**After reading the novel, but before seeing the film, consider these questions concerning the novel.**

1. How well is the novel suited for adaptation to the screen? What natural cinematic possibilities does it have?

2 . Judged as a whole, does the novel come closer to stressing a sensuous and emotional rendering of experience (as in the Hemingway excerpts) or an intellectual analysis of experience (as in the James excerpt)?

3. How essential is the author's verbal style to the spirit or essence of the novel?

Could this verbal style be effectively translated into a pictorial style?

4. What is the novel's point of view? What will necessarily be lost by translating the story into film?

5. If the novel is written from the first-person point of view (as told by a participant

in the action), how much of the spirit of the novel is expressed through the narrator's unique narrative style-that is, the particular flair or flavor built into his or her way of telling the story rather than the story itself? Could this verbal style be suggested through a minimum of voice-over narration on the soundtrack, so that the device would not seem unnatural? Is the feeling of a warm, intimate relationship between reader and narrator established by the novel, as though the story is being told by a very close friend? How could this feeling be captured by the film?

6. Is the novel's length suited to a close adaptation, or must the novel be drastically cut to fit the usual film format? Which choice would seem most logical for the filmmaker in adapting the novel:

a. Should he or she try to capture a sense of the novel's wholeness by hitting the high points without trying to fill in all the gaps? What high points do you think must be dramatized?

b. Should the filmmaker limit himself or herself to a thorough dramatization of just part of the novel? What part of the novel could be thoroughly dramatized to make a complete film? What part of the story or what subplots should be left out of the film version?

7. How much of the novel's essence depends on the rendition of mental states: memories, dreams, or philosophical reflections? How effectively can the film version be expected to express or at least suggest these things?

8. How much detail does the author provide on the origins and history of the characters? How much of this material can be conveyed cinematically?

9. What is the total time period covered by the novel? Can the time period covered be adequately compressed into a normal-length film?

After seeing the film version, reconsider your answers to the questions listed above, and also answer the following.

10. Is the film version a close or a loose adaptation of the novel? If it is a loose adaptation, is the departure from the novel due to the problems caused by changing from one medium to another or by the change in creative personnel?

1 1 . Does the film version successfully capture the spirit or essence of the novel?

If not, why does it fail?

1 2 . What are the major differences between the novel and the film, and how can you explain the reasons for these differences?

1 3 . Does the film version successfully suggest meanings that lie beneath the surface and remind you of their presence in the novel? In which scenes is this accomplished?

14. Did reading the novel enhance the experience of seeing the film, or did it take away from it? Why?

1 5 . How well do the actors in the film fit your preconceived notions of the characters in the novel? Which actors exactly fit your mental image of the characters?

How do the actors who don't seem properly cast vary from your mental image? Can you justify, from the director's point of view, the casting of these actors who don't seem to fit the characters in the novel?

**On Adaptations of Plays**

1. How does the film version differ from the play in its concept of physical space?

How does this difference affect the overall spirit or tone of the film version?

2. How cinematic is the film version? How does it use special camera and editing

techniques to keep the visual flow of images in motion and to avoid the static

quality of a filmed stage play?

3. What events that are only described in dialogue during the play does the filmmaker

show happening? How effective are these added scenes?

4. Are the play's structural divisions (into acts and scenes) still apparent in the

film, or does the film successfully blend these divided parts into a unified cinematic

whole?

5. What stage conventions employed in the play are not translatable into

cinematic equivalents? What difficulties and changes does this bring about?

6. How does the acting style of the film differ from that of the play? What factors

account for these differences?

7. What basic differences can be observed in the dialogue in the two versions?

Are individual speeches generally longer in the play or in the film? In which

version is the poetic quality of the language more apparent?

8. What other important changes have been made in the film version? Can you

justify these in terms of change in medium, change in creative personnel, or

differences in moral attitudes and sophistication of the intended audience?

**From Fact to Film**

1. How does the film story differ from the true story or historical event on which

it is based?

2. Can these changes be justified for dramatic purposes?

3. Do the changes significantly distort the essence of the story and the characters

involved? How?

4. Was any disclaimer provided to warn viewers that the film was not completely

factual? Was there any reason for viewers to believe tlley were watching a completely

factual story?