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Chapter One:
Introduction

In his foreword to Harold Pinter's The French Lieutenant's Woman: A Screenplay, John Fowles comments on the relationship between novels and films, calling them "two ways of telling stories" that are "much nearer sisters than anything else." He goes on to say that "a good director is always partly a novelist, and vice versa...":

...the shared need to narrate, to create new worlds of character and atmosphere, to play the godgame, brings us incomparably closer than any other pairs of artists in different arts. It is the techniques that are so different, not the final aims; and if I have to justify...the selling of rights, one reason certainly lies in my fascination with that difference of technique. Discovering its exact nature can be a very instructive experience for novelists, even when--perhaps, most of all when--the screened result disappoints.¹

Discovering the "exact nature" in the "difference of technique" employed by novelists and film directors is also an instructive experience for students of literature, and
particularly for those interested in the nature of narrative literature, because the novel and the film can be viewed as two forms of one art—the art of narrative literature.² For Fowles, the notion that disappointing screen results can be instructive is important; two of his novels, The Collector and The Magus, were made into films that he did not like. Only the third, The French Lieutenant's Woman, inspired a film that he is happy about. The present study is aimed at exploring the different techniques used by novelists and film directors to tell ostensibly the same stories, and also at evaluating to what extent the resulting films embody the novels' original narratives.

By placing the emphasis of this study of the novels and films on the element of narrative, I am isolating only one element of a novel (or of a film), but it is an element of central importance, and one that is affected by—even propelled by—all the other important elements in novels and films, such as character, point of view, language, imagery, and symbolism. In Fowles's case, it is particularly appropriate to focus on narrative because he is a novelist consumed with questions relating to the ways of telling stories.

In undertaking a comparative study of novels and film adaptations, one makes the assumption that the two forms of narrative art are closely enough related to make such a
project worthwhile. The reason students of literature and students of film can both benefit from comparative studies of the two media is that both forms do rely on, as Fowles puts it, "the shared need...to create new worlds of character and atmosphere." And, although novelists and filmmakers employ different techniques, one can argue that these techniques involve very similar principles. For example, one must tell a story from some point of view, or points of view; one must characterize one's human element by means of language, gestures, appearances, images, symbols, and behavior; and one must convey a setting for the human action. Certainly the novelist uses the written word and the filmmaker uses the visual image and soundtrack, but the processes of conception involved are closely linked.

The key point in any comparative study is not that one narrative varies from another, because that is inevitable given the different forms of telling involved. The important thing is that one must assume that both a good novel and a good film can be made about the same subject. Very often, in order for a good film adaptation to be made, different content must be admitted to (or original content excluded from) the narrative in its new form. By comparing novels with the films based on them, one can evaluate the ways in which the filmmakers attempt to treat the same subject. (One can first ask if in fact the filmmakers have treated the same subject.) And then one can evaluate how
successful the new narrative treatment of this subject is in
terms of its own medium. By examining the ways open to both
novels and films to convey narrative, and by evaluating the
filmmakers' decisions, one can achieve a greater
understanding of and appreciation for the methods of telling
stories in general.

Fowles has resisted the label "novelist," as evidenced
by his explanation of the reason for his publication of The
Aristos:

To call a man a plumber is to describe one
aspect of him, but it is also to obscure a number
of others. I am a writer; I want no more specific
prison than that I express myself in printed
words. So a prime personal reason for this book
was to announce that I did not intend to walk into
the cage labelled "novelist." 3

Despite this desire to be viewed as "a writer" rather than
as a novelist, Fowles finds his public identity inextricably
wrapped up in novels: The Collector (1963), The Magus (1965,
Martin (1977), and Mantissa (1982). But, in addition to The
Aristos (1964, rev. 1968), his Poems (1973), and his
collection of short stories (The Ebony Tower, 1974), Fowles
has also established himself as a writer of essays, usually
in conjunction with photographs. His non-fiction books are
Shipwreck, Islands, The Tree, and The Enigma of Stonehenge.
All this comes from a writer who began his career teaching English, usually to non-English speaking students outside England, and later in London, where he also began to teach literature.

Although Fowles's first three novels have been made into films, one can hardly imagine adaptations of the later novels. Daniel Martin is a lengthy künstlerroman which concerns filmmaking, but its primary concerns are "Englishness" and self-consciousness, while Mantissa is a mixture of fantasy and essay that would appear unlikely to attract the interest of a commercial filmmaker. Yet Fowles was told that The French Lieutenant's Woman was unfilmable. In any case, three of the novels have been made into films, with varying degrees of popular and critical success, and this fact is in itself testimony to Fowles's ability to create a compelling narrative.

Of the three films, The Magus is clearly the least successful, by any measure. (Woody Allen is reported to have said that if he were reincarnated he would avoid seeing The Magus. The Collector and The French Lieutenant's Woman fared much better, the first attracting William Wyler from his initial agreement to direct The Sound of Music, and the latter finally drawing playwright Harold Pinter to do the screenplay and Karel Reisz to direct.

Subsequent to becoming a best-selling novel, The Collector was adapted for film with Terrence Stamp and
Samantha Eggar in the roles of Clegg and Miranda. After opening in New York in June 1965, the film was taken to Cannes, where it accomplished the unprecedented feat of winning awards for both best actor and best actress. The Magus was published in the same year as the film version of The Collector, but it was not released as a film until three years later, in 1968. In an odd coincidence, the first Fowlesian male lead, Clegg, was played by an actor who had starred in the stage version of Alfie, while the second male lead, Nicholas Urfe of The Magus, was played by the actor who was the star of the screen version of Alfie, Michael Caine. Caine was joined in the film by Anthony Quinn, as Conchis, and Candice Bergen, as Lily/Julie. Guy Green, the former director of photography of such films as Great Expectations (1946) and Oliver Twist (1948), was the director of The Magus, but his efforts in this case earned him only condemnation for failing to deliver on his "early promise" and instead sliding into films characterized by sentimentality and, especially in the case of The Magus, "overblown pretense." Fowles himself wrote the screenplay, for which he was both praised and reviled. The French Lieutenant's Woman, after a decade of neglect (partly because of Fowles's understandable apprehension following the film version of The Magus), was at last made into a very successful film starring Meryl Streep in the title role and Jeremy Irons as Charles Smithson.
There are tremendous differences in the way novels and films are produced and in the way they are encountered. One cannot deny the complexity of any effort that is made to compare the processes of reading a novel and watching a film, the former taking place in the privacy of one's own home and over whatever period of time one likes, the latter available most frequently in a large, public setting, and lasting no more than a few hours. Any comparison of a novel and the resulting film adaptation can easily become mired in an almost endless process of cataloguing detailed differences and in arguing over fine interpretive points. This study will analyze representative segments of the novel-film pairs and ask a series of practical questions about the narratives.

Any two-hour film made from a 250-page novel, in the case of The Collector—or from a 600-page novel or a 350-page novel, as in the cases of The Magus and The French Lieutenant's Woman, respectively—must necessarily eliminate portions of the original narrative strictly because of the lack of time necessary to tell the whole story. Furthermore, most films require additional cuts and alterations because of scheduling, casting, technical, or budgetary constraints. And finally, most films introduce changes—even additions—simply because the filmmaker's artistic vision or the form itself leads to such activity.
Questions which must be raised in studying the practical aspects of narrative in novel-film pairs include the following: is the film's narrative essentially the same as the novel's? Are the differences the result of cutting out material, or altering material, or adding material? Does the machinery of moviemaking have, in effect, a mind of its own that inevitably causes substantial alterations in the original narrative?

Beyond these basic questions, there are further areas of inquiry which fall within the realm of the present study. These questions involve the specific characteristics of the fiction of John Fowles and the nature of the novel-film relationship. Do films, for example, tell us anything about the novels they are based on? Do these three films tell us anything about Fowles's particular preoccupations, or about his style? Do the films share any familial traits because of their common origins? Are there filmic equivalents for the descriptive passages so important to Fowles's fiction? And, the question that all these other questions leads up to in the case of the study at hand, do the films ultimately tell us anything significant about the works of literature on which they are based?

The assumption governing the chapters that follow is that a novel shares with a play the status of a set text which can be endlessly interpreted. Just as a play can be produced in any number of different ways to yield what seem
to be "different" plays, so can a novel be made into any number of different films. To be sure, in the case of novels and films it is relatively rare that a book spawns two or more film adaptations, but it does happen, as in the case of *Great Expectations* and *The Great Gatsby*, and the film industry is still very young.¹⁰

It should be clear by now that what is being undertaken here is not, in strict terms, a study of film. If one were to examine the three films under consideration purely as films there would be no need—in fact, no justification—to bring in questions about the novels. Most theorists would approach these films from quite different perspectives, and in few of these approaches would Fowles's novels have a significant part to play.

By studying the films from the point of view of narrative, and largely of a comparison of the narratives of the films with those of the novels, this study does not address questions of film theory, but it does not ignore questions of systematic methodology. As J. Dudley Andrew has warned in *The Major Film Theories*, film theories may have flaws but at least they offer methods which "avoid the dangers of impressionistic connoisseurship which haunt the unsystematic critic."¹¹ In the present case, given that it is impractical to embark upon a comprehensive investigation of every detail of the novel-film pairs, one must establish a basis for comparing the two different forms of narrative,
and quite clearly that must be a selective method of some sort. It is necessary to identify an approach that will permit a useful comparison of the novel and the film without demanding consideration of either work in its totality.

The first step in narrowing the scope must be taken by eliminating from consideration any of the novel's manuscripts and any screenplays or shooting scripts. These "drafts" of the narratives would be interesting and sometimes illuminating to consider, but in the present context it is necessary to limit the discussion to the narratives in their final forms—as published novels and released films. Harold Pinter's fascinating screenplay for The French Lieutenant's Woman, would also reward study; Pinter has in effect synopsized the main action of the novel and interspersed it with entirely new action set in the present century and involving a completely new set of characters, the actors in the film company that is making the film, The French Lieutenant's Woman.  

The next step in narrowing the focus of the present study is even more difficult, and that involves the necessity to select specific portions of the two works in order to apply the comparative method. This problem is complicated by the obvious fact that the novel and the film are not exactly—and, in some instances, not even remotely—parallel. In the case of The Collector, it can be argued that Wyler made a film that is primarily an
adaptation of the first half of the novel. The Fowles-Green version of *The Magus* is a cross between a synopsis of the action and a reworking of it, especially in relation to the characters Lily/Julie and Rose/June, the second of which is eliminated in the film. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, as noted above, is strikingly altered, perhaps to the extent that the novel's main action is reduced to a subplot, depending on one's interpretation of the film. In any case, the third of Fowles's novels to be made into a film is the one with the most obvious alterations, and the complications of selecting representative portions of the narrative are multiplied because of this. But even in the cases of *The Collector* and *The Magus*, as we shall see in Chapters Two and Three, the films introduce so many alterations in the narrative that selecting representative sections of the novel-film pairs becomes difficult.

By eliminating sections of each novel which are absolutely unrepresented in the film adaptation, and sections of the film which are completely new conceptions without basis in the novel, we can choose from the sections remaining which are clearly, if sometimes convolutedly, related to one another. (Throughout the study that follows, these portions or sections will be referred to as sequences.) Each novel-film pair, then, will be examined by means of representative sequences of action through which we can sample the works as wholes, and then compare them to
one another. Because of the ease with which we can refer to a book, moving forward and backward through its pages at will, we will begin each chapter with a presentation of the action of the film as it happens, then compare it with the action of the novel.

Ultimately, the selection of the sequences to be compared in this study must be based on rather arbitrary decisions united by the single criterion of shared narrative elements. But, by considering all these decisions in combination, one can arrive at an interesting mix of sequences; various narrative methods, types of action and setting, and structural components (even simple categories such as beginning, middle, and end) can be assembled. Such a blend of characteristics helps to insure that this study will embrace the important questions pertaining to all areas of the study of the narratives of film-novel pairs.

The sequence of scenes to be discussed in The Collector can be most easily defined by the dates in Miranda's diary: we will look at the entries for November 12 through 30 (pp.196-222), which correspond to Clegg's narrative on pp. 74-101. In the film this action comes toward the second half, but it stops well short of the final scenes in which we see Miranda's death and Clegg's bereavement. In the case of The Magus, in which the film version ignores the action set in England, we will begin by considering the first meeting between Nicholas and Conchis, a meeting that occurs
toward the beginning of the film. In the novel, this meeting takes place at pp. 63-87 (Chapters 10-14). For the second sequence of *The Magus*, we will examine "the trial," which comes almost at the end of the film but well before the end of the novel (pp. 438-480, Chapters 60-62).

Finally, for *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, we will analyze the planned meetings between Charles and Sarah (pp. 11-164, Chapters 18-24) and the two endings (pp. 343-366, Chapters 60-61). In the film these sequences fall, respectively, roughly in the middle and right at the end.

In each case—in the chapter devoted to each novel-film pair—some general information will preface the discussion of the specific similarities and differences between the two works. The order of the discussion will follow the order of the publication of the novels (which is also the order of the release of the films). In the concluding chapter of this study (Chapter Five), the questions raised in the present chapter will be re-addressed, and the overall issue of narrative in the novel and in the film will be amplified. Throughout the discussion, the primary question must be whether or not the novel and film tell the same story in different ways, or whether they tell different stories altogether.
Notes


8 Barry N. Olshen and Toni A. Olshen, John Fowles: A Reference Guide (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1980). Despite the many negative reviews of The Magus, most comments regarding Fowles's screenplay seem to be positive—except for Green's (see p. 29).

9 Recent changes in the way films are viewed—mainly because of tremendous expansion in cable television, pay television and home video systems—are changing this stereotype, but most of us continue to see films in theaters, at least for the first viewing. The trend toward serials on the Public Broadcasting System and other, commercial networks may also contribute substantially to a change in the way we view films—and in the nature of the films we will be viewing. Television productions such as The Golden Bowl, Brideshead Revisited and even Shogun and The Winds of War are examples of what may well be an important form of film in the very near future. Interestingly enough, these are all adaptations of novels.)

10 The Great Gatsby has been made into a film three different times (1926, 1949 and 1974), Great Expectations has inspired six films, and Oliver Twist has been made into a film thirteen times. (See Beja, p. 146, regarding the latter two.)

12 The really fascinating aspect of the Pinter work is that it is substantially altered in the course of Reisz's filming. One could do a detailed comparative study of the changes in the narrative from the Pinter version to the final film.

13 The terminology used in the following chapters will for the most part seem natural, but perhaps a word on the subject is in order here. When referring to the novels, terms like language, imagery, symbolism, and action will of course be brought into the discussion. In the case of the films, terms like "shot," "line," "gesture," and "cut" will be added to the foregoing literary terms (meaning, respectively, any given bit of action uninterrupted by changes in camera position, speech of a given character, physical attitude or act, and abrupt transition from one shot to another, without a dissolve--an abrupt switch, in other words).

14 The unusual, double narrative structure of *The Collector* means that there are two sections of the book for any given scene shot by Wyler, assuming Clegg and Miranda both report the action in question. I have purposely selected action which both narrators report.
Chapter Two:
The Collector

Fowles's first novel takes the form of two characters' autobiographies, with a first section narrated by one character and a second narrated by another character. The first and second sections split the novel almost in half, with brief third and fourth sections also told by the narrator of section one, Frederick Clegg, in the manner of epilogues. As the epigraph to the novel indicates—"Que fors aux ne le sot riens nee" ("So that no living being knew it except them")—the narrative involves a secret drama. The second character, Miranda, writes her half of the story in the form of a prison diary that her captor, Clegg, discovers only after her death. Clegg's framing narration, then, is presented in the spirit of an apologia, given his unexpected discovery of her side of the story. Clegg expects both written records of the events to be discovered only after his death, in "forty or fifty years."

When William Wyler undertook the film, The Collector, he was faced with an obvious limitation at the start: the eye of the camera, single and other as it is, renders it virtually impossible to tell a story from two separate and
distinct points of view. By its nature the camera and the subsequent editing process supply literally hundreds of different points of view which seem to add up to a single, complex perspective from which a film's action is narrated.³

One immediately apparent and fundamental difference between the Fowles novel and the Wyler film is that the latter seems to show us only half the story. The film's action is almost without exception that narrated by Clegg in his first section; Miranda's diary is for the most part ignored. This sets up a situation which can be roughly summarized as follows: the shared plot of the film and Clegg's main narrative section is something like, "Boy sees girl, boy gets rich, boy gets girl, boy keeps girl captive until she dies"; the plot of Miranda's narrative is more along the lines of, "Girl goes to art school, girl meets older man, girl is kidnapped, girl reflects on her relationship with older man, girl dies after many failed escape attempts."

Wyler does, however, make some effort to convey both Miranda's and Clegg's points of view in the film, as evidenced by his occasional shots from Miranda's point of view (usually of Clegg about to descend the steps with his head cut off, and sometimes with his face in the dark). But most of the film is clearly shown from Clegg's point of view, emphasized by the fact that Clegg's voice-overs frame the action. Furthermore, the camera frequently follows
Clegg into the house, or into town, while it never shows Miranda alone in her cellar unless Clegg has just left or is about to arrive.

By examining the part of the film's action that shows Miranda's "Freedom Day" arriving and passing, we can get to the core of the dramatic situation—a young woman's involuntary relationship with a madman. The novel's corresponding sections are of course split into two basic parts, Clegg's side of the story and Miranda's side of the story. One can argue that the narrative, in both cases, has multiple climaxes, two obvious ones being the fight following Clegg's announcement that Miranda will not be freed, and the seduction scene and its ensuing violence. Through an exploration of the supposed day of departure and Miranda's subsequent attempt at seducing Clegg, we can probe the essential elements of the relationship between the two characters as they are differently portrayed in novel and film.

In the case of the film, our discussion will begin with Clegg in the kitchen on June 11 and end with his destruction of Miranda's self-portrait after the aborted seduction. Our discussion of the novel begins with Clegg's account of the events leading up to and including "the last day" and ending with his version of the events of the seduction (74-101). In Miranda's diary, our discussion will span the entries from November 12th through the 30th (pp. 196-222). Both
versions have already given us scenes from four weeks of Miranda's captivity. What we will face again and again is the reality that we are looking at not one narrative, not even two narratives, but three distinctly different narratives (Clegg's, Miranda's, and Wyler's)—three separate, if related stories involving recognizably similar characters.

Generally speaking, we are repeatedly given evidence in the novel that Clegg is, at root, evil while Miranda is innocent—too much so. Fowles emphasizes this aspect of the novel in his preface to *The Aristos*, but he qualifies this good-evil dichotomy in an important way:

...society has persistently seen life in terms of a struggle between the Few and the Many, between 'Them' and 'Us'. My purpose in *The Collector* was to attempt to analyse, through a parable, some of the results of this confrontation.6

Fowles goes on to point out that the evil in Clegg is the result of inadequate environmental factors "over which he had no control." He calls Miranda "arrogant," "a prig," and "a liberal-humanist snob." In a summation of the plot, and of the two characters' relationship, Fowles states simply, "The actual evil in Clegg overcame the potential good in Miranda."

Clegg is upset with himself in the novel for not having "a plan" when the day of the scheduled departure arrives.
This admission—both of the lack of a plan and of his being upset with himself—serves to limit the reader's condemnation of Clegg. He seems human because of these shortcomings; he is not simply a machine for wrong-doing. But the film, characteristically, goes further; Clegg seems more calculating, more efficient, and less human as he goes about his business—for example, when he carries the tray to Miranda on her so-called last day, the tray which includes a meal and her book, over which he will proceed to pick a nasty fight with her. Clegg in the film is spoiling for a fight; by this time he is always looking for an excuse to denounce Miranda.

In addition, we learn from watching Clegg take the box out of the dresser drawer that he has already purchased the expensive dress that he will give Miranda to wear to dinner in the house that evening (when he will propose), while the novel's Clegg spontaneously shops for clothes, and winds up buying jewelry as well. (He buys a necklace and a ring, and with the latter he hits upon his plan to ask her to marry him which gives him an "out" if she refuses, an excuse to break his promise to free her.)

The Clegg of the film, as we shall see in detail below, is a simple kind of monster whose Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde behavior is clearly shown. But the Clegg of the novel is a character in whom good and evil exist simultaneously—though evil clearly maintains the upper hand—and in whom there is
a substantial capacity for subtle rationalization among other recognizably human traits. With the version of Clegg that Wyler gives us, we are never fully allowed to believe in his basic humanity. He is an evil force who appears to be driven by something he does not understand, and he never seems to be able to question that something, much less fight its power over him.

If Clegg is more monster than man in the film, it is also true that Miranda is transformed from the bright, talented, budding artist-intellectual of the novel into something approaching a mere innocent schoolgirl. She has a manner in the film that almost suggests Dorothy in *The Wizard of Oz*, a sentimental and awestruck wonder that is no doubt enhanced—or made worse—by the star-filter techniques that Wyler uses which soften many of the close-ups of her. The Miranda of the film appears unfailingly feminine, very inexperienced and often too fragile, although her fragility does serve to underline the butterfly image.

