers to Mrs. Touchett going to America just now.	Implies cowardice rather than independence.
43. Pansy and Rosier converse at tea table. P tells him he loves him but cannot be disobedient.	Close-ups.
44. Warburton asks Isabel to introduce him to Pansy, but soon adds that it is not urgent. Also adds that I has changed, not to her detriment, not to her advantage, is just simply different.	Midshots remain. Focalisation is relevant: Warburton and I are watching Pansy.
45. Isabel visits sick Ralph in his Rome hotel room. Warburton is also present. When I leaves the two men agree that she has become kind of indifferent, which R attributes to O's influence.	Midshots.
46. While Warburton and Ralph are discussing her on balcony, Isabel passes by some beggars in the street.	Added scene. I's indifference is demonstrated. Fullshot of disappearing Isabel. Two men are focalisers. .
47. Ralph and Warburton again. They agree that they are interested in Mrs. Osmond. W begins to talk about Pansy, to R's question he answers that the case is "serious". O will be flattered, replies R, W only wonders though what Isabel will say to it.	Midshots.  Close-up – implies his words are of special importance.
48. After another reception of theirs Osmond tells Isabel that Warburton is certainly attentive to Pansy.	Mostly close-ups, few midshots.

<p>It turns out that W has already told Isabel he finds Pansy charming. O says I's temper is not good.</p> <p>O wants I to help him with Pansy, as I has power over W. He says he counts on her help.</p>	<p>With this O admits that he desperately wants to capture W.</p> <p>When asking for her help he is shown from high camera position – implication of pettiness. His voice is shrill.</p>
<p>49. Ball in Rome. Isabel, Pansy and Rosier are all present. I does not let R near Pansy. Rosier says he would not leave till Pansy does.</p>	<p>Ball functions as an umbrella scene. (Only two scenes take place though.)</p> <p>Male and female hands reaching out towards each other in the shape of a flower – filmed from above.</p> <p>Also images of fainting girls recur – emphasise Pansy's freshness – sometimes filmed from above.</p>
<p>50. Isabel and Warburton at ball. I refers to Rosier being a rival of W.</p> <p>W is curious why I is so sceptical about the possibility of his love for Pansy.</p>	<p>Midshots, few close-ups.</p>
<p>51. Isabel on her way to Ralph's. When inside, asks if W is really in love. R says he is – with I.</p> <p>Adds that O will be furious, and will say that I does not promote the marriage because she is jealous of Pansy.</p>	<p>When on her way fullshots, later close-ups.</p>
<p>52. Isabel leaving Ralph through a narrow alley.</p>	<p>Added scene. I's moves are slowed down – she is lost in her thoughts. A gate bangs behind her – a metaphor of ending.</p>
<p>53. Isabel and Pansy. I wants to know what she wishes.</p>	<p>Close-ups.</p>

Pansy says her hope is to be the wife of Rosier. Says that W is not in love with her, so there is no danger of his proposing. She is not to inform her father, as he would certainly hatch other marriage plans.	Romantic music.
54. In staircase Osmond angrily tells Isabel it will not be easy to catch Warburton if she works against it. W himself appears. When left alone he tells I he leaves because the little girl does not love him.	Close-ups.
55. Osmond and Isabel arrive home from social function. O forces I to sit down. Accuses her of wanting to humiliate him: he is the father who wanted to catch an English lord for his daughter, but could not. She was skilfully hatching her plans and prevented the marriage. Hits I's hands and face repeatedly. When she wants to leave, he steps on her train causing her to fall over. Says she must be happy at his despair, but I says he is not in despair.	Climactic scene – close-ups.  Explicit violence is present. Fullshots.  In novel there is reference to Isabel recognition of his losing the ground.  Last word is I's.
56. Isabel is walking in a narrow, meandering alley of trees.	Added scene. Good metaphor of I's seeking a get-out from her state.
57. Ralph, Henrietta and Goodwood at Ralph's. H tells R she is to accompany him back to London even if he does not want her as	Offers are made in separate scenes in novel – higher level of time unity in film. (Phenomenon is present in <i>The</i>



a companion. G says the same.	<i>Europeans</i> )
<p>58. Goodwood and Isabel in staircase of Ralph's pension.</p> <p>I tells G that he should leave Rome the sooner the better.</p> <p>Goodwood says I is reserved, one cannot come near her. You have come very near, she says, seeming puzzled.</p>	<p>In novel scene takes place at Isabel's.</p> <p>In novel I makes her remark in a "tone of warning" (471). Campion makes I-G union more possible.</p>
<p>59. Isabel and Ralph in Ralph's room.</p> <p>His things are being packed.</p> <p>She promises R to visit him in London if he calls her.</p> <p>R says Osmond is not to let her, but I says she will go all the same.</p>	<p>Scenes 58-59 are brought closer in place and time.</p> <p>Close-ups.</p> <p>In novel she simply says she "can arrange it" (464).</p>
<p>60. Mme Merle meets Isabel after her return from Naples.</p> <p>Merle tells I her husband is very angry with her. I is surprised at O visiting Merle so soon after her return.</p> <p>M asks if Warburton's resignation is the result of I's influence? Asks I to leave him for <i>them</i>.</p> <p>I loses her head and desperately asks who Merle is.</p>	<p>Setting is Rome street. It is raining again – gloomy atmosphere is established.</p> <p>Close-ups and midshots.</p>
<p>61. Merle and Osmond at Merle's.</p> <p>M tells O that she has just been very wicked with I, and it was him who dried up her soul.</p> <p>Cracked cup appears.</p> <p>On his saying that she is good enough for him, she begins to rage, and calls him</p>	<p>Mostly close-ups.</p> <p>Diagonally composed frame of O's face is notable. (Nose is the diagonal.)</p> <p>Slanted image of Merle also appears.</p> <p>Famous symbol is retained.</p>

evil.	
62. Isabel and Pansy and the Countess Gemini in the Coliseum. Pansy notices behind some railings Rosier but I drags Pansy away. Rosier cries after them that he is now rich as he has sold his bibelots.	Opening frame is slanted image of Coliseum. Railings reappear. Mostly fullshots, but close-up of Rosier and Pansy.
63. Dinner at the Osmonds', only guest is the Countess Gemini. O tells I and the countess that he sent Pansy back into the convent to "think".	Midshots. Beautifully laid dining table is in great contrast with O's violence.
64. Isabel running to her husband's study with a telegram. There she says that Ralph is dying and calls her to his deathbed. O appeals to her moral sense, saying she cannot travel through Europe for other men's sake. Their marriage was of their own deliberate making, and they should accept the consequences of their actions.	When she is hurrying, only Isabel's legs and train are shown. visual synecdoche  As conversation is getting more heated midshots are superseded by close-ups. Final close-up is that of I's face, which is out of focus. Final frame is black – feeling of loss, desperation.
65. Isabel tells the C. Gemini Osmond does not want her to visit the dying Ralph. The Countess informs her that Pansy is Merle and O's common child.	Midshots and close-ups.
66. Isabel goes to the convent to visit Pansy. She bumps into Merle in the parlour, who apologises for being there. I turns her back on her.	Intense music. Row of street lamps at dusk. Close-ups of I. Atmosphere is tense. Merle's vulnerability, regretful situation is emphasised. (She is clutching a doll.) In the novel there is no apology, and I

	talks to her.
67. Isabel is led to Pansy's room. Tells the girl she is to travel to London. P asks her not to leave her. I asks if she wants to go with her, but she does not go without her father's permission.	She and the nun who is leading her are shown from above – they look as if they were figures in a board game. Close-ups.
68. Merle is waiting for Isabel outside the convent in heavy rain. I is in her carriage but M cries to her that it was Ralph who made her rich. I says she thought she only had to be grateful to Merle.	Close-ups. Merle is shown from Isabel's point of view – from above. Situation is more humiliating for Merle than in the novel, where they are conversing in the parlour again.
69. Black and white images of train. Isabel's profile in close-up. Her hair is unruly again.	Dream-like images. Train is shown from low camera position – tension. Isabel looks like her young self again.
70. Isabel arrives in England. We can hear Henrietta's voice greeting her, Sy. asks how her crossing was. First I says it was nice, but corrects herself and says it was rough.	I's moves in crowd are slowed down – dream-like effect. Cannot believe she is there? Sound and sight are separated once again.
71. Isabel at Gardencourt looks into mirror. Picks up dog that appears at the beginning of film.	Slanted image of room – unstable state of mind.
72. Isabel is out in barren, snowy garden with Mrs. Touchett at dusk, who says there has never been any hope for Ralph.	Extreme long shot of two tiny figures all through. Fragility of life is implied.
73. Isabel crying in Ralph's room. Tells him she now knows it was him who made her rich. Also adds O married her	Midshots of I, close-ups of Ralph. The two are also shown from a high

<p>for her money.</p> <p>R tells her if she has been hated she has also been loved.</p> <p>I is now lying in R's bed and the two are practically kissing.</p>	<p>camera position.</p> <p>Reference to <i>Osmond</i> loving Isabel is left out – reference is more general.</p> <p>Unconventional sex scene. There is a definite erotic charge.</p>
<p>74. Ralph's funeral in barren winter cemetery.</p>	<p>Fullshots.</p>
<p>75. Isabel bumps into Goodwood after funeral.</p> <p>G tells I Ralph told him to do everything for her that she lets him do.</p> <p>He knows I is scared and unhappy, he continues, but they could be happy together. Kisses her. At first I seems responsive but then we see her running through the garden. Stops at doorstep of lighted house and turns back.</p>	<p>I is first shown from above, from very high external point of view – a tiny helpless point in universe.</p> <p>Garden and I in bluish – greyish hues.</p> <p>Her moves are also slowed down – surreal touch.</p> <p>Viewer does not know if she enters house, remains outside, or goes back to Goodwood. Open ending.</p>

## VI. *The Golden Bowl*

### 1. Critical Approaches to *The Golden Bowl* as a Novel

One faces a difficult task when trying to identify the functions the major characters fulfil in this novel of James, as, unlike in *The Europeans*, they seem complex and ambiguous. This later fact is reflected by the high number and the conflicting nature of the interpretations attracted by this work. In the forthcoming paragraphs I only intend to introduce the major elements of the most influential or, for me, most illuminating analyses.

Though Dorothea Krook's *The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James* was originally published in 1962, her work is still one of the most often quoted critical works on our author. Krook famously interprets *The Golden Bowl* as a great fable of man's redemption by the transforming power of human love and, as such, she considers it one of the greatest in modern European literature (240). Krook, however, never claims that this approach originates from her: she refers to Frederick C. Crews' analysis, *The Tragedy of Manners: Moral Drama in the Later Novels of Henry James*, the work which first explores the wealth of Christian overtones in the novel (280).

Christianity's basic myth, the myth of salvation, is indeed not difficult to apply to the novel. There is an emphasis all through the story on millionaire Adam Verver's unlimited power, as well as on his ambiguity and inaccessibility. Crews also points out that his relationship to Maggie resembles that of the Father to the Son in the Christian scheme in many respects, while the status of the adulterous couple, Charlotte and the Prince is reminiscent of that of fallen angels. I assume that when Krook describes *The Golden Bowl* story as "simple and melodramatic" (232), she again refers to the conspicuousness of its mythic structure.

Krook's interpretation is, however, much richer than concentrating on just one aspect of the novel; she is also among the first to recognise the great influence of aestheticism on this work. To start with, Krook regards Prince Amerigo as James's quintessential aesthetic man, since the touchstone of taste is the ultimate criterion in the conduct of his life. Aesthetic is the measure of the good, good is the function of the

beautiful for him. In more concrete terms: people are measured by the high style in which they conduct their lives. What he will be awakened to is that the aesthetic and the moral are not the same, these two values can even be mutually exclusive. The trajectory of his life spans between these two very points: at the beginning of the novel the quintessential Prince confesses to not having a real moral sense; with the lapse of time he acquires some but will probably lead a life less decorous (241-2).

Krook assumes Charlotte Stant to dimly suspect that there is a difference between the two above concepts. The young woman after all never admits that she has done anything wrong, not even to herself – which reveals a fundamental moral insensibility. She tells lies with coolness and self-possession. Charlotte also conducts her life in the light of the touchstone of taste – which Krook considers as her most important common feature with the Prince (246).

From this set-up, Krook concludes, derives one of the most original justifications of adultery in world literature. It is precisely because the Prince and Charlotte guide their lives by the principles of aestheticism that they have to commit adultery: in the given situation this is the only brave, only decent, only intelligent thing to do. There is a standard of a higher and braver propriety than the merely moral, they think (249).

According to Krook, Adam Verver is also primarily guided by the same aesthetic principles (250). I find it a significant difference though that this renowned collector and great lover of beauty never considers his own life as an object to which aesthetic principles should also apply. In plainer words, unlike his son-in-law, he never really cares about the form, elegance of his lifestyle.

Significantly, however, Krook does not stop here, and also interprets Maggie's conduct in the terms of aestheticism. Maggie's relationship with the aesthetic is particular: she is fighting devil in that shape (267). This is a very subtle form, not a comparatively simple, tangible one; embodied, for example, by Shakespeare's Iago. Krook emphasizes that the recognition of the destructive element in the aesthetic principle is a thoroughly new phenomenon, a great achievement on James's side. Maggie's task is accomplished by not insisting, by not pressing or harassing her husband, but letting him come by his own effort to the knowledge of good and evil. She wins, because what she does is the most intelligent thing to do, not just the most loving. It is

clever to exploit the adulterous couple's terror of exposure, equally so to hold them in suspense, and it is supremely intelligent to keep them in the wrong, herself in the right (268-70). Maggie is thus standing up to the touchstone of taste in a way thoroughly unexpected by the Prince: she forces her husband to recognise the beauty of his wife's intelligence, which derives from inherent goodness. Krook, however, also emphasises that a relationship based *solely* in the touchstone of taste is merely external and as such it is doomed to fail, which is the very reason for the failure of the Charlotte-Prince relationship as well (298).

Beside the issues of morality and aestheticism, Krook also focuses on the issue of ambiguity in connection with *The Golden Bowl*. She points out that due to the use of two centres of consciousness, the Prince and Princess, the indirect method of presentation predominates here to the almost complete exclusion of direct statement (236). In Genette's terminology we can say that due to the use of only two internal focalisers and one external focaliser (James's narrator) the other two major characters remain quite mystic. This fact will have important consequences for filmmakers. Because of the lack of directness ambiguity becomes all -pervasive in the *Golden Bowl* – crucially, for example, we never know how much Adam Verver knows of the adultery, or we can never be sure whether the move to American City is his idea, or Maggie puts it into his head by first mentioning the place during their Fawns conversation (Book Fifth, Part 3). Likewise, in the second half of the novel we only witness Charlotte's suffering from the uncertainty surrounding her through Maggie's eyes, but are refused any first-hand "glimpse" into her mind. Krook defines this ambiguity as a huge metaphor for James's experience of the mixed nature of all human action, and of the consequent dual character of all human endeavours.

The duality of human endeavour I find the real and most original focus of Krook's sensitive analysis. She ends her study by describing the dichotomised nature of the four protagonists' deeds in the following manner:

Maggie: she wants the Prince possessively – but this is her very motive for her redemptive task.

Prince: wants freedom supplied by Verver's money – if not so he would never acquire the moral sense he lacked.

Charlotte: if she never wanted security from loneliness and want, she would never go to American City and would never have an opportunity to exercise her “greatness”.

Adam: if he had not been acquisitive he would not have made his millions – nobody would have a motivation to stay in his boat (319-20). By pointing out how the positive and negative features mingle in the characters Krook calls attention to the realistic aspects of this work of James as well, which was more than timely as critics tended to appreciate its symbolism only, and here I have to refer to Crews again.

Paul B. Armstrong’s study, *The Phenomenology of Henry James* springs from the recognition that the relation between ourselves and others is the major interest of both phenomenology and of James. This probably holds true for most writers, but James’s interest in the ambiguity of humans and in the misinterpretation of the other is indeed pronounced, and, as I have already indicated on the basis of Marius Bewley’s study, is probably traceable to the influence of the American literary tradition. In this work Armstrong highlights some key ideas of the leading phenomenologists that are also manifest in *The Golden Bowl*.

To start with, Armstrong refers to Sartre who claims that the object that I am for the other can never coincide with the subject that I am for myself. Husserl’s idea that the gap between selves could be bridged by acts of empathy and analogy, and Merleau Ponty and Sartre’s more pessimistic approach that empathy and analogy cannot guarantee intersubjectivity are both relevant in connection with *The Golden Bowl* (137).

The two conflicting views on which Armstrong bases his study, are, however, those of Heidegger and Sartre. For Heidegger care (*Sorge*) is the fundamental structure of existence and “being with” others (*Mitsein*) is the basic dimension of personal relations. Sartre denies the priority of “care” or “being with” and argues that conflict is the original meaning of being for others. With the help of *The Golden Bowl* Armstrong tries to reconcile Heidegger and Sartre: conflict and care are both present in human relations – *The Golden Bowl* is “neither a sordid account of tyrannical manipulation, nor a great fable of the redemptive power of human love” (138-9).

Here I feel tempted to point out that the recognition of the above duality is far from being a new point: we have just seen how Krook already called attention to James’s interest in the dichotomic nature of human relations. By way of example, we can identify



Adam and Maggie's acquisitiveness as conflict-seeking and their trying to help the Prince to "help himself", or Charlotte to find a new meaning for her life as care. Also Heidegger's care is conspicuously close to Crews' Christian love and redemption.

Even more striking for the student of Modernism is the similarity between Sartre's ambiguity of the Other and Walter Pater's views on the same issue, outlined in their most elaborate form in the Conclusion to *The Renaissance*. In this work Pater famously writes that personal experience is but a "group of impressions" that cannot be verified, and that "each mind [is] keeping as a solitary prisoner its own dream of a world" (151). The fact that the lines testify to the author's relativism and solipsism, and even to his epistemological scepticism, has been pointed out by, for example, F. C. McGrath in his *The Sensible Spirit: Walter Pater and the Modernist Paradigm* (12-53).

According to Armstrong *The Golden Bowl* is neither sanguine nor sceptical about the problem of self and the other; it merely states that intersubjectivity is impossible but inevitable to some degree, and to a more considerable degree than most of us achieve. This impossibility does not seem to frustrate James: if others were transparent much of the reason for finding them fascinating would be gone, the whole *The Golden Bowl* story would, for example, disappear. Solipsism is inescapable but it is also absurd: the Other does not even cause problems if I am not aware of its existence. By thwarting the reader's desire for a total vision James calls our attention to this solipsistic dimension of personal relations. James's apparent fascination with lies, which, memorably for all readers, abound in *The Golden Bowl*, exhibits an extreme form of the problems that complicate the relationships between the Self and the Other (139-140).

Armstrong gives an original analysis of the major characters, which reveals how he sees their functions in the narrative.

Maggie and her father live in solipsistic blindness and treat the Prince as an object while Charlotte as a great "personage". Apparently only a reciprocal exchange would allow both parties to be with each other in freedom. Both treatments are examples of "commoditisation"; they are not regarded as sensible, sensitive human beings but as objects. Verver also deludes himself by supposing that Others are unproblematic: on the assumption that his intended cannot have anything to hide he does not read, for example, the telegram the Prince sends to Charlotte in the wake of her engagement (143-4).

In connection with Verver, Armstrong also raises the frequently discussed question: Is this character also the evidence of James's ignorance of business, and businessman types? A businessman can operate on a limited notion of the Other, opines Armstrong. What is needed for business success is not really more than a sharp sense of the adversary's interests, and a wariness of deception, and one reading of *The Golden Bowl* is exactly how much the businessman Verver is learning about the complexity of personal relations in his second marriage (142-3). The argument is convincing enough, still I am one of those who doubt his integrity as a character – and find the film's Adam much more credible as a businessman for reasons introduced later.

As for the Prince and his adultery, Armstrong also comes up with a very original and convincing justification for it: The Prince reasserts his freedom by being false to his wife – he acts when he is expected to be passive, a mere object, a commodity (155). Also significantly Charlotte and the Prince begin their adultery by dedicating themselves to a “conscious care” (*The Golden Bowl* 259) of Adam and Maggie – which would mean the restoration of reciprocity among the foursome.

On this very occasion Charlotte tells the Prince that they have to take things as they find them. This obviously is also a delusion, as she has actively shaped those things by, for example, reappearing in London on the eve of the Prince's marriage. Thus, for Armstrong, she seems to be “the agent of their destiny and he the victim of his fate” (157). I would, however, note that victim is a word that could hardly be associated with the Prince. Many times he is mentioned in the novel as the archetypal aristocrat, a perfect representative of his type. His passivity is rather attributable to his experience that things always work out well for him as a result of somebody else's toil, and *The Golden Bowl* story will actually once again prove him right.

After the period of solipsism a new era in Maggie's history is heralded in by the appearance of the pagoda symbol at the very beginning of Book II. From this point on she serves as the major internal focaliser of the novel, a technical change with the obvious implication that henceforth the important developments will be primarily connected to her. Armstrong states that in the second half of the novel she will gradually become aware that the opacity of others can cloak secrets, and also that conflict might disguise itself as care (159).

Another symbol that Armstrong interprets in connection with Maggie is the golden bowl itself. William James's notion that our minds meet in the world of objects which they share in common is relevant here ("A World of Pure Experience" 78). The object's mere existence prevents falsity, lies: "it is because of *that*" (*The Golden Bowl* 447), says Maggie to Fanny when talking about the discovery of her husband's adultery, and with this *that* she refers to the bowl. It is of course not the vessel that liberates Maggie from delusion, she liberates herself by deciphering its meaning. Her interpretation of the bowl's opacity transforms her into an interpreter of the opacity of others. Significantly, though, we never know if she is aware that she can never make herself transparent for her own understanding. Maggie conceals the discovery of the bowl and the adultery from her father. She demonstrates her concern and her care for him by lying, and this of course is not the only example of benevolent deception in the *Golden Bowl* story. Though her motivation is love, her lie still separates her from her father. As she does not know how much he knows, Adam becomes a problematic Other for Maggie; they are no longer enclosed in happy, ignorant solipsism (Armstrong 163).

