Be the Same but Do the New: A Study of Major Film Versions of *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*

Thesis submitted to University of Calicut in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English Language and Literature

by

PARVATHY G.

under the supervision of

Dr. MOHANDAS C.B.

PG AND RESEARCH DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

SREE KERALA VARMA COLLEGE, THRISSUR

Affiliated to the University of Calicut

2021

A Note on Documentation

For the purpose of documentation, the eighth edition of MLA Handbook is used.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my guide Dr. Mohandas C.B, for his guidance, suggestions and most importantly the patience and constant support he lent to me. His nonchalance is commendable.

I extend my gratitude to the teachers of Sree Kerala Varma College and staff of the University Library for their support. I have found some dear friends in my fellow research scholars. Their inputs and assistance shall always be fondly remembered. My friends at workplace were ever enthusiastic about my research and kind enough to do work adjustments so that I couldn't be bothered on my days off for academic or paper works. Thank you!

Words cannot express my gratitude for my family who had been a steady source of encouragement. They stood by me through thick and thin to complete this task. My mother would have loved to see her daughter completing this journey, but she didn't make it. I would like to dedicate this fruit of my labour to her.

CONTENTS

Chapters	**Pages**
1. INTRODUCTION: Theorizing Adaptation	1
2. *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*- Locating the Novels in the Brontës' Times	35
3. Various Ages and Preferences at Play in Different *Jane Eyre* Adaptations	67
4. The Trajectory of *Wuthering Heights* Adaptations	96
CONCLUSION	134
Works Cited	143

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Theorizing Adaptation

> Anyone who has ever experienced adaptation (and who hasn't?) has a theory of adaptation, conscious or not. (Linda Hutcheon, Preface to the First Edition, *Theory of Adaptation* xiii).

Adaptation is the process of transportation and transformation of work of one sign system to another that follows a different algorithm. It could be how the "stories of poems, novels, plays, operas, paintings, songs, dances and tableaux vivants were constantly being adapted from one medium to another and then back again." It is "not only film, television, radio and the various electronic media" that shall be considered venues of adaptations, Linda Hutcheon puts, but even "theme parks, historical enactments and virtual reality experiments" (xiii) But nonetheless whenever it was time, space and slot for academics and theoreticians to ponder on the mutational forms of adaptations, more attention was put into literature's transposition to cinema than any other form of it.

The walk a film maker does from literature to film is indeed seem, a tight rope walk on seven split single strands of a hair. All hell may break loose if it doesn't match the 'fidelity criterion' the reading public has set for the film to adhere. Yet it hasn't been ever a rare business to adapt literature to screen. In fact, when movie industry was in its infancy, the lack of original scripts often made it customary for film makers to look to literature for stories. Also, in its pre-pubescent years, when

film and film making was viewed with contempt, tagging it along with the literature was a sure way to attract spectators. Held in inferiority, when associated with literature, cinema could have a touch of the crème de la crème. A well read and revered work on screen means well-oiled curiosity from the part of the public and a fascination to see it visualized. Critics like Stephen Bush even made a sentimental statement that the very cause of cinema lays in taking the classics of literature to the masses:

> It is the masterpiece of the ages that especially invites filming, and the reason for it is very plain. An epic that has pleased and charmed many generations is most likely to stand the test of cinematic reproduction…. After all, the word "classic" has some meaning. It implies the approval of the best people in the most enlightened times. The merits of a classic subject are nonetheless certain because of the moving picture to make them known to all. (qtd. in Boyum 4)

As early as 1900, there had been films like *Romeo and Juliet* (1990), *Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp* (1917) etc. Interestingly enough, there was a line of women screen writers who adapted literature to the screen. When Gene Gauntier adapted Lew-Wallace's *Ben-Hur* (1907) for the Kalem film company, though the attempt caused her much damage for the infringement of copyright of the literary property, the success inspired many fellow women like June Mathis—who wrote the screenplay for *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse* (1921) based on a novel by Vincent Blasco Ibáňez— to try their hand in adaptation. D.W. Griffith, credited as one of the early lexicographers of cinema and notorious for *The Birth of Nation* (1915) based many of his movies on many works of literature. In fact, *The Clansman* (1905) by Thomas

Dixon Jr. is the source and serves as the original title for his magnum opus. Griffith has adapted Robert Browning in *Pippa Passes* (1909), Charles Dickens in *The Cricket on the Hearth* (1909) and Lord Alfred Tennyson in *Enoch Arden* (1911) (Boyum 3). Griffith was following suit of French and Italian filmmakers who found immense encouragement in literature for cinema. By 1908, the French even had a company 'Société Film d'Art' established exclusively for the purpose of adapting literature to the screen. In 1930's the outpour of adaptation became torrential, reaching its zenith in 1939 with instalments like *Wuthering Heights, The Wizard of the Oz, Gone with the Wind* and many more. Since its inception in 1927-28, the Academy has had a fairly awestruck relationship with adaptations. According to Morris Beja "more than three-fourths of the awards for 'best picture' have gone to adaptations; and of those, about three-fourths were based on either novels or short stories." (qtd. in Lupack 3). As Joy Gould Boyum half-jokingly put, "Take almost any year in fact, since a list of the movies which have either won or at least been nominated for best picture sounds startlingly like a library catalogue" (Boyum 5) which include *Farewell to Arms* (1932), *Pygmalion* (1938), *David Copperfield, The Grapes of Wrath* (1940), *Hamlet* (1948), *Henry V* (1989), *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1951), *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1958), *Zorba the Greek* (1964) etc.

Yet, if adaptations were a sure bet to pull people and academy in, it had its share of detractors too. People, theorists mainly, found food for thought in the much sought-after alliance between film and literature, but in disagreement mostly. Virginia Woolf in her essay "The Cinema" (1926) cast a rather skeptical and stern stance on cinema in general and adaptation in particular. Cinema's time is yet to come, she argued, and it could, quite idealistically be when a director finds at his command "some new symbol" which stands erect without even the "slightest help from words

or music to make itself intelligible" which will be some "residue of visual emotion…of no use either to painter or to poet." But when cinema and literature are a couple, "the alliance is unnatural" and "eyes and brain are torn asunder ruthlessly." Movies are "parasites" which feed on them books with "immense rapacity" (Woolf 381-383).

Discussions on adaptation have been provincial; and even if they are to occur, chances of them being a diatribe asserting the self -evident superiority of literature over cinema has been the rule of the law. Robert Stam identifies about eight sources of prejudice against cinema when set in equation with literature. 'The older the better' is the dictum which works in support of literature to an extent, it seems. The vestiges of prestige gathered for an art by time is unquestionable. The seniority fixation often pulls up a charge sheet against the younger art of cinema as never equipped enough to shoulder the weight of the signification of any work of literature. Also in between literature and cinema it has been anticipated that a struggle for survival of the fittest ensues in their exchanges with each other. Not to say that there hasn't ever been an institutionalized enmity between these two as Virginia Woolf's above-mentioned polemic itself suggests otherwise, but it was also extended to a level where it becomes a struggle for dominance between the linguistic and visual signs. As Stam puts, "In Freudian terms, film is seen in terms of Bloom's "anxiety of influence," whereby the adaptation as Oedipal son symbolically slays the source-text as "father." ("Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation", *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation* 4).

The struggle is sautéed with the overwhelming reach of 'iconophobia' prevalent in our understanding of cultural spaces. The cinematic vision is often compared to Plato's cave allegory where delusional and artificial projection of images

plays over logical reality. Connected to it would be a ‘logophilia’ where anything lingual is privileged over the visual. Stam words an antipathy to anything cerebral or phenomenal being objectified as it happens on screen as ‘anti-corporeality.’ A film often works opposite literature’s tendency i.e., to work from signification to visualization and that is heavily condemned by many. Virginia Woolf had this issue and she did put it loud how she thought this necessary materialization of the signified in cinema apparently limits or vulgarizes the trans-sensual experience of literature. She couldn’t take it in that in cinema “A kiss is love. A broken cup is jealousy. A grin is happiness. Death is a hearse” (“The Cinema” 382). Nothing more, nothing less.

This kind of perception and undermining of cinema is an appropriation or particularization of a prejudice and cliché that’s often directed to liberal arts in general, which is ‘the myth of facility.’ The quite often naïve big-eyed wondering what’s there in arts to take it seriously takes a new turn when it comes to cinema. The mechanical process of reproduction cinema heavily is dependent on makes it less even of art. An attempt to make cinema out of literature is then, by default, wasting the immense potential the book has. It doesn’t help that cinema faces “a socialized form of guilt by association” (Stam, “Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation”, *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation* 7) a type of class prejudice where it is degraded for, apparently, engaging the mass audience and playing to the gallery. Thus, it is concluded that cinema often attempts to make a spectacle out of literature, never an interpretation. An adaptation is also often accused of sucking the life blood out of the work of literature and ‘parasitism’, i.e., it waters literature down and snitches it for lower passions and popularity.

The monographs published on film adaptation of various pedigrees have dealt with these necessary evils of pitting literature against cinema in varying degrees. It has been more often than not to find a middle ground where all is peace between literature and cinema. Discovering this panacea is deceptive yet alluring and incidentally, the very first major monograph on the discipline, George Bluestone's *Novels into Film* itself set the trail for it. Published in 1957, it orbited around the fidelity issue and since then it has been custom bind that any volume on adaptation can't do away with the concern. Bluestone's idea of an ideal adaptation, with all respect to the altogether different rules and process of aesthetics of the cinema, lies in how much the film is a replica of the text under scan. Though he did give a nod to the immense potentialities of film as a medium, Bluestone's disquisition primarily concentrated on textual considerations. His objection wasn't to film as a medium, but in comparison to literature as in when attempting a discussion on adaptations what he could do, at best, was to be sympathetic towards it. The conventions of studio system in particular and Hollywood in general irked him a lot and to quote Boyum, he "was looking at movies at an unfortunate time for movies themselves" (*Double Exposure* 8). Perusing a discipline which was in periphery at a time when there was much uproar over mass culture's sway over high culture, it couldn't have been coincidental either that his vocabulary gives an innate assumption that medium of words are indeed superior to visuals.

This positioning of literature source and film adaptation as binaries was something that's found as the rule of thumb for works written on adaptations in general. Perhaps the next major thing to happen in adaptation studies, Geoffrey Wagner's *The Novel and Cinema* (1975) put forward three methods of adaptation, namely transposition, analogy and commentary. Transposition apparently is the

translation of the content to the screen as it is. With the other two, interventions are evident. While the second may have altered elements the last one may entirely be considered a different work of art altogether, though still an adaptation. Wagner's categorization of many modes of adaptation had been accommodative of the many practices of adapting texts and varying levels of approach to the text. Contextual placing of adaptations doesn't happen in Wagner's work and much defence is put for adaptations against the rampage in academic circles as how adaptations often defile the literature. Yet it isn't that the privileging of the source material is completely absent in his study.

Both *Film and Fiction: Dynamics of Exchange* by Keith Cohen and *Film and Literature: An Introduction* by Maurice Beja came out in 1979. Cohen tries to strike a balance between the literary and visual and could be seen often clarifying that neither is supreme over the other and what is implied in one could be well implied, though in a different way in another system of signification. Beja is, on the other hand seemed to be on the prescriptive mode when he says that filmmakers should opt for less imposing works for adaptation as 'literature of superior quality' may not find apt resources for in film to match content and its vehicle for signification. Beja's argument seems to prove a case study for Stam's earlier explained 'myth of facility' perhaps.

1980's saw the upsurge of post structuralism and that hasn't left the adaptation studies unmarked. The seat of cinema in the cultural space, by then was transcended from being treated as the mass pleasing visual spectacle to an inimitable artefact which in its own merit had fair share of exegetes who were firm in establishing strong perspectives on it. Dudley Andrew's article "The Well-Worn Muse: Adaptation in Film, History and Theory" (1980) didn't hesitate in acknowledging adaptation as a

valuable cultural practice and often comments on the inconsequential nature of any discussions surrounding fidelity. Joy Gould Boyum's *Double Exposure; Fiction into Film* published in 1985 flows like a well delivered lecture on the journey adaptation studies been on till date. Boyum's style is quite intimate and his narration is accompanied with the feeling of the material entity of the author himself present before us audience.

Translation and Adaptation have always been considered twins, often identical. There hasn't been dearth of analyses which would tie both the practices together and it cannot be negated that systems of translation and adaptation, both, have been traditionally confirming to the source material as its beginning and end. Patrrick Cattrysse's article "Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals" which was published in 1992 wasn't really a chip off the same block though. His use of polysystems theory of translation has been an interesting turn in re equipping adaptation theory with a fresh perspective. Instead of focusing on the starting point of the translation, the source text, polysystems theory talks of the target text in context. How and why cultural elements in their widest sense determine the shape of the target text; how shifts in focus happens, how certain layers of the text are retained, deleted, magnified or marginalized. The adaptation's legacy also comes into consideration, as to how its reception changes, if at all, for the critics and viewers over time and ages.

Catrysse's article incorporated the idea of intertextuality and has put it affirmatively that even the adaptations of the classics cannot and do not limit themselves to referring the source text alone. His repositioning of adaptations "better be studied as a set of discursive (or communicational or semiotic) practices, the production of which has been determined by various previous discursive practices and

by its general historic context" (62) has been releasing for the adaptation studies from the familiar orbit of fidelity discourse and pointing out to the wider repercussions of the theory and practice of adaptation.