At this point, it is interesting to note that although I will argue for a Miranda in the film who has been severely diluted in character and a Clegg who has become more of a monster, Samantha Eggar and Terrence Stamp are nearly the same size in simple physical terms. On the screen, Clegg and Miranda seem to be the same height, and whenever he picks her up it looks like quite a job. In the novel, by contrast, Clegg remarks that "she wasn't strong, smaller
even than I'd thought" (26). And Miranda notes in her diary that Clegg is like "a lanky gawky giraffe" (115). She goes on to estimate his size and compare herself to him:

He's six feet. Eight or nine inches more than me. Skinny, so he looks taller than he is. Gangly. Hands too big, a nasty fleshy white and pink. Not a man's hands. Adam's apple too big, wrists too big, chin much too big, underlip bitten in, edges of nostrils red.... His whole face is too long....(115)

This does not come close to Terrence Stamp's Clegg, with his irrepressible good looks overcoming even the most awkward instances of his exceedingly well-acted stiffness and gracelessness. Finally, Miranda in the novel is a blonde, not a redhead like Samantha Eggar. But this last point is a minor one, to be sure, because the hair in both cases is equally stunning, equally attention-getting--sufficient to make Clegg's interest in Miranda's hair understandable.

It is no doubt important to note that Wyler seems to have made an effort to overcome whatever discrepancies his casting of Stamp and Eggar introduced by costuming Stamp so that, as Clegg, he seems larger than he really is in relation to Eggar. Clegg's ever-present dark suit--missing only after the second chloroform scene when Miranda awakens to find him at her bedside in a sweater--is fitted so that the arms and legs are too short, and it buttons very tightly
in front. This creates somewhat of an illusion that Clegg is "gangly" or "gawky," but overall even these measures cannot hide the fact that Stamp himself is well-proportioned and not really awkward.

Shortly before Miranda's Freedom Day arrives, Clegg discovers a note she has hidden in the letter to her mother which he has finally agreed to send (but which he dictates to her). The resulting argument leads to Clegg's asking about "that book you asked me to buy for you"—The Catcher in the Rye—and to Miranda's excitement at the prospect that Clegg will read the Salinger novel, presumably because his reading it might lead to a better understanding between them. The book plays an important part in the events leading up to the climatic scenes in which it becomes clear that Clegg has no intention of releasing Miranda, that their struggle is one of life and death.

In our first view of June 11 we see the always formally-dressed Clegg (in his blue suit) preparing the tray of food that he will deliver to Miranda. He moves from the stove to the counter by the door, where he picks up the copy of The Catcher in the Rye and places it on the tray, looking at it momentarily before he opens the door to go. Judging by what information we are given, he has read the book and is now preparing to return it. Wyler leaves the camera in position while Clegg moves from the stove to the door, but when Clegg opens the door Wyler pans and zooms to call our
attention directly to the wall calendar on which Clegg has kept track of the days, crossing them off until the X's lead right up to a circled date—June 11. In a device that must be a deliberate foreshadowing of events soon to follow, the illustration on the calendar shows a man sitting in an armchair before a fire with a woman standing behind him, her arms draped around his shoulders. The very type of domestic bliss, this tableau ironically embodies Clegg's dream of life with Miranda and simultaneously caricatures the two violent, perverted scenes that will take place before Clegg's own hearth as Miranda tries to enjoy her farewell dinner and, on an unspecified later date, attempts to seduce Clegg in a vain effort to earn her freedom by whatever means she can find.

Clegg arrives at the landing to look down upon Miranda eagerly arranging the clothes he had provided for her. "I put all the clothes back," she says, in the manner of a conscientious guest preparing to leave. Then she hurries to put on her coat, telling Clegg that he can have all the "pictures" hanging around the cellar, sketches she has made over the past month. "You know today's the last day," she says hesitantly, seeing Clegg for the first time with the tray of food. Here Clegg informs her that she has until "twelve o'clock tonight." He then puts the tray down. Disappointed, but with her hope undimmed, she takes off her
coat, sits, and prepares to eat; then he announces, "I read your book."

The oddness in his manner alerts Miranda to the impending danger. Clegg goes on to say that he does not like the book, and he does not believe the main character—"that boy," as he refers to Holden Caulfield—has the right to do and say what he does. In this way, the film approaches the key scene relating to Clegg's and Miranda's conflicting ideas regarding art. In this sequence, Wyler preserves Fowles's insistence on the relevance of art; it is because of the argument regarding the meaning and value of art that Clegg and Miranda are driven further apart. Miranda is, in both film and novel, placed in a highly compromised position because she is reluctant to say anything that will upset Clegg on this her Freedom Day. But that slim hope of hers is cruelly destroyed by Clegg's relentless attack. "Don't patronize me!" he shouts at Miranda after she responds to his questions and criticisms with the diplomatic sally, "It's an interesting point of view."

This scene is one of the few exceptions in the film that involve material drawn exclusively from Miranda's narrative. The dialogue is recorded—or recreated—by Miranda in her "October 21st" entry, and it is Miranda who suggests that Clegg should read the novel; he does not bring it up. Clegg takes two weeks to read the book in the Fowles
version, as indicated by the conversation Miranda records on November 7. But the novel's treatment of this literary allusion (a direct parallel, in fact, between Holden and Frederick; "You're a Holden Caulfield," Miranda tells him in the novel) is much more complex than the film's treatment. In the novel, *The Catcher in the Rye* reference is mixed in with additional references to Sinbad's "Old Man of the Sea" and Shakespeare's Caliban (the name Miranda uses for Clegg routinely).

Miranda in Fowles's novel is direct and combative in relation to Clegg's uneducated, highly prejudiced comments, but Wyler's Miranda—especially on her Freedom Day—is far less ready to deal directly with Clegg. When Clegg accuses her of comparing him with Holden Caulfield, she denies it. In the novel she comes right out and equates him with Salinger's character, but in the film she equivocates awkwardly in a futile attempt to prevent Clegg from becoming upset and possibly reneging on his agreement to free her on June 11—or ever: [first Miranda]

"He [Holden Caulfield] behaves that way because he doesn't fit anywhere."

"I don't wonder, the way he carries on, he didn't try to fit."

"You don't understand..."

"No."
"I mean, you're not trying to see how much like...like all of us he is."
"Like me, that's what you meant, isn't it?"
"No."
"I don't fit anywhere either."
"No, I didn't mean that."
"Then I'm too ignorant to understand...?"
"I didn't say that either."
"No, but that's what you meant."
"You're twisting my words."
"Am I?"9

It is Wyler who manages to twist Fowles's words in this scene, but in such a way as to preserve Fowles's intent on the whole. This curious development has its roots in Fowles's stated intention (as quoted above) of trying to show that Clegg is evil but not necessarily at fault, while Miranda is innocent but not completely in the right. Wyler so manipulates the dialogue regarding The Catcher in the Rye (and the subsequent conversation about the Picasso painting on the cover of the art book) that we are left in a position of reluctantly admitting Clegg's persuasiveness and greater honesty in this scene. Miranda, because she is in the hopeless predicament of being at a madman's mercy with no satisfactory way out, resorts to little lies to cover up her disagreement with Clegg and preserve the tiny possibility
that he will in fact honor his month-old commitment to let her go.

Wyler's creation of the Picasso part of the action is far more a creation out of whole cloth than the Salinger action. In the novel, Picasso is mentioned only once, and that is a passing reference by Miranda which has no real importance ("I thought of Piero standing in front of a Jackson Pollack, no, even a Picasso or a Matisse"—p. 123). But Wyler invokes Picasso as the prototype of modern art when he has Clegg hold the cover of the book toward Miranda and thump on it threateningly with his index finger: "That's a good painting, isn't it?" Miranda by this time is on the verge of tears; the threat of losing her promised freedom grows with each word Clegg speaks.

"Yes [says Miranda], yes, it's a Picasso."

"People don't look like that."

"Well, of course they don't. He's not trying to draw a face as it is. He's trying to express a face as he sees it and feels it."

"Because he sees it that way, that makes it good?"

"It's not a photograph."

"What's wrong with photographs?"

"There's nothing wrong with photographs."

"Photographs don't lie!"
"Neither does this. It's a face from all different angles. It's a character behind the face."

"It's just a joke. That's all it is. It's just a bad joke."

"Just because you can't grasp it right away...."

"Well how do I grasp it?"

At this point Clegg, in a gesture that is the perfect objective correlative of his literal-mindness, proceeds to grasp the book in both hands as if trying to break it in two. But, because it is a stout, hard-cover book, Clegg can only stand there struggling with it until he finally utters his manifesto on modern art (or contemporary art—the book is entitled, The Contemporary Artist):

"I'll tell you something about this, it doesn't mean anything—not just to me, to anybody else. You just say it does, because some professor somewhere told you it did. It makes you so superior. You and all your friends! I don't think one in a million decent, ordinary people would say this was any good. It's rubbish! Rubbish! That's all it is! And the book, too. It's filthy!"
Clegg lumps Picasso and Salinger together in a large category of contemporary art that he finds threatening and immoral, and in this respect the film's Clegg is surely related to the novel's puritanical Aunt Annie. The novel's Clegg is clearly a puritanical character, too, but his puritanism is that curious brand that is attracted to pornography and voyeurism while the film's character is not so clearly of that ilk, though he does show signs of strong tendencies toward sadism and necrophilia.

The bitter argument over the novel and the painting ends with Miranda virtually on her knees at the door, begging Clegg not to leave, saying to herself, "What have I done!" and, "Oh let me be free!" This echoes a previous exit Clegg makes after the scene in which he discovers her hidden note. In the former case, Clegg leaves with an arrogant announcement pointing out how little Miranda had figured out (about who he is and where the house is located); then he tears the letter and offending note to pieces and scatters them down the steps. In the present scene, Clegg is in effect saying the same thing to Miranda—that she is no nearer escape than she ever was—and her hopes are symbolically shredded once again as she looks up toward the disappearing Clegg. His last words are, "I was right to bring you here—we could never be friends outside."
This is another departure from the action of the novel, which reserves Clegg's revelation about Miranda's future for later in the evening of her Freedom Day, after he has proposed to her and she has reacted negatively (before hurrying to reverse herself and say that she will marry him). Viewers of the film, then, have to contend with the further complication of the build-up in suspense occasioned by Clegg's apparent indication that he will never release Miranda, followed immediately by his giving Miranda a dress that he has stored in a dresser drawer in his bedroom. The novel provides us with Clegg's thought process leading up to the events that allow him to go back on his word:

It's funny how one idea leads to another.
While I was buying the necklace I saw some rings and that gave me the plan I could ask her to marry me and if she said no then it would mean I had to keep her. It would be a way out. I knew she wouldn't say yes. So I bought a ring. It was quite nice; but not very expensive. Just for show. (76)

Here we see Clegg's lack of refinement show up in the unwieldy construction of the second sentence, while his devious thinking runs through everything he writes. At least the novel's Clegg is somewhat humanized by the portrayal of his complex rationalization. In the film, the complexity is missing, but the lack of refinement is brought
out when Wyler has Clegg lapse into a lower-class British dialect every time he becomes upset.

The novel's Miranda, then, is faced with the proverbial no-win situation; she is damned if she says no to Clegg's imminent proposal, and of course if she says yes she will have to live with him. Perhaps she could manage a "yes" that would buy her a greater degree of freedom, but in both the novel and the film Miranda's scruples are too well-developed for her to perceive that possible advantage in time to use it; she is too busy being scandalized by the very idea that Clegg could wish to marry someone who does not love him. But the Miranda of the novel, though ultimately faced with the same no-win prospect, is not aware of it as early as the film's character is, and that creates a different effect on the reader-audience.

As we have seen above, Wyler's version has Miranda staggering from the threat that she will be denied her long-awaited freedom even before she goes up to the house for dinner. In the novel, on the contrary, Miranda has no advance warning. Her diary entry for "November 12th"—"the last night but one"—is a lengthy analysis of her relationship with G.P. which culminates in her first realization that she might after all be able to consider marrying him:

Two years ago I couldn't have dreamed of falling in love with an older man....I don't feel that
anymore. I think I need a man older than myself....(201)

The following day Miranda discovers that she will not see G.P. as soon as she had hoped--if she ever sees him at all. Her next diary entry is not until November 18; it begins, "I have eaten nothing for five days" (202).

In Wyler's version, Clegg's gift of the dress rekindles hope in Miranda that he might relent and let her go that day after all. When he arrives to escort her up to dinner, she acts eager and childlike, spinning around for him so that he can see the dress on her. Once in the living room (with a fire blazing in a friendly manner in the background), Clegg and Miranda begin to discuss whether he will take her all the way home or drop her off at a train station. Her hope is very much in the ascendant. "I do want you to come to London," she says, in all sincerity, it seems, almost imploring him to believe her. But then she discovers the ring in her napkin, and Clegg blurts out, "Marry me!"

Wyler's Miranda, almost exactly like the character in the novel, protests that she could not "marry a man that she didn't belong to, in every way." (In the novel, Clegg reports that she says, "Because I can't marry a man to whom I don't feel I belong in all ways"--p.81.) Both novel and film present a deteriorating situation that climaxes when Clegg feels compelled to resort to the chloroform in order to subdue Miranda; after that, again in both cases, Clegg
takes the opportunity to exploit the body of the unconscious woman, but in the novel it is by taking photographs of her in the cellar, while in the film Wyler has him carry her to his own bedroom, where he embraces her intensely while she lies motionless (looking exactly like a prepared corpse laid out for open-casket viewing).

Time and again, the novel presents a Clegg who collects photographs of a certain kind as well as butterflies, who engages in voyeuristic acts through photography, and who commits symbolic rape by means of the camera lens. But Wyler eliminates photography from among the central concerns of the film. Only in the argument over the Picasso and in a subtle visual allusion (when we see a camera on his dresser as he bends to take out the box containing the dress) is the subject of photography brought into the film. Wyler's treatment of the motif of photography, then, is vestigial at best. There is no real basis for even the two references he gives us, except for the fact that it is of such great importance in the novel.

The film's seduction scene is presented immediately after the Freedom Day dinner fiasco, and it could well be taking place on the following day. Miranda emerges from the upstairs bathroom and asks to remain in the house awhile. Clegg, now without a tie and with his suitcoat uncharacteristically open, agrees; later he obliges her when she requests something to drink. After downing two quick
glasses of sherry, Miranda takes off her nightgown and begins to make advances to the silent Clegg, who stands motionless with his head hanging as if he were a condemned man.

In the novel Miranda attempts the seduction of Clegg more than two weeks after her Freedom Day has passed. It is a clearcut strategy on her part, developed over time and aimed at establishing once and for all the answer to the question of whether he would release her after having had sexual relations with her. She fully realizes the potential consequences of this sort of approach—or she thinks she does: "Even a baby. **His** baby. Anything. For freedom" (218). When the time comes, and Clegg does not follow through on what seems to be an initial interest, Miranda questions him and—as we learn in Clegg's narrative—Clegg invents a story about an army psychiatrist. Miranda responds with a highly intellectualized speech on the importance of viewing sex in the proper perspective:

"...sex is just an activity, like anything else. It's not dirty, it's just two people playing with each other's bodies" (97).

So, while the Miranda in Wyler's version appears daring (because she is desperate), Fowles's Miranda is calculating and persuasive. And Fowles's Clegg, unlike Wyler's silent, pained sexual sufferer, is highly verbal and—as always—a pathological liar. One further point of interest regarding
this difference between the Fowles narrative and the Wyler one is that Wyler's Miranda has our sympathy because of what seems to be both a bold and sensitive move, while Fowles seems to distance himself from his Miranda, especially in light of his statements about sex in *The Aristos* and *The Magus* in which he seems to come down against the idea of sex for mere pleasure's sake. Miranda, then, is both careful and self-deceived in the Fowles version, but in the Wyler film she is neither--she is simply the continuing victim of an impossible situation in which a monster has her at his mercy.

Miranda's attempt to involve Clegg with her in an overt sexual way is apparently quite successful at first in Wyler's version. Clegg seems to become involved in passionate kissing as he lies more or less on top of the naked Miranda--but then something happens, and we cannot be absolutely certain what it is. From Clegg's reaction--he stiffens suddenly, partly raising himself above Miranda, then freezing with a pained expression on his face--we might guess that he has either suffered premature ejaculation or a sudden attack of fear (or puritan conscience). Whatever the source of his breaking off the sexual activity that he so reluctantly enters into, the result is that he is humiliated, and Miranda is confused and frightened.

In a violent act that sets the film on its inevitable course toward tragedy, Clegg tears Miranda's self-portrait
from its frame on the mantel, crushes it, then thrusts it savagely into the flames. As Miranda watches this a look of horror appears on her face. Moments later, at the door, she will say, "I'm never getting out of here alive, am I?"

The symbolic power of the destruction of Miranda's self-portrait is undeniable. In effect, Clegg's incineration of the drawing is the symbolic act that crystallizes his literal action; in Miranda's mind he not only manhandles her body, but he systematically destroys her self-image through his ruthless imprisonment and reduction of her to nothing but his image of her. We see that Clegg's image of Miranda is devoid of intellect and feeling; it is mere surface, and it is as effective for him when she is unconscious (although Miranda does not know about the bedroom scene, we do) as when she is alert and active. In fact, Clegg prefers his butterflies and his captive to merely look good and stay in place. All this begins to come home to Miranda as she waits for Clegg to unlock the door.

Once he has unlocked the door, of course, Clegg and Miranda are confronted with the pouring rain. The image is a cold and dark one, and Miranda's glance at the shovel standing near the door to the cellar is enough to stimulate a plan in her mind that might free her once and for all. She drops her bath paraphernalia, grabs the shovel, smashes Clegg in the head as he bends to pick up her fallen things, and then panics when she sees his face covered with blood.
In the end, of course, her failed attempt to kill (or at least disable) her captor results in her own death. Her realization that Clegg is incapable of caring about her and quite capable of killing her (slowly and indirectly) is still not powerful enough to give her the strength to kill. Wyler's Miranda seems to lack the courage of her knowledge and commitment at the crucial moment—and that is her death sentence.

In effect, Wyler's Miranda fades from the film with her failure to hit Clegg a second time when she has the chance. After that she is no match for Clegg's strength and desperate determination as he struggles to recapture her, then throws her down two different small flights of stairs and clammers into his van for the dramatic drive to the hospital, where he collapses out of the driver's side door onto the pavement at the feet of the emergency-room personnel. His three-day absence is enough to insure that Miranda—deprived of heat by the spectacular upset of her space heater as she struggles to reach Clegg—will literally "catch her death" from the soaking, the chill, and the fact that her hands are tightly bound.

In the novel, Miranda's demise is far less passive. For one thing, we get her own account of why she attempts the seduction, why she fails to follow through with her assault on Clegg, and how she becomes sick and is neglected by her captor. Miranda uses an axe, too, not a mere shovel,
and although she strikes Clegg with the blunt end she does strike him twice. In the novel her nerve does not fail her completely, but she delays long enough to permit Clegg to protect himself, and he is less grievously injured than in the film.

But even more significant than the fact that Miranda's attack is more effective and yet less understandable in the film is Wyler's reordering of the scenes. Instead of what Wyler gives us—first the seduction, then the attack by Miranda—Fowles's narrative shows us Miranda attacking Clegg, and, only after mayhem has failed, then attempting to seduce him. And Fowles's Miranda has well-conceived and clearly stated principles regarding her actions. She tells Clegg and her diary that she will kill him, and then she tries to do just that (pp. 85, 204). Then, after second-guessing herself and accusing herself of having gone against her principles regarding non-violence (205), Miranda formulates the plan that will lead her to once again abandon her principles—but at least it is conscious and seemingly well-thought-out—and invite Clegg to have some degree of intimate sexual relations with her. This change in the order effected by Wyler is curious: where Fowles seems to give us a character who will permit her body to be violated only as a last resort (after determining that she cannot escape), Wyler gives us a character who resorts to possible murder only after having submitted to the potential
violation of her own body and found that ineffective in gaining her release.

But this comparison is further complicated by Wyler's alteration of the after-dinner struggle between Clegg and Miranda. Fowles has Miranda kick a burning log onto the carpet; then Clegg administers the chloroform as she scratches and claws at him. But in Wyler's version Miranda gets into Clegg's collection room and eventually attacks him with one of the pins he uses to mount butterflies. This act is an intermediate step leading toward Miranda's more serious assault on Clegg later. By comparison, Fowles's Miranda is more cunning and less violent in her struggle. By kicking a burning log onto the carpet she could have created a serious diversion that might either have preoccupied Clegg to the point that she could escape or, alternatively, created such a scene (with smoke coming from the house if the fire had spread) so as to call the neighbors' attention to the house and lead to an investigation by the local safety forces.