Unlike her relationship with her father the Maggie-Charlotte relationship unfolds almost exclusively under the sign of conflict (Armstrong 176). Maggie is lying and acting in two well-known scenes at Fawns: on the terrace when she denies that she would accuse Charlotte of anything, and later in the garden, when she pretends to believe that the Ververs' move to America was initiated by Charlotte.

Armstrong also qualifies Charlotte's struggle to save her dignity even if the Ververs have taken away her freedom as self-deception (181). It is exactly because of her self-deception that Charlotte also functions as Maggie's ally in the second half of the novel: had she spoken the truth about her relationship with the Prince, Maggie's "passive resistance" would never work. Interestingly, initially it was the Ververs' self-delusion, unwillingness to see reality that functioned as Charlotte's aid.

In Armstrong's view Charlotte loses so much by moving to America that he sees her as a "scapegoat" – she is the Other against whom the others define themselves as a united "Self" (182). As we saw, Armstrong's original intention was to point out how the duality of human behaviour is manifest in *The Golden Bowl* plot, and to exempt the novel's ending from this approach is I think a regrettable simplification. Intending to get

into the details later, here I would only emphasise that with the final arrangement other characters also lose a lot, while Krook already reminded us of Charlotte's significant gains from having to move to the New World.

Not only does Armstrong see Charlotte's future in dark colours, he is equally pessimistic about the future of the princely couple: he doubts that fulfilling care can grow on the foundation of deception and scapegoating (185). Since I see those foundations in a less negative light, I do believe in their future, but admit that they have yet to learn how to live with each other in freedom.

Jonathan Freedman in his *Professions of Taste. Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture* regards *The Golden Bowl* as the great work of aestheticist art that aestheticism itself was unable to create. The most important elements of his analysis are best seen if gathered round two key characters, Adam and Maggie.

For Freedman, Adam Verver, like Gilbert Osmond, is a man whose emotional life and connoisseurship are identical. He purchases his son-in-law and wife as precious objects, as the "best of their kind".

Freedman adds that the really interesting aesthete of the novel is Maggie Verver, as she is the one who can put aestheticism to work in the social world (231). She fuses the qualities of the Paterian Epicurean with those of the decadent *belle dame sans mercy*, or femme fatale (232). She is Paterian, as she is forced by circumstance to the rigorous inspection of every impression, most of which anyway turn out to be false. As for her second attribute, the association seems quite surprising at first sight. Maggie starts out as a "small creeping thing" (*The Golden Bowl* 168), she is likened to animals that evoke the image of timidity: to a lamb, or to a spaniel shaking off water. As she begins to act, she is becoming more and more powerful though, and she will already see herself as the master of the situation in the Fawns terrace scene, to which I will return.

In the "epistemologically unstable" world of the novel each character possesses secrets that the others attempt to ferret out. It is only Maggie, who, after a while, becomes fully aware of the secrets and sins of Amerigo, Charlotte and Fanny, and duly punishes all of them by signalling to each that she knows, but not what she knows. Freedman emphasises that the more she wishes to punish the person, the greater the ambiguity is (236): to Charlotte she practically does not say anything; memorably, her one desperate

attempt to gain knowledge on the Fawns terrace fails to clarify anything. Fanny is allowed to raise questions, while Amerigo is somewhere midway: Maggie tells him how she has come into the possession of the golden bowl, but when he asks further questions (how much Adam knows) he is rejected quite abruptly: "I have told you all I intended. Find out the rest" (*The Golden Bowl* 464).

I find this femme fatale interpretation a bit overstretched, though, when Freedman is discussing the final scenes of the novel. His claim that Maggie is witnessing Charlotte's agony with an intensity that borders on sadism (237) is not difficult to defy: Maggie apparently does what she can in order to mitigate Charlotte's suffering and expects the same from the Prince as well.

Freedman finds it also obvious that Maggie has the Prince under her control at the end of the novel (238). "What business is it of yours?" (*The Golden Bowl* 571), she meaningfully asks when the Prince wants to tell Charlotte that Maggie is no simpleton as she has found out all their secrets. The form of the question indeed implies quite unbalanced power relations between the spouses, but might just as well be taken as a sign of Maggie's aversion to humiliating those already defeated. Even in a more recent work, in which he applies some basic concepts of game theory to the novel, Freedman writes that "she [Maggie] has won again the love of her husband, but he seems to be as much a hypnotised automaton as an active participant in their marriage" ("What Maggie Knew: Game Theory, *The Golden Bowl*, and the Possibilities of Aesthetic Knowledge" 113). I am afraid the Prince's natural passivity, a trait James never despises but rather juxtaposes to common busybodiness, is misinterpreted here. As for the final scene of the novel, it is hard to interpret otherwise than as Maggie's succumbing to her husband's physical charm. With her victory over Charlotte becoming more and more certain, she herself becomes less and less secretive with the Prince, and with their final embrace she gives up the last remnants of her reserve, of her femme fatale status.

Though I am inclined to find Freedman's interpretation of the novel's ending a bit one-sidedly pessimistic, I would never dispute that his approach to most of Book Second is convincing and illuminating: James there indeed "domesticates" the femme fatale, and her sadistic energies and subtle power are turned towards the establishment of familial harmony. As Freedman also observes, Maggie also successfully achieves the goals of the

male aesthetes of James's earlier works, for example, those of Osmond or Roderick Hudson. These aims can be identified as the following: to force life into the symmetrical perfection of art, and the combination of emotional withdrawal and will to power. All these aims are also Maggie's, but, unlike her aesthetic predecessors, she successfully pieces together the broken bowl: she manages to remould life in the perfect image of an aesthetic artefact (240).

All in all *The Golden Bowl* is regarded by Freedman as the fully achieved work of art that the aesthetic movement failed to bring forth: in this novel the work of art itself is the ontological ground on which the fragments of the characters' lives are reunited, on which lives are reconstructed (243).

## **2. Further Remarks on the Interpretation of *The Golden Bowl***

There is no reader of *The Golden Bowl* who would fail to notice how central the ambiguity of human relations is in this novel – and there is probably no critic who would not identify it as one of the novel's major themes. Explicit lies, which Armstrong regards as a peculiar case of the Other's opacity (140), also play a very much important role in this novel, and their examination certainly adds significant elements to the novel's interpretation.

James warns us early in his text that lies, the difference between appearances and reality, will play an important role in this work of his. In practically the very first dialogue of the opening chapter the Prince demands Maggie to declare that she knows: her intended is not a "hypocrite", he is not someone who "lie[s], dissemble[s], or deceive[s]" (51). James puts it down to Maggie's innocence, to her American roots, that she finds the question too emotional, and is only able to react to it in a puzzled, half-joking manner. He even makes the Prince conclude that the Americans and the English do not discuss duplicity nor do they discuss love (51). Unlike his fiancée the Prince is aware of the problem of the Other.

When Fanny tells him that the Prince said he had never been told about Maggie by Charlotte, the Colonel's reply is quite abrupt and shocking: "And he does not lie?"

(90). The Colonel's question calls our attention to the fact that even the conduct of such a paragon of good breeding as the Prince cannot be taken for granted.

Opacity initially derives from the withholding of truth about the Charlotte-Prince relationship, which is chronologically the first important lie that appears in *The Golden Bowl* fabula. It is notable that in this opacity nobody's responsibility is apparent; nobody's initial intentions are clearly evil. This will be true all through the novel – contrary to horrid, commonplace falsifications, the aim of which would simply be the benefit of the liar and the ruin of those misled, the lies of *The Golden Bowl* are mostly meant to help someone, and we will see that even the few exceptions are easy to justify.

As for the initial withholding of truth, which sets *The Golden Bowl* story into motion, even on Fanny's side there are serious reasons for keeping silent. When she introduces the Prince to Maggie, Charlotte has already fled from Rome to "save herself", and the Prince shows no sign of suffering from the abandonment of a serious attachment. For the same reason, the Prince himself is under no moral obligation to mention Charlotte to Maggie. "There were beautiful intentions all around" (315), concludes Fanny.

It is Charlotte's conduct that is most difficult to defend. Armstrong indicates that she is the one who most actively formulates the plot of the novel by arriving back from America before the Prince's marriage, and later by so effectively managing the Verver's social life that father and daughter spend even more time together, becoming even more solipsistic (156-7). She also urges the Prince to recognise and to use his freedom. The mitigating circumstances, however, are numerous on her side as well: she is painfully lonely, has no immediate family, no relatives, and her American visit, during which she is so much out of place, only deepens this feeling. Although she has no permanent home, only two huge trunks with her clothes in them, her aim is never the hoarding of wealth but only a solid financial background. At the beginning of the novel she is so much deprived of everything worth living for that one is quite willing to acknowledge: she deserves an opportunity to get back into the Prince's life once again if she can. After her marriage, she also seems to give her husband a fair chance to get closer to her. "I've done, earnestly, everything I could" (224), she says to Fanny at the Foreign Office party. She is, however, to realize that at this stage of his life Mr. Verver's interest in his daughter is "the greatest affection of which he is capable" (224).

The adulterous liaison necessitates further lies very soon if appearances are to be maintained. As Armstrong writes, first and foremost it costs a bit of self-delusion on Charlotte's side: despite her claiming the contrary to the Prince, the situation did not form itself; she was an active agent in its formulation. Interestingly there is no indication of her being aware of it (157). Before taking it as the sign of some moral defect, however, we must think of James's narration technique: in Volume Two we are usually following the events through Maggie's consciousness, and it is Charlotte's elementary interest to hide her emotions and notions from her. As for the Prince, in line with her aristocratic passivity he indeed "hadn't struggled, nor snatched, he was taking but what had been given him" (291).

Fanny Assingham is quick to recognise what is going on between Charlotte and the Prince, but decides to say nothing to Maggie. "We know nothing on earth. We are absolute idiots" (321), she clarifies her strategy to the colonel. Fanny's hope of course is that Maggie will take control of the situation, and correctly assumes that confessions would only cause harm.

Maggie herself also begins to suspect something during her husband's Gloucester outing. The birth of suspicion in her is a turning point in the novel, marked by the appearance of the already-mentioned pagoda symbol. This symbol signifies the beginning of the young woman's development, the abandonment of her solipsistic relationship with her father, and the recognition of the depth of her love for the Prince. Human relationships begin to show in their complexity and ambiguity for her. She becomes aware of human faults, one only has to think of her severe judgment of Lady Castledean. As I have already mentioned, from this point on she is so interesting that she acts as the central consciousness or focaliser of the novel. And, significantly, at this point she also joins the group of liars: she does not speak about her suspicion to her husband, or to her father. Her respective aims are to preserve their marriage and to protect his peace, which we have seen to put an end to their above-mentioned solipsistic relation.

Moreover, Maggie also seems to lie to Fanny when telling her that she believes her lie, that she believes in Fanny not knowing anything about Charlotte and the Prince's liaison. As both women cry by the end of this conversation (Book Fourth, Part 6) it is apparent that they both know the truth, but find it too painful to put it into words. The



scene consequently looks like a game (we will see other examples of it in the novel) the aim of which is to ask and give advice, as well as to offer sympathy and comfort, the advice being that if Maggie is to maintain the delicate balance of the foursome's relationship she has to pursue her prevailing strategy, she has to pretend she does not know anything.

Maggie's gaining absolute certainty of her husband's conduct, the result of the antiquity dealer's visit, ends old lies and necessitates new ones. Maggie tells both her husband and Fanny Assingham that she knows the truth, that they no longer have to pretend. The adulterous liaison is likely to end not much after Maggie's revelation, as soon after she sees Charlotte in the cage of delusion, as "a prisoner looking through bars" (484). The Prince's giving up Charlotte so quick is not at all surprising if we think of his aristocratic passivity, his dislike of complications, as well as the nature of his motivation for starting the relationship. By shocking Maggie he has already achieved his aim (demonstrating that he is not an object) and lost his excuse (that he just takes what is given to him without hurting anyone). Maggie is certain that the Prince *explicitly lies* to Charlotte, that he tells Charlotte Maggie does not know anything. The Prince's motive is also to force his former (or soon-to-be-abandoned) lover not to change her conduct towards Maggie, and consequently to maintain the foursome's relationship. Emotional outbursts, scenes cannot take place, appearances are to be preserved for Adam Verver's sake, the extent of whose knowledge is unknown to everyone. James keeps up this uncertainty about him till the very end to maintain tension. The Prince and the Princess are now allies in protecting, if not Verver's peace of mind, then at least his dignity.

Charlotte will make a desperate attempt to learn something about Maggie's state of mind in the frequently analysed terrace scene, which begins with Maggie observing through an open door the members of her family and Fanny Assingham playing bridge within the house. At this time she is already so far from her initial innocent-young-girl self that she feels as if she were the "author" of a play in which the others are actors (488). Charlotte joins Maggie and asks the ominous question: "Is there any wrong you consider I have done you?" (496). Maggie's elaborate answer: "I have never thought of you but as beautiful, wonderful and good" (498), perhaps seems too long for Charlotte to be true, as she says that she only wanted Maggie's denial. Maggie duly provides it too,

which leaves us with another obvious lie. Her apparent aim again is to keep up the foursome's relationship.

Not much later an already mentioned conversation of Adam and Maggie, during which the latter talks of her selfishness, ends with the two agreeing on the Ververs' return to America. Maggie is soon to see that the decision has been communicated to Charlotte, as she sees her rival as "removed, transported, doomed" (512). Now practically certain of her victory over Charlotte, she can afford to have a bad conscience and being very sorry for her. (It is interesting to see how these feelings strengthen in her in direct proportion with her self-confidence. Initially she only sensitively envisages Charlotte's bitter future whereas by the end of the novel she is already moved to tears by her suffering and cannot resist an attempt of comforting.) These emotions lead to another famous scene and another much-discussed lie: Maggie follows a pensive Charlotte into the garden under the pretext of taking some reading for her. A conversation is inevitable, during which Charlotte announces that she feels she needs rest, and has decided to take her husband back to America. Maggie allows Charlotte to come up with her version of the story, the very thing considered "sadistic" by Freedman (237). Though the latter interpretation is apparently in line with Maggie's femme fatale status, we must also see that by letting Charlotte speak Maggie provides her with an opportunity to restore some of her dignity. When she is listening "smiling and smiling" (542) to Charlotte, who is just telling her that she places her husband first, and that is why they go back to America, Maggie's smile can also be considered as a smile of relief and not the smile of a sadistic gloater. A smile of relief on seeing that Charlotte was creative enough to make up such a face-saving story. Though the conversation is about Maggie loathing the Ververs' marriage (something she actually did), both women are aware that their real battle was fought for the Prince, and this battle ended with Maggie's victory. Charlotte's final statement: "you've worked against me" (544) applies both to her marriage and – most significantly – to her love affair. Maggie's answer, "I've failed!" (544), is true if we consider the surface meaning of the dialogue, but is false, is a lie, if we consider its real meaning. As a lie it is the generous lie of a winner who is willing to play the game the rules of which were established by the loser. The major rule – duly accepted by Maggie – is that Charlotte will never ever admit defeat.

As opposed to the novel's "early" naïve Maggie, Mrs. Assingham represents another extreme: she attributes most of her time and energy to the interpretation and formulation of human behaviour and relations. She trusts herself to be a good judge of character, a good reader of the opaque Other. "I'm not speaking of what she [Charlotte] has told me", she boasts to her husband, "That's one thing. I'm speaking of what I know by myself. That's another" (90). James, of course, refrains from recommending Fanny's attitude to life as the only beatific one: her attitude turns out to be equally dangerous, as it takes her close to meddling in other people's fates.

*The Ambassadors* is read by most critics as the Jamesian text probably most permeated by Pater's philosophy, as this is the work in which James's focaliser, or major centre of consciousness, Lambert Strether, most ardently advises the youth around him to expose themselves to life, to expressions. Notwithstanding the apparent Paterian influence James already warns his readers in this novel that *some* of the impressions that penetrate our mind are misleading. (Jamesians will remember that most relevant in that respect is the river scene, in which Strether accidentally bumps into Mme Vionnet and Chad.) *The Golden Bowl*, however, significantly qualifies Pater, as it implies that the impressions we gather of other beings are *mostly* false, and it requires great effort and intelligence to interpret them correctly. Correct interpretation, though, is vital for survival, for "mis- or non-interpreters" are easily deprived of everything precious. This is not the first time that a Jamesian text proves to be an interesting appendix to Pater, as I have noted *The Portrait* seems to achieve something similar.

By enumerating the major duplicities of the novel we could see how love, the intention to protect the Other, or to reduce his/her pain, permeate these deceptions. Also I would say that contrary to commonplace morality it is not evil, not something detestable that derives from these deceptions, but human relations with the capacity to develop. From this an important conclusion can be drawn: with *The Golden Bowl* James declares that lies are inevitable elements of human relations, they are used by the most valuable human beings as well, and as such they cease to be the manifestation of evil. In all this I am inclined to see James's ultimate break with the American literary tradition, as well as the impact of modern phenomenology, and Modernism in general. As for the former, we only have to remember Hawthorne's much more one-sided treatment of evil. What Hawthorne

points out is that evil is sometimes disguised as good and vice versa, but he basically maintains Protestantism's major principle, predestination, which strictly separates the two character types. As for the impact of Modernism, I have already noted that the relativism of truth is one of the axioms of the Modernist movement, with many seeing its origin in Walter Pater's works again, perhaps most explicitly in his essay on Coleridge, where he declares that truth is "not the truth of eternal outlines ascertained once and for all, but a world of fine gradations and subtly linked conditions, shifting intricately as we ourselves change" (68). Through the above examples, James successfully demonstrates the relativism, multifaceted nature of lies as well, which will have important consequences in connection with the novel's ending.

Apart from the above deliberate lies, which I have accepted to be special cases of the Other's opacity, there are some other relevant misconceptions in connection with the Other in the novel, which do not necessarily qualify as deliberate falsities, are rather to be regarded as examples of the Other's opacity, or, from the perceiver's point of view, of human ignorance.

I have already quoted Armstrong's point that the Prince's opacity for the Ververs derives from their treating him as an excellent specimen of his type, the European aristocrat. Father and daughter think they know the type and forget about his being an individual. The Prince duly warns Maggie that beside the member of the aristocratic family there is another part of him that represents "the unknown, unimportant [...] personal quantity" (47), but she cannot do anything with the warning at that stage. Charlotte also thinks she knows her former lover all through, saying that he is not too different from her (258). What she cannot foresee is his wife's influence on him, his potential for development.

This latter failure is already the consequence of an underlying fatal mistake: Maggie's development potential is not recognised by Charlotte. "They have thought of everything, but that I will think" (555), Maggie observes. Much similarly to Eugenia, Charlotte puts an equation mark between "worldliness", elegance, or, if we like, one's aestheticism and his/her ability to influence human relations. Charlotte is not the only one to underestimate Maggie: on the eve of their marriage the Prince also "expected her, desired her, to have character", but, significantly, he "was not afraid of her having too

much” (53). Of the other protagonists it is only the more experienced and less worldly Fanny who recognizes early that behind her shyness, almost clumsiness, Maggie “has no small amount of character” (402).

Charlotte herself is obviously opaque for Maggie for some time, at least between the Matcham week-end and the antiquity shop owner’s visit, and she must be equally so for her husband for a less clearly determinable period. There is, however, also a less frequently discussed element of opacity about her, and that concerns her aim with her initial return from America. Is it a final desperate attempt to take the Prince away? There is motivation for that, as the failure of her American trip makes it apparent that she is deprived of everything that can be valuable in life. The Prince is even afraid of her throwing her arms around his neck when meeting for the first time at Fanny’s. Is her aim just getting back into the Prince’s life, marrying somebody else later, and taking from the Prince what she can take as a married woman? She explicitly says so at the end of Book First Part 6. Or, does she just return because she realized she had nothing to do in America, so she comes back to her natural environment, to her friends? To Fanny she implies this. As I have already noted, quite interestingly Charlotte is rarely a centre of consciousness or focaliser in the novel, we seldom have direct access to her mind, certainly not enough to choose from the above alternatives. It is also not clear from the novel whether she would be willing to give up financial security for her love or not. The issue is simply not raised, as the Prince never considers parting with Maggie, but it will be brought into the foreground by the film.

The source of Adam Verver’s opacity is again the withholding of information, truth. As the narration progresses Adam Verver becomes more and more opaque. Even after the decision on the Ververs’ return to America is made, which must be considered as his being in the complete know of truth, everything he says can be interpreted as an allusion or just as every day chit-chat. When, for example, during his farewell visit he tells his daughter that she has got “some good things” (574) in her drawing room, it is impossible to discern if he means her paintings or her husband and stepmother.

Similarly to opacity, the issue of reciprocity is hard to avoid if one is dealing with *The Golden Bowl*. As Armstrong writes, at the beginning of the novel Adam and Maggie Verver live in a kind of “solipsistic blindness” (140), either do not care about the people

that surround them, or, if they do, they treat them as simple objects. We only have to think of the often quoted dialogue of Maggie and the Prince, in which Maggie explicitly tells her fiancé that he is “a rarity, an object of beauty, an object of price” (49) in her father’s art collection. Objects needn’t be treated as equals, consequently in the relations the Ververs share with those closest to them, with the Prince and Charlotte, there is no reciprocity. As the latter two claim, “there is nothing, absolutely, that one *need* do for her [Maggie]” (110, James’s italics).