Brian McFarlane's *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation* (1996) upset the conventional approach to adaptation in being judgmental about the fidelity quotient of the movie. As McFarlane puts, the concept of a singular meaning functions as a touchstone and blurs our vision to any concern to other issues that are indeed prime in adaptation. McFarlane didn't cling to narrativity as the tool in analysing adaptations but even in his studies, contextual and intertextual layers of adaptation studies were still to get its due. Robert Stam has been consistent in appreciating intertextuality of adaptations and his "Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation" which appeared in James Naremore's *Film Adaptation* (2000) was quite faithful to its title in its intentions. He continued the endeavour with Literature *through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaptation* (2004) and *Literature and Film: A Guide to the theory and Practice of Film Adaptation* (2004).

Linda Hutcheon denigrated branding adaptations derivative or secondary. Her book *A Theory of Adaptation* came out in 2006 in which she has rightly pointed out there could be diverse motives behind adaptations and fidelity often isn't one. The source often isn't singular and she picks Baz Luhrmann's *Moulin Rouge* (2001) as the example. She adds that the tradition of prioritizing source text as the predecessor won't always end up in favour of literature as many people do experience the work in their adapted form first and then only in the form in which it was actually conceived. Being belated in that scenario is applicable to the source ironically. The "oscillation" (Preface to the First Edition xvii) between the source and the adaptation that directs us to register the work in our experiential realm as adaptation may happen regardless of

the direction. Certain times, we may experience adaptation after our encounter with the source but on some other occasions we may get to experience the adaptation first and then only the source. Hutcheon doesn't intend to find hierarchy in this process of oscillation and going by her theory any forms of adaptation, if we are to bring forth some Saussurean vocabulary, share a syntagmatic than paradigmatic relationship with the source. Hutcheon showed involvement with every forms of engagement possible with stories- be it telling (as in novels), showing (as in cinema) or interacting (as in video games)- in multiple forms and foregrounded new series of aspects of adaptations to consider rather than those which were traditionally in the forefront in studies of adaptation. Hutcheon explained her theorizing of adaptation an enquiry to the what, why, who, when and how of adaptations. She put that the term 'adaptation' refers both the process and product. Both process and product cannot exist in void, they have to have situatedness- in a moment or in a location. The moment or the location isn't a monolithic entity as it is a fluid concept rocking from the inception of the work to the reception of its adaptation.

Hutcheon's work is courteous to natural science and her version of 'the survival of the fittest' is in how the fittest of the stories get selected in varied cultural contexts and prosper. Her all-encompassing approach to adaptation, attention accorded to previously neglected arenas (for example video games and opera) and attention to the political, economic and many other contexts of the production were first of its kind.

Working on a similar terrain at similar times, Julie Sanders agrees to the insights of her contemporary Hutcheon against recurrent condemnation on adaptations for being belated. She has affirmed that adaptations offer novel perspectives and has the capacity to cause effect in its own right. Her work works like a codex that has

registered every development and manuscripts available on adaptation recently and her contribution to the vocabulary of adaptation studies, 'appropriation', has now become a laymen's term. Sanders talks about the nexus of intertextuality of our cultural domain and states how refusal to any hierarchical norms of knowledge and truth are evident in what she would call 'appropriations'. She forwarded the term in her *Adaptation and Appropriation: A New Critical Idiom* published in 2005.

Appropriation, a particular practice or style in adapting a text, don't explicitly state the predecessor, either in acknowledgement or in the content itself. The priority shall be put on the various levels of commitment, personal or political, the people involved in the production may have on appropriating a text than on establishing the appropriation's similarity with the source text itself. Unlike Hutcheon, Sanders' work shoulders adaptations in films. Her book is an ode to the destabilizing power of intertextuality which adaptations show case. Nevertheless, she doesn't want to write off 'the author figure' as Roland Barthes or Michel Foucault may like to, as she puts.

The post-structuralist turn and Derrida's radical revamping of Saussurean parlance had its strongest advocate in Robert Stam in adaptation studies. Persistent in his theory, Robert Stam was keen in establishing a perhaps counter polemic to the set notion that cinema is at loss when in relation to print literature. Whilst the text has "linguistic energy", Stam banks on the power of the "audio-visual-kinetic-performative energy" (qtd. in Geraghty 2) which a film adaptation commands. Stam, following the grounds of Barthes on shifting the focus from the 'work' to 'text', draws our attention to the fact that the source texts themselves aren't monolithic. He states that, in extension, the adaptations are ought to be "caught up in an ongoing whirl of intertextual reference and transformation, of texts generating other texts in an endless process of recycling, transformation, with no clear point in origin" (2). It can

be seen that Stam, concentrating on the concept of intertextuality, tows adaptations in with any process of textual play. In conceiving the idea in its widest connotation possible, every film thus considered will be just another instance of cross textual play of references because even the very process of a script being made into a film establishes the concurrence between two forms of works- the verbal and the visual. Christine Geraghty in her *Now a Major Motion Picture*: *Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama* (2007) is appreciative of Stam's work for its fluidity and openness, but she is not content with his theory as his body of work seems to escape from any reference to the societal processes which determine the interpretative process and meaning making.

Geraghty develops on the concept of 'faithfulness'. A large chunk of the audience still needs to hold to the verity that movie should be faithful to the text. But there is still another large chunk of moviegoers who absolutely has no acquaintance with the source work. She also reminds that there are films which don't declare openly, sometimes by choice, as adaptations. Most of the times, the book might not be well known and the makers won't want to make it known either. In such a context, these movies aren't adhering to the fidelity principle because they are not inviting our attention to its predecessor and also, to say the least, they aren't posing as adaptations. She agrees with Catherine Grant who says that "The most important act that films and their surrounding discourses need to perform in order to communicate unequivocally their status as adaptations is to recall the adapted work, or the cultural memory of it" ("Recognising Billy Budd in Beau Travail: Epistemology and Hermeneutics of Auteurist 'Free' Adaptation" 57). If there's no such process from the part of filmmakers, then that particular movie can't be branded an adaptation.

The vantage point literature always holds when in game with literature is problematised by Thomas Leitch in his splendid "Adaptation Studies at Crossroads" (*Adaptation*, 2008). Deliberating over the title of then published *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen* (2007) by Deborra Cartmel and Imelda Whelehan, Leitch analyses the implicational intricacies the authors might have missed in the name. He puts: "What we might ask, is literature on screen? If it is on screen, is it still literature? If it is literature, how can it be cinema as well? And why would anyone want to claim that it is both?" (63). According to Leitch, Cartmel and Whelehan are totally alert about the hierarchical set up which prioritize literature over film and not happy about it. But he finds logical issues in their assertion that literature 'and' film have to be distinguished from literature on screen. The phrase 'Literature on Screen' captures the idea that film adaptations can be considered cinema and qualify to be part of literature as well. But in being specific about literature 'and' film as separate entities, the book, unintentionally but inevitably, close eyes to precisely this possibility which adaptation studies, in general, have never grown to. Leitch puts that any attempts to chart the waters of adaptation, unfortunately, pre assumes the notion that "the primary context within which adaptations are to be studied is literature" and that literature shall be respected as "cinema's natural progenitor" (64). This belief is not abandoned even by those "critics who insist that Julia Kristeva, Mikhail Bakhtin and Robert Stam have persuaded them that there is no such thing as a single source for any adaptation" (64). Leitch is on point when he says that anyone trying to study adaptation, may get frustrated with the limited vocabulary the field offers which collides with the enthusiasm to break new grounds.

Adaptation studies, to borrow Leitch's term, often faces this issue of "conceptual timidity" (70). It is not so often the inadequate answers that dwarf this discipline, but the limited questions that it chooses to work on finding the solutions for. His essay exorcises any and every phantasm adaptation theory has ever contained. The accountability of an adaptation is often measured up directing our attention to its correspondence and comparison with a particular work of literature. The norm that cinema not only owes to the work of literature as its source material but also has to be obliged to it as the signified is a well cemented notion. Any film which avows fidelity to a particular work frequently has to and would have to acknowledge its already established existence and 'essence.' The debate on what the term 'essence' tries to encipher has been of the prime, wouldn't be overboard if you put 'sole' interest in studies of adaptation. Every adaptation owes to an already recognized form in text as its stimulus and its yardstick. Similarly, to take it the other way around, every text in literature "bears a transcendent relation to any and all forms that adapt it, for it is in itself an artistic sign with a given shape and value, if not a finished meaning. A new artistic sign will then feature this original sign as either its signified or its referent." (Andrew, *Concepts in Film Theory* 96). How much this priori, the idea conceived about the whole in text which function as both the beginning and end for the adaptation, is absolute and replicable in another system of signs is a complicated issue. Such motivated endeavour may possibly materialize only if one could presume there is a signified distinguishable, hence separable and duplicable in another sign congregation altogether.

Any stack of signifiers, be it written or visual, does exhibit a lot of explanatory vacancies. The words on a page invoke a phantasmal visualization of the novel for the reader which is part instinctual and part contextual. When a film materializes, a

spectator is invited to the already concretized spectacle of the very idea the reader had in mind but realized in the film through different priorities and choices. The loss the spectator experiences is most probably when, his hypothetical vision disagrees or doesn't match with the film's; the very frequent complaint 'the book was much better' of an average spectator or even critics' stems from this sense of loss. Sometimes how a movie chooses to exhibit its umbilical cord with the text also makes some significant contribution to the subsequent disappointment. Hollywood films, at least the adaptations of classic works, did use to begin with the cover of the book, proceeding to show its pages flipped with a voiceover perhaps then only to the establishing shot. Thus, the film usually made a clarion call to the viewer's conscience to consider it an equivalent of the book. The general sense of betrayal a viewer feels to the film, in such cases, is when the film fails him/her to be 'the book.' Any self-conscious effort from the part of cinema thus becomes self-defeating in execution.

Such techniques and their indoctrinating stances aren't in vogue anymore. Yet it isn't expected for a film, normally, not to channel its audiences' attention to its pre descendant. There are film makers who choose to go by making additions to the name— either with the author's, as in *Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights* (1991) by Peter Kosminsky or with the director's, as it happened with Federico Fellini's *Fellini's Satyricon* (1969)— though it was a clear case of copyright issue that prompted the former to do so. Either way, it isn't as if audience are to buy that Kosminsky's goes by purely what Brontë had in mind or the latter is purely Fellini. In its crudest explanation, it has to be the book and its author through the director and even the most untutored spectator who may not have got an understanding of neither the cultural memory of the book nor the director's legacy, can call for that. Also, it is

expected out of a responsible rendition of the literature to have formal, narrative and generic consistency with the source work.

Keith Cohen elaborates that the narrative codes, their distribution and adequacy could be a valid ground for comparison of the book and its adaptation. He says:

> narrativity is the most solid median link between novel and cinema, groups of signs, be they literary or visual signs, are apprehended consecutively through time; and this consecutiveness gives rise to an unfolding structure, the diegetic whole that is never fully present in any one group yet always implied in each such group. (*Film and Literature* 4)

The accomplishment of an adaptation then must be analysed in terms of the narrative units the book and the cinema employ i.e., the equally put characters, context, point of view and events etc. Many theorists have also put major stress on the narrative mode as the prima facie criterion to measure and judge an adaptation's authenticity and loyalty. The many modes of adaptation or the many classifications within the set of adaptations and how they are explained can be deconstructed to the forever lenience to the dialogue of capturing the essence of the text in literature. The sense of these divisions can eventually be zeroed down to the process of reproducing the narrative units to the target medium and the ability to invoke relatability of the adaptation to the source text.

A slightly unbalanced vocabulary may redirect the discourse back to privileging the work of literature the end and reference point for thus a study to be done. Stanley Fish's concept of 'interpretive communities', in such a context, seem to bring some light at the end of the tunnel. Often, in his self-reflexive style, Fish says

that the idea of interpretive strategies readers employ aren't something put on work right after the process of reading but rather "they are the shape of reading, and because they are the shape of reading, they give texts their shape, making them rather than, as is usually assumed, arising from them" (*Is there a Text in this class: The Authority of Interpretive Communities* 13). But this assumption is not posing in line with post-structuralism and Derrida as Fish was eager to put a cork on the bottleneck of the possibilities of the text being dislodged in favour of the reader. The reader indeed isn't an independent agent. The strategies of which Fish is talking about do not find the individual reader its epicentre, but would rather remind him that he is just a member to a large community. The members of the community have agreed upon certain conventions and only those interpretations which are in accordance with the dominant community of interpretation shall survive. There is no adjudication of any meaning as correct but instead there's the nominating the most acceptable one. Fish would choose 'in between-ness' than stand for any polemic- which are either with the overwhelming interpretations, as Fish would like to state it, or author being the alpha and omega of the text. Most importantly, Fish would remind us that, the competitive readers who share interpretive strategies digesting the text aren't free from institutional interests. It is such that in unloading a text of its connotational load the interpretative community also codes it, for whatever manoeuvres are employed in interpretation, they aren't coming out from vacuity nor are they subjective.