Wyler has not fully ignored this clever side of Miranda's character. Earlier in the film, in fact, he manufactures a scene that has no basis at all in the novel. In this action, Miranda takes a bath—her first—and, while she is in the tub, a neighbor calls on Clegg. Clegg ties her to the exposed pipes, forestalls the neighbor's insistent attempts to stay and chat, then has to handle the
crisis posed by the water flowing down the staircase (and the neighbor's curiosity about it). Miranda has turned the spigot on with her toes, and Clegg has to run up to the bathroom, right the situation, then explain it away (by saying he has a shy girlfriend who could not cope with a broken handle). But the effect of the scene on our conception of Miranda's character is a lasting one; she is resourceful, quick-thinking, always aware of her plight and eager to escape.

But that is much earlier in the film's action, however, and by the end we have seen Miranda become increasingly more demoralized and incapable of effective action. The captivity and the continual presence of Clegg seem to have taken their toll on her by depressing her and making her more dependent on her captor. In the scenes in which Wyler shows us Clegg and Miranda out-of-doors, we sometimes have the sense that Miranda could escape--somehow--if she would only try harder, exercise more vigilance in watching for opportunities, and exhibit more determination in executing the escape attempt when the opportunity presents itself. Clegg's ever-present tray of food becomes symbolic in this respect; he seems to have her so conditioned by his habits and his "care" of her that she is somehow tamed. In the assault scene, then, she is like a pet who bites but cannot mortally wound its owner.
Fowles's Miranda has more reason than Wyler's to be unable to harm her oppressor. Taking the Freedom Day dinner as an example, we can see the variety of ways in which Miranda is driven to share common experiences with Clegg, not all of them by any means unpleasant. In addition to accepting (if temporarily) his jewelry and eating with him (cold chicken and champagne), Miranda plays records on "the gramophone," teaches him "to jive and samba," plays charades with him, and even offers to kiss him (on the cheek). This is of course after she has already dressed up in the special clothes he has purchased for her that day, done her hair "up high...very elegant," as Clegg observes ("Empire, she called it"), and "drawn black lines round [her eyes] so she looked sophisticated." And she drinks sherry and champagne with Clegg and makes jokes with him, even laughing at his.

From Miranda's diary we learn that she regrets all this after it becomes apparent that Clegg had no intention of letting her go. "I prostituted myself to Caliban," she admits to herself in the November 19 segment (204). In the same entry she has already anticipated what will happen in the future (though Clegg never admits it to us): "One day soon he's going to wake up and say to himself--I hate her." She also begins to question his nature, especially regarding her lack of knowledge of anything Clegg has done to her when she is unconscious: "...I even find it frightening that he didn't do anything. What is he?"
But Miranda is too vulnerable to be able to sustain her
determined mood for long. As a demoralized prisoner she
cannot be effective in any program of action, and soon we
see her turning away from this hardened position and
reformulating her earlier principles. By November 22 she is
writing, "Violence and force are wrong" (209). This follows
her aborted attack on Clegg with the axe. She feels now
that she has "given up too soon with Caliban."

The new stage in their relationship, now that it is
clear Clegg will not ever release her, has as one of its
ramifications the feature that Miranda spends a vastly
increased amount of time alone. First this is because of
her new vow to limit their relationship "strictly" to that
of "a prisoner and a warder" (205), but later on it is
simply because interaction remains awkward even despite
Miranda's change of heart. She begins to "think" more, and
this is either the result of a change in her character or
the symptom of a change in the making. "I've been lying for
hours in the dark and thinking," she notes (209); "I spend
hours lying on the bed thinking about how to escape" (213);
and, "I'm thinking hours between each sentence I write"
(216). The best that all these hours of thinking can
produce is a pair of strikingly similar decisions; she is
willing to have sexual relations with two men she would
never have let kiss her not long before—Clegg and G.P.
"I'd let him have me," she now says of G.P. (218). Her
final words of the last entry prior to the seduction of Clegg show how much she is trying to convince herself of the advantages of letting these two very different and yet oddly similar men have her: "I've always tried to happen to life; but it's time I let life happen to me" (220).

Wyler has neither the time nor the mechanism to convey all the reversals in Miranda's labored thought process, or to trace the wild swings in her crisis-ridden emotions. But, very much to his credit, Wyler elicits from Eggar a performance that hints at an intensity below the surface of her often too-girlish manner. In the scenes in which Wyler shows Miranda engaged in physical battles with Clegg there is an undeniable atmosphere of the life-and-death sense that the reader of the Fowles novel associates with Miranda. Time and again she expresses her fear of death and her desire to live. Repeatedly she vows that she will survive. Wyler suggests this effectively through the physical struggles, but he does not have a means of showing us Miranda's thinking, and for some reason--probably the practical concern regarding running time--he rarely chooses to show us Miranda alone. We almost always see her in Clegg's company, and therefore we come to think of her as utterly dependent on him, and merely reacting to him.

The reader of the novel who studies the film must finally admire the later work for its all-around artistry. The direction is excellent, as are the camera-work and the
performances by Eggar and Stamp. But the reader of the novel cannot escape an awareness that the Clegg and Miranda of the film are different characters from those in the novel. It is as if Wyler has consciously adapted the novel's narrative in a free way by making important alterations in the characterizations of Clegg and Miranda while retaining the main features of the situation and action. Part of the odd effect of examining these two works side by side stems from the extremely striking, dramatic relation between the two characters; that distinct captor-captive relationship dominates both film and novel to such a great extent that the two works seem on the surface to be much closer in nature than they really are.

Simply stated, one leaves the film version of The Collector with the conviction that Clegg is an incurable monster. After all, in the film we witness him stalking his next victim, while in the novel we are left hanging with the statement that "it is still just an idea." Fowles concludes the novel with, "I only put the stove down there today because the room needs drying out anyway." But Wyler takes us—riding behind Clegg in the van—almost to the moment of the next capture before the film goes to black. Fowles leaves us with the rationalizing psychopath, but Wyler shows us the monster about to strike again.
NOTES

1 I am indebted to Professor Hans Keller for this translation.

2 It seems clear that we are meant to assume the action of the novel takes place in the present; the book was published in 1963, so we can further assume that "the present" is the early 1960's.

3 This limitation is more a function of Wyler's style of filmmaking rather than an absolute rule. Alan Resnais, as evidenced by *Hiroshima Mon Amour*, would not have had such a problem.

4 In the novel, the violent scene—in which Miranda attacks Clegg with an axe—is unrelated to the seduction scene. This makes three climaxes in the novel, then, and each one of them is related twice, for a total of six narrated climactic scenes. Such a structure obviously does violence to the notion of a narrative's "climax," a point that illustrates how complex a novel *The Collector* is despite its apparent simplicity.

5 The novel's main action takes place in the spring, while the corresponding action in the film is set in the fall. I can find no reason for this change, and I can only
guess that the switch in seasons stemmed from a practical motive regarding the filmmaker's schedule. Because so much of the action takes place indoors, the time of year is not terribly important. However, in very broadly symbolic terms, the springtime action of the film sets up a dark irony, given Clegg's tendency to prefer the dead over the living.


7 Miranda's excitement in response to Clegg's announcement that he will send a letter to her mother is one such example. Once Miranda has written the letter—really just a short note, dictated to her by Clegg—we see Miranda in a Dorothy-like posture once again, this time gulping and squinting with apprehension as Clegg runs his fingers over the envelope containing the note of her own that she smuggled in when he was not looking.

8 This could well be Wyler's echoing of Clegg's comment in the novel that, when he fastened the necklace for Miranda, "It was like one of those adverts come to life" (p.79). Both the film's calendar image and the novel's allusion to advertising images of romantic couples suggest Clegg's inability to achieve a "normal" life, or at least the impossibility of his ever approaching an "ideal" relationship with a woman.

9 Quotations from the film are my own transcriptions from the soundtrack.
Clegg lies down with the unconscious Miranda in his own bed, and he embraces her passionately. Later, after she has died, he caresses her hair, also in a manner that suggests the sort of sexual passion usually reserved for the living.

Fowles's doctrine is that sex has potency and meaning only if it is shrouded in mystery, and he repeatedly argues that sex which is as casual as, for example, having a drink with someone destroys the potential for meaning.
The Magus is a novel that seems to have become to
Fowles what Miranda is to Clegg—an obsession, and an object
from which it is impossible to turn away. Fowles seems to
have been unable to leave the novel alone from the time he
started it in the early 1950's to well after its original
publication in 1965. His continued dissatisfaction with the
published novel led him to take the unusual step of revising
it. In the Foreword to the new version, published in 1977,
Fowles explains his reasons for returning to The Magus:

...The Magus remained essentially where a tyro
taught himself to write novels—beneath its
narrative, a notebook of an exploration, often
erring and misconceived, into an unknown land.
Even in its final published form it was a more
haphazard and naively instinctive work than the
more intellectual reader can easily imagine.¹

This revision process is especially interesting because, in
between the two published versions of the novel, Fowles
wrote a screenplay for the film adaptation that was released
in 1968. But, though the level of interest in the revised
version must understandably be high, any reader of both
versions of the novel must ultimately conclude that the narrative of *The Magus* remains substantially unchanged from the first version to the second. What becomes significant is the point that, while he was writing the screenplay, Fowles was in the process of rethinking the narrative. The resulting film narrative, clearly a substantial departure from either version of the novel, arguably owes its differences from the original to the author's preoccupation with questioning the proper form of the narrative. In any case, the present discussion will focus on the changes in the narrative from the original novel to the film version, and it will assume that the revised version presents narrative changes that are, for our purpose, negligible.2

The novel, *The Magus*, is a large, ambitious narrative, hostile to convenient labels. It is among other things, a *bildungsroman*, a fantasy, and a detective story. It is charged with suspense, but it is also saturated with history, philosophy, psychology, social comment, and allusions to works of art. One might summarize the action as follows:

A twenty-five-year-old aspiring poet, Nicholas, begins an affair with a young woman. But Alison, an Australian who has applied for a stewardess job, is different from other girls Nicholas has known, both because she is so extraordinarily promiscuous and because she
compells Nicholas to be more honest with himself. He flees Alison and England for the mysteries of a Greek island, Phraxos, where he hopes to write poetry when he is not teaching at the Lord Byron School. Alerted to the potential mystery ("the waiting room") that awaits him on the island even before leaving England, Nicholas endures eight months of unrelenting boredom and sometimes suicidal despair before he finally encounters Conchis, the eccentric, half-Greek, half-English millionaire. Conchis invites Nicholas to spend the weekend at his remote villa. Nicholas is invited often, and each time he returns he plunges deeper into the masque that Conchis orchestrates, until finally Nicholas is hopelessly embroiled in a love affair with one of a pair of beautiful twins. A fling with Alison on the mainland leads to her apparent suicide, but Nicholas's adventures in the masque transcend his grief—and ultimately result in a bizarre kidnapping and trial. Then Conchis and his entire entourage disappear, leaving Nicholas to follow a series of clues back to England, where he must continue to wait and seek until the trail leads back to Alison, who, as Nicholas discovers after the trial, is alive and well, and part of the masque by now. Nicholas's
complicated pursuit of Alison culminates in a final, enigmatic confrontation with her. Although the novel is complex enough to lend itself to dozens of different, equally legitimate synopses of the same length, the one above is adequate for the purpose of comparing the novel's action with that of the film, which can be summarized as follows:

A world-weary English schoolteacher and erstwhile poet arrives on a Greek island. Preoccupied with memories of a recent affair with Ann, a French stewardess, Nicholas discovers Conchis, a mysterious Greek millionaire who lives in an isolated villa. At the villa, Nicholas is stunned to see a glass paperweight identical to the one Ann sent him. The mystery of Conchis and his bizarre theatrics begins to obsess Nicholas—especially Lily, a young woman who stays at the villa in some unknown capacity. A weekend on the mainland with Ann leads to her apparent suicide. Just as Nicholas seems on the verge of succeeding sexually with Lily, he is taken captive, drugged, and subjected to some sort of dream experience, apparently induced by Conchis. He is revived and released, only to spot Ann, pursue her to the now-abandoned villa, and find
only an ancient statue and the paperweight. The film ends as Nicholas smiles.

The film's action, too, could be summarized differently, but the variations would be less extreme because the narrative is briefer than that of the novel. The two-hour film has its share of enigmas, reverses, and suspense, but it cannot compare in complexity with the ten-to-twenty hour reading experience of the 600-page novel, which continually strips Nicholas (and the reader) of all the cumulative understanding, and reconstitutes itself again and again as a wholly new narrative with seemingly new characters and new concerns.

Beyond the general differences between novels and film adaptations—lesser degree of complexity, shorter time span, altered characters, altered action—there are dozens of specific alterations in the film version of *The Magus*, each with its own particular significance and distinguishable effect on the overall narrative. Many of these alterations will be addressed in some detail during the analyses of two representative sequences of the narrative below, but a brief survey of the whole catalogue of changes in the narrative will provide a useful orientation.

The major differences between the two narratives, novel and film, begin with the characters, both in terms of additions and omissions, and in the related effects of the film's casting of actresses and actors for the roles created
in the screenplay. Most notably, the novel's Australian Alison becomes the film's French Ann, and the novel's English twin sisters, Lily and Rose (also known as Julie and June), become the single American woman, Lily/Julie, played by Candice Bergen. Nicholas, played by Michael Caine, and Conchis, played by Anthony Quinn, remain substantially alike in the novel and the film.

The tantalizing convolutions that characterize relationships between the novel's and the film's characters seem to suggest a sort of game that Fowles played as he wrote the script. Using the name, Ann, for the Alison character, for example, seems to be rooted in the minor character called Ann in the novel—Ann, the best friend of Alison. The Anton of the novel (the proverbial "good German" with whom Conchis became friends) is either missing or so minor in the film as to be virtually unidentifiable, but there is another character in the film called Anton, (whose chief role is as Lily/Julie's lover in the film Nicholas is forced to watch), and he has no basis at all in the novel, and no relationship to the Nazi Anton—except for their mutual Germanic background. Soula appears in both novel and film, but the Soula of the film is a young doctor (or an actress masquerading as such), while the original Soula is a former housekeeper at the Conchis villa.

Several characters disappear entirely in the film version: Mitford, Leverrier, Hermes, Barba Dimitraki,
Geogiou, de Deukans, Captain Montague, the Norwegian family, Kemp, Jojo, and Lily de Seitas, to name only the most important of the missing persons. Joe almost completely disappears, but he is partly reconstituted in the film's Andreas, principally in the aspects of his supposed muteness and in his role as watchdog. Mitford and Leverrier, too, are to a certain extent present; the film's unseen Williamson, a predecessor (or supposed predecessor) of Nicholas at the school, has committed suicide after becoming too involved with Conchis.

The character Robert Foulkes is missing from the film version, but then the historically authentic Foulkes is present in the novel only through the medium of the masque; one of Conchis's many employees acts out the part of Foulkes. Missing characters and missing action are intertwined in this way, and there are many instances in which alterations in the narrative omit or distort both action and character: the severe compression of the stories Conchis tells about his experiences in both World Wars, Nicholas's syphilis scare, his visits to the village and the cottages on the island, the truncated version of the trip to the mainland, and the completely transformed party scene at which he first meets Alison.  

Changes in action and character are further intertwined with important changes in physical objects, or props. The most significant change in the novel's narrative is embodied
by the glass paperweight that appears in the film—a completely new creation by Fowles. The film offers this paperweight (a lily enclosed in glass) as the central image of the narrative. The paperweight first appears in a flashback showing Nicholas's and Ann's relationship. He finds the paperweight in her purse while searching for cigarettes, and she reacts oddly. He presses her, and she confesses that she always carries it with her, as sort of a good luck charm--but more. With Nicholas's help, Ann expresses her feeling that the paperweight represents "the core" ("What does an apple have?" she asks) of everything.

The paperweight assumes primary importance in the film's narrative when, after receiving Ann's in the mail at the school, Nicholas sees one exactly like it at Conchis's villa. This presentation of two identical paperweights, or of one that is transported quickly and unfailingly--the film does not absolutely demand that we determine if there is one or two--compels us to address the question of Ann's complicity in the Conchis plot. In the novel, it appears clear that we are meant to understand that Alison's involvement in the masque begins only with the excursion Nicholas takes with her to Parnassus. But in the film the paperweight seems to demand that we entertain the possibility that Ann has become part of the masque even before Nicholas's arrival on the island. The film, then, suggests the distinct possibility that the entire masque is
aimed at bringing Nicholas and Ann back together (though we never actually see that happen). This is an aim that is, by comparison, extremely limited in relation to the apparent aim of the masque in the novel, which seems to be nothing less than an attempt to transform Nicholas.

The introduction of the paperweight at Conchis's villa is closely associated with the introduction of the second most important object in the film, the ancient statue with its enigmatic smile. The end of the film juxtaposes these two objects even more explicitly. Nicholas arrives at the empty villa to find nothing left of the masque but the statue and the paperweight, the smile and the core.

Settings are of crucial importance in a comparison of the two narratives as well, and the difference in the settings ranks in importance just behind the difference in central, symbolic objects. The narratives take place in different times, first of all; the novel is set in 1952-53, while the film is set in the present, or sometime around 1967-68. Geographically, the narratives differ substantially, not because of the main locus of action, the island, but because the film omits the novel's frame, the action that occurs both before and after the main action on the island. The novel devotes roughly one-quarter of its pages (140 of 600) to Nicholas's life in England before leaving for Phraxos and his alternating waiting and detective work upon his return. The film narrative, then,
takes place almost exclusively on the island—the exception being the fling on the mainland with Ann—while the novel, especially considering the numerous, sustained stories told by Conchis, is as often concerned with settings off the island as it is with the island setting itself. In the film, we are seldom outside the domain of Conchis, in very strict terms, while in the novel we are often given the sense of being outside the domain, even if, ultimately, it dominates the entire novel—after all, Nicholas narrates his experiences some time after having them, presumably from a point of view totally saturated by Conchis's theories and visions.

Finally, in the ubiquitous illusions to works of art, there is a further category of differences between the two narratives. Dozens of paintings, painters, composers, writers, works of literature, and films are mentioned throughout the novel. The film gives us Auden, Empson, Eliot, Modigliani, and Bonnard, but no film could replicate the climate of allusiveness that pervades the novel. This allusiveness is unquestionably an irritant at times, but it certainly helps to characterize the narrator's intellectual preoccupations. To a certain extent, this pattern of dense allusion becomes so integral to the narrative voice that it seems natural. By the middle of the book, a reference to a "Dufy day" (401) or to "Sisyphean" stacks of papers to be
graded (355) fits into an established narrative rhythm. The film has nothing to compare with this pattern.

What is retained of the novel's narrative is far from negligible, even if it is limited to narrative outline and raw characterization of a few main figures. The basic relationship between Nicholas and Conchis remains intact in the film, as does the dialectic involving the former girlfriend and the mystery-woman-cum-damsel-in-distress. The island setting seems faithful to the novel's description for the most part, and the elements of both World Wars, the mainland visit, and the notion of a trial all contribute to the perception that the film is indeed the offspring of the novel. The specific ways in which what is retained is significantly altered will be explored in the remainder of this chapter, through step-by-step analyses of two representative sequences common to both narratives.

The events leading to Nicholas's first meeting with Conchis consume five of the novel's short chapters (10-14, pp. 63-87), while the film's corresponding action takes place in one continuous scene encompassing more than one hundred shots. Close examination of the two sequences leads one to the conclusion that the film version of this action is both more dominant and less well developed than the
novel's version. The film retains the general atmosphere of the novel's depiction of a meeting fraught with anticipation, mystery, and some degree of apparent cult involvement. In addition, the film adds the paperweight, two instances of violent gestures (a kicked ball, a thrown stick), an airplane, and a set of flashbacks. What the film leaves out is the passage of time, a near suicide, Nicholas's familiarity with the island, women's clothes left on a beach, some detective work, and considerable indecision on Nicholas's part.

Even before leaving England, the Nicholas of the novel learns that one of his predecessors, Mitford, had met one of "the people in the villas" (40). Nicholas learns from Mitford that most of the people are "pretty damn dull," but that "There's one that you might say isn't, but I don't suppose you'll meet him." Then, in parting, Mitford warns Nicholas, "Beware of the waiting room" (41).

Nicholas, then, arrives on the island prepared for some adventure, but he also knows that "the people in the villas" are absent for "ten months of the year" (40). He arrives prepared to wait, already tantalized, and he soon makes inquiries regarding "the man Mitford had had a row with" (48). The novel's continuing exposition--both the first half of the England "frame" and the first part of Nicholas's experience on the island are preludes to the real story--presents us a Nicholas who suffers isolation,
loneliness, self-deprecation, illness, and despair.

Nicholas's narrative reaches the point at the end of Chapter 9 at which a clear picture of the future has emerged:

The pattern of destiny seemed pretty clear: down and down, and down.