What we often fail to see is that since the Ververs only maintain superficial relations with their environment, it is only able to form a stereotypical view of them: that of the innocent lovely girl who is not to see evil, and of the reserved, shy art collector. In that respect there *is* reciprocity in human contacts: I would say that this treatment is also a form of objectification. Frozen in their stereotypes neither Maggie nor Adam Verver can be told unpleasant truths – I see this as the main reason for the withholding of truth on which *The Golden Bowl* story is based. Significantly, these stereotypes turn out to be as false as any: Maggie’s ability to recognise the Prince’s real status in her family right at the beginning of the novel already foreshadows her later capability to judge and form human relations, and Adam’s manipulative power is also only dormant, not missing.

Charlotte then is taken into the family because she can contribute, she can give. In itself this sounds quite horrific, but we must remember that originally no imbalance, no exploitation is intended: Maggie convinces her father that Charlotte will provide grandeur and companionship for the Ververs, while herself will get the means to be grand and a family to belong to. Things, however, do go awry; in Book Fourth, Part 2, right after Matcham, the Princess is thinking about the relationship of the four, and realises that Charlotte and Amerigo are pulling the family coach, while she and her father are not even pushing it. The asymmetry is probably as much attributable to the Ververs’ solipsism, carelessness, as to Charlotte’s guilty conscience.

The consummation of the Charlotte - Prince affair proves to be an eye-opener in that respect, since Adam Verver also soon recognizes the skewed nature of relationships in his family: “One finds that [Charlotte] only wants to know what *we* want. Which is what we got her for.” (390), he observes to Maggie. Charlotte continues behaving as if she was “lady-in waiting to Maggie” (351) after Matcham as well, and quite curiously,

we never see Maggie doing anything against it, she never attempts to establish true reciprocity. The most probable reason for her passivity is that she is unwilling to deal with partial problems, she has already recognised the necessity of a much more radical solution, which is Charlotte's complete removal.

The problem of reciprocity naturally recurs when we consider the novel's final arrangement, settlement of personal relations.

In agreement with Armstrong's scapegoat theory we must admit that at first sight things do not turn out well for Charlotte: she loses the love of her life and she has to leave her beloved Europe. When trying to summarise Armstrong's views on the novel's ending I have also called attention to her significant gains though. It seems probable that she has at last obtained a real partner in life – during their farewell dinner there is already real accord between the Ververs, as James meaningfully writes about their being conjoined in making the occasion easy (572). She also gains opportunity to practice her social skills, and possibly the opportunity to do something for the American community, by “representing the arts and the graces to a people languishing [...] in ignorance” (457). It is a much more promising situation than the one she is initially put into: that of complete deprivation of family ties, of financial safety, and of useful employment.

Maggie retains or rather gains a husband but has to give up one of her most important relationships – the extraordinary harmony with her father.

Verver loses nearly as much as his wife. For many years his most important relationships have been the ones he maintained with his daughter and with his grandson, and of these links he is now deprived. We must again see though that his losing so much is exactly the thing that makes room for Charlotte in his emotional life. Verver also has a hobby that fills his days, and most fortunately his museum project is a genuine interest for his wife as well: in Book Fifth, Part 4 James hints that a good companionship might easily be based on their shared interest in fine arts, and on Charlotte's willingness to learn from her husband.

The Prince gains a maturely loving wife and, as Maggie points out, does not really lose anything. What is a plus in Charlotte compared to Maggie, her elegance and social skills, he and his family have possessed in abundance for centuries, consequently he is unlikely to attach too great a value to it. Moreover, Maggie is also on the way to develop,

if not in respect of social grace then at least in terms of real self-confidence. This is most noticeable when they play hosts for the Castledeans at her father's and she reduces Lady Castledean to an "unprecedented state of passivity" (374), to Fanny's great pleasure.

All in all, the characters seem to lose to different extents, implying that there is never real reciprocity in life. I believe that the lack of attempt on James's side to punish everyone in proportion to their moral fault can be taken both as a sign of realism, as well as that of High Modernism again. A sign of realism, because of the commonplace wisdom that we do not always get what we deserve, and a sign of Modernism, as it can also be interpreted as a consequence of relativism, of there being no absolute truth and no absolute good, and thus no absolute sinner and good-doer in the world.

Finally, I wish to make a few comments in connection with the impact of aestheticism on the novel, which has been considered crucial both by Krook and Freedman.

The novel's most important link with the movement is I think grasped by Dorothea Krook when she points out that the very reason for which the Prince and Charlotte resume their relationship is that if they continued going about "in a state of childlike innocence" (275) they would look unsophisticated, simple. To achieve a look of sophistication and refinement is the typical aim of the upper classes in the aesthetic era; hence aestheticism functions as the force that puts *The Golden Bowl* plot into motion.

For Freedman the link between the movement and the novel is constituted by the figure of the "femme fatale", which he defines as one of the main characters of aestheticism. By definition the femme fatale is someone distant, unreachable – an attractive object; and this is exactly why she can serve as an emblem of the movement. In the second half of the novel Maggie gradually gains this status by denying access both to her mind and body. (With the latter I am referring to the repeated rejection of her husband's advances.) Freedman only refers to Charlotte as to the more likely candidate who fails to achieve the status, but I find this approach a bit one-sided. With her marriage Charlotte actually does become unapproachable, mystic for the Prince at least temporarily, and achieving this status is the very motivation behind turning herself into a social success. The consummation of their affair with the Prince, however, proves her



approachability, which leads to her falling out from this interesting role and consequently to losing the Prince's interest in her.

I have already noted that James's frequent reference to the best representatives of some types – to anything that is best of its kind – has to be considered as a trait of aestheticism in his writings. It seems that James never gave up his attitude of seeing the world in “best” and “second-rate” terms: In this last work of his Prince Amerigo is presented by James as the embodiment of the best traits of European aristocratism. Interestingly, the four (with Fanny Assingham, five) major characters themselves are also all furnished with the ability to notice the best specimens of something, let it be a certain class of mankind or any inanimate object. This ability is a direct consequence of their openness and inherent sensitivity to impressions, or, with the Jamesian term, their being a full vessel of consciousness.

Finally I would make mention of the connection between morality and reason, a problem which recurs in *The Golden Bowl* many times.

“Stupidity pushed to a certain point is [...] immorality. Just so what is morality but high intelligence” (52), raises James the rhetorical question. A possible interpretation of one of the novel's major conflicts is that it is the lack of knowledge (of the Other) that leads the Ververs, Maggie and Adam, to immorality – towards the exploitation of Others. Their immorality entails another form of immorality – adultery. Maggie is only able to disrupt this chain because she is willing to observe the Others, and to learn about them, finally to understand them, leaving us with the (not at all surprising) implication that only intelligence can put an end to all kinds of sins.

A more concrete, but still morality and reason-related reading of the novel for me is that intelligent, or with James's term, “deep” people are capable of lies that take people towards positive outcomes. The outcomes, however, are only stable, if they are moral. Charlotte's aim is to convince the Prince that it is possible to achieve an arrangement that is lasting and immoral, that due to the favourable circumstances, due to their special family relations they can continue their affair as long as they wish. The novel's ending apparently refutes this assumption.

It is also worth noting that when the Prince is talking to Fanny about his lack of firm moral standards in Book First, Part 2, he assumes it to be more present in the Anglo-

Saxon race, in the British and the Americans. One must note that this statement is not in line with James's usual European-American division, whereby the Americans are assumed to be the depositaries of most positive values, among others of morality.

### 3. Post-heritage Films

As we have seen, heritage films only initially received critical acclaim, with time they have been more and more heavily criticized for their alleged escapism, and for the promotion of a conservative, bourgeois, English national identity. No wonder that filmmakers began to dissociate themselves from the heritage industry and tried to avoid even the appearance of petit-bourgeois mentality. A new subgenre within costume or historical films has been born, which Claire Monk in her frequently quoted article "Sexuality and Heritage" calls post-heritage by virtue of its implied reaction against heritage.

In the above article Monk discusses what she labels two typical post-heritage films: one is based on Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* and bears the same title. The other one is based on an original screenplay by Christopher Hampton, who also debuted as a director with this film. The script covers the relationship of Bloomsbury group members Dora Carrington and Lytton Strachey and is titled *Carrington*.

Monk points out that the above works have significant common characteristics with heritage films, making the influence of the latter apparent. First and foremost the viewer can still enjoy visual pleasures: the filmmakers again opted for stories which lead us into settings of ornate interiors and beautiful costumes. In *Orlando*'s case there is again fidelity to a high-brow literary base or, and, in *Carrington*'s case, to biographical fact. Both directors employ excellent actors with accomplished accents and considerable theatrical background: Emma Thompson, Tilda Swinton, Jeremy Northam, Jonathan Price. Emma Thompson in the leading role of *Carrington* by herself creates a strong link with heritage film-making, having played a central character both in *A Room with a View* and *Howards End* ("Sexuality and Heritage" 33).

Monk also compiles a list of differences between heritage and post-heritage films:

Most importantly, the camera here very carefully focuses on human subjects and does not linger on period spectacle without reasons other than aesthetic. In these films we can observe an explicit preoccupation with unconventional sexualities, for example, with gay, bisexual, active female heterosexual orientations, or just with more direct sexuality, with sex scenes in the classical sense. We can also hear some explicit language, especially in *Carrington*, where the scriptwriter's hand was not bound by any literary base (33-4).

From the above one can draw the conclusion that "post-heritage" is indeed best defined as a reaction to heritage film, as an answer to criticism concerning the latter, or if we like, as its antithesis. I would emphasise that, understandably, the changes effected try to please the critics of the subgenre, while the characteristics that were supposed to attract audiences were retained. After the "double success" of the heritage film, filmmakers could not aim at anything less.

In addition to *Carrington* and *Orlando* Monk mentions some further typical examples of post-heritage film: Jane Campion's *The Piano*, and Martin Scorsese' *The Age of Innocence* (33). In my analysis of *The Portrait of a Lady* I have mentioned the former film, and regarded it as an outgrowth of Campion's interest in female independence and female fates in general. Apart from its being set in the 19<sup>th</sup> century practically no other post-heritage doctrine applies to it – the screenplay was written by Campion herself, while the setting is intensely rural, uncivilized; it is certainly not meant to be soothingly and peacefully eye-pleasing. The film also offers no possibility to associate with the higher strata of society. *The Age of Innocence* is a different case, and here it is much easier to identify the influence of the heritage era. Edith Wharton's novel constitutes part of the English-language literary canon, novel and film depict the life of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century New York elite, and rely heavily on attractive interiors. The latter, however, play a special role here: they serve as a great contrast to the protagonists' ordeal, suffering, and make it the more poignant. One of the heritage film's attributes is put to a great cinematic use by director Scorsese.

At the same time there are films which would be hard to interpret otherwise than as reactions to the heritage film, but go to extremes when trying to take the edge off heritage film criticism instead of using the subgenre's attributes in a creative manner. The best examples are the latest re-makes of some Jane Austen works: in Joe Wright's 2005

*Pride and Prejudice* adaptation Elisabeth Bennet's home, for example, is made exaggeratedly humble: the protagonist is seen walking in mud among pigs in the yard of his father's simplistic mansion. My aim is certainly not to discuss Jane Austen in this work, but I cannot resist noting that the clash between morality and the need for financial means to live a respectable, aesthetically also attractive life is the basic conflict of all the Austen novels, and the above described frames mitigate or do away with this very conflict.

From the above I would draw two conclusions. The first is that not all period films shot after the heritage era are post-heritage films – I certainly would not consider *The Piano* as such. If we classify it as a post-heritage film, we again dilute a category to such an extent that it becomes practically useless. Secondly, that some post-heritage films could build on heritage film's major achievement, i.e. on the foregrounding of sight in the adaptation of canonical works as well, while others reacted to criticism in a less forward-pointing manner.

I believe that Merchant-Ivory's *The Golden Bowl* can also be best interpreted as a post-heritage film. This I find important to stress, as the film is often mentioned among prime examples of heritage film (Monk, *Heritage Film Audiences: Period Films and Contemporary Audiences in the UK*, 15). In the analysis that follows, in addition to following the usual procedure that enables me to pinpoint changes in the narrative substance, I will also try to explore how the filmmakers related to their "heritage film" past. One thing, however, is already certain: the very fact that the film was prepared proves that Henry James remained a firm favourite in the new era as well.

#### **4. The Focuses of the Film**

*The Golden Bowl* (2000) is the Merchant-Ivory-Jhabvala trio's last Henry James film. As I have indicated, by the millennium they have translated several British classics into the language of film with great success, most notably E. M. Forster's *A Room with a View*, and *Howards End*, novels that constitute organic parts of the British literary canon, and are appreciated mostly by well educated readers. Still, the trio managed to achieve both financial success and the appreciation of most literary and film critics with their work.

Their aim must have been something similar, i.e. a double success, with *The Golden Bowl* as well. They are likely to have assumed that the highbrow literary material and Ruth Praver Jhabvala's literary skills will guarantee the approval of professionals, while the high society set, the protagonists who are either extremely rich or handsome or both, in more abstract terms the fabula's closeness to myth, will once again appeal to wide audiences.

The film's 2002 Buena Vista Inc. DVD edition contains interviews with the filmmakers in which they introduce the preconceptions, aims they had in mind when starting the filming process. Their goals do not sound very much well-defined. Ivory says that he has just wanted to do one of the major James novels for some time, and that he found *The Golden Bowl* daunting because of its being so much interior. Jhabvala is said to have been happy to be able to adapt one of her favourite novels, but is not among the interviewees herself. Producer Ismail Merchant says he read *The Golden Bowl* as a thriller, an approach in which it is not difficult to recognise the willingness to appeal to mass audiences.

As for the actors, they do not seem to have received quite clear instructions for the positioning of their characters either. Uma Thurman sees Charlotte as the most complex female figure she ever had to handle, and admits that she cannot honestly say she understands her. She sees her as a young woman obsessed by passionate love, who refuses to be declined by her lover, and gets back into his life at a potentially terrible cost to everyone. Kate Beckinsale emphasises the growing-up process going on in Maggie, while Nick Nolte, who plays Adam Verver, sees *The Golden Bowl* as a story of marriages and adultery between friends and family, in which miraculously nobody is hurt. Jeremy Northam, who is cast as the Prince, only hopes that the viewers will perceive something of what is going on inside the characters and will not see them in simplistic baddie-goodie terms.

As we have seen in John Malkovich's case, an actor always brings with him/her something of the atmosphere of his/her previous films, thus the casting itself is indicative of the filmmakers' intentions with the particular characters. In *The Golden Bowl*'s case the actor that seems to be the most surprising casting choice is Nick Nolte. Nolte is an American with a resonating voice and a physique that earned him modelling jobs.

Though he is sixty when the film is made, he is still a commanding presence. As for his previous roles, he played Thomas Jefferson in Merchant-Ivory's *Jefferson in Paris*, but is perhaps best known as playing l'enfant terrible Tom Jordache in the television version of Irwin Shaw's *Rich Man, Poor Man*, aired in several countries, among others in Hungary. The marked difference between Nolte and the Jamesian Verver's appearance already foreshadows significant alterations in the functions performed.

Today Uma Thurman also seems a less obvious choice for the role of Charlotte Stant, the elegant cosmopolitan. She was catapulted to fame by Tarantino's infamous *Pulp Fiction*, in which she played one of the major characters, and also featured in Tarantino's more recent *Kill Bill* films. The latter works, however, were shot well after *The Golden Bowl*, which means that her action lady image was less firm at the time of the Merchant-Ivory film's release than it is today.

Kate Beckinsale and Jeremy Northam at the same time seem to be destined for their roles. Beckinsale is of a renowned British thespian dynasty, and already became known for playing Hero in Kenneth Branagh's 1993 *Much Ado about Nothing*. Northam also has a significant past in theatre, played Hamlet in the Royal National Theatre in 1989, but also appeared in heritage films, for example, as Mr. Knightley in Douglas McGrath's *Emma* (1996). Both Beckinsale and Northam are worldwide-known for their striking good looks.

Anjelica Huston as Fanny Assingham again appears a radical choice. She is best known as the witch-like mother of the *Addams Family*, and also as Grand High Witch in the 1990 *The Witches*. The films' titles already indicate that her image did not predestine her for the role of the ever understanding friend, and indeed we will find her filmic persona to fulfil a slightly different function.

As for their method, Ivory agrees with Robert Emmet Long when – in the course of their book-length conversation – Long says that instead of creating a “dense, oblique psychological atmosphere” that is typical of the late James, the characters' motives in the film are all clear, and the filmmakers concentrate on “strong plotting, dramatic confrontations, and extremely powerful visualisation” (Long, *James Ivory in Conversation* 246).

We will find the characters' motives less complex indeed than they are in the novel, but we will also see that they are not without ambiguities, which, however, are unlikely to be deliberately achieved. As for visualisation, the most typical method is the dramatization, and within that "dialogisation" and "unfolding" that we have already seen in connection with *The Europeans*. As *The Golden Bowl* often takes the form of internal monologues of what the characters imagine, think of some other characters' ideas, deeds, the prevalence of the latter method is hardly a surprise.

In the Long interview Ivory already refers to the need for dramatization (246). An excellent example is when in Book Fifth, Part 1 Maggie tells Fanny that Charlotte must have asked the Prince if she (Maggie) knows anything about the adulterous affair, and the Prince is certain to have lied to his mistress. In the film (scene 40) we can witness the conversation between the two, we can hear Charlotte's question and the Prince's negative answer with our own ears.

There is always a difference, though, between having a character to conclude that something must have happened this or that way, and seeing it happen with our own eyes. In the first case there is always the shadow of doubt, mystery, and the character's mental qualities, logic, knowledge of life, etc. to admire, whereas in the second case we just have to accept facts. I am not claiming that film as an art form in general is unable to create such a sense of ambiguity and uncertainty that we find in this novel, but the cinematic devices used by Merchant-Ivory certainly fail to establish such an atmosphere. It also has to be noted here that James's characters often recall complete sentences uttered by someone as well as the replies to them, leaving less work for the scriptwriter. All in all I have identified six scenes in the film (scenes 11, 24, 36, 39, 44, 47) as unfolding or dialogisation and a further seven as additional or invented scenes (14, 19, 20, 22, 35, 38, and 50) that present no new functions of any character. An example can be scene 14, in which the Prince and Charlotte are photographed at the Lancaster House ball, to which there is no reference in the novel. Charlotte's wearing a daring but tasteful fancy dress is, however, not against her original character, and neither is their enjoying the photography. Some added scenes, though, not only have no textual base in the novel but also alter the characters' original functions. It is remarkable that contrary to the earliest Merchant-Ivory James adaptation, *The Europeans*, the number of function-altering additional

scenes in *The Golden Bowl* is high, I consider 2, 12, 17, 18, 26, 27, 28, 34, 40, 42, and 46, altogether 11 scenes as such. In line with my definition, these scenes serve to establish or reinforce relevant new characteristics of the protagonists, e.g. Adam Verver's crudeness and physical strength, or Charlotte's inclination for self-humiliation. Interestingly, in this film there are some scenes that are mostly borrowings from the novel but also include added elements that alter some characters significantly, and as such are likely to affect the character's functions. In scene 31, for example, Adam Verver, Maggie, Charlotte and the Prince discuss their going down to Fawns early that year. The novel also refers to such a discussion between Maggie and the Prince (368), but in the film, before being joined by the other two, Adam and his daughter say a sentence or two about Adam's not liking this loud modern music. (The conversation takes place at a soiree.) The remarks testify to the Nolte-Adam's inherent insensitivity to arts, which in turn limits the development potential of his relationship with his wife (in the novel their common interest in fine arts serves as an important link) or his ability to help Charlotte to find a vocation. Eight scenes represent this hybrid type, scenes 10, 23, 25, 31, 32, 37, 41 and 45.

Last but not least there is also an added scene type we have also encountered in *The Portrait*: the scenes echoing the novel's major themes in the form of bracket syntagmas, i.e. the scenes presenting further stories of adultery. All in all, the high number of scenes in which we can observe the alteration of some functions is in itself indicative of significant changes in the fabula.

The main focus of Merchant-Ivory's *The Golden Bowl* is obviously adultery – and its being a crime. It is considered as such in a quite primitive sense of the word, where crime is something that is likely to entail physical rather than moral punishment, and because of that it is to be feared and avoided. This approach, as I have indicated, probably derives from producer Ismail Merchant.

To accentuate the motif of adultery and to create the atmosphere of impending doom, harsh punishment, two extra fabulas are added to the narrative of the novel. The first one is set in the medieval castle of the Prince's family, where a young stepmother is caught in flagrante delicto with her stepson, and the aged husband condemns her to death. The story appears in three scenes of the film, two of which, scene 1 and scene 43, can be regarded as bracket syntagmas as they have no organic link with *The Golden Bowl* story.



Only the family name implies that the characters are the Prince's ancestors. This medieval adultery scene recurs in scene 32 as well, when Maggie attends a slide show with Fanny. There the frames introduce the Prince's family history, and the above incident is presented by the narrator as part of it. It is worth noting that Maggie and Fanny also study the Prince's family in the novel, but they do it in the British Museum, and there is no concrete reference to adultery. Thus both novel and film reflect on the grandness of the Prince's ancestry, but a mere museum visit was probably considered too monotonous by the filmmakers to illustrate it.

The second story of adultery appears in scene 30 only, where all the main characters appear at a soirée. Similarly to *The Europeans*' ball this social function is an added setting, to which several of the book's dialogues are moved. The new set here also adds motion and sight to the film. The extramarital affair in this case is presented in the frame of a ballet performance in which the oriental husband duly kills both a member of his harem and her lover. The aim of these new, sinister "subplots" is obvious: they are included to create the sense of a concrete, physical threat looming over the adulterous couple, for the threat represented by Adam Verver is considered too weak despite, or, I would rather say, due to the significant changes affecting his figure.