A co-editor to the Oxford journal *Adaptation* founded in 2008 and founding member Association of Adaptation Studies in 2006, Deborra Cartmell has been instrumental in bringing together diverse views on adaptations since 1996. Cartmell came up with *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation* in 2012 where she muses over the welcome wind of stretching the definition of adaptations. In being "the

art form of democracy" ("100 + Years of Adaptations, or, Adaptation as the Art Form of Democracy", *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation* 3) studies done on adaptation should be inclusive of "Video games, comic books, and popular cinema… and they can be approached from a variety of perspectives, including consideration of economic, historical, commercial, and industrial conditions." (4). Cartmell maintains that though her collection's purview shall be predominantly cinematic forms of adaptation, even in being that, it has steered away from being intentionally or unintentionally privileging film adaptations over any other mutations. Quoted in her introduction to the text is Andrew Davies, the screenplay writer to the British television adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice* (1995), who defined ten "secrets" (8) for being a good adaptor. They are to 1) read the source text, 2) ponder over why should this book be adapted and why should it be done now, 3) think about whose story is this actually, 4)not be scared to make changes, openings particularly, 5)always start with a plan, 6) understand that dialogues are unnecessary if the effect can be achieved with the look, 7) prune the dialogues, 8) add scenes or episodes that aren't in the book if needed, 9) avoid narrator tracks like voice-over, flashbacks and 10) not be intimidated to break your own rules if it is the thing to do. Cartmell defines these measures as layers added to the 'hypotext' which is the term by Gerard Genette for source. Cartmell finds delight in adaptation as how it has democratized the text in freeing it from the clutches of the omnipotence of the adapted author. She explains the measures explicated by Davies as processes in popularizing the text to a larger audience and in doing that the text escapes from the limited purview of the author and his readers.

Theorists have also tried to chart types of varied dimensions of adaptations in order to cope with the different methods and approaches that are possible with the

text. Even when fidelity discourse was in its vogue, the possibility of different approaches to it and non-conformity to any prescriptive style was not excluded from the theoretical spectrum as we can see in the works of Geoffrey Wagner. His three possible types of adaptation which are already mentioned in detail are transposition, where the novel is seen on screen with bare minimum interference, commentary where some cogitation is employed from the adapting agency which do alterations to the source material as a reaction to its policies and politics and analogy where we have autonomous works which are adaptations that are grafted to a new cultural and connotational grammar. These three types exist and making a study of any attempt that has the notoriety of adaptations demand the critic to be aware of what type he is dealing with if he wants his study to be appreciated.

Dudley Andrew has an almost similar pattern to posit which are borrowing, intersection and transformation. Medieval paintings depicting biblical episodes can be specified as an instance of borrowing where the writer basks in the fertility of the source and not so much bent on fidelity. The adaptation seeks a bonus of respectability by its association with a well-established source. This type of adaptations is often considered a tribute or an agency of remembrance to the original and that's it. By virtue of its frequent reappearance, the sources of such adaptations often achieve a cult status and in being a cult, it would attract many to attempt to borrow from it. In rather slippery language Andrew would talk about the second mode of adaptation, namely intersection. The cinema and the medium of it work as eyeglasses to see the source text. The singularity of the original is preserved and feared; the adaptation doesn't claim to brighten up the entire text for us yet it is interesting for how it tries to do that. The third of the tribe is transformation in which it is assumed that the text can be replicated in the movie. Andrew finds it almost

impossible. Andrew wasn't a practitioner of the fidelity theory and for him the study of adaptation is virtually the same as study of the cinema as a whole.

Susan Hayward's entry for adaptation in *Cinema Studies; The Key Concepts* (1996) profess adaptations of plays to screen are the most faithful because both theatre and cinema being performance oriented, the shift in medium has to make allowances for contextual updating, not for any formal alterations, arguably. Her other classification of adaptations includes the adaptations of literary classic and last of the list is of the texts which are yet to be canonized and still considered popular fiction.

Michael Klein and Gillian Parker in their *The English Novel and the Movies* (1981) talk about adaptations which maintain faithfulness to the main focus of the narrative, then to those which retain the narrative but allow reinterpretations and last to the category where the source functions merely as a raw material. In similar lines, John M Desmond and Peter Hawkes classify adaptations based on narrative elements in their work *Adaptation: studying film and literature* (2006). The tripartite model has close, loose and intermediate adaptations. The classing is done apparently on the treatment of narrative elements in each version, i.e., if most of them are retained then it is close, if most of them lost, then loose and if it is in between then it should be intermediate.

Adaptation studies surely, though slowly, is evolving from the staple case studies that pose foregone conclusions of the movie being bad to embracing the call of intertextuality, hypotext and palimpsest. The movie translations of literature are still ahead sprinting in the wide domain of adaptation studies; the generically titled *Adaptation*, an Oxford academic journal and *The journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance* by Intellect have a more or less obvious decree produced in favour of on screen adaptations. Case study manuscripts in adaptation haven't ceased but

theoretical engagements which aim at layering the field with cultural critique are on rise. Any kind of canonization is not desirable in the current moment of post-everything and rightly so especially in the case of adaptation studies. All these years the field had to bear the brunt of not being original enough to be considered pure art. The branch itself from within isn't free from the play of hierarchy too— favouring literature on screen and even in that siding with source material over issue of fidelity. Nonetheless fidelity itself hasn't been a nonchalant concept as what it means by and what we shall accord by its name has been contested and stretched more than often. Remnants of fidelity criticism still lingers at times but as Linda Hutcheon puts it in her preface to the second edition of *A Theory of Adaptation* (2013) it is in the form of loyalty from fan groups than as a measurement of adaptive exercise. The issue of loyalty is severe in proportion with the notoriety the text has. Classics, thus known for the standing they have in our cultural arena thus may be called forth to how much their respective adaptations have fared.

Writers like Italo Calvino have a very personal view of classics as, to each his own, i.e., a book that has the peculiar ability to define our understanding of self in relation to it, even when we are in disagreement with it ("Why Read the Classics", 1991). According thus an intimate view of classics isn't generally the norm. T S Eliot in his address to Virgil Society in 1944 was dismissive towards any modern language in its capacity to produce or vehicle a classic as Virgil. As per Eliot, classics are borne in mature wombs of culture and civilization, which is a beyond the reach of contemporary state of affairs.

It is a fact that classics are the chosen ones by tradition for a demi-biblical status and are religiously appreciated. Hence any distaste in works of such stature, if not blasphemous, surely isn't a welcome gesture. The snob value classics carry is

undeniable. Pierre Bourdieu in his *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (1979) details how the affinity towards classics as a cultural capital connotes superior taste and hence often an acquired one. Any appreciation towards classics is applauded and prodded even in our curricula or at any levels of cultural interaction as a token of elite association. Legitimized by the socio-economic prowess of the higher orders of society, sharing the admiration for it often gives the make of conditioned upbringing. Yet, which all works are to be laurelled as classics isn't an indisputable issue. If Eliot could find only Virgil to carry the weight of the entire western Europe civilization, French critic Saint-Beuve didn't think of the work representing the whole of Europe even while admiring *Aeneid* as the torch bearer of latinity (Kenneth Haynes, "Classic Vergil").

Any definition on classic should ideally not be devoid of its politicised nature. Taking such factors into consideration is a recent phenomenon indeed. For, often eulogized as the touchstones in literature, classics in literature were the heirlooms passed on from our literary forefathers to generations coming. Classics are revered for their antiquity but every claim on their reason for immortality is often traced to their quality being 'contemporary' of all time. J.M Coetzee in skinning Eliot asserts that the veneration Eliot showed for Aeneid had in its crux a sort of self-aggrandizing project of finding a magnificent backing to the poet's attempt in redefining self from an anglophile to being English. Eliot's identification with Aeneas's Virgil as someone entrusted with the task of reinventing poetry and engrossment in projecting a cultural sovereignty of certain forms of power, drove the man in warranting the latter as the supremo of European-ness, claimed Coetzee. Coetzee situates Eliot in the social milieu and backdrop in the latter's attempt in defining the notion of classic. Coetzee's own position as a provincial and his exposure to different climates which Eliot and

company might have considered unbefitting for attention endowed him a perspective which doesn't pay obeisance to likes of Eliot. What is enlighteningly amusing about Coetzee's account, besides his refreshing take on the stalwart that Eliot has been, is his befuddlement in discerning the sudden awakening he had to Bach's music when fifteen years of age. His family was bereft of music; neither did he show any particular inclination to it. But one fine day Bach's "Well-Tempered Clavier" chose the boy and spoke to him and the analytical Coetzee wonders on what prompted such a response from him. Coetzee can be seen wondering whether it could be the pure music touching his soul in a most transcendental way rather than any predilection, subconsciously, towards the high culture. (Coetzee, "What is a Classic") Coetzee's experience informs that the processes in which a classic is accorded with classic status isn't naïve or innocent.

If the work proves its mettle by durability and gets chosen to meet up the fresh demands of succeeding generations and thus has earned the title 'classic', they automatically become food for adaptations. Any referring to the original may not be spared with while attempting an adaptation on the book, because the adaptor when picked the work, the work didn't come alone, it has its legacy hung there. Or maybe, it is the inheritance of the work that has made the adapting agency to pitch on it first of all. The work belongs to a different time zone but in re-presenting it for another era, it offers updations. While repetition is what we would like call the process having multiple adaptations for the same work it also accords for transformation. The element of recall isn't vague and drowned in such experiences where a constant back and forth transfer happen because as much as the source text, the previous adaptations also are called up for the process of identification with the adaptation in consideration.

This process of recall isn't entirely circumferencing the source text because as it is already observed, the acquaintance with the text in consideration isn't getting to read the book itself. The story might be well known through other agencies as abridged versions most often, performances of various sorts, or may be most probably by earlier adaptations in film itself. Such a situation isn't a duel between the book and the movie as theorists often have conceptualized it to be. A classic work which has gone through several instances of screen adaptation will bring to view both familiarity and multiplicity. Familiarity is bred from the consistency found in multiplicity of interpretations available around but the familiar isn't singular here. The very possibility of comparisons possible in a cosmos of adaptations doesn't scream out irreversibility.

The study proposed here is an exploration into certain works of classic stature and their subsequent film adaptations. There had been different strategies in treating the source material to the mould of movie; there hadn't been dearth of filmmakers who had grafted the narrative into totally different cultural climate, hence producing 'appropriations' where the source text is evident in parallel relationship with the movie. Akira Kurosowa was a master of the craft and his *Throne of Blood* (1957) which was a version of *Macbeth,* and *Ran* (1985) based on *King Lear* are cases in instance. Apart from the wide variety of appropriations that transpose texts culturally, there are practices of 'vintaging' and 'anachronising' under the umbrella term. *Clueless* (1995), the teen comedy set in Beverley Hills added vintage value by choosing Jane Austen's Emma to further the everyday of ultra-rich school girls' life. Ralph Fiennes' *Coriolanus* (2011) is a ripe example of anachronism on both Shakespeare and the very contemporary eastern European setting with the use of authentic Shakespeare dialogues set in a place which can't get any more modern. In

any study conducted on appropriations, a large canvas of cultural milieu to be contrasted, both of the source literature and that which to its implanted to should be out there loud and evident. But with adaptations which tend to portray the work within the same spacial, temporal dimensions the relationship of the adaptation with the source text gives out the impression of mirroring. Of course, it isn't that straight forward a process as it has been detailed in the overlook to the dynamics and development of adaptation studies. As it is learned, meanings don't just happen in a text, nor would they be provided finite. Even without delving into the whirlwind of intertextual referencing, which radicalizes the concept of adaptations as merely an extension of the same, the contextual placing of each and every respective work and its adaptation need attention from our part to its environment, social and political, to make sense of them.

While the gap between an appropriation and the source text is pronounced in each of their cultural value, an adaptation keeps its gap in chronological terms. In a different sense the element of gap is more emphasized in adaptation than appropriation— for while the altogether new territory granted for appropriations allow some seemingly autonomic power to it with the native components and framework of the movie making it feel at home for the makers and viewers, the adaptations which are period dramas for the time of their occurrence announce themselves as performances. Christine Geraghty has observed in *Now a Major Motion Picture,* it is this very gap that in reminding us again and again of what is seen and what it cites to goes back to past that it reinforces the performances. For example, while other movies may need actors to craft a character, an adaptation may want an actor to evoke one. Thus, the performances being so evident possibly wins so many Oscars in the acting department of adaptations. But the experience of the gap withstanding, the movie

adaptation is as much of a product of its time as it is the reminder of something of the past and hence the present of the movie will tune the source text's past. Such an exercise is summed up best in a trailer for *Pride and Prejudice* (2005) directed by John Wright, the movie is "from the beloved author, Jane Austen" but is "story of a modern woman" (qtd. in Geraghty 16).

In shedding light to literature of earlier times the adaptations encounter value systems of past which may risk of running at odds with current times. Dealing with that, adaptations often thrust contemporary concerns onto the bygone era, especially on issue like gender, caste, race and ethnicity as Christine Geraghty puts. Unlike an appropriation, adaptation emphasizes its location in the past and thus the movie subtly but evidently becomes a field for deliberations. To quote Kamilla Elliott, when "filmmakers set modern politically correct views against historically correct backdrops the effect is to authorize these modern ideologies as historically authentic" (*Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate* 177). The objective of the study is to show how various elements in narrative and characterization are used for the same.