But then the mysteries began. (59)

The reader is given ample opportunity to know Nicholas's misery, to acknowledge the intensity of his suicidal impulse, perhaps even to wish that this troubled, often irritating character had pulled the trigger. But the presence of the novel indicates that, of course, Nicholas will not—did not—pull the trigger, and so we are prepared for "the mysteries," at last, to begin.

In the film adaptation the exposition is necessarily much more concentrated. A sweeping view of the islands during the opening credits concludes with a tilt to a sailboat bearing Nicholas. We see Nicholas on board the boat, we see him step onto the island, and we see him unexpectedly being met by Meli, another teacher at The Lord Byron School. The camera follows the two as they walk through the village, then along a rural road to the school, and on into the building to Nicholas's room—formerly the room of Williamson, the previous English teacher, the man who has committed suicide. A transitional scene involving Nicholas in the classroom leads to an outdoor scene in which Nicholas receives the paperweight in the mail (in Meli's
presence), then reacts violently by catching a soccer ball that accidentally comes his way and kicking it far away—the camera follows its flight—through the trees and toward the sky. This is what leads us to the scene under consideration, the scene in which Nicholas meets Conchis. With the exception of brief flashbacks indicating some relationship (with Ann) gone awry, this is all we have prior to the meeting with the magus, Maurice Conchis. The pace of the film's exposition is rapid, and the only character development we get regarding Nicholas is through his facial expressions and brief, generally cynical comments to Meli—and, of course, the angry gesture involving the kicked ball.

The Nicholas of the novel is very well established on the island when he finally meets the magus. He has been on the island from the beginning of October 1952 (33) to the end of May 1953 (63). It has become routine for him to hike all over Phraxos in an effort to escape the school and make time pass more quickly. Nicholas tells us that he "often started out on a walk out of sheer boredom" (52). We are told of enough specific incidents to sense the passing of time, the habit he falls into, and then we are told—at the beginning of Part II, Chapter 10—that it is "a Sunday in late May" on which Nicholas takes the hike that will commence his adventure.
But even at this stage the novel fails to present Conchis. This particular Sunday hike leads only to evidence that Conchis is on the island, and that someone else, apparently a woman with literary interests, is with him. In an echo of Nicholas's aborted suicide attempt, when he felt he was "being watched" (57), there is a double reference to someone possibly observing him as he examines the slope above the beach where he had gone for a swim and had a leisurely lunch:

I was staring up at the hot, heavy slope of trees, when I had the sensation that I was not alone. I was being looked at. I searched the trees in front of me. There was nothing. I walked a little nearer.... (64-65)

Here Nicholas is on the verge of discovering the rubber foot-fins, the towel, and the book which are his first clues regarding the beginning of the masque. More importantly, here the novel presents the model for all that follows; a very self-conscious narrator is watched and is watching, but he cannot be certain why he is being watched, or if he is, or by whom--and he cannot be sure what he is looking for. The novel is clearly about a quest for meaning, a need for mystery, and the process of self-discovery, but Nicholas--as he is in this instance--is continually faced with concrete situations involving minor mysteries that may, after all, be nothing out of the ordinary.
But there is always the substantial uncertainty. When he sees the book, he thinks it is his own copy. But it is not. It is a book he knows very well, but this time he sees it with new eyes, because of the situation in which he encounters it, and this time, too, he takes a new message from the verses contained in the anthology because of various slips of paper marking pages which, in turn, have been marked with both vertical and horizontal lines of red ink. The marked passages (in poems by Eliot, Pound, and Auden) are all "at pages where there were images or references concerning islands or the sea" (65). Although the novel tells us that "there must have been about a dozen of them," we are given only a total of eleven lines from five different passages, and the final excerpt is clearly an allusion to much more than islands and the sea:

Yet must thou sail after knowledge
Knowing less than drugged beasts.

Nicholas "sails" after knowledge, often against his will, and he will later be drugged and act beastly. For now, he continues to act—and relate the tale in terms of—the role of the extremely self conscious seeker: "I put the book back beneath the towel, and faced the hill in a rather self-conscious way, convinced by now that I was indeed being watched." (66)

Out of this complex account of finding the objects and contemplating the poetic images, Fowles the screenwriter has
drawn three elements that, as we will see below, he has preserved to some extent in the film's narrative: the notion that the book seemed at first to Nicholas to be his own book; the four lines from Eliot's "Little Gidding"; and the action of the hidden book being discovered by the protagonist. These elements from the original narrative, along with many others, will be examined in the discussion that follows, a shot-by-shot analysis of the film's version of the action leading up to and including Nicholas's first meeting with Conchis.

The sequence in the film that takes Nicholas to the villa for the first time begins with a shot of the sky, trees, and finally Nicholas. This shot is a complicated one, involving panning, tilting, zooming, and, finally, trucking. It is closely linked—or directly reacting—to the final shot of what is, in effect, a montage that performs a transitional function: classroom shots, soccer field, delivery of paperweight, the kick that sends the soccer ball through the trees and toward the sky. This montage, then, is the bridge that takes us from the expository sequences which show us Nicholas's character, his situation, and hints of his past. Green thus delivers us to the effective beginning of the narrative, with Nicholas walking aimlessly somewhere on the island, thinking of Ann.

The extremely complex shot that opens this sequence includes a voice-over of Nicholas's (apparent)
ex-girlfriend saying, "I don't love you deep down...." In addition to the complexity of the visual aspects of the shot, then, there is also complexity in the sense that, for lack of a better way to describe it, this is a "half-flashback," a flashback limited to the soundtrack only.

The next shot we see is a quick cutaway of the chapel, followed by another shot of Nicholas approaching, and then a brief interior shot of the chapel itself, showing us the empty space and the bare, whitewashed walls. Based on the absence of anything resembling the furnishings of a chapel, this is a chapel that is clearly not in use, if clean and apparently freshly painted. Immediately after the chapel series, we are given Nicholas's next discovery—a deserted cove with a beautiful beach. As we see Nicholas descend toward the water, we notice that he is already beginning to remove his shirt. The chapel scene remains seemingly irrelevant, but the sighting of the cove seems more normal, comprehensible; Nicholas is upset, and he welcomes this opportunity to cool off. We sense that something must be about to happen now, even though nothing happened when we were led to believe something might just a few shots before.

Something does happen—we are given, finally, a combination of both the visual and sound elements of Nicholas's continuing thoughts of Ann. This time, after we are presented with a clear view of Nicholas depositing his
shirt and slacks on a rock, it is an airplane passing overhead that triggers Nicholas's memory of Ann. And this time, instead of flashbacks to situations in which the relationship is obviously well established (and soon to be discontinued), we are shown the initial meeting of Ann and Nicholas. The airplane is a fitting reminder of Ann because, as the flashback shows us, Ann is a stewardess or, as the party host introduces her to Nicholas, "My quite but absolutely favorite air hostess."

In six shots, we are given a brief flashback that characterizes both Nicholas and Ann. The former is seen to be intellectual and artistic; the host says, "I may well publish him someday." On the basis of Nicholas's response to that introduction, we see that he is also clever, self-assured and perhaps even arrogant. ("I may well let him," says Nicholas, with a sardonic curve of the mouth and a calculating, cold look in the eyes.) Ann is pretty, very feminine (if heavy makeup and prominent earrings denote femininity), and apparently quite seductive. Certainly Nicholas perceives the sexual potential as great; his movement captures the classic dominance of the male on the make, as he walks around in front of Ann (his back temporarily to the camera) and leans against the wall with his arm arching over her. Nicholas, further introduced as "classless, rootless, jobless" by the host, responds to Ann's question about his work by acknowledging that he is "a
poet without poems." She admits to being a stewardess "without illusions"—with a definite French accent. Nicholas's last remark ends the flashback when he dubs the two of them "twin spirits." 6

Once again a reminder of Ann leads to a violent gesture; coming out of the flashback, Nicholas appears tense, and he immediately seizes a nearby piece of driftwood and flings it as far as he can. He returns to the rock on which his clothes lie, and the the real action of the film begins as he picks up his shirt and finds a book lying on the rock beneath it—a book that has clearly been placed there for him to find while he was treading water and remembering Ann.

The camera presents the book to us very carefully. It is T. S. Eliot's *Collected Poems, 1909-1962*, and there is something marking a specific page. The bookmark is a strand of blonde hair—long, blonde hair—and it indicates a page that is further marked (in pen or pencil) to guide Nicholas's (and our) attention to the following four lines of "Little Gidding":

> We shall not cease from exploration
> And the end of all our exploring
> Will be to arrive where we started
> And know the place for the first time.

We hear these words in Nicholas's voice, but we seem to be hearing his thoughts, not his spoken words. Obviously, some
one has been there, someone has left the book for Nicholas to read, and someone is watching and waiting.

The pace of the action continues to accelerate as Nicholas suddenly hears a bell. He follows the sound of the bell to a gate, touches the gate, and waits cautiously as the gate swings open. On the other side of the gate, Nicholas encounters a sign: "Waiting Room." This recalls the phrase on a slip of paper he had found upon arriving in his room--formerly the suicide Williamson's room. Nicholas follows the bell until he comes to the villa, but there is no immediate sign of anyone waiting for him. He walks up to, then past a classical statue that seems to beckon him toward a table set for two. Then, suddenly, through a series of half a dozen rapid shots, Conchis arrives and introduces himself to Nicholas.

Our first glimpse of Conchis shows us only his eyes, and even his eyes are visible indistinctly because of the vigorous side to side motion of his head that goes with his energetic gait. This introduction of Conchis by means of an extreme close-up--a close-up that is probably captured by the use of a long-range lens zoomed in tight--foreshadows later uses of the extreme close-up (both in this scene and in the framing shots of the trial discussed in the next section of this chapter). The composition of the shot in which Conchis is seen to approach suggests intensity; it
lays the groundwork for a psychological, highly cerebral relationship between Nicholas and Conchis.

In the film, Nicholas's reaction to Conchis is an extremely polite one— and a cautious one. "I came to return this," says Nicholas, indicating the Eliot book. "You came to meet me," responds Conchis, clearly announcing the situation as one in which Nicholas has been manipulated. Conchis further underscores the planned nature of the meeting by reciting a poem:

Here on the frontier, there are falling leaves.
Although my neighbors are all barbarians,
And you, you are a thousand miles away,
There are always two cups on my table. 7

The theatrical manner in which Conchis recites the poem emphasizes the formality of the situation. Nicholas is introduced to Conchis's "housekeeper" (Maria) and "manservant" (Andreas) after he interrupts the obvious flow of things with an awkward remark: "I believe you knew Williamson." "You did know him, didn't you?" persists Nicholas. All that Conchis offers in the way of a response is the grave invitation, "Enjoy your tea, please." This series of shots, the meeting-proper between Nicholas and Conchis, ends with a shot of Nicholas regarding Conchis with a serious, puzzled expression.

The next shot is an extreme long shot of the two of them as they stand by a bench at the jetty below the villa.
We can see them sit on the bench, first Nicholas and then Conchis, and then the next shot cuts in. Clearly some time passed—enough time, we are led to believe, for Nicholas and Conchis to share an uneasy cup of tea before a brief stroll. The second shot of this new series finds Nicholas posing another question, not quite as charged with implication as the one regarding his predecessor, but a bit too inquisitive nevertheless, judging by Conchis's response:

"You live here alone?"

"What some would call... alone."³

Immediately following this enigmatic response, Conchis stands abruptly and begins what seems to be a breathing exercise. As Nicholas watches this odd routine—-is it meditation, after all?—Conchis acts startled and looks up past Nicholas to the higher ground behind him, toward the villa. Nicholas quickly turns to follow Conchis's gaze, but he cannot spot whatever it was that Conchis had reacted to. To Nicholas's inquiry—"What was it?—Conchis responds in the pattern now typical of him: "Nothing," he says, the evasiveness competing with the air of theatrical mystery in his grave tone.

The quick pace of the action resumes once again as the bell sounds and Conchis announces, "I must go." This series of shots ends, but the jump cut encourages us to assume that the next series begins almost immediately, as we rejoin the pair after they have apparently climbed a flight (or perhaps
two) of steps leading up from the jetty. (Unlike the previous apparent gap, which must represent a quarter- or even a half-hour, this latter gap may indicate the passage of a minute or less.) Nicholas, by now, is moving from perplexity to impatience. "Do you mind telling me now what the game is?" he asks, not trying to mask either the impatience in his voice or the insolence that seems to characterize him in general. "I don't understand," says Conchis, to which Nicholas, underscoring his sense of the prepared nature of the encounter, says, "That's my line."

There is a pause, then Nicholas pushes on:

"How did you know I was coming over here today?"

"I am psychic."

Here the camera once again gives us an extreme close-up of Conchis, but this time the method seems to be that of the normal close-up (shot with a standard lens at close range). The effect is that we see Conchis at this strange moment in the way Nicholas must see him. The camera becomes the first person narrator, in effect, and for a moment we have things entirely from Nicholas's point of view. The mood is charged; there is the hint of the supernatural, and the trace of a threat.

We are immediately given an extreme close-up of Nicholas in the next shot, but rather than showing us what Conchis sees, this shot has the impact of giving us a further understanding of Nicholas's thoughts by showing us
the tension, even apprehension, in his face. The series of shots continues with two pans that combine to give us a three-hundred-and-sixty-degree glance at the villa—again, as if the camera were Nicholas—ending up with another extreme close-up of Conchis (eyes and forehead). Another close-up of Nicholas follows, but hard on its heels is a rapid shot that shows us Maria and Andreas nearby—a shock, because they were not visible during the full-circle Nicholas has just made.

"Until next weekend," says Conchis, as Nicholas takes his leave. Then, again in another of his characteristic, unexpected moves, Conchis makes a final speech in an emotional, compelling manner:

Tell no one over there you have met me. Believe nothing they say. They understand nothing; they know nothing; they mean nothing.

Here there is another slight gap, representative of the time it takes Nicholas to walk back as far as the sign that says "Waiting Room." Through the use of a pan from the sign to Nicholas, the camera reminds us of the still-mysterious significance of the phrase, "The Waiting Room", on the note in the desk drawer in what had previously been Williamson's room.

The rapid pace of surprises is not letting up even now, as Nicholas notices a long glove draped over something protruding from the structure of the gate. He picks it up,
examines it, and then replaces it. It is a long, formal
glove, of the type one would expect a woman of the early
twentieth century to wear. As Nicholas continues on his
way, slowly and pensively, a faint sound of a young woman's
singing voice can be heard. He stops, listens, smiles, then
walks away. All we can hear is the light melody and a few
fragments of lyrics ("...hey, ho, Cock Robin..."; "...and on
the way he [met?] a rat...").

As Nicholas returns to his room at the boarding
school—something we are not shown but feel comfortable in
assuming—we know that there will be another meeting with
the magus (as yet not identified as such), and we know that
Nicholas not only knows, but seems amused. He is definitely
curious, and he is certainly game for something new and more
exciting than his apparently boring job as a teacher of
basic English to Greek schoolboys. Meeting the magus has
been an interesting, unusual, and not unpleasant experience
for Nicholas. His curiosity has been slightly appeased but
immeasurably increased in new directions. For the sort of
young man Nicholas is, not the least of these new directions
involves the woman's glove, the woman's voice, and the
possibility of an exotic romance.

Given this action in the sequence of the scenes leading
up to the film's Nicholas meeting Conchis, we can now
compare the elements of the two narratives. What has been
recorded above is primarily descriptive; interpretation was
kept to a minimum, and where interpretive comments have been made, as in the case of the assumption that Nicholas returns to his room after his meeting with Conchis, I have relied on the novel for support.

As noted earlier, the novel is substantially more complex than the film. Even granting the quantity of information contained in visual images—a picture traditionally being valued at a thousand words—one must admit that twenty-four pages of prose is capable of generating more complexity than eleven minutes of visuals and dialogue. The film's approximately 105 shots may seem a great number, but many of these are repeat shots, "head shots," and sustained views of the same objects or landscapes (for emphasis, suspense, rhythm). More significant than quantitative comparisons—which must all end in impressionistic arguments—are the answers one can offer to our basic questions: what elements are added, omitted, retained but altered, and unchanged but placed in new contexts (and therefore, ultimately, altered in significance)? It is to this latter set of questions that we can now return, picking up the thread of the discussion that began this section which directly compares the novel's narrative with that of the film.

We have already established the difference in background; the novel's Nicholas has been on the island for eight months, while the film's Nicholas may have been on
Phraxos less than a week, and perhaps merely for two or three days. (Strictly speaking, we are shown nothing that absolutely rules out the possibility that the action takes place on the very day of Nicholas's arrival on the island, but is is unlikely that the filmmakers—or Fowles the scriptwriter—would want us to take their lack of specific cues so literally.) In any case, the film's Nicholas is a newcomer, while the novel's protagonist is by comparison a seasoned veteran of island life. This sets up a strange contrast: the novel's Conchis becomes the "intruder"—quite a difference from the film's Conchis, who is luring Nicholas, the new arrival, to his apparently well-established villa. Nicholas's first-person narrative clearly defines his own view of the matter in the novel:

...a thin wisp of pale smoke curled up from the roof. It was no longer deserted. My first feeling was of resentment, a Crusoe-like resentment, since the solitude of the south side of the island must now be spoilt, and I had come to feel possessive about it. It was my secret province and no one else's... (64)

The novel's narrative then is one of invasion of privacy, an invasion prefigured by this illusory privacy that Nicholas had thought to possess. The illusion of his possession of the south side of the island is exploded just as the illusion of the psychological impregnability of
Nicholas will later be shattered by Conchis's masque. The first hint of that psychological invasion and manipulation—"rape" may not be too strong a term, judging by the eventual effects of the masque on Nicholas—shows up in the incident with the book on the beach. Nicholas believes it is his copy. The film accomplishes the same sort of thing with the introduction of the paperweight. When Nicholas, on his second visit to the villa, sees the paperweight, he is startled by it; he must ask himself, as we do, whether it is his, or if such a remarkable coincidence could occur. In both cases, the object that is exactly like his suggests the dominant theme of self-exploration, of asking basic questions regarding what one knows, what one has, and what one is.

As mentioned earlier, the literary allusions in the novel are frequent and varied. The four lines from "Little Gidding" have far less weight in the novel than they do in the film. This is very simply because the film offers few literary allusions; other than the Eliot lines, there are the Auden and Empson books and the poem that Conchis recites. The film magnifies the importance of the Eliot lines, then, by blowing them up to a dimension equal to that of the paperweight. The idea of arriving "where we started" is central in the film, while the novel's narrative relies on this return more as a framing device in that the novel begins and ends the action in England, just as Nicholas
begins and ends his quest in himself. In a sense, of course, both narratives involve Nicholas embarking on a journey into the self, then arriving where he began and knowing that "place," as the Eliot lines have it, "for the first time." But the four lines of the poem assume much greater significance in the film than they do in the novel. In fact, the film concludes with a repetition of these lines spoken half by Conchis and half by Nicholas—an articulation of the words that we hear on the soundtrack but that we assume to be inside Nicholas's head and not spoken aloud.

Another common element to both sequences of action is the gimmick of the hidden book. Though presented in a very different manner in the film—and a far more theatrical, magical one—the effect is fundamentally the same. In both cases Nicholas uncovers a book that he had not previously seen. The model of discovering hidden things is central to both narratives, and it will be repeated time and again in both. The crucial point is one made previously, that Nicholas is not merely discovering hidden things, but that someone (Conchis, with help from his associates) is manipulating objects, events, and words so that Nicholas cannot help finding what has been hidden, both in the external world and in his own psyche.

The film echoes the novel in presenting the events leading up to the meeting with Conchis as resulting from Nicholas's impulse to escape reality. In the novel,
Nicholas has of course habituated himself to hikes that remove him from the school, but in the film the walk he takes appears to be a more spontaneous reaction to the confusion he feels upon receiving Ann's paperweight and being forced to recall the unpleasantness of their failed relationship. In both narratives Nicholas does escape, but not fully. In the film, the escape seems less successful than in novel. There is no mention of Alison at all in Chapter 10, during the episode when Nicholas notices that the villa is inhabited, finds the book, and almost goes on up to meet Conchis. In the film, however, Alison's counterpart, Ann, intrudes in Nicholas's thoughts by means of the soundtrack "half-flashback" immediately after we see him walking. Then, not much later, when the airplane passes overhead as Nicholas floats on his back in the water, a full-scale flashback is triggered showing his first meeting with Ann—and nicely foreshadowing another first meeting soon to come.

The film's use of the airplane is crude by comparison with the novel's characterization of the island's solitude. Far from accommodating a low-flying 707 that appears to be either just taking off or just landing—and therefore implies a nearby airport of some size—the island of the novel is exposed to nothing but the distant drone of airplane engines, and rarely at that.
The novel treats Nicholas's meeting with Alison very early (pp. 18-24); and the party at which the meeting occurs is very different from the one in the film. As is the case with the novel as a whole, the narrative follows strict chronological order in relation to Nicholas's experience—although of course Conchis's tales involves numerous flashbacks—as opposed to the many flashbacks of the film, of which the meeting with Ann is the first sustained example.