Readers of the novel will remember that by appearance James's Adam is indeed a weak, unsophisticated figure. There are plenty of references in the text to that effect; the following list is far from being complete:

"A small, spare, slightly stale person, deprived of the general prerogative of presence" (101),

"...he looked, at the top of his table, so nearly like a little boy shyly entertaining in virtue of some imposed rank..." (193),

"Physically is decidedly not strongly built: his shoulders were not broad, his chest was not high, and the crown of his head was not covered" (193).

Not only does he look a mild, forceless character, he also behaves so. He seems to be afraid of power and of taking a firm stand on anything:

“He always did somebody justice” (75),

“Musing, reconsidering little man that he was” (83).

He even seems to dislike the idea of being thought strong because of his wealth:

“His greatest inconvenience, he would have admitted, had he analysed, was in finding it so taken for granted that, as he had money, he had force” (76).

Despite his humble appearance, the novel’s Verver is undoubtedly an extraordinary man, as I have already noted, he is one of James’s “full vessels of consciousness”, on whom “nothing is lost”. He is not simply a great observer and perceiver, through his figure James also demonstrates that real strength, the ability to influence events often resides outside the commonplace “loud and confident” leader types. The greatest demonstration of the above truth in the Jamesian lifework is of course Maggie Verver herself, but Adam Verver achieves something just as difficult as his daughter: he recognizes the need for the two couples’ separation (whether he is the first one to do so or just takes Maggie’s hint is irrelevant from this respect) and successfully carries it out.

Another proof of his extraordinariness is his connoisseurship; for Verver collectorship is a real vocation, his greatest pleasure derives from the feeling that “he was equal with the great seers – and did not dangle so far below the great producers and creators” (140). In this description it is not difficult to recognize the artist manqué, one of James’s typical characters.

It is most significant though that unlike most other representatives of the type, Verver never displays any sign of frustration or disappointment. (As we have just seen in connection with Osmond, who is as good a representative of the type as any, the lack of creativity in itself is many times the source of disillusionment for these figures.) Verver’s serenity is undisturbable, and, when he realises the need, it is his seeming passivity that allows the minute observation of other characters’ conduct, the formulation of well-founded judgements and well-chosen reactions.

This wisdom, coupled with virtually limitless material means, furnishes him with an “almightiness” that is indeed only typical of the god figures of myths. If to all this we

add his already discussed opacity, we are left with a literary figure who is one of the least displaced characters in English literature, and as such, delights the reader by offering a possibility to associate with someone who is demonstrating the furthest-stretched limits of human power.

The consequences of Verver being acted by Nick Nolte I have already touched upon. Even at the age of 60 he looks manly, energetic, even attractive; also, he is associated with spontaneous, violent characters. In addition to the changed physique and the implications of type-casting, added scenes are also included to modify the nature of his character, his functions in the story.

To start with, in scene 10 we are treated to details of his business past – a brief black and white flashback demonstrates how ruthlessly early 20<sup>th</sup>-century entrepreneurs exploited their employees to accumulate their immense fortunes. Remarkably though Verver himself does not appear in the frames, we do not *see* him being cruel with his workers, he is only talking about their joyless, monotonous lives to Charlotte while the frames are running. In two further added scenes, scenes 27 and 28, we can hear Verver telling stories about his impulsive, violent nature, and about his being very protective or rather possessive of his family. In these two scenes again he is just telling us (quite cliché-like) stories, the only function of which is to testify to his above qualities. The indirectness of narration, as well as his gentlemanly appearance, the refined period costume, dinner jackets and top hats he is wearing, may be also his more mature age, all mitigate Nolte's characteristic innate crudeness, and make him look distinguished, even elegant. Moreover, in most of his dialogues his intonation, gestures radiate a kind of joviality that runs counter to the violence of his words.

If the film-making team was not quite successful when trying to enhance the character's weight by emphasising its physical strength, they were even less so when trying to demonstrate his status as a renowned art collector. As I have already noted, the film's Verver is somewhat insensitive to art. He only appears to be interested in well-established artists who have already proved their (financial) worth, like Raphael, Holbein. (In the novel Raphael is just briefly mentioned, and Holbein is not even mentioned). Quite conspicuously, of the pictures of his rented home, Fawns, he knows nothing – to Charlotte's enquiry he only replies that they "came with the house" (scene 10). He also

has no ears for contemporary music, and shows no interest in ballet or pantomime (scene 31). In view of all this the American City museum project seems to be another opportunity to practice his management skills – and is not an outgrowth of his interest in arts, or of his sensitivity as in the novel.

Another interesting change affecting Adam's character concerns his relationship with Charlotte. All the interpretations I know agree that the novel's Adam takes her into his life as an intended substitute for his daughter, and when she turns out to be superfluous in this capacity he does not pay too much attention to her for quite a long time. Only at the very end of the novel does he try to establish emotional bonds with his wife. The film's Adam, however, seems to be attracted to Charlotte from the very beginning. There are several scenes in which he is seeking physical intimacy, he strokes, kisses her, or places a necklace around her neck himself. Also, an element of care is always present in his attitude towards his wife, an example of which is scene 17, where he makes a heartfelt apology for sending her "alone" to Matcham. In a strong contrast, it is only in Book Fourth, Part 5 that James's Verver begins to moralise about Charlotte's exploitation, but till the very last pages we never see any sign of real tenderness, let alone any attempts on his side to mitigate his wife's loneliness. I assume that the filmmakers could not accept that a viable relationship can be established between two parties if there is no sign of at least some one-sided chemistry between the partners from the very beginning.

Though one senses a gap between the directorial intentions and the Verver character we infer from the film, the presented figure is still quite credible. Albeit the film's Verver does not evoke fear in us, he can be perceived as someone who is living the phase of his life when, after the accumulation of unimaginable wealth, he wants to give. His "wild past" is already well behind him, is only present in the form of story-telling. Interestingly, his insensitivity to arts also contributes to his credibility as a businessman: his pragmatism and willingness to donate is the very combination that made the Rockefellers or Carnegies so memorable.

Hereby I have to note that, memorably for the James reader, the novel's Adam is less successful a creation in that respect: he lacks ruthlessness and impulsiveness, and possesses sensitivity to an extent that is already incongruous with early 20<sup>th</sup>-century

entrepreneurship. I suspect that James's only reason for not making Verver simply a rich heir is that his self-made man status is supposed to imply strength, and is meant to serve as a psychological and dramaturgical justification for his ability to act when necessary. This business past, however, is not really integrated into the Jamesian character.

The failure of the directorial intentions to present a scary Adam has a significant positive consequence: should he be more of a brute in the film, the Prince's abandonment of Charlotte should primarily be attributed to his fear of Verver's physical retort, which would result in the simplification of both characters in the extreme. There are indications of such directorial intentions; in added scenes 27 and 28, in which Verver talks about his inability to control himself when provoked, the Prince's face expresses tenseness.

Perhaps even more importantly, the changes do away with Adam's resemblance to deities: instead of an opaque and omnipotent figure we are presented a fallible human being. This will result in the loosening of one of the fabula's mythic patterns, and with this an important integrating possibility is abandoned; the very thing most critics will find the film to be in need of.

Maggie's figure is also affected by significant changes. First and foremost, the young woman's winning over her husband is the result of both characters' development in the novel. As we have seen, Maggie gets rid of her solipsism and learns to see the world in its complexity, while the Prince obtains a stronger moral sense and also becomes a more elaborate judge of character. He notices the "depth" of his wife, and becomes aware of Charlotte's shortcomings. Volume Two is basically constituted by the description of these maturation processes. In view of this latter fact the Princess's development is bound to be sketchy in any film, but some of the Merchant-Ivory production's simplifications cannot entirely be attributed to the existence of time limits.

The pagoda symbol, marking the beginning of Maggie's awakening in the book, is turned into a simple nightmare in scene 25. Instead of hearing a weak response from inside to her knocking, as it happens in the novel, the cracked pagoda's pieces fall apart and bury Maggie. To her greatest horror she cannot cry out because her father must not hear anything. This way, instead of signifying her awakening to the necessity of interaction with her environment, the scene just confirms her father's number one position in her life.

The lack of real depth in the character becomes most conspicuous in climactic scene 37, when the bowl is cracked by Fanny Assingham. During the subsequent conversation with her husband Maggie acts as the stereotypical wronged wife, is hysterically accusing him of abusing her non-worldliness, ignorance. A great difference indeed from simply letting him know that she knows, and thus remaining on the right side while putting her husband and his mistress on the morally wrong one. The corresponding chapter in the novel ends with her meaningfully telling her husband to find out what Adam Verves knows, and with this masterstroke she enhances her own ambiguity and her husband's interest in herself. In the film (scene 37) she also denies the answer to the Prince's question about the extent of Adam's knowledge, but hastens to add that it is him (her father) she has to protect. The scene ends with her tearful regrets that she has no birthday present for her father. Nothing could be more filial, girlish and thus immature than this behaviour.

Soon after she is reading her husband's letter (scene 38) in which he is begging her to take him back into her life. This way the initiative to reconcile, to mend their marriage is taken by the Prince, which again entails significant changes in both characters. Maggie is not seen to make efforts, we cannot even be sure that she recognises it was mainly her neglect, solipsism that has lead to her husband's infidelity. In scene 26, which is already after the Matcham week-end, she is still said to be planning a visit to Spain with her father, whereas James's Maggie proposes the trip for her husband and father at this stage. Even in scene 44 (also an added scene) the Prince assumes that they cannot go to Italy as a family, because Maggie would never leave Adam behind.

In similar vein, we do not see Maggie spending more and more time with Charlotte, or invading Charlotte's territory by growing confident in her role as a princess at social functions.

There is only one added scene that can be interpreted as demonstrating Maggie's becoming less rigid, less solipsistic: in scene 39, after reading her husband's letter, she is not afraid to send Charlotte to comfort the Prince who is brooding over the illness of his favourite dog. (In the novel Maggie is sending the adulterous couple for another week-end together as a demonstration of her trust.)

Book Fifth Part 5 marks the zenith of the development process going on in Maggie: it is here that Maggie provides Charlotte with an opportunity for face-saving by letting her present her own version of the story about the Ververs' relocation in America. In scene 48 we can see the main elements of the chapter retained and duly enacted. Interestingly though, due to the sketchiness of Maggie's transformation process, we do not perceive it as an act of generosity, rather as a whim without preliminaries, or even as a syrupy comforting attempt from someone whose victory is mostly attributable to her father's wealth. The literal borrowing of the Jamesian sentences once again does not ensure the retaining of functions. All in all, in connection with the Beckinsale-Maggie one rather fears that her attitude to life remains untouched by the events described by the film: instead of living in isolation with her father, in the future she is likely to do the same with the Prince and the Principino.

The above alterations in Adam and Maggie's character will have their impact on the Prince's figure as well. As I have many times recalled, for James the Prince "... is, profoundly, a Prince" (320), the quintessential refined aristocrat, the best representative of his type. The way the Prince relates to the fair sex could also be called typically aesthetic: "He knew but one way with the fair. They had to be fair – and he was fastidious and particular, his standard was high, but when once this was the case what relation with them was conceivable [...] but that of plain interest in the fairness?" (157). On these grounds the initial, a bit sudden, shift of his interest from Charlotte to Maggie has to be accepted. Starting off from this point he develops as far as to appreciate the beauty of her wife's morality and goodness.

Interestingly, besides being a great connoisseur, the Prince is also described as someone inherently passive and even unimaginative: "His life was deliciously dull, and that was what he liked best" (180), says James's narrator. A bit later Charlotte complains: "It's not that you haven't my courage, but that you haven't my imagination. Unless indeed it should turn out that you haven't even my intelligence" (251-2). This noble passivity, however, is never condemned by James. What he seems to despise is plebeian busybodyness, and this is the very point where Charlotte fails with her always managing something. James seems to believe that although one has to be open to impressions, we

should not seek exposure to them *too* actively, a thought that again can be interpreted as a supplement to Pater.

As the passive, athletic type of Aristotle, the Prince “replied to nothing, denied nothing, explained nothing and apologized for nothing” (478) when confronted with his wife’s knowledge after Matcham. It is notable, though, that on seeing the intelligence and cleverness of the wife’s behaviour he also gives up his elegant idleness, and begins to act in line with her attitude: he spends more time with Verver to help him develop new ties with human beings other than this daughter.

The Prince’s image as the quintessential aristocrat is strengthened by casting Jeremy Northam, who often plays such characters, into the role, and whose physique, height, stature is in strict conformity with like stereotypes. With the Matcham bicycle race (scene 18) he is also turned into something more physically active – the reason for which is probably the fact that according to Hollywood conventions a passive person, a mere daydreamer could not attract two remarkable women. His newfound sportiness is anyway in perfect harmony with his inherent aristocratism; the analogy between Matthew Arnold’s hunter aristocrat and the race winner Prince is again difficult to miss.

His reaction when his wife informs him that she knows about his adultery marks a great change in the character. After the bowl is cracked, the novel’s Prince almost unobtrusively assists Maggie’s efforts to come up with an arrangement that is moral and is liveable for everyone concerned. As Maggie’s such efforts are not included in the film, the Prince naturally cannot assist them. To save his marriage, he writes the already-mentioned letter of begging to his wife, and, without any significant objections or reservations, he gains prompt absolution from his sin.

The question that arises concerns his motivation for remaining in the Ververs’ boat. In the novel two valuable female types fight with very subtle means for an equally remarkable man, a situation that in itself is capable of generating unflagging tension. In the film not only is the wife’s maturation process less than spectacular, we will also find Charlotte’s figure deprived of most of its sophistication, annihilating both of the above-mentioned sources of tension. Moreover, Maggie is also unassisted by her father’s remarkable personality, ambiguity, leaving practically only Verver’s millions to induce his son-in-law to stay in his marriage, besides his own conformism. Memorably, James’



Prince just takes his due from life when he marries into a millionaire's family, and is persuaded by a morally superior wife to stay in the marriage.

Charlotte's figure is moved just as ruthlessly towards the vulgar as Maggie's. Instead of the novel's complex protagonist, who is always governed by her intelligence and sense of decorum in her decisions, the film's Charlotte appears to be trapped in an infantile obsession, due to which most of her deeds are spontaneous outbursts rather than strategically considered steps. Instead of a mysterious, proud femme fatale whose intentions are never completely clear we have a protagonist who repeatedly begs her former lover to run away with her, even at the very end of the film (invented scenes 2. and 46). The temptation represented by an emotionally demanding and unstable Charlotte is of course not irresistible. Such self-humiliation would certainly be irreconcilable with the novel's heroine, whose intelligence enables her to guess the Other's intentions without asking superfluous questions or making unacceptable proposals, and whose pride keeps her going even in the direst circumstances, when Maggie successfully isolates her from everyone in her close environment.

The Thurman-Charlotte is no more dignified in her other relationships either. The novel's Charlotte would never complain to her husband about Maggie and Fanny's changed conduct towards her, for complaining as such would simply be against her nature. Moreover, such a move would only raise Verver's suspicion, which would be against her basic interests. In added scene 40 she, however, does tell her husband that her former friends have changed towards her. This scene does not only reinforce Charlotte's image as a commonplace intriguing woman, but also that of Verver as the understanding aging husband, for, despite referring to his daughter's inability to change towards anyone without a strong reason, his response is quite sustained. As the scene continues with the spouses chatting about the museum project, again no sense of threat or suspense is created.

I have already noted that the climactic Fawns garden scene between Maggie and Charlotte loses its significance due to the lack of development in the Maggie character. Regrettably, the want of poise in Charlotte further weakens the scene, from her perspective it becomes an attempt to deceive that verges on the ridiculous rather than remaining a respectable and painful attempt of face-saving.

Through Charlotte's figure an interesting observation can be made: though her character undergoes significant changes, those have no consequences with regard to the function she fulfils in her most important relationship, which is not to raise real interest in the Prince despite several desperate attempts. In the novel the Prince tires of her being always on the rampart, of her always managing; in the film he might be irritated by her willingness to possess, by her short-sightedness, and her inability to accept failure. The distinction between function and character can well be observed through her figure here: two practically different characters can perform the same function in a relationship.

Remarkable changes can be observed in connection with Fanny Assingham's figure as well. James's Fanny is the quintessential friend. Her exceptional empathy allows her to see the right of both Maggie and Charlotte: in Book Third Part 3 she is accusing Charlotte of messing things up by marrying Adam Verver, and puts her trust in Maggie. In Book Third Part 10 she already points out the beauty of Charlotte and the Prince's conduct, and is deeply moved by their fear of themselves and of the blindness of their spouses. Instead of criticizing anybody's behaviour she is rather scared at the delicate state of affairs, as James's narrator explicitly refers to it in Book Third Part 4. Even on her way home from Matcham she is inclined to believe in the goodwill and innocence of Charlotte and the Prince, and persuades herself to interpret the couple's staying behind as a demonstration of their having nothing to hide. Technically her figure enables James to comment on the foursome's deeds, the very role Frye assigns to the so-called chorus figures of comedies and tragedies. Her function in the narrative is not too significant in the sense that her deeds or thoughts do not steer the fabula into a new direction.

In the film, in line with Hollywood preferences, she is also turned into a more active, energetic person. Casting Anjelica Huston in the role already has its implications: as I have already noted the characters she is associated with are mostly negative ones, wicked, calculating or imperious. Accordingly, the Huston-Fanny's determination and outspokenness already borders on being judgmental and tactless. The way she says farewell to the Prince at Matcham is tantamount to plainly calling him an adulterer; or, in scene 41, when telling Isabel Archer's story to her bridge partners, she overtly refers to the "usual Italian fortune hunter": a hint so obvious that apparently nobody misses it in

the company. (The reference to *The Portrait of a Lady* can be regarded as a nod to the imaginary “typical” heritage film viewer, who is assumed to appreciate such practices as a field where his education pays off.) All in all, the Huston-Fanny does not act as everybody’s sensitive support, she rather functions as the voice of commonplace and hypocritical public opinion.

The changes in functions discussed so far can be summed up in the following table:

**Table 6. Character Functions in *The Golden Bowl* (novel):**

	<b>Maggie</b>	<b>Prince</b>	<b>Charlotte</b>	<b>Verver</b>	<b>Fanny Assingham</b>
<b>Maggie</b>		Acts as lovely but uninteresting wife.	Embodiment of a bit simpleminded innocence, who by good luck possesses everything worth having.	Acts as beloved daughter who has to be sacrificed for both of them to be saved.	Inexperienced friend whose marriage she initiated by introducing her to other friend.
		Grows into mature wife, a personality “deeper” than himself.	Sy who takes her lover but nobly tries to mitigate her pain.		Mature personality who is able to save her own marriage.
<b>Prince</b>	Acts as deeply loved husband, who is to be kept at all costs.		Love she fights for, and who has to be given up.	Perfect specimen of young aristocrats bought for his daughter.	Friend who is likely to be false to wife, who is also her friend.
				Acts as friend.	
<b>Charlotte</b>	Acts as intelligent and attractive friend who attempts to take away her husband.	Acts as attractive, sophisticated woman whose love he can be sure of, and whom he abuses in order to strengthen his identity.		Wife gained to sooth his daughter’s conscience.	Friend in need of help
	Someone who keeps her dignity amid much misfortune.	Becomes burden that has to be dumped in the most civilised manner.		Acts as wife with the potential of becoming a real partner.	
<b>Verver</b>	Acts as beloved father who has to be protected and later to be sacrificed for both of them to be saved.	Acts as rich father in law whose intentions are ambiguous.	Acts as cheated husband the extent of whose knowledge is ambiguous.		Generous host
		Grows into a friend.	Acts as husband with the potential of becoming a real partner.		
<b>Fanny Assingham</b>	Friend, confidante	Friend and critic	Friend and critic	Friend of daughter	

**Table 7. Character Functions in *The Golden Bowl* (film)**  
(changes indicated in green)

	Maggie	Prince	Charlotte	Verver	Fanny Assingham
Maggie		Acts as lovely but uninteresting wife. Maturation process is missing.	Embodiment of a bit simpleminded innocence, who by good luck possesses everything worth having. No noble comforting attempts.	Acts as beloved and sheltered daughter, who has to be sacrificed in order to be saved.	Inexperienced friend whose marriage she initiated by introducing her to other friend.
Prince	Acts as deeply loved husband, who is to be kept at all costs.		Love she fights for, and who has to be given up.	Perfect specimen of young European aristocrat bought for his daughter. No sign of friendship.	Friend who is false to his wife, wife is also her friend.
Charlotte	Acts as more sophisticated and experienced woman who attempts to take away her husband.	Acts as commonplace ex-lover whom he abuses out of boredom. Becomes burden that has to be dumped in the most civilised manner.		Wife gained to soothe his daughter's conscience. Acts as wife with the potential of becoming a real partner.	Friend Former friend who tempts husband of friend and stepson to commit adultery.
Verver	Acts as beloved father who has to be protected and who has to be sacrificed for both of them to be saved.	Acts as rich father in law, intentions are quite clear. No sign of real friendship.	Acts as cheated husband who is likely to be aware of his wife's adultery. Acts as husband with the potential of becoming a real partner.		Rich host
Fanny Assingham	Friend	Critic and friend	Critic	-	

The small number of characters enables the edition of a relatively simple table, in which the changes in functions, in line with my preliminary remarks, affect Maggie, Charlotte and Verver's characters.