The Brontë sisters had always exuded kind of an enigma, part of which is attributed to their thinly veiled authorship with pseudonyms and much more to their languid persona and existence from which works of such intense passion were unexpected from. Their lives were spent by 1855 and together their works aren't copious but any assumptions on their adaptations being so would be sheer idiocy. *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*, the most acknowledged among their oeuvre have seen derivatives in various forms on stage, large and small screen. Patsy Stoneman's humungous work *Brontë Transformations; The Cultural Dissemination of Jane Eyre and Wuthering Heights* (1996) has recorded such off shoots of the text including parodies, allusions and references sprawling over 300 pages. The Brontës have lent a

mythical charm to Yorkshire moors and Haworth Parsonage that the geo locations now carry archetypal value. It is their very otherworldly charm and seemingly alien existence that prodded the thesis to select their work for a very grounded and material enquiry on how deliberations with contemporary reality might have occurred within their output and adaptations.

A tight but frail group of artists, the Brontës started making up stories from their childhood itself to relieve themselves from a closeted and isolated experience of life- the Angrian and Gondal sagas pertaining to namesake paracosms were their juvenilia. Apart from the very known Charlotte (born 1816), Branwell (born 1817) Emily (born 1818) and Anne (born 1820) there had been two eldest of them all- Maria and Elizabeth who were to lose lives in 1825. The Angria and Gondal tales were, as recorded, a development from the games they invented with toy soldiers gifted by Patrick Brontë to his son Branwell in 1826. The sheets of paper stitched into tiny books carrying the tales of these imaginary realms were the products of their novitiate in writing which even for their young age showcased an acute awareness of their world around, politics, explorations and metanarrative moments of the children making jokes about the "great creating Genii (the Brontë children themselves)" (Glen 4) , which prompts writers like Heather Glen to opine that "from childhood, each of the Brontës was not merely a reader but a writer; and a highly self-reflexive one" (3).

The childhood splendour in imagination was a strong anchor to each of the Brontës and their every attempt at being self-sufficient by getting trained and seeking appointments as governesses were largely failures owing to the strong urge in getting back home. Their expectations of an independent and respectful position convinced them of opening a school on their own, for which they ventured to Brussels but the plan fell flat. It was in Charlotte's diligence the Brontës found an opportunity in

publishing and their first venture with poems were a disaster in market but well appreciated by critics. Inspired by the approval from critics, assured of the anonymity granted by their pseudonyms of Currer, Ellis and Acton respectively, the sisters published their novels *Jane Eyre, Wuthering Heights* and *Agnes Grey* in 1847 with the first two catapulted to sudden acclaim.

With 2500 copies sold in three months, *Jane Eyre* became a best seller. It was the story of the eponymous heroine who, orphaned at a very young age and ill-treated for a substantial amount of her younger life finds bliss at the end of a long tunnel. The Reed family to which she was adopted to offers her nothing but despise, her stint in Lowood School was tormenting except for some female companionship and Thornfield, where she was accepted as a governess, burns down to ashes. A girl met with constant disdain, moments of rare but real warmth are extended to her by Miss Temple and Helen Burns at Lowood. Though initially overwhelming, the stay at Thornfield as a governess grants her pleasure of a romantic relationship with Edward Rochester, the owner of the estate. On the brink of getting married, Jane gets revealed to Rochester's first marriage that's still not annulled and to utter shock to his wife who is kept at Thornfield itself on account of lunacy. When it seems that life has turned sour again for Jane, she gets help from the Rivers who lets her in their home to recuperate from weakness by starvation at the moors where she gets stranded after leaving Thornfield heartbroken. A surprising turn of events grants her with a fortune and St.John Rivers, a missionary by profession asks her hand in marriage. Jane though, returns to Thornfield refusing Mr. Rivers' proposal to find the remains of a burnt mansion. She learns about the Rochester's first wife committing suicide while burning the building down and Rochester himself losing eyesight and injured in the fire. Her long lone journey culminates in marrying Rochester and starting a family.

Along with *Jane Eyre, Wuthering Heights* did extremely well but in Patricia Ingham's words, it "troubled readers more than *Jane Eyre*" (*The Brontës* 26). The house Wuthering Heights, built in 1500's, serves a home to a landed gentry family, the Earnshaws. A tale of all-consuming passion originates at the bleak interiors of the house when the 'gypsy' foundling of Mr.Earnshaw, Heathcliff, gets involved with Catherine, Mr. Earnshaw's Daughter, in a tumultuous romance. The moors around become their playground and a den for romance until their life gets entangled with Lintons of Thrushcross Grange, their neighbours. Edgar Linton's fascination for Catherine doesn't go unreciprocated and not wanting to risk a penniless future, that would be awaiting her if she gets married to Heathcliff, she accepts Edgar's proposal. Heathcliff leaves Wuthering Heights before Cathy and Edgar unite in matrimony only to comeback a short while after rich and determined to avenge his heart's ache. What ensues is a tale of revenge where Heathcliff usurps Wuthering Heights from Catherine's brother, himself getting married to Linton's sister and begetting a boy child to secure himself of the rights to Thrushcross and a ploy to get Catherine's daughter married to his weakling son. Heathcliff never finds his heart's peace as he becomes all the more a lonelier figure after Catherine's death and embittered, confused over his parental feelings for Catherine's nephew and his ward Hearton. Heathcliff's death paves way for a union of sorts for the two houses with Hearton and Catherine's daughter deciding to get married. Heathcliff and Catherine's spirits, meanwhile, become a local fable in which together they continue to haunt the moors.

These two books were not to wither in time, instead their popularity has seen an emphatic increase as the proverbial wine. They are staple with elementary English literature lessons across universities now and with countless adaptations in credit, all the more permeating in our cultural memory. While *Wuthering Heights* has

indomitable energy, which may either amaze us or repel us but would never leave the grip on the folks into literature, *Jane Eyre*'s tale about survival was not to fail because its sheer ability in resonating with the human folk.

The study intended here is on the film adaptations on these two works by Charlotte and Emily of the Brontë clan. The movies selected are of from the similar clime, either Hollywood or British productions, well known and appreciated as attempts in 'faithful' re-creation of the novels. The epithet 'faithful' here is employed in the sense of these adaptations' reputations in not being appropriations. The output in theorising adaptations and an overall view of the major texts, as in a literature review, is provided throughout the pages of this introduction, which also familiarises various terms associated with categorising adaptation like the aforementioned 'appropriations'. As such, the movies considered here are not appropriations and they were produced and publicized as exercises of visualising the novels on the screen with the references of temporal, spatial and cultural elements of the novels kept in tandem. The movies under consideration are *Jane Eyre* (1943) directed by Robert Stevenson, *Charlotte Brontë's Jane Eyre* (1996) directed by Franco Zeffirelli, *Jane Eyre* (2011) directed by Cary Fukunaga, *Wuthering Heights* (1939) directed by William Wyler, *Wuthering Heights* (1970) directed by Robert Fuest, *Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights* (1992) directed by Peter Kosminsky and *Wuthering Heights* (2011) directed by Andrea Arnold. It doesn't intend to be a manuscript concentrating on the fidelity aspect but would bring forth the literary progenitor in relation with the adaptations as to how the material in transformation was presented in its own right. In doing that, we are to take into account the contextual understanding of the source text, the interpretations, the perception and discernment of it amongst the acquainted. The awareness on each of their specific contexts informs the enquiry to the adaptations

too. It is a triple fold procedure— 1) gathering an understanding on the legacy of the source text by awareness of their backdrop in and of composition, 2) acquaintance with the adaptation's time of production, its core values and tastes in mapping out the possible reaction of the audience to a work that belongs to a different dimension, 3) analysis of how the adaptation has accommodated for the deliberation of both in its execution. Terry Eagleton's insights on the Brontës and his attempts in locating them to their immediate context in *Myths of Power; A Marxist Study of Brontës* (1975) guides the processes in analysing Jane Eyre and Wuthering Heights. The theoretical concepts of Christine Geraghty, Linda Hutcheon etc serve sources of reference in conducting studies on their respective adaptations.

There are monographs which concentrated their theoretical prowess on contextualising the adaptations of *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*. Some of them had been incredibly useful in supplying substance to the thesis' arguments. Robert Lawson Peebles' "European Conflict and Hollywood's Reconstruction of English Fiction" published in *The Yearbook of English Studies* in 1996 concentrated on classic adaptations of *Wuthering Heights* along with *Pride and Prejudice*. He detailed how the adaptations served contemporary political motives by projecting a glorious British culture to the cause of a united western front against Fascist powers. These movies released in USA gave an appealing and inviting representation of the British Culture. By taking care that it does agree with American sensibilities, the movies could effectively provide for a pro-British attitude. Lin Haire-Sargeant in her essay "Sympathy for the *Devil: The Problem of Heathcliff in Film Versions of Wuthering Heights" published in Nineteenth-century Women at the Movies: Adapting Classic Women's Fiction to Film* (1999) edited by Barbara T. Lupack did an inclusive survey of the adaptations around the world till the 1990's to analyse the portrayal of

Heathcliff in particular and *Wuthering Heights* in general. The essay documented insights into contemporary events, politics and sensibilities that proved influential in designing *Wuthering Heights* and its lead character appropriate to each age. Lisa Hopkins talked in her "The Red and the Blue: *Jane Eyre* in the 1990s" (2000) about how Franco Zeffirelli's adaptation worked towards to emphasizing the classic and heritage value of *Jane Eyre* by his movie version. Hopkins also commented on how by the 1990's the portrayal of Bertha Mason and the depiction of Rochester has evolved and analyses possible reasons for that. Hopkins' essay was published in Classics in *Film and Fiction* (2000) which was edited by Deborah Catrmell, I.Q. Hunter et al.

Liora Brosh's *Screening Novel Women; From British Domestic Fiction to Film* (2008) analysed how British and American adaptations of nineteenth century British novels responded to the twentieth century ideals of gender. Her films of research interest span larger frame of time- starting from the releases from early decades of twentieth century to the 90's. Hila shachar worked with similar interest on film adaptations but she chose to invest her research on adaptations of *Wuthering Heights* predominantly. Her *Cultural Afterlives and Screen Adaptations of Classic Literature: Wuthering Heights and Company* (2012) provided insights on how adaptations are informed by its contemporary context and also how adaptations in turn contribute to the source text's legacy.

Kirsten L. Parkinson's "Mrs.Rochester's Story: Franco Zeffirelli's Adaptation of Jane Eyre" (2015) published in *Literature/Film Quarterly* concentrated on the 1995 movie version of *Jane Eyre*. Parkinson detailed how the new movie version has reinvented the characterization of Bertha and provided a new perspective of her, picturising her as humane. The most recent of the lot is Catherine Paula Han's

"Picturing Charlotte Brontë's Artistic Rebellion? Myths of the Woman Artist in Postfeminist Jane Eyre Screen Adaptations" that came up in the journal *Adaptation* by Oxford in March 2020. The article examined a particular trend in post 1990 adaptations of Jane Eyre in accentuating the protagonist's similarity with the authoress herself. She argued that in doing so, these films benefitted from the mythical status the Brontës command and their reputations of being feminist. Han identified the protagonists of these adaptations are postfeminist and to prove that she situated the movies with contemporary postfeminist milieu.

Moving on to the chapters coming up in the thesis, it shall be noted that they are divided to concentrate on the novels first and then their respective adaptations. The compare and contrast method of the novels and the movies is avoided in favour of an approach where the novels and the movies are analysed with respect to their respective timeframe of composition. Thus, the first chapter is entirely dedicated to the novels where aspects of their production and publication is discussed. While the events pertaining to both novels are either early 19th or late 18th century, Brontës had them penned in mid-1800's, in Victorian era. Hence, an understanding of Victorian sensibilities, politics, prejudices and ideology with respect to the creative output of the Brontës is attempted.

The second chapter similarly contextualises each of the adaptations of *Jane Eyre*. The adaptations span from the war ridden years of the 1940's to as recent as 2011. The third chapter ventures in same direction where the adaptations of *Wuthering Heights* are discussed on the basis of each of their respective timestamps; the novel's adaptations stretch from 1930's to 2011. The task in both these chapters is to see how much the contemporary reality, events and tastes determine, reshape or influence the presentation of a classic which belongs to different timescales. The

conclusion rounds up the insights gathered from the study as well as observes about further and related areas for consideration in adaptation studies.

The main endeavour thus, is an exercise in identifying the importance of context in assimilating a text. A text is no longer restricted to its singular entity of a bound book or pages; its legacy is equally shared by every reincarnation of it available in different formats, known as adaptations in its widest sense. Hence, adaptations are studied in their dual connection position; to a text with which it has a median of narrative and the time when they are being made, which defines its strategies in presenting the former. Such a study, hopefully, will contribute a new approach in adaptation studies which will be analytical, not on subservient terms to the source texts and more informed about context's play in meaning making.

CHAPTER TWO

Jane Eyre and *Wuthering Heights*- Locating the Novels in the Brontës' Times

While chronicling the life of the Brontës for her book *The Brontës* (2006), Patricia Ingham comments that it seemed rather dissonant with the otherworldly aura of Emily to refer to the colliding financial interests of the landed and industrial classes in *Wuthering Heights* as represented by the Lintons and Heathcliff. Her wondering at what she thought to be unexpected, though it was more of why only Emily than why Emily, may direct the curious to ponder on the possibility to measure up the passionate intensity the fey sisters were associated with, to social occurrences. Attempts in said direction aren't unprecedented as hullabaloo over 'limiting' texts by interpreting them socially is fading down. Q.D. Leavis for instance has commented that *Wuthering Heights* "is remarkably similar to Great Expectations. The latter too is a work of art which also contains a sociological novel on the surface." (*Lectures in America* 131). Terry Eagleton's vision of a sociological understanding of a work of fiction ran deeper than Leavis because the 'social' is not be found on the surface, in its didacticity but to be understood as the grammar itself of the work where to be found the kernel of every discourse possible as he puts, "Leavis's metaphor of the sociological novel draped across the surface of Wuthering Heights graphically expresses the alienation of a society whose own character as society has become casually extraneous to it."(Introduction, *Myths of Power* 3) Eagleton's point is in explaining the 'social' is never the extra in any work but rather it is the "matrix within which all other terms are fleshed and shaped"(2).