The film's Ann is a glittering, sophisticated young woman, while the novel's Alison is very different:

...a girl of about my own age [twenty-five] carrying a heavy suitcase, with a small rucksack on her shoulders. She was wearing a whitish old creased mackintosh, and she had the sort of tan that only weeks in hot sun can give. Her long hair was not quite blonde, but bleached almost to that color. (19)

Furthermore, Alison is "waif-like, yet perversely or immorally so," and her smile is "very thin, very insecure, and very curt." Both women have a definite sexual presence, but they are characterized in substantially different ways. Ann is slick where Alison is rough; Ann is French and formal while Alison is "down-under" and casual; Clegg (of *The Collector*) would call Ann "la-di-da," whereas Alison is unquestionably down-to-earth.
There is no formal introduction of Alison in the novel, in contrast to the film. Because her flat's bath is filled with beer for the party, Nicholas offers Alison the use of his flat. The meeting is the result of purest chance, it would seem, since Nicholas has been invited merely "to kill complaint" and Alison's arrival is supposedly unexpected. They end up in bed together, and they are inseparable until Nicholas leaves for Greece, even though he has become leery of Alison well before that, despite the fact that "the affaire was like no other" he had known (31). Thoughts of marriage complicate the situation, however:

I wasn't ready for marriage, for settling down. I wasn't psychologically close enough to her; something I couldn't define, obscure, monstrous, lay between us, and this obscure monstrous thing emanated from her, not from me. (33)

This sort of passage exemplifies the complexity of the novel in the way in which it forces the reader to continually question the information Nicholas presents. The obscure monstrous thing is never further explained; we are left to speculate on its nature, and we can only conclude that the probable identity of it lies in the nature of the feeling Nicholas admits to having experienced but failed to recognize earlier: "A terrible deathlike feeling, which anyone less cerebral and self-absorbed than I was then would have realized was simply love" (32). This feeling,
mysterious as it is to Nicholas, envelops him as he watches Alison looking at a Renoir at the Tate. The incident characterizes Nicholas well for us—far more fully than anything we see in the film.

Further treatment of Alison is provided in the novel even after Nicholas arrives on the island, but this additional attention is always in relation to Nicholas's weakness, his loneliness, and his failure. It becomes evidence of the character of Nicholas rather than information regarding Alison or further illumination of their relationship. At one point, just prior to meeting Conchis, Nicholas succumbs to thoughts of Alison and makes love "to the memory of Alison, like an animal, without guilt or shame, a mere machine for sensation spreadeagled on the earth" (74).

The Nicholas of the novel engages in detective work before he meets Conchis, questioning villagers who admit to knowing something of the mysterious man. For readers of the novel, the long-delayed introduction of Conchis is calculated to heighten the suspense that attends the eventual meeting. An examination of the novel's description of the man as Nicholas perceives him makes the casting and presentation of Anthony Quinn in the film role seem quite faithful to the novel:

He was nearly completely bald, brown as old leather, short and spare, a man whose age was
impossible to tell; perhaps sixty, perhaps seventy; dressed in a navy-blue shirt, knee-length shorts, and a pair of salt-stained gym-shoes. The most striking thing about him was the intensity of his eyes; very dark brown, staring, with a simian penetration emphasized by the remarkable clear whites; eyes that seemed not quite human. (75)

Aside from the age—Quinn seems more like fifty-five in the film (and was actually fifty-two when the film was made)—this description of Conchis agrees with the film's portrayal of him. But, as always, the novel provides so much more in the way of specific characterization from Nicholas's point of view. Quite in passing, for example, Nicholas observes that "he [Conchis] was slightly mad" (76). We have no reason to doubt Nicholas's perception, unless it is in our growing understanding of the way in which the narrative is a "confession" in the autobiographical tradition of Rousseau.

Aside from the much more extensive dialogue in the novel's version of their first conversation, the dynamics of the beginning of the relationship between Nicholas and Conchis agree substantially. Both conversations are dominated by failed attempts on Nicholas's part to elicit information from Conchis. The latter succeeds in spinning a web of surprises and mysteries for the narrator so that, by the end of the meeting, Nicholas's attitude seems to have
softened: "Whatever else he was he was not like anyone else I had ever met" (84).

But this changing attitude is immediately struck a blow by the reaction Nicholas has to the glove he finds at the gate. Unlike the film, the novel shows us a sinister response in Nicholas, as he entertains the notion that someone with a terrible disfigurement lives on the island with Conchis. This, too, quickly passes, and Nicholas goes on his way singing (86), but we are perhaps meant to remember the "monstrous thing" that had "emanated from" Alison earlier. The film version is dramatically different in that there is no sinister moment, and what singing there is is the singing of a mysterious woman, not that of Nicholas (though he does smile).

The effects of the alterations in the narrative in the corresponding passages of the novel and the film are many, including the film's elimination of (or inability to communicate) Nicholas's lengthy waiting period before even reaching the "waiting room," the film's strongly projected association of the pain of the past (the relationship with Ann) and the mystery of the future, the novel's more profound characterization of Nicholas, and the novel's much more ominous potential with regard to the start-up of Conchis's masque. Still, the film does convey many of the same kind of plot elements that are present in the novel, and it perhaps even outstrips the novel in terms of its
capacity to make us curious about Nicholas's affair with Ann by means of the flashbacks invoked. This, too, is derived from the novel to a great extent, given Nicholas's observation that, "I knew that on the island one was driven back into the past" (72).

As we turn to the comparison of the respective versions of "the trial," we are left with the conviction that, given the severe time limitations of the commercial film medium, the film's narrative, though greatly simplified, fairly represents most of the major plot and character elements of the novel's action regarding Nicholas's initial contact with the magus, his domain, and the mysterious masque.

Any reference to a "trial" must evoke images of Kafka's K. lost in the impossible world of The Trial. Fowles's Nicholas undergoes a trial throughout the masque, but the action on the island culminates in a literal trial that certainly owes something to Kafka. As we shall see below, when we compare the novel's narrative with the film's, neither version of The Magus presents a trial similar to the one to which K. is subjected, but there are a number of ways in which both narratives clearly create bizarre, Kafkaesque experiences.

In the novel, Nicholas is torn from what seems to be a triumphant sexual conquest and held captive. A German-accented "Anton" is the first to inform Nicholas of the trial
to come. Just before that, the following exchange takes place:

I stared at Anton.

"Of course, this is all good homely fun to you Germans."

"I am Swiss. And my mother is Jewish. By the way." (443)

The twist of Anton's part-Jewishness suggests the sort of surprise that is not new to Nicholas; but it also sets up one of the more masked literary illusions in *The Magus* because, in his next speech, Anton announces the trial: "Today we have the trial and you must be awake. ...You are awake" (444). It was after waking up "one fine morning" when Joseph K. encountered the beginning of his trial (12).

Of course, a major segment of action labelled "the trial" requires no further overt reference to Kafka, and Fowles provides none. What he does, instead, is present a trial in which the victim is placed in the role of judge and executioner. To what extent the victim is free to act out these roles remains subject to question, but for psychological reasons rather than any physical restraints. As one would expect, the film's trial is far less involved than the novel's, but the film's trial is also distinctly different—if not completely altered.

The trial sequence in the film is introduced by an extreme close-up of Conchis's eyes, echoing the way in which
we were introduced to the magus by the camera. There are reaction shots of Nicholas as he is injected with a drug and begins to lose consciousness—and gain a new form of consciousness, or "conchis-ness" (always the possible play on the name and the state of mind). The dominant image of the shots before the trial sequence, however, is definitely of the eyes and forehead of the magus. The experience has taken a sinister turn, right in Nicholas's bedroom at the school, following Lily/Julie's breaking away from his embrace and hissing, "There is no Julie!" Then the three black-shirted men--Andreas, the man from the village who knocked on Ann's door in Athens, and the "doctor" called Anton--burst into the room and pin Nicholas to his bed. They are followed by Conchis and Lily/Julie, the latter carrying a syringe.

After the shot in which we see a change come into Nicholas's eyes (connoting, we assume, the overwhelming effects of the injection), we get a montage sequence of seven shots involving monstrous masks: a stag head, a female mask whose head is a tangle of snakes, a witch-crone, an Aztec-like, red-and-white monster crowned with five tiny heads, and a jackel head. Two of these masks--the snake-head (probably representing Medusa) and the Aztec mask--are allocated two shots apiece. All seven of the shots in this series involve either camera movement or a swirling, dreamy, mystifying movement of the objects
themselves, as if these presumably terrifying (and at least strange) images are dancing in Nicholas's head.

This montage sequence is succeeded by a series of shots establishing the presence of figures wearing the above masks and surrounding Conchis, with Nicholas apparently off to the side, strapped into a throne and wearing a noose around his neck, an echo of the hanged man card the film has presented in an early scene between Nicholas and Conchis. Conchis announces, in an eerie, echoing voice, "All gods. Ancient gods." He is dressed as the magus on the card by the same name from the scene with the tarot cards. A vast number of people are present—apparently all the characters from the film, including the hundreds of extras; the action seems to take place in a vast interior space, much like a giant television or film studio, but no doubt intended to seem either underground or supernatural. There are no boundaries to the space, and the crowd seems unlimited as well.

Conchis proceeds from mask to mask, indicating to the figures that it is their turn to speak. Each one repeats a statement from earlier in the film, then lifts off his or her mask to reveal someone Nicholas knows. The characters so revealed (along with their lines) are as follows: Anton ("If it hadn't been for you and your damned games, she'd still be alive!"—a line Nicholas shouts at Conchis regarding the apparent suicide of Ann); Soula, Conchis's other medical colleague ("I fear you are deceitful, Mr.
Urfe"—a line Lily delivers after looking at Nicholas's palm in their encounter by the jetty); Meli ("Marriage is for mice, Meli, not for men"—Nicholas to Meli, prior to receiving the message from Lily/Julie regarding their rendezvous and the letter announcing Ann's death); Maria ("Why did you cast me as the traitor?" Nicholas to Conchis, when the latter has announced the end of "the comedy"); the villager-spy ("You'll never see me again! Never! Never again!"—Ann to Nicholas through her hotel room door after Nicholas has failed to respond to her demands for an answer and been thrown out of the room); one of the German officers ("To hell with Ann"—the seducer Nicholas to the protesting Julie just before the men burst into his room); and, finally, Andreas ("Prodotis!"—the Greek word for traitor, spoken both in Conchis's account of the guerillas' capture and in the reenactment involving Nicholas in the role of the traitor).

Following these echoes and revelations, Conchis makes grand gestures which result in the sudden presence of heavy winds and bright banners. The mass of people walks in some impossible-to-determine direction; everyone ends up facing Nicholas on his throne, with Conchis front and center, standing beside a very primitive computer. It is a parody of a computer, just as the entire sequence will rapidly generate into a parody of a trial (at least for the time
being), and the whole experience for Nicholas must be seen as a strange dream or hallucination.

The machine, when turned on by Conchis—"this is the latest god"—fails to work, so he kicks it. It then speaks (sounding like Candice Bergen) the following speech about Nicholas, an "instant analysis" based upon "all the known facts":

The subject is devoid of interest...[Conchis kicks the machine] except as a familiar type of male parasite. His only law is his own pleasure, his only morality is his own good. He is a machine for self-gratification, not a human being. I recommend that he be sterilized. [Here Conchis asks for more.] He is shallow, he is vain, he is ego-centric, he is a liar. There is no hope for him.

The solemn mood set by this indictment of Nicholas is shattered by the hilarious response of the hundreds of people to Conchis's qualifying remark: "Except as an actor, of course!" It is a mammoth dream-joke on Nicholas up to this point. Then the whole tone of the action changes.

Conchis orders Nicholas released and informs him that he will now become "not only the judge" but also the executioner." He equips Nicholas with a "cat," cues a movie projector, and stands aside as Nicholas looks at the screen. The film begins with a straightforward shot of Lily/Julie,
then follows with an old-fashioned title: "Lily, Julie and Diana: A Fable." The film is a crudely produced, near-pornographic episode involving Lily/Julie (as Diana) and Anton. Not much is explicitly shown, but quite a bit is hinted at--more than enough to enrage Nicholas. The role of Anton in the film is a cutting caricature of the one Nicholas had hoped to play with Julie, and he now realizes that he has been humiliated before a multitude of people, and strung along from the beginning by a woman who had pretended to be both dependent on him and possibly in love with him.

When Nicholas has seen more than he can bear, he grabs the cat and slashes through the film screen, only to discover Julie tied to the stocks, prepared for her punishment. As Nicholas raises the cat to strike her, we see the first of a series of flashback shots which perform somewhat complicated, even confusing functions. The first shot shows the young Conchis in his role as executioner, the role Conchis has described at length to Nicholas in the narrative that we have seen acted out. We have been taken through Conchis's entire World War II experience on the island, and this quick shot deftly reminds us of the parallel between Nicholas and Conchis in this situation. Just as Nicholas and Anton of the pornographic film were doubles, now Nicholas and Conchis, victims of complex, highly public charades, are doubles.
The next shot is of the guerilla screaming (silently now) "eleutheria." Then we see Nicholas with the cat, followed quickly by a shot of something we have not seen before—the young Conchis beating the guerilla with the machine gun butt. First, there is the shot of Conchis swinging the weapon, then there is a shot of the guerilla being hit, then Conchis again. This is followed by a shot of Nicholas, and then we are given a wholly different shot—Nicholas and Ann during the "yes or no" scene. All this results in Nicholas finally surrendering the cat, giving up the opportunity to inflict punishment on the helpless Lily/Julie, the surrogate figure for everyone involved in the masque. Within a few shots more, Conchis approaches the camera until we are again faced with the extreme close-up shot. This is followed by a shot of Nicholas struggling back to full consciousness, and then there is another close-up of the magus, showing that he is with Nicholas as the latter wakes from the dream experience.

The key to the dream experience seems to lie in Nicholas's juxtaposition of the traitor story with the Ann story, with the intervening re-imagining of Conchis's role in the execution of the guerillas. We are forced to accept that all this occurs in Nicholas's dream, but we cannot guess how much the film intends us to assume that Conchis has manipulated the dream process. Whether or not the trial is an induced imagining, the film insists that we take it as
the experience of Nicholas, and we have no choice but to accept that the thoughts have passed through Nicholas's mind. Given that, we must conclude that the dream makes Nicholas aware of his ruthless, traitorous, selfish behavior. Nicholas is, then, ripe for a change.

The film races to the end upon Nicholas's return to the conscious world. He opens the door following Conchis's departure to discover that he is not in the Athens hotel, but in a specially constructed replica situated on a hill on a small island near Conchis's villa. Far below him, standing near a waiting speedboat, is Ann. Far from being dead, Ann is obviously part of the masque, too (we know that she must have joined in Athens after the "yes or no" incident). Nicholas's pursuit of Ann leads him to the statue, to the paperweight, and, the film's final image, to his own self-aware smile.

The difference in the trial sequences of the two narratives is of another order altogether than the comparatively negligible differences regarding the "meeting the magus" scene discussed earlier in this chapter. The two trials are utterly conflicting narratives. The novel's trial is a carefully planned, precisely executed program in which Nicholas is both audience and chief actor. The film's trial seems to be nothing that actually happens; it cannot, given the cues we receive, be other than a dream, a hallucination, or a hypnotic experience. The implications
of this fundamental difference are of the first order of significance, and they illustrate the essential difference in the two narratives, as we shall see by a survey of key elements of that action in the novel's version of the trial.

The similarity between the two trials is limited to a few isolated, almost insignificant elements which the two narratives almost accidentally share: Nicholas's capture and drugging, the notion of "a trial," the masks, the notion of a report on Nicholas, a pornographic film, the cat, and the opportunity to inflict punishment on Lily/Julie. As plot elements these might seem at first glance to be significant similarities, but to call the two sequences similar because they pass through several of the same plot points would be akin to equating two different around-the-world tours that both passed through New York, Paris, Moscow, and Tokyo but differed absolutely in between those points. Both sequences depict "trials," but that is where the similarity ends.

The circumstances leading up to the trial scene in the novel are enormously complicated. The plot of The Magus is at its most convoluted; we reel (with Nicholas) from one reversal to the next, dizzy from the rapid about-faces in both plot and characterization (the latter with regard to Lily/Julie and Rose/June). Simply put, the overall situation prior to the trial has Nicholas convinced of the sincerity of the twins and of their fear of and desire to
escape from Conchis. Their insistence on carrying out minor parts of the masque because they feel some obligation to "Maurice" is a mild irritant to Nicholas, but he trusts them nonetheless. Nicholas believes he will ultimately be united with Julie, and at the end of Chapter 58 this seems to be happening when, after continued complications, June finally brings the two of them together at the Hotel Philadelphia (430).

Following a tantalizing lovemaking scene in which Julie teases Nicholas into a state of extreme arousal and impatience, two blackshirted men burst through the door and take Nicholas captive. The statement, "there is no Julie" (436), is preserved in the film, but everything else about the scene is altered. Nicholas spends five days in a state ranging from total unconsciousness to dim awareness. "I was to have no sense of time for the next five days," he says at the outset of Chapter 60 (438). Nicholas finally returns to full mental capacity and has plenty of time to ponder the recent past. His contemplation of "the ultimate betrayal...of all finer instincts" by the Lily/Julie twin leads his mind to plunge "sickeningly...as if I had walked off the edge of the world" (440). It is at this point that Nicholas's thinking takes him further than we can ever imagine of the thought processes of the comparatively crass, superficial Nicholas of the film:
Alison. I stared at my own dilated eyes in the mirror. Suddenly her honesty, her untreachery--her death--was the last anchor left. If she, if she...I was swept away. The whole of life became a conspiracy. (440)

Here Nicholas is reaching a state of severe mental disturbance. Conchis's manipulation of reality has dissociated Nicholas to the extent that he cannot be certain of anything. "For awhile," Nicholas tells us, "I let my mind wander into bottomless madness" (440).

Nicholas is rescued from his psychotic episode by Conchis's further manipulations; he is transported to "a huge underground room, the kind of enormous cistern, the size of a small church, that is found under some of the old Venetian-Turkish castles that are crumbling away in the Peloponnesus" (446). In this extraordinary space Nicholas observes a formal arrangement of physical objects involving a dais, a throne, three long tables placed end to end, and thirteen chairs. Batteries of motion picture projectors "added a vaguely reassuring air of the film studio...." Thirteen masked figures finally enter the room, and the trial begins. It is all strangely cultic and yet also scientific in tone, with familiar characters in the masque now identified as internationally-known scientists (and new figures--also scientists--introduced for good measure). A "woman from Edinburgh" ("Dr. Marcus") reads a report in "a
belligerent transatlantic monotone" (457). As Nicholas listens to this and other scientific observations regarding his behavior in "this year's experiment," he feels his mood building toward extreme violence. However, because he is gagged and bound, he is limited to impotent rage.

The Lily/Julie twin is presented as Dr. Vanessa Maxwell in the trial, and she is bespectacled" (454). At one point in the proceedings, a note from "Dr. Maxwell" regarding "the subject" is read:

...our attitude should be one of pity towards a personality that has to cover its deficiencies under so many conscious and unconscious lies. ... He was...born short-sighted by nature and has been further blinded by his environments. It is a small wonder that he cannot find his way. (461)

Soon after this point, Lily/Julie is tied to a flogging frame, the bare skin of her back exposed, and Nicholas is provided with the cat. He is convinced of his "absolute freedom of choice" (466). He chooses not to use the cat on her, understanding the significance of the situation, its relationship to Conchis's past, and the doubling that has been going on all along:

All Conchis's maneuverings had been to bring me to this; all the charades, the psychical, the theatrical, the sexual, the psychological; and I
was standing as he had stood before the guerilla, unable to beat his brains out.... (466)
But this is not, as Nicholas assumes it is, the end of the trial.
Now Nicholas is subjected to two spectator experiences: a soft-core pornographic film and a live sexual encounter between Lily/Julie and the American black (Joe). But the film, which features Lily/Julie and Joe, also includes footage of Nicholas and Alison (474). The actual lovemaking between the two people in the room with Nicholas is "without obscenity, merely private, familiar" (477). It makes Nicholas see Lily/Julie as "far ahead of me in time." Soon after the sex is finished and the participants have departed, Conchis returns to tell Nicholas that he is "now elect" and that he should "learn to smile" (479). At the end of Chapter 62 a drug is administered and Nicholas does not wake up again until he finds himself in a deserted place, "staring at a ruined wall" (480). The novel has more than 120 pages to go. The film's narrative has ended by now--with one exception; there is the matter of the identification of the living ex-girlfriend. In the novel, Nicholas does not discover that Alison is alive until he returns to Athens. But that is just the beginning of a new, major portion of the narrative in which Nicholas returns to England to track down Alison and anybody else associated with Conchis--and to wait, wait, and wait some more.
The above accounts of the two narratives are part summary, part interpretation, but the film is much more fully treated than the novel because the novel's trial sequence is so much more complex. In this respect, then, the trial versions differ in their particulars in radical ways. Most significantly, the trial scene in the film resides largely—no matter how much hypnotism is involved—in the imagination. The trial scene in the novel is real. The implications for the interpretation of the two narratives as wholes are many and varied, but the overall ramification is that the film's narrative is far less serious than the novel's.