*The Europeans* and *The Portrait of a Lady* both relied on conspicuous mythical patterns which were retained by the filmmakers, in the first case practically intact, while in the second case with slight modifications. *The Golden Bowl* is a thoroughly different novel: the mythical patterns here emerge much less clearly. Through its few characters and short but enigmatic plot the text, however, is able to bring several complex themes into focus and evokes quite different interpretations. Having examined the changes in functions it is also worth considering what remains of the novel's main themes, and what other new themes emerge, if any. The analysis and comparison of the two tables of function also allow us to consider if the functions are able to refer to such abstract themes at all, and whether the retention or drop of these themes is indicated by them or not.

To start with, the opacity, ambiguity of the Other is an issue that has lost most of its significance due to the already mentioned character simplifications.

In scene 16 the Prince talks to Charlotte about not understanding the Ververs very much, and in the dialogue he uses the same words as in Book Third, Part 5. The film's Ververs, however, are so close to the agile American entrepreneur and his innocent and uninteresting daughter stereotypes that this remark seems to be totally out of place. This case is a further excellent example of the common problem I have already described in connection with *The Portrait*: the filmmakers alter some functions of the characters but retain some well-sounding sentences uttered by them in the novel, and with this generate a sense of confusion in the viewer. *The Golden Bowl* provides several examples of the phenomenon.

This is not the only occasion in the film when Adam's opacity is referred to with the aim of creating suspense. The Prince and the Princess discuss the extent of his knowledge in scene 37, the Prince and Charlotte in added scene 39. The latter scene is another good example of "unfoldings", of sequences that show events which must have taken place – Maggie herself discerns so from the concerned parties' behaviour – but we are not allowed to "witness" directly or in a descriptive form in the novel.

Though their words testify to their being in the dark, still no sense of impending doom is created, because, quite inconsequently, there are scenes which reveal Adam knowing quite enough, and also that the others must know that he knows. In scene 34 Charlotte reacts to his plan to go to America to settle some minor affairs so hysterically that it is tantamount to her admitting she cannot leave England because of some emotional bondage. Instead of the already described conflict between functions and words (“such a character cannot possibly say this”) we face a more basic inconsistency within the plot (“she must simply know that he knows.”) Moreover, right after this, in scene 35, Adam tells Charlotte, who is just descending the stairs that he is to sleep in his study as he has work to do. The scene is again hard to misinterpret: Adam is in the know but what he has learnt does not spark an Othello-like response from him. His refraining from any violence is anyway very much in line with the already mentioned care and joviality he shows towards his wife. Quite perplexingly, a few scenes before, he talks of himself as of someone who nearly stabs a stranger that looks at his first wife in a peculiar way, and now we can see (a very much predictable) mild response from him to a much harsher situation. It is only due to some inherent dignity of Nolte’s figure that instead of simply calling him a self-alluding boaster one is rather inclined to feel that he has just become more understanding and considerate since his youth.

As for Maggie’s ambiguity, I have already labelled the oversimplification of her maturation process as one the film’s greatest shortcomings. As a result of this, her opacity (in her husband’s eyes) in the interval between Matcham and the antiquity dealer’s visit is lost: before Fanny’s cracking the bowl the Prince has no reason to believe that she suspects anything. Maggie’s revelation caused by the reappearance of the bowl is totally without preliminaries in the film and consequently is merely accidental, whereas in the novel it marks the culmination of a longer learning process. Memorably, during this period Maggie is trying to become more present in her husband’s life, is trying to learn more about him.

Two scenes after the climactic “bowl cracking scene” (scene 37) we can see Charlotte suffering from Maggie’s ambiguity, from not knowing what Maggie knows, and being denied an answer when she tries to get some information from the Prince in added scene 39. Interestingly, despite the uncomplicated nature of his function, which I

identified as cheating on his wife mostly out of boredom and remaining in his marriage for convenience, Jeremy Northam as the Prince still exudes some ambiguity, mystery. The reason for this might be that one is incapable of thinking of him just in this single role. His handsome looks and period costumes recall memories of other romantic characters played by him (especially Mr. Knightley) and we soon find Charlotte and Maggie's love of him quite credible. The object of love is then always a kind of mystery. His figure is an excellent example of how the roles associated with an actor influence any subsequent performance of his, any further character he plays.

If we have a look at the two tables of functions we can see that the loss of ambiguity is already indicated by them. In Adam's case I have found it inevitable to refer to his becoming much more transparent, while in the female characters' case their ambiguity is part of their "attractiveness" and "greatness", two features only present in the novel's heroines.

As for plain lies, one finds them to retain more importance in the formulation of the film's fabula.

First and foremost, the withholding of truth which enables the marriage of the Prince and Maggie is present as the story's base. Fanny pretends not to know anything about the adulterous affair at the slide show and in the cab (scenes 31-32, only the setting is changed, conversations are almost literal borrowings from the novel) and in climactic scene 37.

The most memorable explicit lie scenes are also included in the film: Maggie's two important lies to Charlotte on the Fawns terrace (about her not accusing her of anything) and in the Fawns gardens (about believing that the Ververs' move to America is Charlotte's decision) are retained, and the dialogues again are practically identical with those of James. Since Charlotte's character has been changed, we have also seen these lies carry a different meaning, though. As I have noted, Charlotte herself is also told a lie by the Prince when she asks him about what Maggie knows.

It is notable that the film contains some quite common, brute lies, which could never appear in the novel. Maggie, for example, is not corrected when she asks her husband to show Charlotte around in the Palazzo Ugolini as she has never seen the place before. (She has, in scene 2.) Charlotte thanking Fanny in scene 5 for doing a great thing



when marrying the Prince to Maggie also seems to fall within that category. Since not much before she is begging the Prince to run away with her, she sounds confused to say the least. In the novel Charlotte also admits that Fanny was wise when she enabled the princely couple's marriage, but there her motive for her return to Europe is wholly ambiguous, probably as much for herself as for the others, making the reference to Fanny's wisdom much more acceptable.

Contrary to the role of ambiguity, the special role of lies is not apparent from the novel's table of functions, and the theme is not even included in the film. The non-inclusion is due to the fact that some important character functions are performed *through* lies in the novel (for example, Maggie mitigates Charlotte's pain) and the lies themselves are not functions: they are not meant to deceive. The vulgar lies that appear in the film, however, just constitute part of the characters' more general vulgarisation.

The issue of reciprocity we have already seen to remain in the foreground. It has again received a more simplistic treatment than in the novel, as, due to the Maggie character's conventionality, money, Adam Verver's wealth plays a more apparent role in saving the Amerigo-Maggie marriage than originally. *The New York Times*'s review also refers to the predominance of the "money can buy and keep whatever it wants" attitude:

They also tilt the movie gently but decisively away from its hothouse psychological climate of secrets and lies charging a rarefied cultural world, making the story a chillier, more contemporary social allegory of how money can buy people as well as art. (Holden, "All the Sensibility that Money can Buy")

If we consider the costs and benefits of the two couples' separation from everybody's point of view we have to recognize that the filmmakers chose to emphasise the gains on Mr. and Mrs. Verver's side. The film's final frames on the Ververs' triumphant arrival in the New World affirm the solidarity of Charlotte and Adam Verver, and hint at the bright future that awaits them in America. This shift of emphasis does have positive consequences for Jamesians: though James refers to the development of accord between the two, the reader, and the critics are included, is liable to concentrate on

what Charlotte is losing with her move to the New World. James's endings, however, seldom allow one single interpretation, and Jhabvala and Ivory's final scene reminds us of this. In the Robert Emmet Long interview Ivory emphasises that for him the really interesting couple is actually the Ververs, while the Prince and Maggie are a couple of secondary importance who remain an appendix to Adam Verver (*James Ivory in Conversation* 250).

The above approach is of course another simplification in itself. Merchant-Ivory's princely couple is indeed much less interesting than their novel counterparts, but it is the filmmakers themselves who made them so. James's Maggie and the Prince are unlikely to sink into a new kind of solipsistic blindness in the aftermath of such a complicated maturation process. The peace, relative uneventfulness of their life should not be taken as a sign of their conventionality, after all one must not forget that this is how Maggie had been perceived by her environment before she became the engine of the changes that make up most of the novel. It should rather be construed as a sign of their rising above the usual hustle and bustle of life, a state James many times expressed preference for – not least through the figure of the Prince. Also one cannot help thinking of Tolstoy: “Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.”<sup>26</sup>

Moreover, while the novel's Charlotte is presented as resourceful enough to find a meaning or even mission for her life in America, we have no reason to believe the same about the Thurman-Charlotte. Her eventual acceptance of the role of Adam's wife appears to be an escape to another dependent position, as is implied by Adam caressing her like a child in the last but one scene. The sensational newspaper headlines on the Ververs' arrival in America that appear in the final frames also seem to treat Charlotte as a potential celebrity and not as a missionary of culture.

The treatment of the issue of reciprocity is again reflected by the tables: with their help we can reconstruct the original relationships between the characters, we can see what, whom they “possess” initially, what attempts are made to change the status quo, and what new arrangement emerges.

Finally, we should consider if the impact of the aesthetic movement is perceptible on the film, or if there is any reference to aestheticism in it at all. A piece of art, the

---

<sup>26</sup> The often quoted initial sentence of *Anna Karenina*.

golden bowl obviously still serves as the basis on which truth is revealed and relationships are restored. The femme fatale motive, however, should be declared missing due to the already discussed alterations in the two female protagonists.

The film does not put emphasis on the non-aesthetic, inelegant nature of the adulterous couple's neglected, slighted status either, this way doing away with an important motivation for their infidelity. Since the movement's criticism would have no relevance for 21st century cinema-goers, this omission is easily understood and accepted. The remaining inducements, emotional neglect and boredom on the Prince's side and a willingness to possess on Charlotte's side, still lend credence to the subsequent events, but they are apparently much more commonplace reasons for adultery than those presented by James.

The entries in the novel's table do imply that we are to witness a conflict between an initially "simple" and a "sophisticated" woman, and we can see that these qualities change by the end of the story. All this indicates that the changing process itself is also tackled by the novel, but it would certainly be an exaggeration if we said that the central role of aestheticism is revealed by the table. The description of primary functions only allows a general reference to the eternal issue of form's importance, whereas the novel discusses an age-specific approach to the problem which is called aestheticism.

Interiors could also recall traces of aestheticism, but, oddly for a Merchant-Ivory work, they are never really important in this film. This is due to the technology used: the film was mostly shot with anamorphic lenses, which blurs the background. This break with the team's traditions is most probably a reaction to frequent criticism that their films are mere picture books, presenting nice images without any function. Just to mention one example, director Alan Parker referred to the Merchant-Ivory films as belonging to the Laura Ashley<sup>27</sup> school of film-making in a cartoon originally published in "Screen

---

<sup>27</sup> Laura Ashley was a Welsh furnishing material and fashion designer. Her style is characterized by romantic English design, often with a 19th-century rural feel, and the use of natural fabrics.

International”.<sup>28</sup> “The press picked it up and it’s hounded us down through the years”, complained Ivory to Long (*James Ivory in Conversation* 21).

The female protagonists’ frocks, however, are calling back the era of aestheticism, especially in soirée scene 29 (added scene), to the great pleasure of the sartorially-minded. Mention also has to be made of the effect of turn-of-the-century artist John Singer Sargent on costume designer John Bright and on his designs. In the Long interview Ivory talks about his team’s visiting two Sargent exhibitions just before starting the shooting of the film. The artist’s portrait of Italian high-society physician Doctor Pozzi is an apparent impact on the Prince’s wardrobe, and might even be behind Northam’s slightly feline presentation of the figure (*James Ivory in Conversation* 247).

As we have seen, the filmmakers have not revealed preconceptions about conveying any kind of special message when starting the filming of *The Golden Bowl*. This time fortune was not on their side either: there was no contemporary feeling, problem with which the film could accidentally resonate, as was the case with *The Europeans*. As I have shown, the film’s intended main theme, adultery, is deprived of most of its interest since it is acted out by much simplified characters that are unable to perform the complex functions which make up the novel.

I have also already noted that in James’s text the positive and negative characteristics are distributed very complexly among the multifaceted major characters. Very often positive functions are performed through lies or by deliberately withholding information, whereas the motivation behind some seemingly noble deeds turns out to be questionable. Due to this, and contrary to *The Europeans*, mythical patterns in *The Golden Bowl* emerge less clearly; some see Maggie as a self-sacrificing redeemer, others as a manipulative femme fatale. Some perceive Adam Verver as a figure with strong resemblances to the Christian God, others as the possessive businessman, the villain who is only interested in hoarding wealth. Whichever approach we accept, we also have to accept that the novel does resemble myths in one significant respect: all the five major characters are furnished with exceptional intellect and moral sensitivity; moreover, two of these characters are liberated from material constraints from the story’s very beginning and thus enjoy a god-like freedom to act, while the other two also gain such liberty with

---

<sup>28</sup> The cartoon is reproduced in Higson: *English Heritage, English Cinema*.

their marriage. Interestingly, it is probably this general extraordinariness that leads to the lack of one well recognisable mythic pattern: as all the characters abound in excellent qualities the novel cannot present one single hero and its enemies, the positive and negative roles switch many times.

This means that contrary to the two other films examined, the filmmakers here could not rely on the base text's mythical patterns when constructing their film, and consequently they were forced to apply other means to achieve some kind of a narrative and artistic unity.

As it is already implied by my remarks on the scene types and on the treatment of the theme of reciprocity, Merchant and Ivory opted for strengthening *one* of the possible mythical structures in their film. As we have seen, with Maggie's simplification the Prince's abandonment of Charlotte is vulgarised in the film, making Charlotte more of a victim than she is in the novel. The spot on her original character, her always managing something, is not even considered to be a shortcoming by most contemporary viewers, and her added characteristics, her inclination to make requests and even to beg, as well as her never containing her despair, are also unlikely to be seen as vices by today's mass audiences. Merchant and Ivory apparently try to sell Charlotte as a *hero* who escapes a hostile society that mistreated her and starts a promising new life in a new land, which leaves us again with the Fryeian pattern already identified behind *The Europeans*. The film's focusing so much on her bright American future is at least partly the consequence of the above approach: she suffers, she is abandoned for a not really worthy woman, therefore she has to be compensated, or the moviegoer would be left with the feeling of frustration. Also, one suspects that the American or Americanised filmmakers are patriotic enough to refrain from presenting their country as the land of exile, punishment.

*The San Francisco Chronicle's* review reflects on Charlotte becoming more of a central character than in the source novel, and also on the simplification of her character:

Charlotte wasn't the principal character in James' 1904 novel of infidelity and betrayal, but in the film version by director James Ivory and producer Ismail Merchant, she takes center stage. Played by the long-necked Uma Thurman, she's less vixen than ninny – a smooth operator whose manoeuvres seem to issue

not from shrewdness or intelligence but from a microchip that allows her to robotically spout her lines with careful inflection. (Guthmann, “*The Golden Bowl*”)

It has to be emphasised once again that this closeness to myth in this case is achieved by the significant simplification of basically *all* the original character functions. In itself this approach could be as rewarding as any; the problem is that instead of presenting a gradual evolution of the theme the film grabs it into the foreground in a last ditch attempt to lend some cohesion to the story. In more simple terms, a significant part of the film presents a very shallow Charlotte, and it is only the ending that focuses on her apotheosis. Regrettably, the film practically fails to establish any link between the two approaches to the character, let alone to present any interaction between them.

All in all, one must conclude that not only is the film unable to keep the base novel’s problems in the focus, the simplified fabula also fails to offer new issues of real interest. When studying the contemporary reviews it did not come as a surprise that most reviewers, critics consider *The Golden Bowl* as an unsuccessful movie. It is perhaps *The USA Today* review that manages to sum up the reasons of the failure most successfully:

Too many dialogue exchanges sound like actors reading lines, and even the film's better performers seem to be acting in a vacuum. All in all: the movie establishes good will (or even great will) in the initial scenes because it's so gorgeous, but the rest is such a slog that even the revealed significance of the title artefact elicits a shrug. (Clark, “*Bowl: Visually Filling but otherwise Empty*”)

Other well-established literary critics, for example, Lee Clark Mitchell are also very critical of the film, complaining about the figures two-dimensional and stereotypical nature (“Based on the Novel by Henry James” 290). The vacuum, the lack of context, and the general inability to raise the viewer’s attention rhymes with what I said about blurring the original themes and about the lack of new ones; as well as with the discrepancy

between the functions performed by the film's characters and the dialogues that are borrowed unchanged from the original text.

David Lodge in *The Times Literary Supplement*, however, praises the cast and the film's ending, and claims that the Master would probably be happy with Merchant-Ivory's achievement (Lodge, "In the Home of Eternal Unrest"). His satisfaction might be due to the simple fact that those who read a novel many times are unable to separate the fabula of the novel and the related film, fill the voids in the film with details from the novel, and thus do not notice the shortcomings of the former at (literally) first sight.

## 5. The Use of Cinematic Devices

As for the peculiarities of the visual images, I have already noted the use of anamorphic lenses that blur the background and thus are able to call our attention to the foreground, to the characters' faces. The choice of the depth of field often serves the same purpose: the high number of medium shots and sometimes even close-ups also allow us to focus on faces and facial expressions. Compared with *The Europeans*, the number of the above shot types is conspicuously high. As the table of scenes indicates, most of the scenes in this film only involve two characters and their dialogues, and these are recorded as traditional sequences of shots and counter-shots of the above image type. Just a few examples: scene 17, when Adam and Charlotte converse on her going to Matcham to represent the family, the technical museum scene and the subsequent cab scene where we can observe the Prince's face particularly closely; scene 29 where Maggie and Charlotte are conversing at the soiree on the planned trip to Spain and about Adam marrying Charlotte for Maggie's sake, etc.

The reason for this medium-shot abundance is not difficult to find: in dialogues the reaction of the listener is important and can best be observed this way. In all the above cases the viewer senses some kind of a tension between the characters, leading one to recognise that these shots serve as the filmic counterparts of some of James's internal monologues, as means of conveying non-verbal information about somebody's state of mind, suspicions. The scenes that do away with much of the character's ambiguity, however, ruin their effect. Moreover, there is also an unfortunate consequence of this excessive reliance on them: the viewer is often unable to sense a depth of space in the sequences, the very reason for which critics sensed the film as unpleasantly two-dimensional. The ornate interiors could also serve as a good contrast to Maggie and later Charlotte's isolation and anguish, as they do in Martin Scorsese's already mentioned *The Age of Innocence*; where Newland Archer's ordeal is the more poignant as it takes place against a very attractive, aesthetic setting. A useful filming tool is sacrificed by Merchant-Ivory to no avail.

Except for a few establishing shots before the Fawns scenes we cannot really enjoy beautiful scenery either. As I have mentioned, this wariness of offering attractive



sight is most probably a reaction to criticism that Merchant-Ivory tend to focus too much on visuality. In this film we can already see the pioneers of heritage-film-making give up one of the most important achievements of the movement.

The use of lighting is, however, also more sophisticated in this film than in *The Europeans*, as in some cases it also serves narrative purposes. The most remarkable examples are scenes involving the Prince and Charlotte (for example, scene 42), who, when tête-à-tête, often speak in the dark or in dimly lit rooms, which, very much contrary to the novel, lends a clandestine character to their affair.

Camera angles mostly mark the position of the speaker and listener, for example, at the beginning of the soiree scene Maggie is sitting, Charlotte is standing during their conversation, so Maggie is shown from a high camera position. In a few cases, however, the positions seem to refer to something else than simple point of view. By way of example, in scene 3 when Maggie sends Amerigo to fetch Charlotte, the Prince is shown from a low position, and this I am inclined to take as a sign of his looming over the two women's lives, of his determining their fates. In scene 10, when Adam invites Charlotte with him to see Mr. Guterman-Seuss's Turkish tiles in Brighton, a step that marks their embarking on a potentially dangerous new path, it is Charlotte who is shown from a low camera angle and is looming over Adam as if she was a huge problem to tackle. In scene 35 in which Adam tells his wife that he is to spend the night in his study, it is already Adam who is shown from a low position, towering above Charlotte – as if he was a threat. In all the above three cases high and low positions are achieved by placing the focaliser at the top or bottom of stairs. Unlike Campion's cinematographer Stuart Dryburgh, who sometimes just seems to play with positions, Merchant-Ivory likes to provide practical justification for showing someone from above or from below. In the latter two cases focalisation is apparently internal, which makes the camera position even more natural.

Frame composition is mostly traditional in the sense that we are treated to carefully composed, often static, closed pictures. However, contrary to *The Europeans*, in this work there are already examples of less conventionally designed frames as well, in several scenes, for example, we can see diagonally composed ones. Merchant-Ivory's cameraman seems to be less imaginative than Campion's, as the diagonal of the frames is

almost always constituted by flights of stairs again for the reasons described above (for example, scenes 35-36). In scene 16, though, it is the Prince and Charlotte's bodies that serve as diagonals. This I am inclined to regard as the effect of Dryburgh, who seems to enjoy toying with this composition type.

Intertitles are usually considered an "unfilmic" device, as it is usually information that cannot be conveyed by filmic means that is transferred through them. Similarly to several other Merchant-Ivory works they are appearing regularly in this film, indicating locations and the lapse of time. In *A Room with a View* they serve as a link with the high-brow literary base as they look like pages from a nicely printed book. In *The Golden Bowl* they are used less consciously (the letter types, for example, could easily serve as a reference to aestheticism), but first of all less systematically: in the first quarter of the film they appear before every new setting, but later they are becoming less frequent. By way of example, there is one title indicating that we are within Adam Verver's London house, but there is none marking our entry into the Prince and Maggie's home. In similar vein, there is a title indicating that we are in the Lancaster House costume ball, but never see one indicating the location of the soiree in scenes 29-31. The haphazard nature of their use is probably due to simple neglect.