The Brontës by no measure were parthenogenetic as nobody is. Being observant of their times and context isn't a cake not worth the candle. If to investigate the literary and publication history primarily—since their reputation as writers precedes everything else about them, it shall be noted that when Brontës sent their manuscripts for publication, poetry stood higher than novels. It was apparently conceived that novels being a slice of reality are flawed and mundane while poetry pertaining to a realm remote to the circumstances of men folk works in giving us a view of the sublime. Any exception to such ostracization could be expected only for fiction of historical genre such by Sir Walter Scott which stood by tradition. But with literacy rising and availability of books in cheap price made novels especially by Charles Dickens popular. Dickens would have written at least six of his novels including Oliver Twist by the time Brontës get their first novel published. But that didn't change the general perception on novels that they should abide by the conventional morality. Novels weren't meant to be embarrassing when read aloud and reading in solitude wasn't quite free from suspicion. Circulating libraries were flourishing during that time and by 1842 Charles Edward Mudie opened the most acclaimed of them. Publishing gained momentum and propriety was a big concern in selecting which works are to see the light. Mudie named his establishment as 'Mudies Select Library' emphasizing the need of sanction for the works, both of his puritanical tastes and common decorum. Prudence in dealing with matters of religion, resorting to allusion when anything carnal to be brought up and disapproval of any indulgence in gore and grume of life were to be understood as criteria for good literature during the time. The adjudication of literary quality was also controlled by the gender of the writer or at least their supposed one because writers with pseudonyms weren't uncommon. Not surprisingly, women were meant to be 'maternal' in their choice of

subjects. The Brontës did take up pseudonyms— Currer, Ellis and Acton Bell respectively. Emily wanted anonymity but Charlotte had different rationale for it as she was well informed by the expectations and pre judgements on women who venture into writing:

> a sort of conscientious scruple at assuming Christian names positively masculine, while we did not like to declare ourselves women, because—without at that time suspecting that our mode of writing and thinking was not what is called 'feminine'—we had a vague impression that authoresses are liable to be looked on with prejudice; we had noticed how critics sometimes use for their chastisement the weapon of personality, and for their reward, a flattery, which is not true praise. (Charlotte Brontë, Biographical notice of Ellis and Acton Bell, *Wuthering Heights and Agnes Gray* ix)

The Haworth Parsonage wasn't altogether a pleasant place to live in by its poor sanitation, often contaminated water and life longevity generally being in question by about forty percent of the children not making it up past six years of age. But in no melodramatic terms the place held emotional value for the Brontës as it would be for anybody to their place of home. The place could be anything you look at it to be as Elizabeth Gaskell would put it her *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* (1857). The moors may feel impressive or imposing for the same quality they may suggest—namely solitude. Brontës exercised isolation and weren't really mingling with the native population and any friends they acquired were mainly Charlotte's acquaintances and any correspondence maintained was normally through letters. The creativity of the Brontë siblings is often credited to their father Patrick who could manage to study at Cambridge University with the patronage of several evangelicals at a time when the twin universities were still not very much open to people of

humble beginnings. His life was a hard earned one though it wasn't cosy or spectacular with an annual salary 170 £ of a perpetual curate of the Anglican orders and a family with six children. Patrick Brontë reportedly specified once in his biographical record for Gaskell that his father belonged to a noble family, but he never knew nor was bothered to know which. Tom Winnifrith had a theory that his adoption of the name 'Brontë' which was initially 'Brunty' could have been driven by his desire to blanket his modest origins and to associate with aristocracy and scholarly. The Brontës thus were quite in between- a respectable family, but of moderate earnings, with Tory lenience. Patrick himself represents a kind of torn identity. He had a reactionary bend which was solidified by the ongoing threats and attacks by Luddites, the secret radical organization who protested against automation by destroying manufacturing machines during 1811-12. His recounting of the repulse for incidents of violence of the fraction is said to have influenced the siblings and it is often credited for many episodes in Charlotte's *Shirley, A Tale* (1849).

No uprising was tolerated by the Tory government but had been a few like the Luddite attacks mentioned above. In the Peterloo Massacre in 1819 about eleven were shot dead in a protest of fifty thousand people who demanded reform in parliament representation. The class strata weren't strictly impenetrable during times of the Brontës, because apart from the few clashes the political and economic interests of different sections of the society were intermingling. Landed gentry could not turn their heads from the prospects of investing in industrial projects and manufacturers buying estates was rising. The landed gentry's marriage to manufacturers, though not desirable, was allowed if the prospect is from the second generation of the industrialist family who has managed to cleanse the stigma of nouveau riche in time. Terry Eagleton archives many instances of such entrepreneurs in his *Myths of Power:*

A Marxist Study of the Brontës (1975). John Marshall, a man from Leeds who was into flax spinning bought land in Lancashire, Cumberland and North Riding; William Denison of West Riding had acres at Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire; Walter Spencer- Stanhope owned about 11,000 acres in Yorkshire. There were manufacturer families who had decided to invest in land than in industry as the prime capital. The descendants of such rich landowners could access quality education and upbringing that they could boast of refinement and influence. Accommodating the new emergent class was the only practical solution left for the rest in the changing scenario for the landed gentry. They were reputed to be more restrictive and conservative than the aristocracy. But with the latter coming into terms with new social class, the landed gentry who in many terms were dependent on their superiors, were forced to be inclusive of the industrial class. The Brontës weren't living in still waters and it did run deep in complexity. In fact, the eldest of the Brontës, Charlotte was born right next year after of battle of Waterloo when the duke of Wellington, Arthur Wellesley was fresh in his triumph. The Tories in governance had opposition from Whigs but the Brontë patriarch and through him his children imbibed a Tory affinity which also held sentimental value for the family not unlike most of the landed gentry for it almost felt befitting to maintain the status quo and honour the party which was ruling the country almost continuously since 1783. Patrick didn't feel any incongruity in his wish for welfare of the working class with his belief in existing political conditions. His involvement in the question of the natives over water sanitation issues and support for factory act of 1833 in restricting child labour stemmed from this foundation and he saw no reason for questioning his political convictions. Either way both parties were led by the propertied that any initiatives from their part to re-engineer the society to topple prevalent system of class was not happening. The

repeated assertion of class structure was foiled by the diffusion of economic interests among them.

The ingrained contradictions and compromises of the age is what Terry Eagleton finds transposed in the dualities of the works of Brontës. Apart from the historical appropriation of specific events in their texts, we shall be able to grasp the modus operandi or modus vivendi of their oeuvre. The friction of blunt rebellion and still conservatism that run deeper in the Brontë's situation exemplifies as their position in the societal strata was always on the fence. Their solitude was not only imaginative but that of educated women who were daughters of a clergyman who had to fight his way out of poverty to the modest but respectable standing. Their exposure to the strict, utilitarian system of the Conan Bridge School was nothing less than trauma and the perpetual feeling of being square pegs in round hole bothered them for the rest of the life. Their plan to start a school of their own plummeted because of lack of capital. Their stint as governesses gave them little security as the families who appointed them didn't provide any feeling of inclusivity. The Brontës always thought themselves at par with the 'cultivated'. Lack of acknowledgment from other's part embittered them as observed by Tom Winnifrith that "it is scarcely surprising that the sisters should have expected to have been treated like friends of the family, and it is scarcely surprising that when they were treated like governesses, they felt bitterly hostile to the class which so despised them" (*Brontës and their Background* 153). Both of Charlotte's friends, Mary Taylor and Ellen Nussey weren't to give her or her siblings entry to the social circles they were included in, because these groups flourished for the close family ties they maintained and not by finding any intellectual common grounds with outsiders. Charlotte's refusal to accept Henry Nussy's hand in marriage closed any chance of inclusion to the Nussy's but as Winnifrith puts "it is

probably more correct to emphasise not the exclusion of the Brontës from the closely intertwined family circle, but to emphasise how very narrow this circle must have been" (152). The immediacy of such personal experiences of rejection coupled with a sense of superiority did in turn form in the Brontës a form of "dual allegiance" (Terry Eagleton, Introduction, *Myths of Power: A Marxist Study of the Brontës* 11) which nonetheless was inherent in their father too. The larger social and cultural fabric complicated the sensibility and understanding of many subsidiary factors of Brontës, which found peace in an amalgam, an in betweenness, both in their personal lives and literature.

It wouldn't then be surprising to learn that the Brontës weren't really agreed upon the 'otherworldly' and nonconformity which they are often associated with. In her preface to the second edition of *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall* (1848), Anne Brontë reinstates that her novels do fulfil the didactic function as it was deemed desirable for fiction of that time. She defends her often "coarse if not brutal" scenes of the novel as a warning for the "snares and pitfalls" in life and she "wished to tell the truth, for truth always conveys its own moral to those who are able to receive it. But as the priceless treasure too frequently hides at the bottom of a well, it needs some courage to dive for it." *(*Preface, *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall* 3-4.) Charlotte Brontë is often seen defending her sisters against being deemed unwomanly- a blunt blame she knew too well her siblings may have to bear from their unconventional choice of subjects and portrayals. According to Charlotte Brontë, *The Tenant in Wildfell Hall* was "an entire mistake … Nothing less congruous with the writer's nature could be conceived. The motives which dictated this choice were pure." (Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell xii-xiii) Of *Wuthering Heights*, Charlotte seems supposedly in mood for acknowledging that creating Heathcliff isn't "advisable" but she avows that such a

character was born in Emily's anvil from "devise principles", from the "creative gift … of which he is not always the master" and "be the work grim or glorious, dread or divine, you have little choice left but quiescent adoption" (Charlotte Brontë's 1850 Preface to *Wuthering Heights* xxiii, xxiv).

Charlotte's professed preference for a higher truth in novels than depiction of life au natural wasn't discordant with the contemporary standards. The tone with which she defends is often apologetic and, in the vindication, often she is seen asking to excuse the choice of subjects which she and her band knew all well to be not appropriate. In her personal letters though, the frustration surfaces but in response to and often defensive to reviewers and harsh criticism as she said in one of her letters:

> The standard heroes and heroines of novels, are personages in whom I could never, from childhood upwards, believe to be natural, or wish to imitate: were I obliged to copy these characters, I would simply- not write at all. Were I obliged to copy any former novelist, even the greatest, even Scott, in anything, I would not write. Unless I have something of my own to say, and a way of my own to say it, I have no business to publish; Unless I can look beyond the greatest Masters, and study Nature herself, I have no right to paint; unless I can have the courage to use the language of Truth in preference to the jargon of Conventionality, I ought to be silent. (qtd. in Ingham 119)

Charlotte's preposition is not with a tinge of the old school battle between conformity and imaginative fiction. Even within the novels of Brontës, such type and dividedness are spread to the characters— protest and piety are found consistently not pitted against each other but as layers of a single entity. The reception of their novels gathered similar disposition too of a schism between appreciation for originality yet

with suspicion for indelicacy especially with Charlotte's *Jane Eyre* and Emily's *Wuthering Heights*, both published in 1847. After a set of critically acclaimed but hardly sold poems which came out solely for charlotte's industriousness, the sisters ventured for a three-decker which was the preferred format for economical and circulating preferences of the publishing firms and libraries. Originally conceived a compilation of novels of one each from each sister, Charlotte's *The Professor* was rejected and rest, Emily's Wuthering Heights and Anne's Agnes Grey found a publisher in Thomas Newby. Earning the trust of Smith Elder, Charlotte produced *Jane Eyre* and by October of 1847 it got published while the other two came out in December. *Jane Eyre* sold 25,000 copies in three months and *Wuthering Heights* caused quite a stir. Both met with some applause for the compelling narratives but some apprehension for their apparent audacity in depicting the physical. But *Agnes Grey*, the traditionally abiding one of the lot, ironically, met with lukewarm reports only. The Brontë's incognito selves, safe under their nom de plumes were to be blown off cover soon with speculations on the rise on their gender identity lending to many theories- also Newby claiming Anne's to-be-published *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall* is by the author of all the Bells' novels (Ingham 26).

It has always lent to confusion on how much personal history and authorial account shall be engaged in dealing with an account of fiction especially when the interest of the study wishes it to be situated in broader structure. The study envisioned in this thesis isn't really laying out a worksheet for finding equivalent units of literature to units of the social but would rather recognize schemata that relates to both the historical reality and the imaginary realm. From many elements already identified it shall be understood that the body of work Brontës have produced is informed by ambiguity and disruption but in a way that ends up not in a cacophony but in

complexity. Authorial function is identified a catalyst in processing the social structures and churning out historically sensitive work of fiction instead of viewing it as a dormant and replaceable agency which acts only as a vessel to carry pre-engineered product.