In the novel, events go far beyond the pleasant notion of a masque. The film, it is true, shows us Nicholas roughed up (in the traitor scene with the Nazis) and Nicholas pinned and drugged, but the Nicholas of the novel is completely manhandled and repeatedly abused, psychologically even more than physically. The fallout from reviews of *The Magus* (and *The Collector*) led Fowles to defend himself in his preface to *The Aristos* against charges of cryptofascism. *The Magus* does raise grave questions about the meaning and the morality of Conchis's masque—and about the apparently laudatory response of Nicholas (overall). Conchis seems to be presented as a model educator, and yet his methods, to borrow a Conradian phrase, do seem rather unsound.
The Conchis of the film adaptation is much more the benevolent guru-uncle-jokester. He means well, and Nicholas ends up smiling. It is all rather good fun in the end, and nobody is hurt. Nicholas and Alison are bound to get back together; everything will turn out for the best. The novel is not at all this way, however, and there is a good chance things will not turn out well, that Nicholas will become an embittered, very disappointed man, condemned to an existence characterized by futile attempts to recapture the lost domain.

One of the chief reasons Fowles revised the novel seems to be that he was genuinely disturbed by the effect of the original ending. In the new version, little changed as it is, one can see important, if subtle ways in which the last scene is altered to shape Nicholas's future in a positive way, to ensure that he will be seen to be capable of becoming another happy alumnus of Conchis's strange summer school. But no matter how positively we wish to interpret the ending of the novel's narrative, we must not mistake it for a light (if somewhat mystical) entertainment of the kind the film seems to be. Above all, it is the trial scene in the film which departs so drastically from the tone and content of the action that the film takes from the novel. By comparison, most of the other material included in the film is faithfully if superficially rendered, presented
metaphorically perhaps, but preserved in such a way as to be recognizably a narrative called *The Magus*. 
Notes

1 John Fowles, The Magus: A Revised Version (New York: Dell, 1978), p. 6. This confession regarding Fowles's own appraisal of the first version of The Magus occurs in his Foreword to the slightly revised and enlarged version. For the purposes of this study, unless otherwise noted, direct quotations from the novel itself will use the original text: John Fowles, The Magus (New York: Dell, 1965).

2 For discussions of the changes from the first version of the novel to the second, see the two articles on the subject in the "John Fowles Special Number" of the Journal of Modern Literature, 8:2 (1980/81): Michael Boccia, "'Visions and Revisions': John Fowles's New Version of The Magus" (pp. 235-246); and Robert L. Nadeau, "Fowles and Physics: A Study of The Magus A Revised Version" (pp. 261-274).

3 The novel's party scene is described very early in the narrative (pp. 18-24), while the film's version comes proportionally later, through still in the early part of the film. The novel's party is an affair characterized by casualness and youth, while the film's version is
characterized by formality and maturity—the one seems a young people's party, the other seems an adult's party.

4 The statue used in the film is a copy of a famous sculpture of Poseidon housed in The National Museum in Athens.

5 Because Fowles is credited with the screenplay on the film, the assumption is that he is responsible for everything about the new narrative. However, based on the little that is known about the way in which Fowles's script was altered by director Guy Green, there is a strong possibility that some changes were not Fowles's ideas, but Green's. Chapter Five addresses this question further.

6 Here is a vestige of the novel's pervasive doubling motif. There are real twins in the novel, and Julie and Alison are compared, as are Nicholas and Conchis, and Nicholas and the guerilla leader.

7 The novel's version is substantially the same (p. 77).

8 Transcribed from the film; the novel's version of this exchange is slightly different (p. 79).

9 The abruptness of the jump cut joining the two scenes combined with the absence of any kind of establishing shot like the long shot used to bridge the previous two sequences seems to indicate that the action is continuous.

10 One could offer complicated arithmetical examples of the comparative numbers of words in the novel and in the film—-one could even estimate how many words would be
required to describe the purely visual content of the film—but the important fact to keep in mind is that spoken English rarely exceeds a rate of 150 words per minute. In the case of the eleven minutes of film in question, only about 275 words are actually spoken. The textual counterpart of the novel contains approximately 9000 words. This is almost a 33:1 ratio.

One of the few times Nicholas hears the sound of an airplane occurs at p. 106. (This passage, incidentally, seems to be the basis for the film's scene described above.) Subsequent events raise a question in the reader's mind as to the possibility that Conchis may have been responsible for the sound as a part of the masque. Here is an example of how the reader can be drawn into the guessing game, just as Nicholas is.


Some viewers of the film may not agree with my interpretation of the sequence. To me, the film's cues indicate that the viewer is being taken inside Nicholas's unconscious—or, at most, semi-conscious—mind. My feeling is that the film provides nothing to clarify the nature of the action; whether or not Conchis is hypnotizing Nicholas and putting him through an actual experience seems to me impossible to determine. I prefer to see the sequence as
taking place entirely in Nicholas's mind, whatever the stimulus may be (drugs, hypnosis, or Nicholas's own fears and fantasies).
Chapter Four:  

The French Lieutenant's Woman

The outstanding aspect of the adaptation of The French Lieutenant's Woman, in comparison with the two previous films made from Fowles novels, is the introduction of whole new sets of non-Fowlesian characters and narrative elements. Screenwriter Harold Pinter and director Karel Reisz created a twentieth-century framework for the main nineteenth-century action of The French Lieutenant's Woman which primarily involves two new characters, Anna and Mike (played by Meryl Streep and Jeremy Irons), who are themselves acting the roles of Sarah and Charles in the film being made within the film, The French Lieutenant's Woman. The main action of the new portion of the narrative is an affair between Anna and Mike—an affair which ends when the filming of The French Lieutenant's Woman is completed.

Although, on the surface, the new characters and action superimposed on Fowles's novel seem strikingly different from the original narrative, some critics have remarked on the way in which this film about filmmaking directly reflects Fowles's novel, which devotes considerable attention to the processes and pitfalls of novel-writing.
This sort of observation may be related to what Fowles means when he writes, in his foreword to Pinter's screenplay, that the screenplay provides "the blueprint...of a brilliant metaphor" for his novel.\(^2\) Yet the film does not directly translate the novelistic concerns into filmic ones. It is apparent, in the first place, that a novelist who writes about novel-writing is not quite the same as a director who makes a film about actors making a film. There is, in fact, very little in the film that shows the filmmaking process directly; most of Pinter's additional action involves the affair between Mike and Anna, not the making of the film.\(^3\)

The addition of Mike and Anna as doubles for Charles and Sarah introduces complicated problems which this chapter will attempt to address. But there are a number of other new and altered narrative elements—and of course omitted ones—which are of the first order of importance in assessing the degree to which the film version embodies the narrative of the novel. One striking aspect of the film is its altered characterization of Sarah. Representative of the overall change in the character is the specific transformation she undergoes from that of governess-model in the novel to governess-painter in the film. The idea of Sarah as an artist is a further embellishment of the idea of Sarah as a fictionist which is contained in the novel and preserved for the most part in the film. These questions will be raised in greater detail below, in the course of our
examination of two sections of the novel and their corresponding sequences in the film.

The first portion of the narrative that we will consider includes Chapters 18-24 (pp. 111-164), which corresponds to a sequence of film scenes roughly seventeen minutes long— including two scenes involving Mike and Anna. The action begins with Sarah's appeal to Charles and ends with Mrs. Poulteney's firing of Sarah. The second sequence includes both of the novel's main endings—an earlier false "ending" is inserted in chapter 44—and consists of Chapters 60-61 (pp. 343-66). The film, through use of both the Victorian and contemporary characters, retains both major endings in the sequence of scenes that culminates with the credits and runs for more than twelve minutes at the end of the film. This final sequence includes one scene from the contemporary action, the film's most startling development, climaxing with Mike's futile shout toward Anna's fleeing automobile: "Sarah!"

The film action in the first sequence begins with Charles entering the graveyard in search of Sarah, in response to the latter's note that was boldly smuggled into Charles's napkin during the teatime visit Mrs. Poulteney makes to Aunt Tranter's. Charles arrives at the graveyard at night and is startled by Sarah's whispered greeting. He immediately upbraids her for her act, then proceeds to listen to her request for a further meeting. The atmosphere
of the present meeting is almost a caricature of the atmosphere of gothic novels. Prominent among the elements of the setting and action are darkness, secrecy, mystery, the surprising peal of the church organ, the vicar's startling exit from the church, the presence of the gravestones, and the situation involving a respectable person coming into contact with a potentially corrupting character—this last element being an ironic reversal of the traditional gothic situation in which a virgin young woman is typically thrown in with a darkly handsome, probably evil, and definitely non-virgin older man. In this setting, then, the highly respectable, recently betrothed Charles compromises himself even further; he agrees to a meeting with the so-called "French lieutenant's woman," a meeting in which she is to confess what happened to her in relation to the Frenchman some eighteen months before.

The film immediately cuts to another nighttime scene, this one set more than one hundred years later and involving the actor and actress whom we saw playing the roles of Charles and Anna in the previous scene. As we already know from an early scene in the film, Mike and Anna are having an affair during the filming of The French Lieutenant's Woman. In this earlier scene we saw Mike unafraid of telling someone (or letting someone guess) about the relationship, while we saw Anna somewhat disturbed by the idea that anyone would know they were sleeping together. Now we see Mike at
the window, either gazing out into the darkness or contemplating his own reflected image (as we can). When he moves back to the bed where Anna is sleeping, he inadvertently disturbs her sleep. Anna murmurs, "David?" (pronouncing it as a French name); Mike responds that it is not David--her husband, apparently--but Mike. She asks him what he is doing, he says that he is looking at her, and she urges him to get in bed.

From this scene the film cuts to a third consecutive nighttime scene, at Dr. Grogan's residence, in which we see Charles in formal evening attire and hear his host expressing pleasure in Charles's having "dropped in." After what seems to be some initial sparring, Charles jumps at the opportunity to question Grogan about Sarah. Grogan responds by expressing the opinion that more is know of the fossils Charles is interested in than of "that girl's mind." He proceeds to an analysis of "poor Tragedy's" melancholia along the lines suggested by "a German doctor called Hartmann." Grogan labels Sarah's illness "obscure" melancholia--which means the cause is unknown. The conversation, to some extent taking on the shape of a short debate, results in Grogan's assertion that "she would be cured" if she told someone of the true cause of her misery.

The film cuts to Sarah and Charles obviously on the verge of the attempted cure; she is about to tell him what happened with the Frenchman. In a previous scene we have
already caught a glimpse of the hidden smile on Sarah's face that seemed to indicate the possibility of her manipulating--even amusing herself with--the earnest Charles. Now, in his nervous, sincere manner and in her almost theatrical presentation, we are aware that Charles may be at more of a disadvantage than he suspects. We do not know the precise nature of his vulnerability, but we sense that, in 1867, he is risking more than the possibility that he will be seen in company with the outcast of Lyme. Perhaps he is becoming "emotionally involved," as the saying goes, with his "patient"--for it is clear that Charles, in this pre-Freudian period, has taken on the role of therapist that Sarah begged him to take and that Grogan, unknowingly, has reinforced.

The content of Sarah's confession is highly suggestive, and the method of her telling is in itself quite seductive. Reisz's use of multiple camera angles--we see Sarah from a different point of view almost every time we switch back from a cutaway of Charles listening--magnifies the effect of the suspense of the story itself. Finally, after a great deal of detail concerning her relationship with the Frenchman, Sarah reveals that she "gave" herself to him even though she knew that "he had changed...that he was insincere," that she was "an amusement" for him. "I did it so that I should never be the same again," says Sarah, "so that I should be seen for the outcast I am."
This confession greatly disturbs Charles, and he tells Sarah—after she has referred to herself, dramatically, as "the French lieutenant's whore"—that she must leave Lyme. Just then, a young couple intrudes upon their solitude, and, although Sarah and Charles remain unseen, this incident effects an obvious shift in their self-awareness, suggesting the aspect of their situation that has so far gone unfulfilled: they are two young people of opposite sexes, unchaperoned and in an isolated place, and therefore they must be seen as lovers—or at least as sinners.6

Here the film cuts to Anna and Mike on the beach. "Why are you sad?" asks Mike. Anna denies that she is sad, but it seems likely that she is bothered by something; she is at least pensive and uncommunicative. We easily jump to the obvious conclusion that she either misses David, feels guilty about the affair with Mike, or both. We are less likely to conclude that she is sad because she will be separated from Mike once the film is finished. Something is not right between Anna and Mike, and we have seen Anna's hesitancy to have their affair publicized and her uneasiness in Mike's presence twice before this.7

The final two scenes in this sequence involve Sarah's intentional transgression—she walks out of the forbidden area of the Undercliff right in front of Mrs. Poulteney's spy (Mrs. Fairley)—and the nighttime scene in her bedroom in which she works on a self-portrait prior to being
summoned to an interview with Mrs. Poulteney by the violent pounding on her door (presumably by Mrs. Fairley). These two brief scenes mark the end of Sarah's employment at Mrs. Poulteney's, and we assume that the outcast will now be literally cast out of all refuge in Lyme. Only Charles is a potential ally—or savior.

The novel's treatment of this action is generally similar, but it includes a multitude of small but significant differences in action, setting, and characterization. There is no mention of Anna and Mike and filmmaking, but there is some extraneous material—material unrelated to the suspenseful narrative concerning Charles and Sarah. For example, only peripherally related to the main narrative are the epigraphs heading each of the chapters (18-24). Every chapter has at least one quotation from a poem or a non-fiction source, and two chapters have a pair of quotations (Chapters 18 and 20). The sources include the poetry of Arnold, Tennyson, and Hardy, and the prose of Darwin, G. M. Young, a Victorian-era doctor (Dr. John Simon), and—anachronistically—William Manchester. More important than the epigraphs is the narrative concerning Charles's bachelor uncle (and only surviving relative). The film ignores this character entirely, as it does the expectations Charles has in his role of heir to Winsyatt, Uncle Bob's—Sir Robert's—3000-acre Wiltshire estate (16). As we shall see, the subplot of the novel involving
Charles's future baronetcy has a substantial impact on the decisions Charles will make. Furthermore, the settings of some of the film's action differ markedly from those in the novel, and this difference between the two narratives is the first one we confront as we examine Chapter 18 in light of the film's version of the action.

The pair of epigraphs heading Chapter 18 suggest the need for sympathy concerning Victorian outcasts and the presence of mysterious figures, respectively (111). Both epigraphs seem to allude to Charles's perception of Sarah, before and during the action of this chapter. In contrast to the film's rapid pace, in which the tea with Mrs. Poulteney appears to precede the clandestine interview with Sarah by a mere matter of hours, that of the novel gives us a two-day interlude between the tea (which takes place not at Aunt Tranter's, but at Mrs. Poulteney's) and the meeting with Sarah. But in the novel there is no daringly smuggled note; Sarah simply follows Charles when the latter explores the Undercliff in search of a way to interrupt the monotony of an overcast day on which he is left to his own devices because of Ernestina's migraine (111). All the gothic elements present in the film's setting are absent in the novel's. Instead, in an interesting echo of The Magus, in which Nicholas has the capacity to sense when he is being watched, Charles feels "one of those inexplicable intuitions," and knows that he is "not alone" (113).
The history of the relationship—if it can be called that at this point—of Charles and Sarah is an odd one, and it varies slightly from novel to film. In both cases the two characters meet for the first time at the end of the Cobb, Lyme's curving quay, where Sarah is known to spend some of her time gazing mysteriously out to sea. Without ever being formally introduced, they become suddenly important to one another. In the novel, Charles is accompanied by Ernestina, so that it is Ernestina's plucking at Charles's sleeve that draws him back from Sarah (15). But in the film Charles leaves Ernestina to run a considerable way along the upper level of the Cobb until he comes face to face with the enigmatic "French lieutenant's woman." Then, in what has the effect of slow motion, the film audience is given a long look at Sarah, presumably as Charles perceives her. She is tragic and mysterious figure—and surprisingly naked in her look, perhaps even mad. Subsequent encounters between the two central characters occur in the Undercliff (65), near the dairy on the same day (74), and at Mrs. Poulteney's. Prior to the meeting orchestrated by Sarah which begins the sequence, Charles and Sarah had had words only in the course of the second of these encounters, when Sarah refused to let him accompany her and begged him to "tell no one that you have seen me in this place." For all practical purposes, then,
the interview we turn to now is the first real conversation between the two.

It is characteristic of the differences between the two narratives that the Sarah of the novel offers Charles two "tests" (or "marine shells") prior to making her request for "but one hour of your time" (119), while the Sarah of the film plunges immediately into her request as a result of Charles's instantaneous attack on her: "How did you dare to behave in so impertinent and presumptuous a manner? How dare you do such a thing in front of Miss Freeman?" The novel's version of the meeting includes a long descriptive passage regarding Charles's activities before Sarah's sudden appearance. Even after her abrupt intrusion, the novel's version of the narrative supplies a long stretch of dialogue (pp. 113-19) as compared to the terse, rapid-fire dialogue in the film. Not only is Sarah more aggressive in the film than in the novel, but she inspires--judging by what we can see--a much different kind of fear, awkwardness, and sense of duty in Charles. In the novel, Charles is "almost frightened" at first (113); then he is catered to, reproached, appealed to, argued with, and finally "horrified" (114-17) as Sarah tries to get him to agree to another meeting. As he leaves her, he feels confusion and strong emotion:
He should have taken a firmer line, should have left earlier, should have handed back the tests.... He felt outwitted.... (119-120)

It was as if, when she was before him, he had become blind; had not seen her for what she was, a woman most patently dangerous.... (120)

Despite the differences in the atmosphere, the setting, the pace, and the duration of the two scenes, the novel's version and the film's version agree on one thing: Charles is clearly at a disadvantage; he is threatened, and he reacts awkwardly. In the nervous, stumbling Charles of the film we see someone not exactly like the Charles of the novel, but someone whose actions have almost the same effect on an audience. In both cases we are shown a young aristocrat at the mercy of an erstwhile governess. In both cases there is more to Charles's reaction than can be explained by the simple facts. Something is going on in Charles's unconscious that he does not understand just as surely as there is something going on in Sarah's conscious, intentional thought processes that we are not aware of at this point in the narrative. The graveyard scene of the film, with all its gothic ponderousness, does serve as an analogue to the novel's action by capsulizing a variety of emotions. The gothic version presents us a Charles who is already overmatched, and not only by the village outcast, but by inclinations unknown to himself that dwarf his paltry
altrusim and his habitual show of duty. The fascination Charles feels for the mystery of Sarah is in both narratives rivalled only by his potential embarrassment were he to be observed in such a compromised position.\textsuperscript{12}

In \textit{The French Lieutenant's Woman}, Fowles employs very short chapters, quite unlike anything in \textit{The Collector} or \textit{The Magus}. The effect of these brief chapters (especially if one skips over the epigraphs) is "cinematic"; one feels the novelist "cutting" from one scene to the next.\textsuperscript{13} This is not to say that there is more dialogue than description in the novel. Fowles alternates long descriptive passages with sustained sections of dialogue. It is the rhythm of the novel that seems cinematic.

Chapter 19 (pp. 120-32), which is an excellent example of the cinematic quality of the novel, is one of the longer chapters in \textit{The French Lieutenant's Woman}, and yet it includes enough variety in terms of time and place to make it seem quite short. The action begins at a dinner party, but first we are given a lengthy introduction of a new character, Dr. Grogan. After the main event of the evening is concluded, and Ernestina and Aunt Tranter have been seen home by the two men, Charles accepts an invitation to accompany Grogan to the latter's residence for "a copious toddy." There, the two men discuss important political and philosophical issues—the sort of subjects Ernestina and Aunt Tranter would find little interest in, presumably;
subjects it would not be proper to discuss in front of them, according to Victorian conventions. But the most important subject of all is Sarah, and Charles cannot be acting unconsciously when he turns the conversation to this subject, successfully camouflaging his motives before Dr. Grogan. But this conversation is not continuous; it is interrupted by Fowles's abrupt switch—"At that very moment..." (128)—to Sarah sleeping at Mrs. Poulteney's house. This interlude takes the form of an essay on woman-to-woman relations in the mid-nineteenth-century, and on the living conditions of the rural poor of that time. Then, with an ironic return to Charles and Grogan—"The two lords of creation..." (130)—Fowles picks up the masculine conversation once again. But, in the chapter's very last line, Fowels ultimately returns the reader's attention (with Charles's) to Sarah. As the chapter ends, Charles seems to feel that he understands everything in the world, "except Sarah" (132).