Music is always important for Merchant-Ivory-Jhabvala: composer Richard Robbins is again the fourth member of the team. Besides his classical-sounding pieces the film also contains scores from Debussy, as well as some ragtime music of Scott Joplin in the final American scenes. In a high number of scenes the music accompaniment is made up by weird, sinister tunes, with the apparent intention of heralding in some impending doom, threat. Not surprisingly, in line with the film's "adultery is a crime" approach, it is characteristically present when the Charlotte-Prince duo remains tête-à-tête, for example, in scene 16, during Charlotte's visit at the Prince after a day of rambling. As I have noted, the lighting sometimes reinforces the uncanny effect. On one occasion it is the abrupt ending of music that is especially meaningful: in scene 34 when Charlotte screamingly rejects Adam's first-time proposal of their going to America, the loud, intense music ends on her "no", making it really deep-felt, even tragic.

All in all, we can say that compared to *The Europeans*, more information is conveyed through non-verbal means in this film but valuable possibilities are missed,

and, even more regrettably, the verbal- and non-verbal pieces of information sometimes do not complement, rather contradict each other.

The IMDb awards the film three stars out of five.

As for the box office result, according to IMDb costs amounted to 15 million dollars while revenues only approximated 6 million dollars, which apparently marks a significant failure in box office terms as well.

Finally, the usual table follows, incorporating the relevant changes effected in the narrative substance as well as the cinematic devices applied.

## 6. Scenes in the Novel and in the Film

Scenes in the film	Cinematic devices Relevant changes compared to text
1. Medieval adultery scene running under opening credits. Young stepmother caught in flagrante delicto with her stepson.	Added scene. Reason for inclusion: to foreshadow and emphasise the topic of adultery.  A typical bracket syntagma.
2. Prince tells Ch about the medieval story (part of his family's history) outside the Palazzo Ugolini in Italy. It turns out Prince is engaged to daughter of millionaire. Ch talks about her impending trip to Baden and then to America. Prince says he would like her to marry someone good and rich. Ch desperately tells him there is nobody who could make her forget the Prince and begs him not to marry, to run away with her even if they have no money. Tries to embrace Prince, but Prince ducks her approach.	Added scene. In the novel Ch never tries to hinder the Prince's marriage – at least not until her return from America on the eve of the wedding. It is herself who flies from Rome as she sees no future for their relationship – proof of her strength and intelligence. She does make an attempt to marry in America – perhaps even too apparent an attempt – but fails.  One of several scenes where Ch loses her head and is begging – we never see that in the novel.  Filmic tools: weird music  Charlotte's despair is mainly shown by her uncontrolled moves, in full-body shots.
3. Maggie is on the phone talking to Fanny about Ch's arrival to London. Meanwhile Adam Verver and the Prince examine medal with a portrait of Amerigo's ancestor. Maggie sends Amerigo to fetch Charlotte.  Verver and Amerigo discuss medal.	Camera is lingering on beautiful ceiling initially. Exquisite home foreshadows the inhabitants' extraordinariness.  Both men embrace Maggie – implication of conflicting interests. Dramatic power is increased by close-up of arms.  At the end of scene Prince is photographed from low camera angle – looms over the

	frame – emphasis of his influence over both women.
4. Maggie talks to her father of losing their “symmetry”. Verver’s tone is as if he was talking to a small child. He asks if he should marry too. Maggie says if he did she would certainly understand.	<p>In novel Verver always talks to his daughter as to his equal.</p> <p>In Book Second Parts 2-3 Adam is chased by Mrs. Rance so vehemently that idea of marriage seems inevitable. Father and daughter discuss the issue most rationally.</p>
<p>5. Fanny and Ch converse at Fanny’s. Ch says Fanny did a wonderful thing for the Prince when bringing him together with Maggie.</p> <p>Fanny tells her that she also has to marry – she is made for grand life.</p> <p>Ch asks if she told Maggie that they knew each other with the Prince.</p>	<p>The scene seems pretentious in view of her previous begging the Prince to change his mind; it can even be considered a vulgar lie.</p> <p>The point of Ch’s escape from Rome is exactly the hope that both herself and the Prince can make good marriages. Her return to Europe signifies the failure of this hope on her side – she could not honestly thank Fanny at this stage.</p> <p>Seeing no sign of Ch’s superior intelligence and style one does not really understand why she is made for grand life.</p>
6. The Prince arrives to pick up Ch at the Assinghams’ home. Ch says that he could not get rid of her.	<p>Since – contrary to the novel – the Prince has really found it difficult to free himself from Ch, the phrase has to be taken at face value, and thus it positions Ch very much unfavourably.</p> <p>James’s Ch cautiously avoids being a burden on Prince till the consummation of</p>

	<p>their affair – and one reading of Volume Two of the novel is exactly how she does become a burden for him despite all her excellent qualities.</p>
<p>7. Prince and Charlotte in Bloomsbury antiquity shop. Prince offers Ch a present; she asks if she can show it to Maggie. Prince is angry: why in the world not? Ch tells Prince she came back to be with him. Losing her head she says she had to come back, because she missed him too much. Shopkeeper presents bowl – Prince leaves the shop – Ch likes the bowl but says she has to think.</p>	<p>Close-ups, midshots.</p> <p>In novel Prince never loses his head – he is presented very much as the Hyppocratesian athletic type.</p> <p>Ch makes it apparent she wants nothing from life but the Prince-loses her head once again.</p> <p>Novel's Charlotte is much more ambiguous – she only says she came back for this hour.</p>
<p>8. Verver family (Prince included) are airing the Principino in garden at Fawns. Ch arrives at Fawns. Maggie, Adam and the Prince greet her one after the other.</p>	<p>Ch seems to be insecure about her arrival-as if she was an intruder.</p> <p>In novel it is also her who initiates the visit by writing to Maggie that she is perfectly willing to go if she is invited. Initiative is part of her masterful management of any situation.</p>
<p>9. Prince and Princess talk about Amerigo's homesickness. Princess suggests that they can now go to Italy. She would feel perfectly at ease now that Ch is their guest.</p>	<p>Their body language shows how much they are at ease in each other's company.</p> <p>One does not really see why such an insecure Ch would be a comfort for the Princess.</p>

<p>10. The princely couple has left by now for Italy. Ch plays the piano for Verver – he praises her performance.</p> <p>Ch asks Verver about some portraits – they came with the house – then starts to talk about a Raphael drawing, and then talks about his plans to build a museum in America.</p> <p>His motivation is that he wants to give sg. back to the workers who worked 12 hours seven days a week for him, to make coke. Adam invites Ch to go to see Turkish tiles with him – Ch accepts the invitation before he finishes the sentence.</p> <p>Adam is musing at a female portrait.</p>	<p>Some parts of scene are invented.</p> <p>Adam's interest in arts seems superficial – he is only interested in very famous pieces.</p> <p>In book we never see Adam Verver as an entrepreneur, and do not know how he made his fortune. His having made millions is altogether problematic.</p> <p>Ch's acceptance of Adam's approach is abrupt, she does not show any doubts – contrary to novel, where Adam is even hurt by Ch's hesitation.</p> <p>Ch is shown from a low camera angle – she is looming over Adam. Adam's voice and body language is, however, confident.</p> <p>Sign of Adam's vacillation. He seems to simply regret his first wife, though, and does not seem to be afraid of taking a new one. In book Adam's first marriage is described as quite unlucky, sg. that might have hindered the development of his personality.</p>
<p>11. Prince and Princess are at Palazzo Ugolini.</p> <p>Prince takes part in restoration of the palazzo. Maggie is waving telegram heralding the arrival of Ch and Verver – they want their consent to their marriage.</p>	<p>Added scene. In novel we only read about Adam sending a telegram.</p> <p>In film we see nothing of the uncertainties, doubts surrounding their engagement on both Adam's and Charlotte's sides.</p> <p>Points of view are peculiar, but are</p>

	“justified” by the Prince standing at the top of a huge ladder.
12. Verver and Ch have just arrived at Palazzo. The two women are embracing. Maggie asks the Prince to show Ch around, who, she thinks, has never seen the palace. When asked what he thinks of her engagement the Prince tells Charlotte that it requires good intentions and courage. Ch calls the Ververs “good children”	Added scene.  Concealing Ch’s previous visit to the Palazzo is a brute lie – the novel operates with much more sophisticated ones.  Phrase is used in book by Prince in Book Third Part 7 during his Matcham visit. On the eve of her marriage it sounds cynical.
13. Lancaster House, a fancy costume ball. Fanny is shocked that Bob calls Ch and the Prince a couple – Bob says Verver cannot lock Ch up in one of his cabinets. Fanny – Ch dialogue: Mr. Verver is at home with Maggie – that is how they are most happy. Fanny – Prince: Mr. Verver should be more often seen as Ch’s husband. Ch is summoned by Italian royalty through ambassador.	Fancy dress gives Ch chance to dress very daringly, to display her charms, sensuality. Characters are moving on impressive flights of stairs – interesting points of view, and diagonal frame compositions again.  Nolte-Verver sounds and seems quite noisy and sociable – remark seems out of place.
14. Participants of fancy costume ball are photographed. Prince and Ch are photographed together.	Added scene. Opportunity for Ch to strike sexy pose, and photograph plays crucial role later in another scene.
15. Fanny and Colonel at home after ball. Fanny is uneasy about having introduced Maggie to the Prince, though she knew about his former relationship with Ch. She trusted the Prince though – and she still trusts him, she says.	Fanny is only talking about her guilty conscience. There is no real analysis of the situation, and no sign of her beginning to put her trust into Maggie. Her doing so foreshadows Maggie’s maturation in the book.



The Colonel asks her playfully to go to bed.	Good state of Assingham marriage is indicated by it. Reference is also present in novel!
<p>16. Ch. visits Prince in his home. She tells him about her day-she has been rambling the streets alone. Old feelings come back-she says. Ch talks of Adam and Maggie being most happy when they are together. Prince says he understands these people among whom he has married less and less. A bit later he calls them simple and good.</p> <p>The two are kissing and are interrupted by butler.</p>	<p>Diagonally composed frames of the two characters as they are leaning back on a sofa.</p> <p>Calling the Adam Verver of the film simple and good contradicts what he tells of himself in connection with his entrepreneur past.</p> <p>It is relevant in the book that theirs is not a simple clandestine affair – the point exactly is that all the circumstances are in their favour, kind of force them together.</p>
<p>17. Ch is packing for the Matcham weekend in her room. Adam is popping in to apologise for not going – they will say of him he does nothing and goes nowhere. He touches, strokes Ch, and presents her with a necklace.</p>	<p>Added scene.</p> <p>Close-ups, midshots.</p> <p>Film's Adam simply looks energetic and sociable.</p> <p>There is no sign of physical intimacy between Ch and Adam in the novel, and one of the horrors is exactly that such relationship is difficult to imagine between the two. In this scene – despite his age – Adam still exudes strength, sex appeal, and care.</p>
18. Bicycle race at Matcham.	Added scene – Prince's active side is

<p>Prince tells Fanny this week-end programme would not be good for Adam and Maggie. “How can that be good for you?”, she asks. Prince says he has to stretch out his legs sometimes. When asked if he is homesick, he answers he permanently is.</p> <p>Lady Castledean asks Ch to stay over.</p> <p>Fanny invites them to travel back together to London. To Ch and the Prince’s rejection of the proposal she responds dryly: You are bearing up... Good...</p>	<p>emphasised.</p> <p>One does not really understand why he has to stretch out his legs – he is turned into the type that has nights out. Going to parties to represent the Ververs is rather a duty for him in novel. Homesickness does not figure as a motive for her going to Matcham either.</p> <p>Fanny sounds judgemental: In novel she is described as rather scared.</p>
<p>19. Ch and Prince are whispering in the staircase at Matcham. Ch says they needn’t be afraid of Fanny. Prince says Fanny was right when making his marriage.</p> <p>Everything is right, they are happy and we can be happy too, says Ch.</p>	<p>Added scene. Location, the lighting, shadows, noises all exude uncertainty and potential threats to the Ch-Prince relationship. In novel, as Fanny puts it, “their extraordinary relation [is] but an opportunity (300).</p> <p>Conversation’s elements, however, appear in novel as well.</p>
<p>20. Prince and Assingham are talking in the staircase. Assingham says Fanny is brooding over sg., but does not tell about what.</p>	<p>Added scene. Prince must feel Fanny’s uneasiness, but is never told explicitly about it.</p>
<p>21. Assingham and Fanny in their Matcham room the same night. Fanny is worried about what she will say to Maggie the next day. If she stays innocent she will lose her husband, she laments. Bob: men do not like it when it is made too easy for</p>	<p>Fanny says this in Book Third Part 11.</p> <p>Assingham is made a bit more dominant in</p>

them.	film – more traditional marriage.
22. Mr. Blint and Lady Castledean are playing the piano, her ladyship sitting in Mr. Blint's lap. Prince pops in, inquires for Ch. The two say that Ch is looking, hunting for him.	Added scene. Prince has to suffer vulgar remarks – change compared to the ever smooth situation described in the novel.
23. Ch and Prince in Matcham garden. Ch tells the Prince her ladyship does not want them for lunch – she only wants Mr. Blint. They can set off right away to see the cathedral in Gloucester. She has already chosen the right inn, she adds. Prince tells her to get her things quick. Ch is running away and is looking back in happy disbelief that he is willing to go with her.	Despite making all the arrangements Ch does not seem to be a fearful master of situation, her apparent obsession with the prince relegates her to a dependent position.
24. Ch and Prince in Gloucester inn. Sex scene.	Unfolding. In novel there is of course no sex scene between Ch and Prince. What happens exactly, what emotions are born in them in Gloucester, remains a secret for the reader – just as it is a secret for the characters in the novel.
25. Prince arrives home. Princess is sitting on the floor in dark. Prince tells his wife about the week-end, he does not know the tomb of which king they have seen. Maggie tells him about her “nightmare”: In dream pagoda and bowl symbols are mixed: pagoda has a crack on it and as she touches it, it collapses and the pieces bury her. She cannot cry, though, because her	Pagoda still refers to the adultery. In novel pagoda is rather the symbol of the Princess's relationship with the Prince, or with the world in general. Exudes

<p>father mustn't hear anything.</p>	<p>something positive: when she touches it there is a favourable response from inside. Marks the beginning of her giving up her solipsism.</p>
<p>26. Ch and the Prince are in a wax museum, because there they are unlikely to meet anyone who knows them. Prince seems to be tired of such practices.</p> <p>Ch tells about latest plan of Ververs: they want to go to Spain together.</p> <p>Ch suggests that they should spend more time with each other's spouses.</p>	<p>Added scene. In novel we never see them tête-à-tête after Matcham. There is reference, for example, to their going for another week-end together on Maggie's initiative, but their relationship seems to end abruptly after Matcham – no reference to any further intimacy.</p> <p>In novel plan is an old one – at this stage the Princess is already aware of the danger of spending too much time with her father. In Book Fourth Part 2 the Prince, seeing that his wife chose to spend more time with Ch, starts to spend more time with Adam. In novel it is already Maggie who has situation under control at this stage.</p>
<p>27. Prince, Verver and Principino are in Science Museum in London, examining some fearful giant machinery. Principino turns to his grandfather saying he is afraid. Talking about fears Prince says he cannot imagine Adam be afraid of anything.</p> <p>Adam: he is afraid of himself, of what he might be capable if anything happened to Maggie or the boy.</p> <p>Prince's face is shown to be tense.</p>	<p>Added scene.</p> <p>Emphasises Adam's strength and manliness. Totally contrary to original text. There Adam's strength is of a completely different nature.</p> <p>Prince's fear of Adam's reaction is implied by filmic means: fearful noise of machines, and close-ups of huge machine parts as</p>

	well as of the Prince's tense face.
<p>28. The trio travelling in a cab. Adam tells the Prince how he once almost stabbed sy. in a Paris restaurant because the guy looked at his wife in a manner he did not like, and then left without paying.</p>	<p>Added scene.</p> <p>Aim is same as of previous one. Story, however, is unusually commonplace for Jhabvala – does not create real tension in viewer.</p> <p>Close-ups of Prince's face are revealing tension. Adam is shown from low camera position – still no real implication of strength due to the commonplaceness of story.</p>
<p>29. All characters are gathered at a party.</p> <p>Adam cannot eat anything, as he is very choosy.</p> <p>Ch tells Maggie it is common knowledge that Adam married her for Maggie's sake.</p> <p>Mr. Blint and Lady Castledean appear and compliment Maggie on her appearance. When they leave Maggie criticises her ladyship for her falseness, and the Prince welcomes her new-found critical vein. Ch asks Fanny what the marmalade cat (Lady Castledean) wanted – to find out</p>	<p>Ball as setting is added – to add spectacle and motion to film.</p> <p>Intended to emphasise Adam's stay-at home character, but strongly-built Nolte Adam seems to be able to feed on anything.</p> <p>Ch's declaration is kind of abrupt in the film – we have not seen much of Adam's vacillation, and Adam does seem to be attracted by Ch's beauty.</p> <p>Close-ups of Maggie's face show her wariness of Charlotte – good contrast with scene 3, where her face and voice reveals happiness at her arrival.</p> <p>One of scarce signs of Maggie's maturation.</p> <p>Unfolding of Maggie recalling her memories of the lady (360).</p> <p>Language is more sarcastic than in novel.</p> <p>Lady Castledean's figure is made more</p>

<p>what I have found out.</p> <p>Ch threatens Fanny – if she throws any stones they will fall back on her.</p>	<p>dominant. She could serve as a good counterpoint for Ch to illustrate that there are less and more vulgar forms of adultery, but film's Ch fails to represent the more sophisticated form.</p>
<p>30. Pantomime performance during the party. Theme is a young wife cheating on her old husband, and the latter stubbing the adulterers. Maggie and Fanny are fidgeting while watching it – Ch does not seem to mind. Mr. Blint to Lady Castledean: it is like Hamlet.</p>	<p>Added scene.</p> <p>Theme of adultery accentuated.</p> <p>His words represent criticism of just as corrupt world.</p>
<p>31. Maggie leaves the show before it ends and joins her father who is lounging on a sofa outside. He is not interested in the show and finds the 20<sup>th</sup>-century music “mighty loud”. When Charlotte and the Prince join them Adam asks if they are ready to return to Fawns. On Charlotte's “most willingly” he says they are very fortunate to get on so well.</p>	<p>Characters are shown from very high camera position initially, which seems to be just play with sight.</p> <p>Nolte-Adam's interest in art is superficial.</p> <p>Charlotte's close-ups reveal her tenseness.</p> <p>Adam's tone reflects simple joviality and does not seem to carry any hidden meaning.</p>
<p>32. Maggie and Fanny attend a slide show on the history of the Ugolini family. Theme of young stepmother seducing her stepson recurs.</p> <p>“What awfulness is there between them?” – bursts out Maggie. Maggie asks Fanny to go with her to Matcham to help her through. Fanny says she cannot go as Ch</p>	<p>In book Maggie raises the question during a lunch they have together – sets had to be made more diverse.</p>

has changed towards her – Maggie says it is her father's house.	In Book Third Part 10 Fanny refers to Maggie spreading so much in her father's house that there would be no room for Ch's friends if she wished to invite any. Maggie's reply can be regarded as unfolding of this reference.
33. Maggie and Fanny are in Bloomsbury antiquity shop, in search of a birthday present for Adam. Maggie finds the bowl. Tag on it indicates it was intended for sale three days before her marriage. After leaving the shop Maggie bursts out: they know that I know.	Ch's punishment lies in <i>not</i> knowing how much Maggie knows.
34. Ch and Adam are already at Fawns, the Princely couple is not yet there. To Ch's remark that it is lonely without them Adam kisses her and says that they have each other. Shows his plan of the American City museum again, and says there is a legal problem that needs his immediate attendance, so they have to go to America for an indeterminate length of time. Ch screamingly says no. Adds that taking his treasures to his American museum is like burying them. To Adam's answer that there are beautiful tombs, for example, the Taj Mahal, Ch says that queens are not buried alive in them.	Added scene.  Adam's attraction to Ch seems genuine.  James's Adam never tests Ch in this open way.  Weird music and its abrupt end signify great tension. Ch's body language, hunched back implies her total despair.  Ch is unlikely to protest this openly against her "transportation" to America.
35. Ch is on her way to retire to her bedroom. Adam calls after her in the	Added scene.  Illustrates tension between Ch and Adam,

<p>staircase that he is to stay in his study for the night – he has work to do. Adam goes back to study and is musing over medal he is looking at with Amerigo in scene 3.</p>	<p>and his awakening to the real nature of relationships in his family. Ch and Adam are in same staircase as in scene 10, when he invites her to see Turkish tiles. This time Adam takes upper position – Charlotte is shot from high camera angle.</p> <p>Can be regarded as implication of change in their positions.</p>
<p>36. Antiquity dealer delivers the golden bowl for the Princess himself. While waiting for her he notices the photography that was taken of Ch and the Prince at the Lancaster House ball. Identifies them as the couple who also intended to buy the bowl. When Maggie appears he tells her about his discovery. Maggie is shocked. Shop-keeper explains he came in person to ask for a reduced price as the bowl is cracked.</p>	<p>Unfolding of what Maggie is telling Fanny about dealer's visit in Book Four Part 9.</p> <p>The two scenes are linked by the photograph.</p> <p>Midshots and close-ups testify to Maggie's despair.</p> <p>Diagonally composed frames when dealer is descending the stairs.</p>
<p>37. Fanny enters Maggie's room, both women are dressed for a ball. Maggie shows Fanny the bowl and tells her about the crack in it. She also tells her about Ch. and the Prince thinking about buying it a few days before her marriage. They have never told her about having been so intimate before their marriage. Assures Fanny that she is sure of her good intentions.</p> <p>Fanny destroys the cracked bowl as symbol of tarnished relations between the</p>	<p>Dialogue is quite literally borrowing from novel.</p>