Charlotte Brontë once has declared that she “cannot write books handling the topics of the day” (qtd. in Ingham 100) It is unsure whether the rest of Brontës would have agreed to such a pronouncement, as Ingham wonders, but unearthing references to the contemporary isn’t impossible in their fiction. *Jane Eyre* might be a self-professed bildungsroman and it generally met a warm reception, but certain reviewers grinding their teeth when analysing the text was attesting to the fact that it disturbed the current set of norms- especially troubling the calm waters of domestic sphere. Lady Eastlake’s observation on the novel that appeared in *The Quarterly Review* ran in that direction. “We do not hesitate to say that the tone of mind and thought which has overthrown authority and violated every code human and divine abroad, and fostered chartism and rebellion at home, is the same which has also written Jane Eyre” (qtd. in Allott 109-110).

Sarah Stickney Ellis, popular writer of Victorian conduct literature put “there is an appropriate sphere for women to move in, from which those of the middle class in England seldom deviate very widely. This sphere has duties and occupations of its own, from which no woman can shrink without culpability and disgrace." (qtd. in Ingham 128). Brontë sisters themselves, with their education and aspirations were not really confirming to such standard notions of womanliness. The idea of domesticity was etched with marriage that it perpetually remained a question for the Victorians how to accommodate for the ‘redundant’ women i.e., the unmarried and unfortunate finance wise. Seeking an occupation was correspondent to necessity, for women in

well off families needn't be working hence making leisure for women proportionate to the money her family possessed. Fulfilling the purpose of entering the institution of marriage, women were to be declared 'femme covert', whereby their legal existence gets suspended and as a result, litigation of any sorts becomes impossible through any male relative. Without a pre-nuptial agreement, her money, bequeathed or earned becomes her husband's if at all she manages to get divorced and until 1839 mothers couldn't get custody of children no matter of what age the latter were. Women's education didn't aim for any better than prepping girls for marriage and 'accomplishments.' Thus, it was limited to mainly preparation of meals, some knack in playing a piano may-be and needlework. Jane Eyre voices about such a frustration while her term at Thornfield where she is expected to be "making puddings and knitting stockings… playing on the piano and embroidering bags" (93) and craves beyond: "women feel just as men feel; they need exercise for their faculties, and a field for their efforts as much as their brothers do; they suffer from too rigid a restraint, too absolute a stagnation, precisely as men would suffer" (476). The idea of marriages informed by the necessity of it but also with the consequences might have had an effect on Brontës as both *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights* aren't without any disillusionment towards marriages. The marriages in *Wuthering Heights* are either abusive or not fulfilling. Catherine Earnshaw identifies her soul mate in Heathcliff, but decides to get married to Edgar since it would degrade her to marry Heathcliff. Heathcliff's marriage with Isabella was evidently violent while Cathy and Edgar's union is marked with a deep schism. Marriages nonetheless work as closure in both the works. The young Cathy poses as a tutor to Hareton first and finding asylum in that feeling of superiority and assurance seemingly, decides to get married with Hareton. Rochester has become blind and weak physically and, in his dependency,

Jane finds some much-needed agency in the institution which has already met with hiccups with the menacing presence of the mad Bertha Mason.

Quite interestingly, 'mad women' weren't uncommon in the Victorian era; in fact, madness was decided by gendered and subjective notions which often dubbed passion for mental derangement. It was said that women's temper is regulated by the reproductive capacity and hence being at the mercy of the menstrual cycles they can't be logical like men. The set standards of expected behaviour didn't show much mercy to women who had deviational tendencies and According to Lisa Appignanesi, as she puts in *Mad, Bad and Sad: Women and the Mind Doctors from 1800 to Present* which studies history of the study of female mind from 1800, women patients were viewed rather sceptically and were put in solitary confinement in asylums. The many mental disorders women may afflict to are listed by Patricia Ingham as melancholia, neurosis, nervous collapse and moral insanity. Melancholia was understood as persistent depression, neurosis was used as an umbrella term for many related disorders and still being explored, nervous collapse manifesting in despair and agitation while moral insanity any breach of societal rules making it a very tricky term (*The Brontës* 65). The causes of insanity, generally, were also crudely understood and listed as grief, jealousy, religion, love and heredity. In the newly industrialized society this definition of mental makeup and its variable nature in terms of gender was extended to social classes. The working classes are prone to intense emotions and collective violence if not controlled, as it was associated with the French Revolution. Here madness parallels to rebellion: "Just as the mob threatened the breakdown of law and order, so madness would shatter the individual when inflamed appetite, fanned by imagination, rebelled, usurped Reason's office, and became ruling passions (Roy Porter 41). Thus, the pronouncement of illness didn't limit to medical but was

affected by strata of gender and class. The treatment, once pronounced insane, wasn't less discriminatory. The stigma attached to the illness made the rich to keep their affected ones in private care but the poor wouldn't have such an option for the unbearable expense.

The idea of fallen women was not limited to prostitutes alone. It was a belief validated by even doctors that a modest woman is never after sexual gratification. Any woman who deviated from this norm, was to be deemed questionable in character. To quote William Acton who wrote in *his Functions and Disorders of the Reproductive Organs* (1857): "As a general rule, a modest woman seldom desires any sexual gratification for herself. She submits to her husband's embraces, but principally to gratify him; and were not for the desire of maternity, would far rather be relieved from his attentions." (qtd. in Ingham 56) It is further added that the sexual excess, if exists, may develop into nymphomania. The argument was not uncontradicted, especially by medical doctors like George Drysdale but didn't win much support though. A hint to nymphomania surfaces in *Jane Eyre* when Rochester explains Bertha Mason's malady to Jane and names her "Indian Messalina" (265) after the promiscuous third wife of Roman Emperor Claudius. Bertha's illness is many folded as by her gender, any odd behaviour easily makes her maniac and being of mixed-race descent she is supposed to be easily prone to eccentricities. Mad Bertha is not only Rochester's ex-wife, but also serves as a foil to the ideal woman he is in search for: as an "antipode of the creole" (265) whom he was after among his many mistresses who are spread all over Europe. Bertha's 'excesses' are called hereditary by Rochester and hence the condition she sinks to is nothing new to her kith. Contemporary depictions of mental illness definitely had a say in Charlotte's depiction of Bertha taking into account the Brontë family's heavy dependence on the

books like Thomas John Graham's *Modern Domestic Medicine (*1826) of which Patrick Brontë himself possessed a copy. Patrick's concern over his children's health was determined by loss of his wife and three elder children within thirteen years. The general attitude towards mental maladies was not imbued with sympathy and that informs pretty much of Rochester's behaviour towards Bertha. Elaine Showalter puts in her *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and Culture in England, 1830-1980* (1985) that it was generally conceived that women are the major carriers of insanity (Showalter 67) and hence Rochester attributing her madness and alcoholism to have inherited from her mother was nothing novel. In connecting Bertha's timing of attacks with the full moon "broad and red" (*Jane Eyre* 262) Rochester and through him the novelist could be very well perceived how much sexuality and reproductive cycle might have wielded an influence on 19th century conception of insanity. The narrative use of the character of Bertha could be to posit a villain and some drama in the romantic persuasion of Rochester after Jane and in providing a remote background and ethnicity for Bertha Charlotte's intention in alienating readers from her might have got secured. She is referred to as 'it' thus making her gender out of equations, though ironically the derangements she has fallen into was perceived 'female' in nature. Any sympathy directed towards her for her being of shared racial and social make up may fail Rochester's cause. The alien, hence, became a convenience for Charlotte to complicate the plot.

References to various sorts of mental ailments aren't absent in *Wuthering Heights* as well. But Emily chose either to downplay it or make it ambiguous. Any reference to extreme passion in the novel may double as the manifestations of the supposed malady of the character and understanding it either way is completely plausible. Heathcliff and Catherine's desire for each other, especially the singularity

of the emotion Heathcliff possesses is noted by Nelly as "Monomania on the subject of his departed idol" (*Wuthering Heights* 248). Monomania, as identified by French psychiatrist J.E.D Esquirol in his *Mental Maladies* (originally published in French in 1838), was the obsessive fixation on a single thing which as a disorder don't affect intellectual prowess when occupied in other provinces. Nelly adds, on Heathcliff's behaviour, that "on every other point his wits were as sound as mine" (*Wuthering Heights* 248). Any engagement with Catherine's corpse in the grave which Heathcliff bothers to get opened also gets accounted for in his "mental tension towards one absorbing subject" (222).

In fact, the Brontës' adoption of physiognomic calculations in acquainting the readers with the character was also in agreement with the contemporary development in studies of mental health. The pseudoscience of physiognomy attributed implications for each particular facial feature, an examination of which, the branch of study claimed, will give an insight to the constitution of the person in discussion. The colour of the skin, forehead and jaw were significant give away of development in social, ethical and cerebral maturing; for example, the protruding jaw was very well associated with primitive beings.

Nelly's reflections on Hareton Earnshaw as how she could read from "his physiognomy a mind owning to better qualities than his father ever possessed" (*Wuthering Heights* 152) is an example in instance. Charlotte's description of Rochester's "broad and jetty eyebrows, his square forehead…his decisive nose, more remarkable for character than beauty; his full nostrils, denoting, I thought choler; his grim mouth, chin, and jaw" (*Jane Eyre* 102) among many of the similar nature has been a consistent pattern in the narratorial strategies employed by the Brontës. By contrast we may see a more direct way of description in Jane Austen as we may see

the author detailing a character simply as “generous, amiable, interesting; she was everything but prudent” (*Sense and Sensibility* 44) which is markedly different. Physiognomic elaborations that attributed features and corresponding character traits to people who were classified on already prevalent divisions of race and many other divisions were staple. Alexander Walker’s *Physiognomy Founded on Physiology and Applied to Various Countries* (1834) showcases such a trend. He is quoted in Patricia Ingham’s *The Brontës* as “it often happens that the sensations, as in the negro, are strong while the mental operations…weak” (68). His argument puts black race as sensual and their features bearing testimony to their weak will and unintellectual preposition. The adjudication wasn’t limited to races of colour only and any forms of ‘other’ weren’t immune to such analysis. In Victorian society the groups which were situated farthest from the predominant, the poor, the Irish, the Welsh or the colonials were to be condemned by such means of examination.

By time of the childhood of Brontë sisters, Britain was enlarged to the most powerful empire in the world. The empire’s colonials were of varied racial make as it consisted of descendants of white immigrants as in North America, Southern Africa and Australia along with blacks and all possible Orientals. The Indian subcontinent and the West Indies were of particular interest because both were delivering extremely well to the commercial requirements Britain had and the former was literally a jewel in the crown especially after Queen Victoria was anointed Empress of India in 1876. With India, it had begun with the East India Company setting its hold but later on the power to control the people and their land was carried over to the crown for which the interests were as commercial as for the Company. By the expansion of the imperial power into covering up the nook and corner of the globe, an empire where sun could never set, the British could receive products from any clime

possible and not certainly least in consideration, cheap workforce. In black colonies, commodities like alcohol were to be exchanged with slaves who would be shipped to large plantation yielding colonies for example, the West Indies. It was profitable either way, the slave trade, for Britain had been involved in both buying and selling them. But perhaps the intricacies and investment of the British involvement in slave trade interest less than its decision to abolish the practice. It was never an overnight development in imperial policy though. An English court had already declared in 1772 that a man on English soil ipso facto is free as the English parliament never have defined slavery, by law, as an institution over the realm. In 1807, slave trade was abolished but not the institution of slavery until 1833, which meant those who were possessed as slaves were to continue so for a few more years. The slave owners were to be compensated for their lost revenue and the resultant debt were to pay off only by 2015. The interests behind ending the practice even at the risk of getting into humongous debt were to be assumed a mixed bag; Abolitionists William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton were constantly reminding the parliament its moral duty as a Christian empire to end it, the realization that slavery itself isn't yielding expected profits especially from those Caribbean sugar plantations, the empire's review becoming less dependent from any other colonies than from its possessions in India and China. The empire's self-proclamation as the torch bearer of enlightenment and civilization apparently even led them to appoint their navy to patrol the Atlantic to make sure the slave trade is done with for every part around. The response to such a move was not one of enthusiasm. The supposed lowliness of non-white races wasn't to go away and banning slave trade didn't really change the scenario. The moral high ground often assumed by the British never understood the institution of slavery as an issue involving inequality, but instead, was citing it as immoral not to grant liberty

and life from the pedestal the nation positioned itself on. The blacks and the orientals were not to be at par with whites in any consideration and the strength of such a belief is exemplified by the fact that the aforementioned text on physiognomy by Alexander Walker was released in 1834 and was widely accepted.

Many British were to cross the Atlantic and settle down in colonies in search of fortune predominantly and Brontë sisters were said to have personal acquaintances with a few; Charlotte's good friend Mary Taylor was to immigrate to New Zealand. The White and the natives, or slaves, living in close proximity was to occasion mixed alliances and their offspring were to be an object of curiosity in popular imagination. Edward Long's *History of Jamaica* (1774), which even to his age sounded extreme, had virulent depictions of blacks in general and was applauding caricaturing of creole community of the British colony. Long's work was arguably more malicious than, but in similar fashion of the travel literature of the eighteenth century in playing to the gallery of a commercial readership. Often it indulged in providing salacious details and resorted to sensationalize any forms of cultural others in colonies.