The film gives us a fraction of Chapter 19—nothing more than what concerns Sarah. The film omits the dinner-party characterization of the four in attendance, the glimpse of Sarah's intimate relationship with Millie (and the Fowlesian disquisition on related subjects), and the detailed exchange of views between Grogan and Charles on the Reform Bills and Darwinian theory. This last subject results in Charles and Grogan discovering that they are
brothers in a sort of secret society of Darwinian disciples. This sudden friendship is far weightier than the pleasant conversation we are given in the film, and it has implications for the sacrifice Charles eventually makes in breaking his engagement to pursue Sarah.

In Chapter 20 we find substantially the same material presented by the film in the long confession scene. Setting aside the obvious fact that not all of the novel's dialogue is used in the film—the chapter is almost twelve pages long—one is struck by the extent to which the Pinter-Reisz version of the action conforms to the Fowles original. The chief omission lies in the absence of the action in which the novel's Sarah meets Charles and leads him on a perilous ascent to the "secluded place" where she will launch the two of them into a new realm, into an intensified relationship and out of the societal roles in which they seem so permanently fixed. In addition to Fowles's description of the Undercliff during the hike and climb to Sarah's isolated spot, the novel also provides a further development regarding the tests. Sarah has brought another one for Charles, prompting him to offer to pay her "what I should pay at Miss Anning's shop" (133). Sarah's reaction ("she was offended") causes Charles to be put on the defensive at the outset of the scene: "...again he had that unaccountable sensation of being lanced, of falling short, of failing her" (134). Beyond these elements, one can argue that Chapter 20
is as completely translated into film as one could imagine. As mentioned earlier, Reisz's stunning use of camera angles, shot composition, and editing are very successful in charging the confession with a sort of explosive suspense. Here is a scene in which the film version is arguably superior to the original—and yet faithful to it.

The confession does not end with Chapter 20, however; the following chapter contains the conclusion of the film scene, including the arrival of a pair of lovers. In the film it is difficult to identify the pair, but Fowles tells us who they are—Sam and Mary. But the reactions of the film's characters in this (for Charles) embarrassing situation cannot begin to compare in precision with those which Fowles describes (150).

As in The Magus, where a smile takes on tremendous significance (in both novel and film, but differently in each), so in The French Lieutenant's Woman we are presented with a facial expression that is overlaid with layers of meaning. "Without warning," Sarah looks at Charles: "Then she did something as strange, as shocking, as if she had thrown off her clothes. She smiled." To Charles, this smile is earthshaking:

It was a smile so complex that Charles could at the first moment only stare at it incredulously. It was so strangely timed! He felt she had almost been waiting for such a moment to unleash it on
him—this revelation of her humor, that her sadness was not total. And in those wide eyes, so somber, sad and direct, was revealed an irony, a new dimension of herself....

Where are your pretensions now, those eyes and gently curving lips seemed to say; where is your birth, your science, your etiquette, your social order? (150)

The film cannot communicate all this to us. For one thing, the film does not prepare us for this degree of reflection because the amorous couple we see is far less sexually active than the one Fowles hints at in the novel: "...it was clear that the two servants were far more interested in exploring each other than their surroundings." This does not agree with the hilarious chase that we see in the film, which is a stimulus capable of provoking nothing so complex as the smile Sarah turns on Charles in the novel. Minutes pass in the novel, but in the film there is only a moment or two of uneasiness before the lovers are out of the way. The novel's narrative is much more highly charged at this point, and this prepares us better for Charles's line, "We must never meet alone again" (150).

And yet the film once again delivers something in the way of an analogue for the novel's more complex narrative, because the film shows us Meryl Streep. Streep's appearance is so extraordinarily sensual that one is aware throughout
the confession scene just how tempted Charles must be to throw away duty, propriety, piety and all the other Victorian ideals in favor of the woman before him. The analogue, then, comes into play not at any one moment—though there are certain moments (such as the one in which Sarah begins to loosen her hair) which stand out—as in the novel, but continuously. Despite Fowles's considerable descriptive gifts he cannot give us a description of Sarah to match the non-verbal description Reisz and Streep create.

We have skipped over the question of how the nighttime scene between Mike and Anna relates to the novel, and now we come to a point in the narrative at which the film once again returns to the present, to the actors off duty, this time lying together on a beach. The striking thing about the beach scene is that it comes just when—in the novel—Charles is distancing himself from Sarah, first by will and later in literal terms, when he is called away to Winsyatt unexpectedly. Both forms of distancing occur in Chapter 22, immediately after the confession scene. At this point in the film, by means of a cut to the beach scene, we are given action in which Mike begs Anna to confess—"What's the matter?" and "Why are you so sad?"—but she does not respond with anything more than a terse denial that anything is wrong. In the film, then, Mike is further distanced from Anna, as we have seen him beginning to be distanced prior to
this scene (for example, when Anna calls to David in her sleep). The Winsyatt part of the novel's plot is omitted, but the idea of a narrative element that both distances the male figure and makes him weaker (more in need of the female figure) is preserved.

Despite Charles's efforts to persuade himself that he has acted on the purest of motives (152), that he is "endowed with free will" (152-53), that he would in the future delegate "all administration of his interest" to Aunt Tranter (153), and that Sarah could now be regarded "as an object of his past" (153), the reader begins to understand how deeply involved with Sarah he has become. Even his eager grasping at the excuse of having to leave Lyme betrays his increasing desperation. Fowles shows us how Charles's mind works:

I am afraid Charles smiled as soon as he read [the telegram]; he very nearly kissed the orange envelope. It removed him from any immediate further embarrassment; from the need for further lies of omission. It was most marvelously convenient. (153)

In fact, what this imminent development will do is provide a "marvelously convenient" reason for Charles to abandon everything about his present life in favor of having Sarah. By being disinherited, in effect, through the marriage and probable offspring of his uncle, Charles will (in Chapter
24) supply Ernestina with the opportunity to show her true colors, and he will provide himself with the escape from tradition and propriety that is all he needs to allow him to surrender to his growing urge to make Sarah the focus of his life.

Chapter 23 of the novel is primarily devoted to showing us what Charles's life would have become had he inherited Winsyatt as expected. It indicates more about his childhood, too, and it therefore provides further characterization of the Charles who is about to be transformed. In addition to this further development of what is about to be shattered—including devotion to duty ("immense duties") (158-59)—chapter 23 also presents one of the novelist's cinematic cuts. As the reader is given enough information to understand that Charles has been called to Winsyatt to learn of his uncle's marriage, Fowles concludes a section of the chapter with the one-line paragraph, "But still he did not guess." Then, after a white space, we get the following:

Nor did he—but in this case, how could he?—guess what had happened to Sarah when she left the previous afternoon. She had walked quickly back through the woods...then emerged in full view of the two women at the cottage door.... (159)

This long paragraph (which has been severely cut above) shows Sarah making a conscious decision to be seen— one of
the women is Mrs. Poulteney's spy, Mrs. Fairley—committing an unforgivable transgression. She knows as she acts that the result will be the loss of her position; she will be irrevocably cast out.

On his return to Lyme, Charles (in Chapter 24) is first greeted with "dear Tina's" unrestrained outburst against Uncle Robert (160-61) and then by the news that "there has been an event," that "Mrs. Poulteney has dismissed Miss Woodruff" (162). Tina's behavior alienates Charles while Sarah's plight inspires his concern; he has no idea that Sarah intentionally betrayed herself. But above all else, what is on Charles's mind is whether or not he had been seen with Sarah. He panics, and as his anxiety mounts, his concern for Sarah gains the upper hand:

It became imperative to discover how much was publicly known about the reason for her dismissal. He suddenly found the atmosphere of the little sitting room claustrophobic. He had to be alone. He had to consider what to do. For if Sarah was still living—but who could tell what wild decision she might have made in her night of despair, while he was quietly sleeping in his Exeter hotel?—but if she still breathed, he guessed where she was; and it oppressed him like a shroud that he was the only person in Lyme to
know. And yet he dared not reveal his knowledge.

Our sequence ends with Charles "striding down the hill to the White Lion" with "thunder in the offing, as in his heart." As in the film, Charles does receive a note, and he will subsequently see Grogan before ignoring that man's advice and seeking out Sarah himself.

At this point, before we move to the sequences which conclude the two works, it is interesting to note the way in which we can already understand how the Pinter-Reisz film alters the Fowles narrative. One obvious category of difference is in what is omitted, including the Winsyatt subplot (and therefore further characterization of both Charles and Tina). A second readily apparent category is what is added in terms of the contemporary action—everything involving the idea of making a film, the affair between Mike and Anna, and the vivid juxtaposition of the reality of the action in the latter part of the twentieth century with the elaborate illusion (being created by that action) of the nineteenth century. But a third major category is equally striking—what is added to the Victorian action, what Pinter adds to the part of the Fowles narrative that he appears to be faithfully preserving.

Among the new elements in this third category of alterations are the asylum scene that follows Charles's receipt of Sarah's note and the "real" tennis action that
occurs in London when Charles seeks out Montague, his solicitor, to instruct him to send money to Sarah at Exeter. Neither scene is absolutely necessary to the action, but both scenes may be necessary to make the film interesting. Another example of this category of Pinter-Reisz addition to the Victorian portion of the action is the creation of an artistic side of Sarah. Our first sequence ends with the film scene in which Sarah studies herself in the mirror, assumes a position that may be an echo of the earlier scene in which she sketches her dead employer (who is lying in a coffin), and closes her eyes as we hear the inhuman shouting and pounding of Mrs. Fairley, calling Sarah to her dismissal scene with Mrs. Poulteney.

Whenever one thinks of The French Lieutenant's Woman, one thinks of a work with "two endings." This is a contradiction in terms, of course, because any work, whether it be a novel or a film, a poem or a play, can have literally only one ending. So, in the case of The French Lieutenant's Woman in its two forms, there are two pairs of endings, a false one and a true one. The film's endings are allocated to different sets of characters, and the second ending (or true ending) is the one involving the contemporary characters, the actors Mike and Anna. The first ending (or false ending) is the end of the film within a film, or the end of the illusion-making
process. The two major scenes that end the Pinter-Reisz work correspond to the final two chapters (60-61) of Fowles's novel.

The title, "Three Years Later," appears on the screen following a cast party at Mike's London home in which Mike and Anna's husband David have a confusing conversation regarding "which ending" the film will choose to portray:

D: Have they decided how they're going to end the movie?
M: End it?
D: Aren't they changing the script?
M: No, no, not at all. Where did you hear that?
D: Well, there are two endings in the book, a happy ending and an unhappy ending, no?
M: We're going for the first ending— I mean the second ending.
D: Which one is that?
M: Hasn't Anna told you?17

The brief scene that follows shows us a much-deteriorated Charles sitting in a near catatonic state somewhere by a sea- or lakeside resort. He is brought a telegram that announces Sarah's discovery. He shows no reaction.

What follows is "the first ending" (or the "happy ending") in which Charles arrives at the Windemere home of an architect to find Sarah working in her studio.18 She is
apparently a successful painter now, and she has sent for Charles. After a tumultuous meeting punctuated by passionately bitter outbursts on Charles's part, Sarah softly observes, "If you still love me, you can forgive me." We are given to understand that he does both love her and forgive her by the glimpse we get of them in a rowboat emerging from the darkness of a boathouse and heading out onto the bright lake.

The scene that follows is set in the present, at the party following the shooting of the film-within-a-film's final scene. Mike and Anna have apparently agreed to meet in the same room in which they have recently played the scene described above. The camera shows us a variety of shots of cast and crew members dancing and conversing, and we witness Mike's gesture to Anna which is meant as a signal that it is time for them to meet. Anna disengages herself from the actor who has played Dr. Grogan and slips upstairs, pausing a moment to consider the dressing table where the red wig she wore in the role of Sarah occupies a prominent place. Mike follows after a few moments, sees the table and wig, switches off the lights surrounding the mirror, and walks into an empty room. He is clearly at a loss upon discovering that Anna is not in the room, and he reacts with alarm when he hears an automobile starting outside. He hurries to the window in time—we assume, because the camera never leaves his face—to see Anna drive (or being driven)
away. He calls out, "Sarah!" Then he slumps onto a sort of couch and lights a cigarette. From a long shot of Mike forlornly smoking in the darkened room, the film cuts to the shot of Charles and Anna in the rowboat, emerging from the boathouse, and the music and credits take over.

On the surface, there is very little that the film's pair of endings shares with the novel's endings. However, in terms of overall effect, the two sets of endings are absolutely similar: there is, as Anna's husband observes to Mike in the film, "a happy ending and an unhappy ending"—and in that order. How these endings are portrayed is of interest, then, because the details are almost without exception quite different in the two narratives, but the impacts are equal. Each work finally concludes with the important male character losing the woman he is in love with. Each work preserves the mystery of Sarah in the end.

The penultimate chapter of the novel is set in London, not Windemere, and Charles goes to an address in Chelsea near the then-foul Thames. He does not know who has tipped off Montague about Sarah's present situation, but the reader knows that it was Sam. Conscious of being a gentleman calling on a "superior form of servant" (345), and knowing that although her name is "Mrs. Roughwood" she is not married, Charles knocks on the door and is immediately thrown into confusion over whether or not the young woman who answers is or is not a maid. Until that moment,
however, the Charles of the novel has quite a bit more knowledge and security approaching this meeting than does the Charles of the film. Montague had assigned a clerk to play detective, and in this way Charles had Sarah indirectly under surveillance during the time it took him to return to London from New Orleans, where he received Montague's message.

The role of Sam in the novel is highly relevant at this point, because it is through Sam's machinations in Exeter that Charles loses his chance to win Sarah after the hurried sexual encounter in the hotel there. Entrusted with a brooch and a letter (292), and with instructions to deliver them to Sarah's hotel and wait for a reply, Sam disregards his master's orders, and Sarah leaves Exeter ignorant of Charles's tortured thoughts and desperate hopes. Sam subsequently resigns from his position with Charles and, in effect, goes over to the enemy; by the time he sends the information to Montague, his wife Mary has borne him two children and he has graduated to a surprisingly high-paying job in Mr. Freeman's mammoth store. Mary is seen wearing the brooch that was, ironically, purchased by Charles for Tina, but finally intended for Sarah.

The fact of Sam's duplicitous initiative in the first place, and his later, modest attempt to make up for it by informing Charles's solicitor of Sarah's whereabouts is important not only because of the difference in his
characterization but because of the way it alters Sarah's character as well. In the novel, Sarah's disappearance from Exeter is more understandable, and her consistent intention of never seeing Charles again seems more in character. The novel's Sarah, in one of her final lines to Charles in the hotel, confesses that she cannot explain why she has done what she has done: "It is not to be explained" (279). We later learn that Sarah has changed her name—even moved from one situation—because of the advertisements she saw concerning Charles's efforts to locate her (354). She does not wish to see Charles again, unlike the film's Sarah, who apparently sends for him with the intention of living happily ever after with him.

The film's version of Sarah is altogether more assertive than the novel's, from the smuggled note at tea to the first ending. In her role as artist, Sarah is more aggressive and individualistic in relation to society than she is in her role as amanuensis and model in the Rossetti household, even though the mere fact of being connected with that household does indicate a large degree of independence from social norms—but that is something the Sarah of the novel has always shown, if in a more passive manner than her counterpart in the film.

In passing, we should note that the film preserves much of Sarah's style of dress (347) and hair (349). There is no direct reference, either verbal or visual, to the
possibility that Sarah has borne a child as a result of the encounter with Charles in the film. And, even though she is about to accept Charles in the novel, Fowles's Sarah shows her consistent character by stating her belief that she is "not to be understood":

...I am not to be understood even by myself. And I can't tell you why, but I believe my happiness depends on my not understanding.

...you cannot understand that to me it is not an absurdity. (354)

All the seriousness of Chapter 60 seems to be for the sake of suspense; the chapter ends with the humorous observation by the narrator that, by banging her rag doll against his cheek, Charles's daughter "reminds her father...that a thousand violins cloy very rapidly without percussion" (360).

The comparison of the two "first endings" is simple enough; there are many differences, and yet there is an overall equivalency in the two portions of the narratives. Perhaps the simplicity of this comparison is explained by the fact that we ultimately discount both first endings as false when compared with the actual endings of the two works: The film's first Windemere scene and the novel's Chapter 60 both do little more than set the stage for the final episodes. By appearing to embody endings to the two works, these scenes build up suspense for the actual
conclusions. By the time we reach the beginnings of the second endings we are ready for a heightened seriousness, and we are aware that these second endings cannot be traditionally happy ones.

Because the film leaves us with the scene in which Mike shouts "Sarah!" at Anna, there is a final accent put on the possibility that it has been a film about Sarah told from Mike's point of view. One can argue that the entire action of the film amounts to a record of the process through which Mike becomes obsessed with Sarah. But Sarah does not exist, except in the illusion-making machinery of the novel and in the film Anna and Mike have just completed—and in Mike's imagination. It is Anna with whom Mike has had his affair, but Anna has stubbornly maintained her distance from him despite his concerted efforts to draw closer to her, perhaps even to persuade her to leave David for him. Mike is clearly indifferent to his own wife in the scenes prior to and during the party at his home. If anything, he is depressed by his marriage in the face of some unknown potential that he seems to see in a relationship with Anna. But, in her reluctance to express her feelings verbally, in her continual withdrawing from Mike, Anna also remains an enigma for the film audience. Just as in the case of Sarah's behavior toward Charles in the novel, Anna's motives for having the affair with Mike remain mysterious and inexplicable.
The final version of Sarah that we are given in the novel is a character with tremendous integrity and will. As the epigraph from Mathew Arnold suggests—"True piety is acting what one knows"—this Sarah is self-aware, authentic, and courageous. She does not waver in her determination to lead her own life, and yet she makes an attempt to help Charles understand her conviction. This may be more than what Anna does in the film, because the latter is apparently intoxicated at Charles's party, and she seemingly chooses to flee rather than discuss the subject of their relationship after the shooting of the final scene at Windemere. In this regard, the Anna of the end of the film echoes the Sarah of Exeter in the novel who leaves without any intention of seeing her lover again.

In Mike, we have an analogue for the narrator of the novel in the sense that it is from Mike's and the narrator's points of view that we get the two narratives. Fowles's own statements regarding the composition of the novel are curiously akin to Mike's attitudes regarding Sarah. In both cases, those of author-narrator and actor, the sources of our point of view are characters obsessed with the mystery of Sarah. In Mike's case, of course, his obsession is a mixture of Anna and Sarah, but his final word seems to betray where the main part of the obsession lies. Fowles creates a character in his "narrator," but it is a character closely linked to John Fowles, just as Mike's experience as
Charles must be seen as related to Fowles's imaginative experience. Witness Fowles's description of the way in which he first began to visualize Sarah:

The woman obstinately refused to stare out of the window of an airport lounge; it had to be this ancient quay...

...I always saw her in the same static long shot, with her back turned.... An outcast. I didn't know her crime, but I wished to protect her. That is, I began to fall in love with her. Or with her stance. I didn't know which.20

That is Mike's problem, too; he does not know exactly what he is in love with, a real woman or an illusion brought alive to him through Anna. Unlike Fowles, who writes that his imaginary woman "had no face"—certainly an interesting comment in itself on the nature of Fowles's creation—Mike has a very specific face to fall in love with, even if it is surrounded by different hairstyles and clothes from one hour to the next.

Mike is denied in the film what Charles is accorded in both the novel and the film within the film—a final confrontation with his lover. The Pinter-Reisz version avoids this final confrontation, probably because the filmmakers could not devise a workable way of bringing it off without diminishing Anna's mysteriousness. But the effect of this missing element is that the audience is
confronted with its own attitudes toward Sarah and Anna—the romanticized past and the banal present, the illusion and the reality—as it perceives Mike's inner confusion. The final confrontation of the film, then, takes place in Mike's mind (if he does realize what he has done) and in the minds of the film's viewers.

The Collector and The Magus are both novels that focus much of their attention on the image-making energies of their characters, and The French Lieutenant's Woman is no different in this respect—perhaps even more involved in this project than its predecessors. Clegg forms an elaborate image of Miranda in his mind before he kidnaps her, and after he has her in captivity he first realizes that she does not look as he thought she did and later realizes that she is not at all the person he thought she would be. Similarly, Conchis is a creator of images and Nicholas expands upon the suggestions the former provides for him, with the result that Nicholas is continually discovering that the other characters are unlike his first impression of them. In The French Lieutenant's Woman, Fowles is concerned with Charles's notions about Sarah and with twentieth-century reader's notions about the Victorian era. In the film, Anna and Mike must both be professionally concerned about the images of their characters, and Mike becomes further involved in creating a character that is part Sarah and part Anna. Anna creates a character who is
herself engaged in creating a character (by means of her story regarding what happened with the French lieutenant), and Mike becomes mired in the confusion of living with this double layer of illusion-making.