<p>foursome.</p> <p>Prince enters, Fanny leaves. Maggie turns hysteric about Ch and Prince's concealment. She also asks why Ch had to marry into the family, as none of them needed her unless the Prince did.</p> <p>Prince also shouts why in the world he could not visit an antiquity shop with Ch as she wanted to buy a wedding present for Maggie.</p> <p>Soothingly asks Maggie what she wants. She says she wants the bowl without the crack.</p> <p>Cries over not having a birthday present for her father.</p>	<p>Maggie never loses her head, he merely lets the Prince know that she knows about his former intimacy with Ch. Leaves the Prince in uncertainty about how much exactly she knows (she only talks about the Prince having two kinds of relations with Ch) and also about how much Adam Verver knows. Her extraordinary strength and depth is shown by her not acting as a stereotypical wronged wife. The regret over Ch-Adam marriage is present in Ch XXVIII, but there Maggie only muses by herself!</p> <p>James's Maggie gets her husband back by showing him that it is really he who is foremost in her life. In film final sentence again emphasises her girlishness.</p>
<p>38. Maggie is reading the Prince's letter in Fawns garden. In it Prince asks her to hold and keep her.</p>	<p>Added scene. Prince never writes such letter – there is no need for words. He shows his repentance and willingness to regain Maggie by playing the game the rules of which are set by her.</p>
<p>39. Soon after Maggie is bathing the Principino. Ch appears, Maggie sends her to comfort the Prince who is brooding over the illness of his dog.</p>	<p>Added scene.</p> <p>Maggie's trust and generosity has no preliminaries in film.</p>
<p>40. Ch meets Prince. Asks him if Maggie has told him anything. Prince lies to her. Asks if Adam has told her anything, to which she answers he only talks to Maggie.</p>	<p>Unfolding.</p> <p>Maggie tells Fanny in Book Fifth Part 1 that Ch must have asked the Prince if she (Maggie) knows anything, and he</p>

Ch says Fanny is good friend only to the Ververs, not for “us”. Tries to cry on Prince’s shoulder and embrace him but Prince averts her approach.	apparently lied to her. Scene is unfolding of this reference. Maggie’s talent for guessing human behaviour, however, is not demonstrated in film.
41. Ch tells Adam Fanny has changed towards her, she does not want her at Fawns. Also she has made Maggie change towards her. Adam says Maggie never changes unless sg really horrible happens. The two are looking at a picture, a supposed Raphael, the purchase of which Adam considers, but says he never acts till he is certain of sg.	Added scene. In Book Fourth Part 6 Maggie refers to Ch having become restrictive of the Assinghams. There is no reference to her saying anything to Adam, as the last thing she wants is raising his suspicion. Scene again is relegating Ch to the level of gossip commonplace wife. Adam’s remark is another attempt to create suspense.
42. Fawns bridge party. Prince and Ch look worried and also absorbed in the game. Maggie is looking on from terrace. Fanny tells Isabel Archer’s story and refers to the “usual Italian fortune hunters”. Ch follows Maggie to the terrace, and asks if she has anything to say against her. Maggie gives her denial and the two embrace and kiss each other.	Fanny in book would never allow herself such vulgar references. Whether it adds to tension in film is questionable. It is, however, a nod towards cultivated audiences – a tool favoured by heritage film.
43. In staircase Ch tells the Prince Maggie does not know anything as she has just kissed her. Prince calls her very foolish. Adam interrupts their talk, Ch calls him to bed but Adam refuses, saying he needs fresh air, it is stifling inside.	Added scene.  Adam rejects Ch’ invitation too Knowingly – the extent of his knowledge is never clear in novel.
44. Italian adultery frames are repeated for	Added scene. Aim is to emphasise

some seconds.	(physical) threat imposed by Adam Verver.
<p>45. Prince is reading out tale to Principino who is again afraid of sg. Prince is talking about his homesickness and that they should go to Italy to make the child more relaxed.</p> <p>Maggie: Adam cannot live without them.  Prince: and you cannot live without him.  Prince says he would never ask Maggie to go with him. Maggie is lovingly shaking her head.</p>	<p>Added scene.</p> <p>Scene probably also intends to emphasise that there is much tension in the family.</p> <p>In novel Princess has made it sure by this time that the Prince is her priority in life. Still, scene reflects that the spouses have recognised the need for attending to the other's needs.</p>
<p>46. Maggie calls on Adam in his study. Maggie again talks about her selfishness, her major selfishness being her husband. Adam says that if she talks like this he and Ch will have to go back to America. To Maggie's remark that he is her victim in that case, he says that he is victim of nobody, he can take care of himself and his wife.</p>	<p>This calling on her father at night in a virginal white night dress emphasises the Princess's girlishness again, not her becoming a real, mature woman and wife. In novel she often thinks about sacrificing her father – but there she seems to accept the fact that she can only get closer to her husband by devoting less time to her father. Conversation on the Ververs' return to America is included in novel but here Adam is presented as apparent decision maker – harsh contrast with the ambiguity of the novel.</p>
<p>47. Adam Verver's treasures are being packed for America.</p> <p>Prince is reading his papers. Same time Ch is looking at some photographs of America. Ch bursts into the Prince's room, saying she cannot be shipped to America. Prince is soothing her – saying her husband intends</p>	<p>Added scene.</p> <p>Parallel syntagmas.</p> <p>According to Book Fifth Part 1 Ch avoids any meeting with the Prince after the Ververs' return to America is decided.</p>

<p>to give her a great role: she will carry the torch of civilisation.</p> <p>Ch again comes up with offer of running away and accuses the Prince with lying to her.</p> <p>Prince says he loves Maggie more and more every day, and talks of the dishonour of lying to his wife.</p> <p>Ch desperately runs away.</p>	<p>Ch in novel is far too clever not to see her defeat at this stage – but she would never admit it. This is the likely reason behind her avoiding the Princess and Prince.</p> <p>Commonplace sentences of disillusioned former lovers vulgarise both characters further.</p>
<p>48. Ch acts as “cicerone” at Fawns – introduces Verver’s treasures for guests. Maggie and Fanny pityingly look on from gallery.</p> <p>Lady Castledean also appears among the guests, this time with her husband.</p> <p>Ch also introduces Holbein’s Henry VIII portrait, calling it the illustration of the masculine ego.</p>	<p>Unfolding. There is reference to Ch guiding guests in Chapter XXXVIII. The scene is presented through Maggie as focaliser.</p> <p>Theme of marital reconciliation accentuated.</p> <p>Well-known but critically acclaimed painting is included to flatter more educated audiences – heritage film influence.</p> <p>The portrait also implies that Ch had to give in to some external force when remaining in her marriage.</p> <p>Maggie is observing Ch from gallery – dominant position.</p>
<p>49. Prince and Princess look down from their window at Ch in the garden. Prince says Ch has not even begun to know the Princess.</p> <p>Maggie hopes she never will, for otherwise she would realise that it was her who asked her father to take her back to America. She</p>	<p>Maggie in film never admits that – some of her ambiguity is retained.</p>

<p>averts her husband's kiss saying he should wait.</p> <p>Maggie goes down to garden to Ch under pretext of taking her some reading.</p> <p>Ch tells Maggie it was her [Ch's] decision that the Ververs go back to America, as Maggie "worked against her".</p>	<p>Dialogue is almost literally the same as in novel, Book Fifth Part 5. It marks the culmination of Maggie's development in novel, but the film does not make it clear why Maggie accepts the accusations.</p> <p>As Charlotte has not really been dignified so far, we cannot really consider it as a face-saving attempt on her side either.</p>
<p>50. Ch is desperately crying in her room. Adam goes over to comfort her. He caressingly says that in America everything will fall into place. Ch will be appreciated – they have never seen the likes of her there. Ch is desperately clinging to Adam's neck.</p>	<p>Added scene. Close-ups.</p> <p>Ch and Adam seem to be in harmony in closing chapters of book as well, a perhaps less emotional scene is easy to imagine between the two.</p> <p>Scene in film implies that Ch can get rid of her obsession but remains dependent.</p>
<p>51. Fake contemporary photos, newspaper cuttings and film extracts show Ch and Adam's arrival in America.</p> <p>The couple's arrival is a major media event, Ch seems to be absolutely fascinated by the amount of attention surrounding them.</p>	<p>Added scene. Flash forward. Monochromic colours separate frames from the rest of the film.</p> <p>Ragtime music foreshadows busy social life in early 20<sup>th</sup>-century America – a kind of happy ending. Ch is a celebrity – and not someone carrying the torch of civilisation.</p>

## VII. Conclusion

I have had three major aims with my work.

First of all, I wanted to demonstrate that the instruments named “Proppean-type functions” by me can successfully be used for the comparison of narrative texts and their film adaptations.

I have tried to demonstrate at some length that the structure of *The Europeans* is very close to some comic and tragic mythoi types as they are described by Northrop Frye. The tables of functions in this case could be used exceptionally well for the indication of functions. The introduction of secondary functions, however, proved useful in this case for me to be able to describe the minor changes, i.e. changes that did not steer the narrative into a new direction.

In the second case, in connection with *The Portrait of a Lady*, the mythical pattern was still clearly recognisable. James, however, practically cut off the narrative’s ending, leaving generations of critics to guess his intentions behind this step. Jane Campion shortened the narrative one step further, and, interestingly, this move highlighted the relative clarity of James’s ending. I consider this case an excellent example of the interaction of the original work and of its adaptation – which is generally believed to be a one-way process.

Apart from this shortening, both novel and film faithfully follow the pattern of one of the most wide-spread myths of mankind: the youthful hero/heroine is forced to leave his/her home, original environment and is trying to find his/her place in the world. Though Campion focused on one possible aspect of this myth, the search for one’s partner in life, she retained the pattern itself, which is well noticeable from the comparison of the two tables of functions.

*The Golden Bowl* has proved to be a special case. In this novel the mythical pattern emerges much less clearly than in the previous two cases, and this is the very fact that allows quite contradictory interpretations of the work. Here the table of functions I have constructed on the basis of the novel is only *one* of the possible tables, and it has been prepared relying on some prominent critics’ interpretative judgements, as well as on

my own insights. Other readers, interpreters might have come up with a different table, but, notwithstanding this pluralism, the compilation of a table is always possible.

As a much simplified narrative, the Merchant-Ivory film only allows the construction of *one* table, which, however, can always be compared to the ones based on the novel, and I believe that in each case the comparison will yield thought-provoking results.

The very ambiguity of functions in the novel allowed the emergence of some abstract themes discussed at length by prominent critics. Memorably, one of these themes was the ambiguity, the opacity of the Other itself, yet another one was the role of lies, which is obviously very strongly linked to the former issue. The description of functions usually did not reflect the central role of these themes. The reason for that is that the lies themselves, for example, are not character functions here, they are rather the means through which other functions are performed. They would only qualify as functions if they were simply meant to deceive. One of my examples was Maggie assisting Charlotte's face-saving attempts (lies) by lying herself that she believes her. In one case, though, which was the case of reciprocity, the theme's centrality could be inferred from the table.

The introduction of secondary functions, functions that do not change the course of the story, allows even more minute comparisons between text and film, as we could observe in connection with *The Europeans*.

At this point an interesting observation can be made. Certain changes in characters can be considered as secondary functions in some cases, and the very same alteration can be considered as a change in primary functions in other cases.

The example we can use here is that of Lizzie Acton on the one hand and those of Maggie Verver and Charlotte Verver on the other. In connection with both heroines I was writing about the vulgarisation of the characters. In Lizzie's case the change did not allow the presentation of an attractive American female type as opposed to the European aesthete, but she still performed her primary functions, which were to voice the American society's opinion on Eugenia and to distance her from Acton and from Clifford. In Charlotte and Maggie's case, however, the same character change does not allow the presentation of their original primary functions, which in Maggie's case is to impress her

husband by her development, and in Charlotte's case to impress everyone by her sophistication.

The changes in functions have been carried out by the inclusion of added scenes, as well as by adding elements to scenes borrowed from the novels.

In *The Europeans* we mostly meet the first type: the scene, for example, in which Lizzie Acton is trying to persuade her brother to stop thinking about Eugenia, has no equivalent in the novel.

*The Portrait of a Lady* does not add scenes which would significantly change character functions, the added scenes mostly reflect on the characters' state of mind; an example can be the scene in which Mme Merle is travelling to Florence amid very bleak scenery. The parallel between her intentions and the barren, repulsive sight is hard to miss; I have even suggested the use of the term metaphor here. The further added scenes are also very much in line with the functions performed by the characters in the novel. By way of example, the famous scene presenting Isabel Archer's sexually-charged phantasm, which at first sight seems to be "alien from James's spirit", can be regarded as an unfolding of some references to Isabel's puzzlement about male interest in her, and also about having no cues for how to react, let alone how to make a choice among her suitors. In some other scenes the dialogues are almost literal borrowings but the film frames again present something unexpected, something "beneath James's elegance". An example can be when Isabel is sniffing into her boots. I have argued that the presence of these shots in the film can be justified by manifold reasons the most important of which is that these brief intermezzos link Isabel to our own age. They successfully indicate that Isabel is not a time-bound phenomenon; her problems are likely to be eternal. Campion puts great emphasis on this fact, the opening scenes of her film are devoted to presenting contemporary women who are overwhelmed by the same feelings, who are struggling with the same problems as their 19<sup>th</sup>-century predecessor.

*The Golden Bowl* does add scenes to the plot that change character functions, examples can be the two scenes in which Charlotte is begging the Prince to continue their relationship. More interestingly there are several scenes which start out as borrowings but turn out to be function changing scenes: in scene 42 the novel's famous Fawns terrace



scene is acted out quite literally, but Fanny Assingham's added references to fortune hunting do have a significant impact on her character and her functions.

Though the analysis of only three films does not allow the drawing of firm conclusions in this field, I find it probable that the inclusion of the latter added scene type is the sign of Merchant-Ivory's getting less intimidated by their source material. In *The Europeans* they strictly separate the Jamesian and the added elements, in *The Golden Bowl* they already dare to mix them.

The major conclusion we can draw through the examination of functions is that *The Europeans* and *The Portrait of a Lady* strengthen the mythical patterns of the original texts. They stress the *eternal* elements of the base plot, which in the first case is the myth of a youth partly changing an ill-functioning society, partly saving someone from it, whereas in the second case it is a young woman's search for the meaning of life.

The more time-bound elements, for example, the criticism of the aesthetic elements in Eugenia's behaviour, are less in focus, the reason for which is obvious: the issue is of less importance for 20 -21<sup>st</sup> century viewers than it was for James's contemporaries. Another time-specific element, the presentation and criticism of a Puritanical lifestyle, however, did receive emphasis; even added scenes are included to stress the theme. Merchant-Ivory never said that this extra attention was intentional, still one suspects a willingness to appeal to large American audiences behind the step, as those are likely to be pleased by references to their moral firmness and to the roots of their super-power status.

In *The Portrait's* case we have also found that Jane Campion chose to focus on just one aspect of the novel's major theme, on the search for one's finding a partner in life, which can be easily presented by visual means.

In *The Golden Bowl's* case the mythical patterns are less conspicuous; in fact one can say that several myths are mixed in this novel in fragmental forms. Crews and Dorothea Krook identified elements of the Christian myth of salvation in the novel, for them Adam Verver is primarily the omnipotent God-Father figure, while Maggie Verver is the Redeemer who uses the power of love to improve human lives around her. For Armstrong the Ververs are villains who ruthlessly exploit their spouses, while Freedman is discussing an age-bound variation of the latter theme: Maggie, the villain femme fatale

assumes control over the Prince and Charlotte and chases her away. Instead of focusing on one of these myths, or examining their interplay as James did, the filmmakers only belatedly grab another myth into the foreground, according to which Charlotte is a worthy hero who escapes a hostile society. It is probably for this reason that the reviews I have quoted all complained about the actors playing in a “vacuum”, without any context.

From the above it is already apparent that the examination of Proppean-like functions has led to the examination of the underlying mythical patterns in each case. This is hardly a surprise; I only have to refer to Frye again who already stated that the mythical patterns are present in every narrative in more or less displaced forms. Still, the *comparison* of mythical patterns leads to a more systematic approach to the examination of adaptations.

At the beginning of my work I raised the question why the 1980s, 1990s saw an unprecedented surge in demand for Henry James-based screenplays. I have listed several factors that are likely to have contributed to this phenomenon, and one of them was the conspicuousness of mythical patterns in Modernist texts, consequently in pre-Modernist James. The above paragraphs reinforce my assumption that the mythical patterns have actually been *strengthened* in two of the examined films, and the film which failed to decide what pattern(s) to bring into focus proved to be a failure in every sense of the word.

If we examine the tables on the three films’ various scenes, or recall my summaries of the use of cinematic devices, we can also notice significant differences among the three works. In *The Europeans* the cinematography is quite conventional; the frames are mostly carefully composed closed frames. As I have pointed out, the definite step forward represented by this film is the high number of scenes shot on New England locations. I am convinced that no one who saw this work could tolerate the staid studio atmosphere of the earlier BBC James adaptations any more. The timing of the shooting, though not deliberately chosen, also seems to have been most fortunate: the vibrant autumn colours are in line with both the comic and the tragic plot elements, mythoi, in the film. Also contrary to the earlier BBC adaptations, the sight here already plays an important role in establishing a peaceful but at the same time optimistic tone. The earlier

films primarily focused on borrowing as many dialogues from the novel as possible even when trying to establish some kind of an atmosphere.

Jane Campion is primarily known for her original interpretations of the male-female relationship. *The Portrait* is no exception, even today it is unique in the sense that in this film we can follow how the male is fetishised by an inexperienced young female. As I have noted, most films present the reverse process.

Campion's cinematographer, Stuart Dryburgh, is also much more innovative than Merchant-Ivory's Larry Pizer and Tony Pierce-Roberts. I have already mentioned in this conclusion how certain added scenes complement the scenes before them, and serve as visual metaphors. The use of visual synecdoches is also conspicuous in this film: when Isabel is rushing into her husband's room to tell him about Ralph's imminent death, we can only see her feet and train, thus creating a real sense of hurry. This method is of course far from being new, still it is not at all typical in the earlier James adaptations, or in earlier Merchant-Ivory works.

Frame composition is also less traditional than in *The Europeans*, more mobile, open frames are included, for example, a close-up of Isabel where the top of her head is missing. At the same time Dryburgh seems to have enjoyed playing with diagonal compositions, as there are plenty of examples of these kinds of frames in the film. The large number of close-ups and the use of extreme close-ups (for example, presenting Isabel's eyes only) is also something remarkable – it seems that while the earlier BBC adaptations and *The Europeans* primarily relied on midshots, the emphasis here was shifted towards these more intimate shot types. As I have noted this change is in line both with Campion's psychologising nature, and with the theme she chose to focus on: what reactions are evoked in Isabel by the various twists and turns in her life. Hereby I would note once again that the costume design, Isabel's changing wardrobe and hairstyle are also masterfully used to reflect the development of the young woman's character.

Dryburgh also often preferred high or low camera positions instead of the usual midpositions, this way successfully accentuating the vulnerability of the characters that often look like figures in a board game. Another repeatedly applied tool is the use of tilted camera angles, which again was not at all typical in earlier James adaptations. The

first image of Osmond's house is recorded from such an angle, and one is inclined to regard the slanted image as a metaphor of Osmond's unbalanced state of mind.

*The Golden Bowl* demonstrates well how far the Merchant-Ivory team moved from their original quintessential heritage style. Perhaps most striking is the unfolding of the novel's reference to the consummation of the Charlotte-Prince relationship. Although the team did not refrain from the presentation of nude bodies or from references to sexuality in their heritage period, they were certainly avoiding such directness.

Even more importantly, the filmic language, cinematography of *The Golden Bowl* is more complicated than that of *The Europeans*. Instead of the usual midshots and few close-ups the number of the latter shot types has increased in *The Golden Bowl*, indicating the filmmakers' intention to focus on the characters' feelings, reactions, rather than on mere story-telling. Camera-positions also became more varied – both high and low positions appear in the film in addition to the usual midpositions. Lighting has also been found to play a more relevant role than in *The Europeans*: in *The Golden Bowl* it is often used to signal the clandestine character of the Charlotte-Prince relationship. Though *The Golden Bowl* is far from using as complex a filmic language as *The Portrait* (there are no added “visual figures of speech”, synecdoches, metaphors in this film) the intention to become more “filmic”, visual is apparent. It would be difficult to tell to what extent these changes are attributable to Campion's influence, and to what extent to the already mentioned differences in source materials – *The Golden Bowl* as a novel is much less a narrative than the description of a series of reactions from which a vague narrative emerges – but I suspect that *The Portrait of a Lady's* impact is not negligible. *The Portrait of a Lady's* message to filmmakers and audiences is indeed so explicit that the whole film can be interpreted as a manifesto: if you turn a novel into film, no matter how revered a part of the literary canon the text is, the new piece of art is a film, and as such it should primarily rely on sight, on film's major vehicle of information.

All in all I believe that of the three films I have analysed at least two should be regarded as valuable achievements. Chronologically the first one, *The Europeans*, already constitutes part of the heritage movement, is one of its first exemplars demonstrating all its positive characteristics. The major works of the movement, for example, Merchant-

Ivory's *Howards End*, are known to have achieved double success: both with critics and with audiences.

Jane Campion can and should be regarded as a leading figure of the "crossover movement" observable in film-making at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Her 1993 *The Piano*, which is based on an original screenplay penned by herself, attracted both art house and mass audiences. Her *The Portrait of a Lady* adaptation seems to have been influenced by heritage film-making primarily in the choice of the literary base. I regard her work as a successful crossover film which represents a significant forward step in foregrounding sight and cinematography in literary adaptations – a process that already got much emphasis with heritage films.