As a group that is brought up in a more ethnically inclusive environment, creole identity was located far from British everyday experiences. Being a creole was a case of the blended nature of the environment one is brought up in than a matter of place of birth or ethnicity which meant a white creole who may have born England still would face the brunt of being the child of a clime that might be felt inscrutable for a British. As per Christer Petley, the stereotyping of creoles was to be encouraged by how British were put off by the apparently garish showing off of their wealth and their nouveau riche status along with disdain for their mixed alliances which were to be perceived as lack of sexual restraints ("'Home' and 'this Country': Britishness and Creole Identity in the Letters of a Transatlantic Slaveholder" 47). The abolitionist

movement often put to the front not only a redeeming but also a ‘cleansing project’ of the creole women. The impropriety and lethargy the Creole women were oft attributed to were assigned to the influence of black slaves they have maintained and especially their part in developmental years of infancy. Barbara Hofland’s *The Barbadoes Girl: A Tale for Young People* published in 1818 packs references to both motives aforementioned. The tale is about a young girl Matilda, who on losing her father, is sent to England. Her impetuosity and insolence are to be understood from the demeaning treatment of her slave. But the story develops her character arc by how her follies are corrected for good when she associates with the compassionate English. Except for very rare eruptions of passions, which are described as residue of the indulgences she enjoyed in her country, she is cured of her deceit. It acknowledges her disposition prior to the journey to England as “little better than a negro” (*The Barbadoes Girl* 37). Matilda comes to understand how slavery is a folly and how her behaviour towards the slave could never be fathomed flattering. The story’s intention, in educating young minds about solicitude and sophistication finds a case in point in a girl whose origins always and only gets emphasized for her imprudence.

It was a popular notion that the exotic new world of the east and the west were to be dealt strictly professionally because their need and acceptance as commercial pursuit notwithstanding, the tropics and its people were not supposed to be the best of influences for a gentleman. Rochester’s marriage to Bertha Mason, the heiress to fortune of thirty thousand pounds, hints on how he was lured with her money as such as with her charm. The exotic beauty and sensuousness were already a dish served and savoured by English readership by the accounts of Edward Long and the like, which Charlotte Brontë never intended to object to in her depiction of Bertha. Though of shared descent, the creoles were susceptible to moral and intellectual atrophy

which are to be blamed on the hot climate of their home. Rochester's complaints of not able to find happiness with his marriage have strong foundations in charges normally directed against women of new world:

> her character ripened and developed with frightful rapidity; her voices sprung up fast and rank: they were so strong, only cruelty could check them; and I would not use cruelty. What a pigmy intellect she had- and what giant propensities! How fearful were the curses those propensities entailed on me! Bertha Mason, -the true daughter of an infamous mother,- dragged me through all the hideous and degrading agonies which must attend a man bound to a wife at once intemperate and unchaste. (*Jane Eyre* 261)

The British brought women to the new world to ensconce the young men of colonial enterprise but it wasn't an easy task to carry out. The Lord Protector apparently took this issue to be of grave concern and in correspondence with his secretary John Thurloe had proposed to have one thousand Irish girls to be collected for "breeding purposes" (qtd in Mair 20) The plan didn't actualize but the idea itself interestingly reveals many layers of pretence and discrimination which the British maintained for their men overseas and the Irish.

The 'Irishness', if it can be called so, couldn't have left untouched the Brontës for their roots were Irish. Reverend Patrick Brontë came a long way from modest beginnings in Ireland to be educated at university, giving him and his breed ample sophistication but also insecurities for their origins. Irish were food for racial stereotyping that were subjected to blacks and pseudo sciences were of help in establishing the relative negroid connection they were supposed to have. John Beddoe, the founding member of Ethnological Society of London even put forward

"index of Nigresence" which taking into account the melanin of one's body adjudge the proportion of negritude in any population. As per his argument "Africanoid celts" are "to be found in Wales and Ireland than in Central England" (qtd. in Michie 126). Novelist Charles Kingsley's account of travel in Ireland which loathed the Irish on their gruesome existence shall be understood in similar light where he condemns that the people share white skin with the English:

> But I am haunted by the human chimpanzees I saw along that hundred miles of horrible country. I don't believe they are our fault. I believe there are not only many more of them than of old, but that they are happier, better, more comfortably fed and lodged under our rule than they ever were. But to see white chimpanzees is dreadful; if they were black, one would not feel it so much, but their skins, except where tanned by exposure, are as white as ours. (qtd. in Michie 127)

The Brontës don't engage in obvious references to Irish in their works except may be for Malone of *Shirley* whose visage has American Indian features and his demeanour could be described haughty, suited for a slave owner. The indeterminateness of the racial identity of the Irish is a subject of curious and often unsettling nature and of a similar convention followed in the characterization of Heathcliff of Wuthering Heights. Situating Heathcliff in any definite forms of identity has been a tricky business and there had been different theories surrounding the same. M. Hope Dodds in his essay "Heathcliff's Country" (1944) had placed an interesting argument that Heathcliff belongs to an imaginary realm of Gondal, somewhere situated in South Pacific, a fantasy realm etched in the early writings of Emily and Anne. Heathcliff in such a perspective may place on equal footing with may be a Frankenstein as Maria Beville observes in *The Unnamable Monster in Literature and*

film (2013), a form of other which shall remain unfathomable. But Terry Eagleton built precisely on this ambivalence and has emphasized that the quality of being hazy could easily be a standard view of an Irishman. Eagleton extended Raymond Williams' description of Emily's world as of "desire and hunger"(qtd. in "Emily Bronte and the Great Hunger" 111) in her fiction to be a metaphor for Heathcliff— he is hunger personified who is a "fragment of the famine" (111). The great famine resulted in some 100,000 deaths and caused huge influx of migrants to the English soil with around 1.5 million people daring to cross the sea in desperation, most of them arriving at Liverpool. Branwell Brontë apparently made a visit to Liverpool during August 1845, which wasn't lost on Emily's biographer Winifred Gérin, as she observes in *Emily Brontë: A Biography* (1971) how the writer's choice of place where Heathcliff was to be found, could be influenced by his travel accounts. It was also duly noted that Emily's writing of her novel was in the autumn and winter of 1845.

Emily's chronology for her fictional narrative predates the famine itself, hence not making Heathcliff an Irish immigrant in temporal terms. But his inception wasn't to be called a figment of unadulterated imagination by neither Eagleton nor Michie and many others in line. Terry Eagleton in "Emily Bronte and the Great Hunger" (1992) had suggested a very sentimental flourish of describing Heathcliff as a rural revolution gone awry. He and what he represents, various stages of Irish revolution, are to be ultimately thrown out by the landowners of Thrushcross Grange. Young Cathy is reinstated as the true heiress of the Heights with Hareton by her side who is by now sufficiently civilized. Hareton, of course, has a chance at redemption in the narrative since his racial origin isn't complicated like that of Heathcliff. Eagleton picked up cues from Branwell's visit just like Gérin, and the Irish connection became food for his thought.

Elsie Michie points out in agreement with Terry Eagleton's observation that there are many instances of references to Heathcliff in *Wuthering Heights* that evoke Kingsley's description of Irish. Nelly Dean's disowning of Heathcliff as not "a creature of my own species" *(Wuthering Heights* 125) or the descriptions of him having hair like "a colt's mane" (46) with a look that is "contrived to convey an impression of inward and outward repulsiveness" (53) serve as examples. Michie makes an interesting and curious comment on how Heathcliff's outpouring of his desire to "have the privilege of flinging Joseph off the highest gable, and painting the house-front with Hindley's blood!" (38) resonates with what was described by the 1834 *Edinburgh Review* to be naturally Irish in character: "a desperate recklessness of the consequences of actions" … "a spirit of revenge, not to be satiated except by blood." (qtd. in Michie 131). The English gentlemanliness doesn't rub off to Heathcliff even when he rises to fortune. He is fixated on the unattainability of Catherine and access to any aforementioned is just tools to be operated in his mission which now translates to destroying the Linton lineage.

Michie's analysis points to exact moments in the novel which combines race and class prejudices that work against Heathcliff. While their ill-starred escapade to Thrushcross Grange, Mr. Linton abuses Heathcliff as a Heathen and calls out him to be hanged "before he shows his nature in acts, as well as features" (*Wuthering Heights* 39) while Cathy is instantly welcome there. According to Michie, it is the class status of each member that directs them to see Heathcliff in which light to be projected: for Mr. Linton, the gentry, he is to be feared while for Nelly, he could be oriental royalty. On her return from the stay at Thrushcross Grange, Catherine is seen thinking of Heathcliff as "black and cross" (42) and it is understood that she feels so because she is now "used to Edgar and Isabella Linton" (42). In being 'black',

Heathcliff suddenly becomes an exotic object both to be feared and desired which his state of being a 'white chimpanzee' could not have accorded. This instance is one of many cases on how concerns near home, aka local colonialism at Ireland, are transported to the "distant imperialist scenarios" (Michie 125) and in Michie's terms, "extrojected onto the orient" (137). According to Michie, whenever hints are provided in to point to Heathcliff's Irish origins, they are immediately shaded by exotic references. She adds that, behind any such images, there is strong undercurrents of Irish stereotyping.

The schema of 'extrojection' is adopted by Charlotte Brontë, although for a different effect, in *Jane Eyre* as when she describes St. John Rivers as despotic and hard yet in awe for his toil for his race. The 'extrojection' here is on how anything unpleasant in England is justified when cast out to far away and directed for a supposedly higher cause. Rivers' controlling nature isn't to be applauded at home but while dealing with orient this has to be allowed and approved. Michie's meticulous eye for details fetches out descriptions allotted to Rochester in *Jane Eyre*, which also point out to stereotypical Irish portrayal of 19th century British understanding. For example, Rochester's appearance constantly gets contrasted against typical English make as that of St. John Rivers' and is concluded as ugly even by Jane herself. But Rochester's ethnicity is not that much of a romantic enigma as it was with Heathcliff, hence any enthusiastic query from critics on his origins aren't frequent. But, as per Michie, it is not impossible to assume influence of Irish stock imageries in constituting his unconventional status.

Heathcliff's bleak origins, meanwhile, conveniently pull him out of any possibility of reformation, let alone association with the respected or gentlemanly. Michie points out that *Wuthering Heights* poses questions as to whether Heathcliff

being an uncouth resulted from Hindley's neglect or is it immanent in his supposed racial makeup, but does leave such questions unanswered. Heathcliff is deemed a lost cause even by his saviour Mr. Earnshaw who calls him "as dark almost as if it came from the devil"(*Wuthering Heights* 29). It wouldn't wrong to assume then that his moral turpitude isn't to be disassociated with his genesis and unconventional origin. He is varyingly called gypsy, lascar-born of an East Indian Seaman, people report him praying to a God he confounds "with his own black father" (135) though he isn't outright called negro.

The Brontë's place of dwelling Yorkshire had connections with slave trade as many families like that of Baron Harewood's built their fortunes and homestead based on the money procured from investment in the same. Hence any assumption of Heathcliff's black ancestry won't be unjustified either. Christopher Heywood, with acutely specific instances of Yorkshire slavery in *Wuthering Heights* in an article that goes by the same title explains how the Sill family of Dent whose riches came predominantly from plantations of Jamaica could possibly be the Earnshaws of the novel. Dentdale is 50 miles away from Haworth parsonage but the sisters were known to be aware of the locale through their journeys to Clergy Daughter's School at Cowan Bridge, to which it was a neighbouring place. Sills themselves held slaves and it has been documented by newspaper advertisement of 1758 which is well preserved in the Dent Village Heritage Centre. The advertisement offered reward for returning a slave who managed to escape. The Sill estate was later bequeathed to an unmarried niece of the family patriarch John named Ann, who maintained a rather elliptical relationship with the estate manager Richard Sutton. Richard Sutton's origins were humble and his upbringing was humiliating. He is said to have got adopted at a young age to the family by John's brother Edmund and was put up with slaves. The exact

date of adoption could not be known since there aren't records to prove so and, in every essence, he had been a servant at the estate. But he rose to money, as he was later made the manager and by winning Anne's confidence and her estate after her death. Much of these anecdotes were to be found in *The Rural Life of England* (1838) by a Quaker William Howitt whose book was quite popular in the nineteenth century. His access to some people with confidential input on the Sills, like Ann's servant, made his narrative of the family sound believable and juicy at the same time. Author Kim Lyon drew much from Howitt's tales from the countryside in establishing the Heathcliff connection to Sutton's story in her *The Dentdale Brontë Trail* (1985) She also elaborates how another scandal from the locale became the flesh to Brontë's Heathcliff- Catherine relationship. Gossip mills had it that Ann fell in love with a black coachman who eventually disappeared and was thought to have murdered by her brothers. Much of Lyon's enthusiasm was directed in demonstrating how Heathcliff could be Sutton and in doing that, she provides actual comparisons of events from novel pitted against the latter's life. This much of private history often turn pedantic in description but she stirred the pot for Brontë scholars, for Heathcliff's enigma was too hard to resist. Heathcliff's irresistibility is multi-layered and surely problematic. As a racial question, with new parallels drawn for possibilities, one thing became clear that Heathcliff's ethnicity is as ambiguous as England's claim to any sort of purity.

The possibility of Richard Sutton being black was unlikely for as simple a reason that, if that had that been the case, Howitt would have put in his book. If we must draw from references from the book, striking off the possibility of Heathcliff's gypsy background will not be logical either. Howitt had a chapter in his book on gypsies in which he says about the community frequenting English countryside.