It is in the layers of self-referential commentary on illusion-making that the Pinter-Reisz work matches the original Fowles novel. One can regard the contemporary framework of the film version as a successful metaphor for the essay-like material in the novel, but the film succeeds at a more impressive level than even this one. Ultimately, despite differences at every level, the film version of the novel stands on its own as a separate work of art at the same high level of accomplishment. Remarkably, the film audience is made to consider the same emotional, psychological, philosophical, and historical points with which Fowles confronts the reader in the novel. And, in both cases, Fowles's wish for Sarah to remain a mystery is granted, and in both works that mystery is a richly evocative source of energy.
Notes

1 Leslie Garis (The New York Times Magazine, 30 August 81), in an early article on the film, "Translating Fowles into Film," observes that advance opinion on the film was split between those who "think the device brilliant—a metaphorical equivalent of Fowles's contemporary asides" and those who "resent the interruptions" (p. 24). David Ansen ("The Woman on the Quay," Newsweek, 21 September 81) finds the film's structure so carefully crafted that "what's disconcerting at the outset gradually becomes doubly engrossing" (p. 96), but he emphasizes the contrast between styles of courtship. More subtle views of what goes on in the film are found in comments by Peter Conradi (John Fowles, Methuen, 1982) and Jim Welsh ("The French Lieutenant's Woman," Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. X, No. 1, 1982). Conradi notes that "we seem invited imperinenty to ponder what can be the relations between the actors...who portray the actors" (100-01). Welsh is struck by statements director Karel Reisz had made long before beginning work on The French Lieutenant's Woman in which he explicitly favors the values of discovery and improvisation in filmmaking (p. 66). After multiple viewings, one is struck by the extent to which The French Lieutenant's Woman really is a film
about filmmaking, even though there are very few shots of the hardware and the settings one associates with the making of a major commercial movie.


3 Scenes which show the apparatus connected with filmmaking include, most strikingly, the opening shot of Anna preparing for a take of Sarah walking along the Cobb, several scenes in which Mike and Anna rehearse or discuss scenes, two party settings involving members of "the unit," and a few brief shots of film-related matters, such as Anna's departure from her hotel showing the Victorian street scene giving way to the contemporary one, and Anna picking out clothes for Sarah to wear in the final scene. The only self-conscious use of filmmaking technology occurs when Reisz employs a match cut to show Mike and Anna rehearsing and Charles and Sarah interacting without a break in the action.

4 It is tricky to time the final two scenes because of the question of whether or not the second shot of Charles and Sarah in the rowboat really takes place in Mike's mind—as suggested by our awareness that Mike has just lit a cigarette and sat down in the studio where the "final scene" was shot—or simply serves as a pleasant visual background for the credits.

5 Mike answers the phone in Anna's room—they are in bed together—and when Anna remarks, "But then they know,"
he replies, "I want them to know." They joke about it, but one senses that Mike cares much less about the matter than Anna does. Her ambivalence concerning their affair continues to grow in subsequent scenes.

6 It is difficult to positively identify the young couple shown in the film, but in the novel Fowles does identify them, and it is Charles's manservant, Sam, chasing (and catching) Aunt Tranter's maid, Mary (who is wearing one of Ernestina's old dresses).

7 Anna behaves oddly in the rehearsal scene; she seems very uneasy and acts as if she is irritated by having Mike touch her. The other instance involved the wake-up call (note 5).

8 Manchester, in The Death of a President, quotes Mrs. Kennedy as saying, in refusing to change her dress, "Let them see what they've done."

9 Dr. John Simon asks, "Who can wonder that the laws of society should at times be forgotten" by those ignored by that society? Thomas Hardy speaks of "a faint figure" which "seemed" to stand, characterized by "the bygone look."

10 If not actually shown in slow motion, this close-up of Sarah seems as if it were shot in slow motion. The abrupt change in the soundtrack, from the roar of the ocean to the music of violins--reinforces this effect.

11 All quotations from the film have been cross-checked with the Pinter screenplay for accuracy. Often, there are
small changes in the dialogue from screenplay to film, and occasionally there are major changes. Unless otherwise noted, the quotations used in this discussion are transcriptions from the film.

12 The two narratives share Mrs. Poulteney's (and Tina's) opinions concerning the impropriety of Sam and Mary's speaking in public. In the novel, Charles merely questions this interdiction by asking, "But surely...we are not going to forbid them to speak together if they meet?" (P. 88, Fowles's ellipsis.) In the film, Charles goes further in challenging Mrs. Poulteney and his own fiancee: "...I do not understand what crime, Mary and Sam, by talking, appear to commit." In both cases, Mrs. Poulteney reprimands him for his insufficient strictness. Ironically, it will be Sam and Mary who discover Charles with Sarah—but then Charles is not merely talking with Sarah by this time.

13 The use of white spaces in *The Collector* to break up Clegg's narrative sometimes has the effect of rendering his version of the action in slightly cinematic rhythm, but this does not hold true often. Miranda's diary entries are brief, but the effect is not often cinematic; her "writing style" is characterized by strong emotional statements and analytical passages more frequently than by narrative passages.

14 For a discussion of "real" or "court" tennis which mentions *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and *The Seven Per

15 Because the novel is controlled by Fowles's narrator (likened to "a gamma-ray particle" as well as to "the successful impresario," pp. 361, 362), the two endings seem to some extent equally artificial. In the film the second ending seems more real because the first is obviously "only" a film.

16 Even this statement simplifies matters; there is the final scene (over which the credits roll) to consider, a reprise of the earlier rowboat shot of Sarah and Charles.

17 Pinter's screenplay contains substantially the same language as this transcription from the film. (See p. 95.)

18 A young man introduces himself as "Tom Eliot." This seems to be an example of Fowles's penchant for literary allusions affecting Pinter. There is an interesting configuration of literary influence involving Fowles, Eliot (whose poetry is quoted in The Magus), Alain-Fournier (a large influence on The Magus and Eliot's tutor in Paris), and Jules Laforgue (with whom Eliot and Alain-Fournier were both obsessed). Hartmann, the "German doctor" quoted by Grogan, was a major influence on Laforgue.

19 The narrator suggests that the reader may think that in placing her hand on Charles's arm she "betrayed...a certain weakness of purpose" (365).
Chapter Five:  
Conclusions

Ernest Hemingway, after being shown a script for a projected television adaptation of one of his short stories, took the time to restore all the dialogue to the exact form that it had in the original. Hemingway seemed to have expected "verbatim conformity" and "literal fidelity" to the printed text, according to Gene D. Phillips in Hemingway and Film, and he could not bear the thought of having his works expanded or compressed in any way. Yet despite Hemingway's complaints about the adaptations made from his novels and stories, Phillips concludes that "the complex thematic structure of the Hemingway code as found in his fiction is implicitly present in varying degrees in most of the motion pictures based on his work."¹

Although there are far fewer adaptations of works by John Fowles so far committed to film--sixteen films have been made from Hemingway's works--one might say that in Fowles's case, too, a sort of "complex thematic structure" has found its way "in varying degrees" into the films that have their origins in his fiction. The Collector, The Magus, and The French Lieutenant's Woman are very different
kinds of films, as the foregoing chapters have attempted to show, but each of them bears the unmistakable trademark of what could be called Fowles's "code."

In this final chapter, in addition to a review of the ways in which the film versions of Fowles's works embody the content and values of the originals, there is a need to confront a variety of questions raised in Chapter One about the relationship between novels and films in general, and between a set of three novels and the film adaptations inspired by them in particular. Before addressing this series of questions it is appropriate to focus briefly on a definitional question that is important to this study: what do we mean when we speak of "a narrative"?

Frequent references have been made in the preceding pages to narratives being embodied in the works of literature and film under consideration here, but what exactly does it mean to speak of a shared narrative or an altered narrative? In *The Nature of Narrative*, Scholes and Kellogg define narrative to mean literary works characterized by "the presence of a story and a story-teller." At the very end of their book, the authors add the observation that, although it may not be "immediately obvious," film is "a form of narrative rather than dramatic art because it does not present a story directly, without narration, but always through the medium of a controlled point of view, the eye of the camera...[and]...its
synchronous sound track...." The real problem is with the term, "a story." It is easy enough to see that the story-teller in a novel is either the author or the narrator, and the story-teller in a film is either the director or the camera (and sound-track recorder). But what constitutes the story? This is the real question that we ask when we approach the issue of a narrative—what is the story that is being told by the teller?

For the solution to this preliminary problem, I prefer to turn to an observation made by Christian Metz in Film Language. Metz, perhaps the most important of recent film theoreticians, is a semiologist whose works have used structural linguistics to examine the language of film, and whose highly abstract concerns have seemed to me to have minimal bearing on the present project. But, in attempting to justify his own structural analysis of narrative film, Metz makes the statement that narrative "is primarily, in some way, a real object, which even the naive listener clearly recognizes and never confuses with what it is not." This notion of narrative as "a real object" projects the sort of solidity that one does sense when analyzing a work...
of narrative literature—and especially when comparing two closely related works such as a novel and a film adaptation of that novel. Despite the complex, multifaceted nature of a narrative, one begins to feel—after a long period of exposure to a work—that one can almost touch the story embedded in the work. There is a curious impression that the narrative of a given novel or film comes to emanate, an impression of concreteness, uniqueness, and irreducibility.

Let it be said, before this essay descends to the kind of "impressionistic connoisseurship" Chapter One warns against, that Metz's suggestive notion of narrative as a real object seems to me useful primarily because it articulates the sense one comes to have that there is a story in a novel (and in a film) in the same way that there is said to be solid matter somewhere in the midst of all that empty space that constitutes an atom. One can take away so much of a novel or a film—this minor character or that brief scene—and still retain the essence of the unique narrative. Here we had better return to specific examples provided by the three novel-film pairs, The Collector, The Magus, and The French Lieutenant's Woman.

What should be clear after the analyses in the foregoing chapters in that film adaptations, if they are of the two-hour "Hollywood" kind, inevitably leave out much that is contained in the novels on which they are based. The sequences of scenes examined have all illustrated this;
in *The Collector* the most striking loss from novel to film is Miranda's diary (and her point of view, generally), while in *The Magus* it is the larger world Nicholas inhabits (England, his own history, his thoughts and convictions), and in *The French Lieutenant's Woman* it is probably the portrait of the age (and also of Charles's place in that age) that is lost to the film. But, once again, it must be admitted that this general observation is of little use, because it seems obvious that 120 minutes of film cannot embrace all of the action included in, for example, the 600 pages of *The Magus*. The most that can be said concerning the issue of omissions is that, in general, any given 600-page novel is certain to be open to many different two-hour "interpretations." One comes to the point of realizing that, in an adaptation worth considering in the first place, what is left out is of secondary importance; it is what the filmmaker puts into such an adaptation that determines its character.

Given the obvious pressure on scriptwriters and directors to eliminate elements of the original narrative, it becomes apparent that the categories of alterations--in the sense of present but changed elements--and additions are of greater significance. (These, of course, also come under the heading of what the filmmaker chooses to put into the adaptation.) In the case of *The Collector*, the addition of the nosey neighbor takes on great significance in our
understanding of the overall interpretation of the film, but the alteration of the manner in which Miranda attempts to kill Clegg (and the events leading up to that assault) is even more revealing in regard to the characterizations of Clegg and Mirands. In The Magus, the alteration of the scenes involving Nicholas's holiday with Alison/Ann is a strong clue concerning the sort of film that results; the addition of the paperweight is even more significant. And, finally, in the case of The French Lieutenant's Woman, the addition of the twentieth-century framework is crucial to the understanding of the meaning of the film, just as the subtle alterations in Sarah's behavior are vital to an appreciation of how the Victorian action has been changed.

In a comparative study of novels and film adaptations, every difference one can detect between the two works eventually contributes to a better understanding of each individual work. I hope the preceding chapters have served to reinforce what "literature and film" courses have taught for years, that an increased capacity for analyzing and appreciating one version of a work can tangibly aid one in analysis and appreciation of another version. And this point can be broadened to include two entire fields—assuming they have something in common, as do narrative fiction and narrative film. But the present study can also produce more specific conclusions regarding the works of John Fowles and the films based on those works.
Earlier in this chapter, the idea of a Fowlesian "code" or "complex thematic structure" was introduced. By studying the three films made from three of his novels, one can compile a catalogue of shared components that might be said to reveal something about the novelist's concerns. In order to be convincing, such a catalogue must include only those thematic threads present in all three novel-film pairs. It is surprising to discover how extensive such a list is; and it is difficult to be certain how significant each individual item is. Nevertheless, such a list is interesting, and it is worth attempting here.

All three films involve young men (Clegg, Nicholas, and Charles/Mike) encountering difficult experiences with romantic love and strong though seemingly fragile young women (Miranda, Ann and Lily/Julie, and Sarah/Anna). As one can readily see from the difficulty in listing the main characters in the films, doubling is a very apparent theme in the three adaptations, beginning with the way in which one comes to see Miranda and Clegg as, in some sense, doubles (because they are both imprisoned by Clegg's obsession, and by differences in education and culture). In *The Magus*, Alison and Lily/Julie are doubles, Nicholas and the younger Conchis are doubles, and Nicholas and the guerilla *and* Lily/Julie all play the role of prisoner-victim, though the doubling in the film is severely limited compared with that of the novel. *The French
**Lieutenant's Woman** puts the accent on the doppleganger more than the previous adaptations of Fowles do; doubles include Charles and Mike, Sarah and Anna, Charles and Sam, Charles and Tina, and every actor who plays two roles in the film. All three films take place in remote or exotic settings, have more or less open endings, emphasize illusion-making, rely on art for allusion and echoing, suggest complications in point of view, portray marriage as an undesirable or unworkable solution to ideal love, value nature, and underline the significance of randomness as a critical determinant in human lives and relationships.

It would take a much broader study than the present one to determine whether these common characteristics of the three films—characteristics shared by the three novels—are truly significant, or whether a large proportion of novels and films share them, but on the surface the catalogue seems to indicate that something characteristic of Fowles has been understood by filmmakers and transferred to film. Despite the author's dissatisfaction with the first two films, there are clear thematic ties between all three novel-film pairs. And Fowles is not as preoccupied with fidelity to the novels as Hemingway was, so there is some question as to whether preservation of the thematic content of the works is even important to him. In his book on Hemingway, Phillips seems to mourn the fact that none of the Hemingway films is "pure Hemingway." Fowles does not demand anything like "pure
Fowles' from film adaptations of his work, but he understandably wishes for a high standard of film. As a member of a later generation than Hemingway's, Fowles has had a lifetime of film viewing to teach him the impossibility and even undesirability of placing fidelity at the top of a film adaptation's priorities:

I saw my first film when I was six; I suppose I've seen on average—and discounting television—a film a week ever since; let's say some two and a half thousand films up to [1968].

Fowles subsequently asks the question, "How can so frequently repeated an experience not have indelibly stamped itself on the mode of imagination?" In addition to his sympathy for the filmmaking enterprise based on his extensive film viewing, then, Fowles also admits to being influenced in his habits of perception by film techniques:

At one time I analyzed my dreams in detail; again and again I recalled purely cinematic effects...panning shots, close shots, tracking, jump cuts, and the rest.

This awareness has increased Fowles's tolerance for film adaptations of novels which involve obvious alterations in the original narrative, and his enthusiasm for the Pinter-Reisz version of The French Lieutenant's Woman is the best evidence of this. But he has also developed
increasingly firm views about the "proper domains" of novels and films, and also of novelists and scriptwriters.

Fowles's greatest involvement in scriptwriting seems to have been with The Magus. Though he helped with The Collector by putting the script "back into British English," he did not write that script. In the case of The Magus, however, he is given credit for the screenplay even though there is strong evidence that Guy Green, the director, altered the Fowles script substantially. By the time of the release of The French Lieutenant's Woman, Fowles expressed awe at the talent of a good scriptwriter, as well as praise for "the arbitrary limits imposed on film length" which stimulate the cinema to remain "at its best a major art" while television (with its less stringent time restrictions) is more like "a recording device, or mere translating machine."  

In writing The French Lieutenant's Woman, Fowles apparently exploited his conscious knowledge that prose fiction can do some things film cannot do. The most important example of something a novel can do that a film cannot do is make absolute demands on the imagination of its audience. But Fowles makes a broader point:

One has in fact only to do a film script to realize how inalienably in possession of a still vast domain the novel is; how countless the forms of
human experience only to be described in and by it.\textsuperscript{12}

In Fowles's case, one form the novel can take is that of an essay on some aspect of philosophy, psychology, sociology, biology, or history. Of the three novels considered in the present study, \textit{The French Lieutenant's Woman} contains the most of this type of material and \textit{The Collector} the least. In order to convey much of what is left out of the film version, \textit{The French Lieutenant's Woman} would have had to resort to the techniques associated with film documentaries. It is interesting to recall that \textit{The Magus} does do this at one point, in the sequence in which Conchis is describing his relationship with the young Lily prior to the first War.

The juxtaposition of disparate historical periods in \textit{The Magus} and \textit{The French Lieutenant's Woman} provides an interesting aspect of those films which \textit{The Collector} lacks: a mechanism which transcends the period during which film is made. Because \textit{The Collector} remains in "the present" (the late 1950's or early 1960's), it may seem to be more easily relegated to a particular period. But an historical overview is essential to the study of any film, and any further adaptations of the three Fowles novels will naturally emphasize the ways in which film adaptations are tied to historical factors. For the present, one must note that this study has not pursued film history aspects of the three adaptations; there is much of interest that remains to
be done in that area, including consideration of such categories of filmmaking as directorial style, casting, set design, costume design, camera work, editing, musical elements, acting styles, and film fads and fashions in general.

The ultimate question in the present study is perhaps inevitably a very simple one, and that is the question of whether or not the narratives of the novels are preserved in the films. Very simply, the conclusion seems to be that the films all create new narratives, that there is a clear relationship between the novel and the film in each case, but that the narratives finally vary to such an extent that they assume new identities of their own, independent of the prose fiction works of the same name. Oddly enough, it is the film that seems to be most different from the original novel that has the effect of creating the impact on its audience most like the impact of the novel on a reader—*The French Lieutenant's Woman*. When one finishes reading the novel or viewing the film, one is left with the same feeling of the relativity and fragility of human destinies, the same understanding of how many potential, seemingly equally possible endings there are to each of our stories.

Common sense, however, would dictate that *The Collector* be given equal billing in terms of the degree of equivalency between the narratives of novel and film. After all, Clegg causes the death of a young woman in both cases, and he is
intent on repeating the process once again. The Magus, with its across-the-board alterations of action and character ends up seeming least like the original narrative, and yet one retains the suspicion that it somehow adds up to a more accurate synopsis of the novel than do either of the other films.

What emerges from this study is the awareness that comparative studies of novels and film adaptations are useful in enlarging one's understanding of decisions made by both novelist and filmmaker regarding every aspect of narrative art, but that no easy answers are possible in terms of trying to achieve positive identification of something as concrete as "a real object." Narrative art in both novels and films is too complex to reduce to simple statements. But comparative analyses of action, characterization, setting, symbolism, and other such elements of narrative art are useful because—to put it in terms of one of our three subject-works—"one can begin to appreciate how many possible "endings" there are. Just as the novelist might be expected to write a different novel if he were to undertake the same subject at a later date, so the filmmaker is bound to create a different narrative than the original. It seems clear at this point that any attempt to produce a first-class film adaptation will inevitably result in a different narrative, and any attempt to preserve
the original at all costs is likely to result in an inferior film.

The study of novels and their resulting film adaptations is profitable for anyone interested in any of the aspects of each form that are related to the narrative elements of the works. One can say at least this much. But, furthermore, one can look forward to the next film adaptation of a given novel, just as one looks forward to the next production of a certain play, to see what that version will have to say to us about the one that went before it—and about the original work as well. In all three cases, Fowles's novels are sufficiently interesting to merit further adaptations, and not because the existing films fail. A novel is a different form altogether from a film, and—with John Fowles himself, who admitted to having no idea what Sarah looked like before Meryl Streep "created" the role—we can look forward to each new adaptation to find out what the novel might look like on film. The visual images of the film adaptation are fixed and therefore, to some extent, perishable, but the images a reader evokes mentally are forever fluid, continually changing as one's experience and awareness change. One assumes—and hopes—that these novels will in the future find talented new filmmakers to show us what they look like.
Notes


3 Scholes and Kellog, p. 280.


6 McCormack, p. 170.

7 McCormack, p. 170. Fowles uses a slightly modified passage from Flaubert to show how prose fiction anticipates scriptwriting in form and content.

8 McCormack, p. 170.

9 JML, p. 198.

10 JML, p. 198. Fowles is quoted as follows in his interview with Singh: "I wrote the original screenplay, but the director didn't like it and it was changed. And then the producers had a shot at it."
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12 McCormack, p. 170.
13 Metz, p. 16.
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