I have found it important to stress that *The Golden Bowl* is also a post-heritage film despite the fact that it was made by the emblematic team of heritage film production. The willingness to react to heritage film criticism is apparent in this work, especially in the more complex cinematography, in the shift of focus to the depictions of feelings (close-ups and midshots) instead of presenting fullshots in attractive interiors, and also in the inclusion of overt sex scenes. Still, the film fails to integrate into a coherent piece of art, mostly because the effected changes in functions are contradictory in themselves, or run counter to some utterances retained from the novel. The latter phenomenon I regard as a common malaise of literary adaptations.

As we have seen, some representatives of the heritage film and post-heritage film subgenres managed to reach both art house and mass audiences, and thus became crossover films. None of the three films I have analysed achieved this feat. In the case of *The Golden Bowl* I have already outlined the reasons for this when discussing the changes of functions. In the case of *The Portrait of a Lady* I have attributed the failure to the fact that the streamlined functions were still too complex for mass audiences, and – compared to the novel – too simplistic for more select ones. The visual language was also unusually unconventional for the adaptation of a canonical text. As for the third film, *The Europeans* was received favourably wherever it was screened, but it was only introduced at few places with little marketing effort. Had it been released after the success of *A Room with a View* and *Howards End*, distributors certainly would have had greater faith in this work. The film's simple plot, in which screenplay writer Jhabvala successfully

emphasises the “evergreen” element – the fight of a young and pragmatic girl and a more mature and sophisticated woman for dominance and male attention – entertains any viewer. The extra emphasis put on America’s Puritanical past must have had an extraordinary appeal to American and British audiences at the end of the 70s after the Watergate scandal and the unsuccessful Carter presidency, and is still likely to flatter them.

The large-scale success that avoided James in his life has so far avoided the films based on his texts as well. I expect adaptation attempts to continue, though, since, as I have tried to prove, due to the conspicuousness of mythical structures and to the peculiarity of characters, the film versions of James’s texts do have the potential to appeal to mass audiences. As the heritage and post-heritage movements proved the compatibility of box office success and critical acclaim, a feat many had already thought impossible to achieve, film producers and directors are likely to continue experimenting with these two movements’ favourite source materials.

## Works Cited

- Almási, Miklós. *Antiesztétika* [Antiaesthetics]. Budapest: Helikon Kiadó, 2003.
- Anesko, Michael. "The Consciousness on the Cutting Room Floor: Jane Campion's *The Portrait of a Lady*." In *Henry James on Stage and Screen*. Ed. John R. Bradley. Houndmills, New York: Palgrave, 2000. 177-190.
- Armstrong, Paul B. *The Phenomenology of Henry James*. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina Press, 1983.
- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. 1813. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994.
- . *Sense and Sensibility*. 1811. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.
- Arnold, Matthew. *Culture and Anarchy*. 1869. Oxford: OUP, 2006.
- Barthes, Roland. "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives." In *Image, Music, Text*. Transl. by Stephen Heath. London: Fontana Paperbacks, 1990. 79-125.
- Bauer, Dale M. "Content or Costume? James as Cultural Capital." In *Henry James Goes to the Movies*. Ed. Susan M. Griffin. Lexington, KY: The U Press of Kentucky, 2002. 240-254.
- Bazin, André. *What Is Cinema?* 1967. Berkeley: U of California Press, 2005.
- Bentley, Nancy "Conscious Observation: Jane Campion's *The Portrait of a Lady*." In *Henry James Goes to the Movies*. Ed. Susan M. Griffin. Lexington, Kentucky: The U Press of Kentucky, 2002. 127-147.
- Berliner, Todd. *Hollywood Incoherent: Narration in Seventies Cinema*. Austin: U of Texas Press, 2010.
- Bewley, Marius. *The Complex Fate: Hawthorne, Henry James and Some American Writers*. 1952. New York: Gordian Press, 1967.
- Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. 1957. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1973.
- Bordwell, David. *Narration in the Fiction Film*. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
- Bradbury, Nicola. "Filming James". *Essays in Criticism* 29.4 (1979): 293-301.
- Brake, Elisabeth. "Marriage, Influence and Deception in Merchant-Ivory's *The Europeans* and *The Bostonians*." In *Henry James on Stage and Screen*. Ed. John R. Bradley. New York: Palgrave, 2000. 143-157.
- Campion, Jane. *Interviews*. Ed. Virginia Wright Wexman. Jackson, MS: U Press of Mississippi, 1999.
- Chandler, Marilyn R. *Dwelling in the Text: Houses in American Fiction*. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1991. 91-120.
- Clark, Mike. "Bowl: Visually filling but otherwise empty". *USA Today*, 29 May 2001. <<http://www.usatoday.com/life/enter/movies/2001-04-27-golden-bowl-review.htm>>.  
Accessed: 10 Aug. 2011.
- Crews, Frederick C. *The Tragedy of Manners: Moral Drama in the Later Novels of Henry James*. 1957. New Haven, CT: Yale U Press, 1971.
- Crofts, Stephen. "Foreign tunes? Gender and nationality in four countries' reception of *The Piano*." In *Jane Campion's The Piano*. Ed. Harriet Margolis. Cambridge: CUP, 2000. 135-161.
- Deleyto, Celestino. "Focalisation in Film Narrative." *Atlantis* XIII.1-2 (1991): 159-177.
- Edel, Leon. *Henry James: The Conquest of London*. Philadelphia, NY: Lippincott, 1962.

- Eisenstein, Sergey. "Dickens, Griffith and the Film Today". In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Ed. Gerald Mast, Marshall Cohen, Leo Bradbury. Oxford: OUP, 1992. 395-403.
- . "The Cinematographic Image and the Ideogram". In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Ed. Gerald Mast, Marshall Cohen, Leo Bradbury. Oxford: OUP, 1992. 127-38.
- Eliot, George. *Daniel Deronda*. 1876. Oxford: OUP, 2009.
- Engels, Frederick. *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science: Anti-Dühring*. 1894. London: Forgotten Books, 2013.
- Forster, E.M. *A Room with a View*. 1908. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2006.
- . *Howards End*. 1910. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000.
- . *Maurice*. 1971. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2005.
- Freedman, Jonathan. *Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture*. Stanford: Stanford U Press, 1990.
- . "What Maggie Knew: Game Theory, *The Golden Bowl*, and the Possibilities of Aesthetic Knowledge." *The Cambridge Quarterly* 37.1 (2008): 98-113.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. 1957. Princeton: Princeton U Press, 1973.
- Genette, Gerard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Transl. by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell U Press, 1983.
- . *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Transl. by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, NY: Cornell U Press, 1988.
- Guthmann, Edward. "The Golden Bowl". *The San Francisco Chronicle*, 18 May 2001. <<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=c/a/2001/05/18/DD208659.DTL>>. Accessed: 10 Aug. 2011.
- Habegger, Alfred. *Henry James and the "Woman Business"*. 1989. Cambridge: CUP, 2004.
- Hale, Dorothy J. *Social Formalism: The Novel in Theory from Henry James to the Present*. Stanford: Stanford U Press, 1998.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The House of the Seven Gables*. 1851. New York: Pocket Books, 1958.
- . *The Marble Faun*. 1860. Oxford: OUP, 2002.
- . *The Scarlet Letter*. 1850. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *Philosophy of Mind*. 1830. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Higson, Andrew. *Waving the Flag: Constructing a National Cinema in Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- . "Re-representing the Past. Nostalgia and Pastiche in the Heritage Film." In *British Cinema and Thatcherism: Fires were started*. Ed. Lester Friedman. London: U College London Press, 1993. 109-29.
- Hill, John. *British Cinema in the 1980's*. New York: OUP, 1999.
- Hipsky, Martin A. "Anglophil(m)ia: Why Does America Watch Merchant-Ivory Movies?" *Journal of Popular Film & Television* 22.3 (1994): 98-107.
- Holden, Stephen. "All the sensibility that money can buy." *The New York Times* 27 Apr. 2001. <<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/04/27/arts/27BOWL.html>>. Accessed: 10 Aug. 2011.
- Horne, Philip. "'It Works Diagonally': A Conversation with Ruth Prawer Jhabvala on the *Golden Bowl* and the Art of Adaptation." Merchant Ivory Productions: The



- Golden Bowl. <<http://www.merchantivory.com/goldenbowl/ruth.html>>. Accessed 15 Jan. 2010.
- . "Varieties of Cinematic Experience." In *Henry James on Stage and Screen*. Ed. John R. Bradley. Houndmills, New York: Palgrave, 2000. 35-56.
- Ivory, James. "Director's Comments: *The Europeans*." Merchant Ivory Productions: Filmography. <[www.merchantivory.com/europeans.html](http://www.merchantivory.com/europeans.html)>. Accessed: 10 Sept. 2010.
- James, Henry. *Daisy Miller*. 1878. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2007.
- . "Four Meetings." 1877. In *Selected Tales*. Ed. John Lyon. London: Penguin, 2001. 1-25.
- . *Selected Letters*. 1974. Ed. Leon Edel. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U Press, 1987.
- . *The American*. 1877. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995.
- . "The Art of Fiction." 1884. In *Selected Literary Criticism*. Ed. Morris Saphira. Cambridge: CUP, 2011. 49-68.
- . *The Bostonians*. 1886. OUP, 1998.
- . *The Europeans*. 1878. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
- . *The Golden Bowl*. 1904. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
- . *The Portrait of a Lady*. 1881. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997.
- . *The Princess Casamassima*. 1886. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2006.
- . *The Sacred Fount*. 1901. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995.
- . *Washington Square*. 1881. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995.
- James, William. "The World of Pure Experience." In *Essays in Radical Empiricism*. New York, London, Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co, 1912. 39-92.
- . *The Correspondence of William James. Vol. 1.: William and Henry 1861-1884*. Ed. Ignas Skrupskelis and Elizabeth Berkeley. Charlottesville: U of Virginia Press, 1994.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *Mandala Symbolism*. Princeton: Princeton U Press, 1972.
- Koch, J. Sarah. "A Henry James Filmography." In *Henry James Goes to the Movies*. Ed. Susan M. Griffin. Lexington KY: The UP of Kentucky, 2002. 335-59.
- Kovács, András Bálint. *A modern film irányzatai: az európai művészfilm [Types of the Modern Art Film: The European Art Film]*. Budapest: Palatinus Könyvesház, 2005.
- Krook, Dorothea. *The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James*. Cambridge: CUP, 1963.
- Leavis, F.R. *The Great Tradition*. 1948. London: Faber&Faber, 2008.
- Levin, Amy K. *The Suppressed Sister. A Relationship in Novels by Nineteenth-and Twentieth-Century British Women*. Lewisburg: Bucknell U Press, 1992.
- Lodge, David. "In the Home of Eternal Unrest." *The Times Literary Supplement* 10 Nov. 2000: 20-21.
- Long, Robert Emmet. *Henry James: The Early Novels*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- . *James Ivory in Conversation*. Berkeley: U of California Press, 2005.
- Maslin, Janet. "Not Too Literally." *The New York Times*, 27 Dec. 1996. <<http://www.nytimes.com/1996/12/27/movies/henry-james-not-too-literally.html>>. Accessed: 10 Jun. 2012.
- Maslow, A.H. "A Theory of Human Motivation." *Psychological Review* 50.4 (1943): 370-96.
- Matthiessen, Francis O. *Henry James: The Major Phase*. Oxford: OUP, 1946.

- McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- McGrath, F. C. *The Sensible Spirit: Walter Pater and the Modernist Paradigm*. Tampa: U of South Florida Press, 1986.
- Meisel, Perry. *The Myth of the Modern: A Study in British Literature and Criticism after 1850*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1987.
- Metz, Christian. *Film Language: A Semiotics of Cinema*. Transl. by Michael Taylor. New York: OUP, 1974.
- Mitchell, Lee Clark. "Based on The Novel by Henry James." In *Henry James Goes to the Movies*. Ed. Susan M. Griffin. Lexington KY: The U Press of Kentucky, 2001. 297-301.
- Monaco, James. *How to Read a Film*. Oxford: OUP, 1981.
- Monk, Claire. *Heritage Film Audiences: Period Films and Contemporary Audiences in the UK*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U Press, 2011.
- . "Heritage Film Audiences 2.0: Period Film Audiences and Online Fan Cultures." *Participations* 8.2 (2011): 431-477.
- . "Sexuality and the Heritage." *Sight and Sound* 5.10 (1995): 32-34.
- . "The British Heritage-film Debate Revisited." In *British Historical Cinema: The History, Heritage and Costume Film*. Ed. Claire Monk and Amy Sargeant. London: Routledge, 2002. 176-98.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Ed. Gerald Mast, Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. Oxford: OUP, 1992. 746-57.
- Orr, John. *Cinema and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.
- Ozick, Cynthia. "What Only Words, Not a Film, Can Portray." *The New York Times* 5 Jan. 1997: 22.
- Pater, Walter. H. "Coleridge." 1865. In *The Works of Walter Pater*. Cambridge: CUP, 2011. 65-105.
- . *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry*. 1873. Oxford: OUP, 1998.
- Propp, Vladimir. *The Morphology of the Folktale*. 1927. Transl. by Laurence Scott. Austin: U of Texas Press, 1968.
- Putt, S. Gorley. *The Fiction of Henry James*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- Robertson, Roland. *Globalisation: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage Publication, 1992.
- Sarbu, Aladár. "The Lure of Lacedaemeon: A Note on Pater and Modernism." In *Publicationes Universitatis Miskolcensis. Sectio Philosophica*. 15.2 (2010): 71-85.
- Smith, Dinitia. "Hollywood Trains Its Lights on a Master of Shadow." *The New York Times* 30 Oct. 1998: 20.
- Stam, Robert. "Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation." In *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. Ed. Robert Stam and Alessandra Malden Raengo. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 1-52.
- Strawson, Peter. "Determinism and our Attitudes to Others." In *Western Philosophy*. Ed. John Cottingham. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1996. 234-41.
- Takács, Ferenc. "Egy hölgy arcképe." [The Portrait of a Lady.] *Filmvilág* 41.11 (1998): 58.

- The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton NJ: Princeton U Press, 1993.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenina*. 1877. Transl. by R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky. New York: Penguin, 2004.
- . *War and Peace*. 1869. Transl. by R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky. New York: Vintage Books, 2008.
- Troost, Linda V. "The Nineteenth Century Novel on Film: Jane Austen". In *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. D. Cartmell and I. Whelehan. Cambridge: CUP, 2007. 75-90.
- Vajdovich, Györgyi. *A filmes adaptáció: az irodalmi művek filmre adaptálásának elméleti és gyakorlati kérdései*. [The Film Adaptation: The Theoretical and Practical Questions Related to Adapting Literary Works for Film.] Diss. Eötvös Loránd U, 2005.
- Wagner, Geoffrey: *The Novel and the Cinema*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1975.
- Weisbuch, Robert. "Henry James and the Idea of Evil" in *The Cambridge Companion to Henry James*. Ed. Jonathan Freedman. Cambridge: CUP, 1998. 102-120.

## Filmography

- A Room with a View*. Dir. James Ivory. Screenplay: Ruth Prawer Jhabvala. Perf.: Helena Bonham Carter, Daniel Day-Lewis, Judy Dench, 1985.
- Bridget Jones's Diary*. Dir. Sharon Maguire. Screenplay: Andrew Davies, Richard Curtis. Perf.: Renée Zellweger, Colin Firth, Hugh Grant, 2001.
- Carrington*. Dir. Christopher Hampton. Screenplay: Christopher Hampton. Perf.: Emma Thompson, Jonathan Price, 1995.
- Chariots of Fire*. Dir. Hugh Hudson. Screenplay: Colin Welland. Perf.: Ben Cross, Ian Charleson, 1981.
- Daisy Miller*. Dir. Peter Bogdanovich. Screenplay: Frederic Raphael. Perf.: Cybill Shepherd, Barry Brown, 1974.
- Dangerous Liaisons*. Dir. Stephen Frears. Screenplay: Christopher Hampton. Perf.: John Malkovich, Glenn Close, Michelle Pfeiffer, 1988.
- Emma*. Dir. Douglas McGrath. Screenplay: Douglas McGrath. Perf.: Gwyneth Paltrow, Jeremy Northam, 1996.
- Fanny and Alexander*. Dir. Ingmar Bergman. Screenplay: Ingmar Bergman. Perf.: Pernilla Allwin, Bertil Guve, 1982.
- Howards End*. Dir. James Ivory. Screenplay: Ruth Prawer Jhabvala. Perf.: Helena Bonham-Carter, Anthony Hopkins, Emma Thompson, 1982.
- Jefferson in Paris*. Dir. James Ivory. Screenplay: Ruth Prawer Jhabvala. Perf.: Nick Nolte, Greta Scacchi, Gwyneth Paltrow, 1995.
- Lady in the Lake*. Dir. Robert Montgomery. Screenplay: Steve Fisher. Perf.: Robert Montgomery, Audrey Totter, 1947.
- Love*. Dir. John Gilbert, Edmund Goulding. Screenplay: Lorna Moon, Frances Marion. Perf.: John Gilbert, Greta Garbo, 1927.

*Maurice*. Dir. James Ivory. Screenplay: Kit-Hesketh-Harvey. Perf.: Hugh Grant, James Wilby, Rupert Graves, 1987.

*Mary Reilly*. Dir. Stephen Frears. Screenplay: Cristopher Hampton. Perf.: Julia Roberts, John Malkovich, 1996.

*Much Ado about Nothing*. Dir. Kenneth Branagh. Screenplay: Kenneth Branagh. Perf.: Kate Beckinsale, Kenneth Branagh, Emma Thompson, Keanu Reeves, 1993.

*Orlando*. Dir. Sally Potter. Screenplay: Sally Potter. Perf.: Tilsa Swinton, Billy Zane, 1992.

*Pride and Prejudice*. Dir. Simon Langton. Screenplay: Andrew Davies. Perf.: Jennifer Ehle, Colin Firth. BBC TV miniseries, 1995.

*Pride and Prejudice*. Dir. Joe Wright. Screenplay: Debora Moggach. Perf.: Keira Knightley, Matthew Macfadyen, Rosamund Pike, Judy Dench, 2005.

*Pulp Fiction*. Dir. Quentin Tarantino. Screenplay: Quentin Tarantino. Perf.: Uma Thurman, Harvey Keitel, John Travolta, Tim Roth, 1994.

*Rambo: First Blood*. Dir. Ted Kotcheff. Perf.: Sylvester Stallone, 1982.

*Rich Man, Poor Man*. Dir. Bill Bixby, David Greene, Boris Sagal. Screenplay: Dean Riesner. Perf.: Nick Nolte, Peter Strauss, Susan Blakely. ABC TV miniseries, 1976.

*The Age of Innocence*. Director: Martin Scorsese. Screenplay: Jay Cocks. Perf.: Daniel Day-Lewis, Michelle Pfeiffer, Winona Ryder, 1993.

*The American*. Dir. Paul Unwin. Screenplay: Michael Hastings. Perf.: Matthew Modine, Diana Rigg, Aisling O' Sullivan. WGBH/BBC TV film, aired in 2001.

*The Bostonians*. Dir. James Ivory. Screenplay: Ruth Prawer Jhabvala. Perf.: Christopher Reeve, Vanessa Redgrave, Madeleine Potter, 1984.

*The Europeans*. Dir. James Ivory. Screenplay: Ruth Prawer Jhabvala. Perf.: Lee Remick, Robin Ellis, Lisa Eichhorn, 1979.

*The Golden Bowl*. Dir. James Ivory. Screenplay: Ruth Prawer Jhabvala. Perf.: Uma Thurman, Jeremy Northam, Kate Beckinsale, Nick Nolte, Anjelica Huston, 2000.

*The Golden Bowl*. Dir. James Cellan Jones. Screenplay: Jack Pulman. Perf.: Barry Morse, Jill Townsend, Daniel Massey, Gayle Hunnicutt. BBC TV miniseries, 1972.

*The Heiress*. Dir. William Wyler. Screenplay: Ruth & Augustus Goetz. Perf.: Olivia de Havilland, Montgomery Clift, 1949.

*The Piano*. Dir. Jane Campion. Screenplay: Jane Campion. Perf.: Holly Hunter, Harvey Keitel, Sam Neill, 1993.

*The Portrait of a Lady*. Dir. Jane Campion. Screenplay: Laura Jones. Perf.: Nicole Kidman, John Malkovich, 1996.

*The Portrait of a Lady*. Dir. James Cellan Jones. Screenplay: Jack Pulman. Perf.: Suzanne Neve, Richard Chamberlain, Edward Fox, 1967.

*The Wings of the Dove*. Dir. Ian Softley. Screenplay: Hossein Amini. Perf.: Helena Bonham-Carter, Linus Roache, Alison Elliott, 1997.

*The Witches*. Dir. Nicolas Roeg. Screenplay: Allan Scott. Perf.: Jasen Fisher, Anjelica Huston, Rowan Atkinson, 1990.

*Titanic*. Dir. James Cameron. Screenplay: James Cameron. Perf.: Leonardo DiCaprio, Kate Winslet, 1997.

*Tom Jones*. Dir. Tony Richardson. Screenplay: John Osborne. Perf.: Albert Finney, Susannah York, 1963.

*Vertigo*. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock. Screenplay: Alec Coppel and Samuel Taylor. Perf.: Kim Novak, James Stewart, 1958.

*War and Peace*. Dir. King Vidor. Screenplay: Bridget Boland, King Vidor, Robert Westerby. Perf.: Audrey Hepburn, Henry Fonda, Mel Ferrer, 1956.

*Washington Square*. Dir. Agnieszka Holland. Screenplay: Carol Doyle. Perf.: Jennifer Jason Leigh, Albert Finney, Ben Chaplin, 1997.