Substantiating Heathcliff's identity has been of a very romantic pursuit for many, as the novel grew larger in readership and the characters got their spell cast. Emily's descriptions of him being elliptic and her sources as reported so varied, any pinpointing escapes our scope. But as much as the endeavour seems frustrating, the feeling does parallel with the greater fact that every tension and any anxiety that's deported on Heathcliff could be understood as the confusion that's born in a typical English mind when they encounter an alien; especially somebody who is able of crossing of the class strictures which only escalates the agitation.

Perhaps as baffling is Heathcliff's masculinity, which disturbed set sensibilities but ironically contributed much in making the novel a sensation. The violence in his general demeanour has been a matter of concern but for a Victorian he would not have been less dangerous for his emotional temperament. Rationality and sentimentality were distinctly compartmentalized with enough explanations that were sold scientifically to assure that each can sustain only separately in male and female. Gender roles were formed accordingly-with men deemed logical and in control of emotions while women sensitive and of excitable nature. Thus, any task of decision making was to be entrusted on men which made them in charge of women even in legal sense. The doctrine of coverture must be reminded of at this moment, where a woman's legal identity was to be subsumed by her husband's. But, the men Brontë universe men are of a certain bearing where it is not difficult to see how they are constituted of good and bad of both worlds- reason and passion. Often their passion becomes the driving force in dictating their logical compass. Hence their elements are of both Victorian and Romantic make, which is contradictory and for the same reason interesting.

The refusal of effeminacy, a quality that was typically associated with the Romantic gentleman could be a hallmark of the Victorian understanding of masculinity. The ideal Victorian male should be robust, with restraint and somebody who abstain from indulging in any sort of 'wasteful' inclinations in life. Conduct books, though traditionally targeted to women, were popular in directing men to a certain code or pattern of behaviour throughout the Victorian era. But even with the ideal being set, the transitioning of the 'maleness' from the Romantic to the sturdy Victorian was tough and still a very happening process while the Brontës composing their texts. John Tosh in *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth Century Britain* (2005) clarifies that the terms 'gentlemanliness' and 'manliness' shouldn't be confused for synonyms in Victorian era. With the rising middle class and nouveau riche, the aristocratic gentleman was forced to enforce their standing and authority time and again even though they had denominations bequeathed upon them. The idea of manliness was a shared aspiration for men of all origins which could be understood as acquired and often it was the 'work-ethic' of the middle-class men that got translated to masculinity. The gentleman was positioned at a different end of the spectrum with his educated upbringing the only weapon against the claims of the working men around in resisting their contention to supremacy. The concept of masculinity though aiming fixity was not without strong undercurrents in the opposite direction. Also, it was understood that the often-conflicting standards and practices of masculinity could have made its subsistence in comparison with a constant feminine only.

The men in Brontë texts, especially Heathcliff and Rochester had this impression of an inscrutable male as it is often commented on by the characters themselves and once published, by the readers. Heathcliff's origins make him beyond

the reach of English definition of masculinity and for the same reason he is ridiculed but coveted, simultaneously. Heathcliff's whole life gets encompassed in his plan of revenge and even his son is an aide in his ploy. He decides to get the property and money to be taken away from both the Earnshaws and the Lintons by smartly crafted and executed means. His way of getting things done is definitely meticulous and foresighted; especially his decision to bring up Hareton in his own shoes, as a servant. But the whole nucleus of his well-crafted and very legitimate plan had been his unrelenting passion for Catherine which made him even to unearth her coffin and get its one side removed. The event itself had been interpreted as an event of necrophilia and the emotion behind it identified as monomania.

When Catherine makes a choice of Edgar Linton over Heathcliff, she is opting for a certain type of masculinity over the other. Heathcliff possesses working class masculinity and remains stagnant in that type, though he manages to gain wealth to climb the ladder up to the status of a gentleman. He lacks the necessary pruning by formal education and that shortfall is not lost on beholder's eyes. Mr. Lockwood's reaction to Heathcliff's affluence is that "Did he finish his education on the continent and came back a gentleman" (*Wuthering Heights* 71) or just made a fortune. In utter contrast though, Linton's bearing is genteel and soft, which does not come as a surprise since his parentage is of gentry. His manner is a foil to Heathcliff's as much as his appearance. Linton's light skin and blue eyes are in stark contrast to Heathcliff's dark hue. Heathcliff's life in exile proves him good as he reaps a fortune and "retained no marks of former degradation." (75) but Brontë still marks the possibility of his "half-civilized ferocity lurked yet in the depressed brows and eyes full of black fire" (75). Heathcliff wasn't altogether unmotivated to forms of approval Linton had in abundance of. In a moment of vulnerability, Heathcliff pours out to

Nelly how he wished to have “light hair and a fair skin, and was dressed and behaved as well, and had a chance of being as rich as he will be!” (45). Against Heathcliff’s vigour, Linton’s upbringing and, obviously, genes place him notches up high and Heathcliff bear the brunt for that though he does not give out the impression of being deterred for it. Out of spite and obstinacy, he continues to be in his Byronic self against Linton’s sophisticated soul. Heathcliff’s fancy for gentility is only so far to make him suitable to Catherine and nothing else. He finds it ridiculous that Isabella found him” hero of romance” (118) and mocks her for not seeing it through his façade.

Catherine’s rejects Heathcliff as she finds herself and Heathcliff of the same make. Her understanding of Linton as her complementary, hence desirable, had also been in lines with theories prevalent at that time. Emily Davies in *The Higher Education of Women* (1866) articulates about this notion of the realization of this complement was treated as essential during the era and how it was believed to be fructified by a union by marriage. Catherine’s self-proclaimed untamed self finds its equal in Heathcliff, but Linton’s restrained masculinity is respectable and adheres to the principle of complement. Catherine though, finds Linton tedious in that his masculinity is anchored on his emotion of compassion which is in stark opposition to Heathcliff’s passion. It also added up to the situation that Catherine was not suitable for a steady domestic role. She describes Linton’s ways and choices of life as heaven where she finds her a misfit, finds herself thrown out from and thankful for it. Her role, by being inconsistent with the ideal, the marriage to Linton becomes self-destructive. Catherine cannot maintain the ideal consistently to be Linton’s complementary and make their marriage work. This theory of complement was

sanctified by the belief that everyone can have only one perfect supplement to themselves which romanticized it further.

Sexual passion was understood as something to be tamed and mastered and was allowed vent typically in marriages only. Marriages made sacred with the theory of complement largely allowed sex because it served reproduction and of the Victorian perception that sex within marriage facilitates spiritual union. Heathcliff's intensity is often called inhuman and animalistic because his actions are dictated by his zest for Catherine whom he is not married to nor, by societal standards, eligible to get married to. Heathcliff thus remained irresistible nevertheless unacceptable for the Victorians.

Jane Eyre's Rochester on the other hand, doesn't share dilemma of parentage with Heathcliff. He is endowed with respectability, property, and power. Mrs.Fairfax reports him to Jane as somebody of gentleman status and of liberal, just ways to his tenants and she finds these qualities admirable. On further prodding, she reveals him to be peculiar, somewhat unfathomable but honestly, she doesn't count them of consequence because Rochester fits the necessary specifications of a gentleman and that is deemed admirable. On his own part, Rochester has dealt most difficult situations strategically, be it with his mad wife or his supposed illegitimate daughter. He could manage to hide both for longest possible time and maintain his reputation and his flair with his many mistresses. Thus, he has successfully demarcated his private and public spheres logically and in being able to do that, he again proves an apt Victorian.

The assimilation of Victorian sensibilities in the Brontë universe is often accentuated by the Brontë sisters' insecure condition by Victorian standards. The understanding of deliberations with the contemporary standards on women, mental

ailments, racial and colonial tensions along with notions on masculinity evident in their output is useful in forwarding critical attention towards their adaptations. In fact, the elements that are mentioned function as points of reference in the study. To put it as concisely as possible, the Brontës might be celebrated for their seclusive nature and singular passion but the currents of contemporary events are deciding factors in shaping their works' course.

CHAPTER THREE

Various Ages and Preferences at Play in Different *Jane Eyre* Adaptations.

The beginning credits of the film adaptation of *Jane Eyre* in 1943 couldn't have done better to invoke the *Jane Eyre* in print. The specifics are put on turning pages of a book which on its front cover shows not the director, not even author with the director, but the author alone. The sequence captures and makes use of the heritage value of *Jane Eyre* as a text, the elder Brontë as the author and if extended, it could function as a metaphor for what the film meant in relation with the book; as an interpretative agency of the text. Or in other words, it established anything and everything the film meant in relation with the book. It ingeniously states that *Jane Eyre* belongs to Charlotte Brontë while the director, whose name we get to see at the end of the credits, is in charge of this particular narration of *Jane Eyre*, the movie. There is a reading of the first passage from the book on screen in the movie:

> My name is Jane Eyre. I was born in 1820, a harsh time of change in England. Money and position seemed all that mattered. Charity was a cold and disagreeable word. Religion too often wore a mask of bigotry and cruelty. There was no proper place for the poor or the unfortunate. I had no father or mother, no brother or sister. As a child I lived with my aunt, Mrs. Reed of Gateshead Hall. I do not remember that she ever spoke one kind word to me.
>
> (*Jane Eyre* 00:01:28-55)

The lines aren't the actual beginning of Brontë's *Jane Eyre*. In the novel, it starts rather abruptly as "There was no possibility of taking a walk that day" (5). The director's choice of an altered beginning, if enough acquainted with the text, brings to our understanding that when we see the passage as it is seen in the book on screen

narrated, it strictly means the book that's shown on screen. Instead for the original text's opaque beginning we have facts, characters and narrative which serve as springboard to the story of *Jane Eyre,* the movie. Stevenson's attempt has been simple in that he brought forth the tale of a text as seen by the cinema, the medium which shall be at his control as a valid tool for interpretation. In a certain sense, Dudley Andrew's 'intersecting' style of adaptation is at work in how the segment doesn't own *Jane Eyre*, the novel, rather awed by it. The movie becomes aloof, respectful and not daring to claim the book.

In a typical book versus movie conundrum, the metonymical weight of *Jane Eyre* as literature will place the book a notch up high than the movie as it is the antecedent. *Jane Eyre* is no less formidable as a text without its figurative value— its content was lauded to be revolutionary by Virginia Woolf and many others like Elizabeth Bowen. The latter even declared the book as the "first feminist Novel" (qtd. in Brosh, 46) in *English Novelists* (1932). Jane's 'independence' was hailed and David Cecil in his *Early Victorian Novelists: Essays in Revaluation* (1934) put Charlotte Brontë along with D.H. Lawrence for the audacity in being vocal about sexual tensions in prudish Victorian times. Surely such legacy wouldn't have gone unseen with Robert Stevenson or especially with David O. Selznick on board. Selznick was known for his palate for classics and it was under his wings the project took off. Obviously with *Jane Eyre*, its 'woman question' must be brought up eventually and necessarily. But as a detailing of a membrane of the textual entity, how it shall be brought up should be as much contextualized, as much as *Jane Eyre*'s reciprocity with its historical milieu which had been part of our discernment. Hence, how women were understood during the times of making the movie becomes the informant in understanding women in *Jane Eyre*, the movie.

The 1940's were tense times, as World War was raging, and this led to a drastic change in economic roles of women too. There happened a major rise of employment for women. The 1930's were reluctant towards appointing women in traditionally male centric jobs but with the war starting, hiring women became unavoidable. Statistics would serve the figures of percentage of women employed in United States by certain months of 1944 being 50 percent. About 37 percent of them worked on regular basis (Brosh 48). Many already had worked during depression and many had been in the labour force for years, but the increase in the percentage was still remarkable. Liona Brosh adds that it was more interesting to see changes in the nature of work for women than the numbers. Many jobs would have left unattended had they been continued to prefer men over women. This further contributed to the exposure of women in unionized employment fields which were better waged and generally unavailable to them. The war, though detrimental generally, proved somewhat reformative for women and their economical subsistence.

It couldn't have been that every woman employed enjoyed conducive working atmosphere or they found the nature of work convenient, but being employed and finding themselves included for a larger cause along with the pleasures of workplace camaraderie, made women feel empowered. Thus, many were not ready to forsake the jobs even when the war was declared over. There weren't dearth of married women and mothers in the labour force. Susan M Hartmann reports in her *The Home Front and Beyond* (1982) that the number of working women with a child under 10 was 12.1 percent in 1944 when compared to the 7.8 percent of 1940. Women needed work and they were needed for work, but with working mothers the situation was especially tense as support for child care provided by the neither the employers nor the government was adequate. Often, they were caught between the Scylla of their

necessity to work and Charybdis of sense of duty and care towards their children on which the societal standards yet wasn't ready to compromise. In fact, the public perception on married women working weren't favourable; hadn't been for the wartime needs these women would not have been allowed to work at all as being married and mothers, their primary duty was always advised as looking after family and children. The wartime employment as insisted by the government and society in a larger sense was to be understood only as an interim digression from the traditional ways of the world. Moreover, any work they undertook were projected as a sacrifice and not as economically rewarding opportunity, stretching the already established sense of responsibility women were bound to have, careful not to incite any professional aspirations in them. When the War waned the appreciation for working mothers came further low and advertisements slowly started to abandon the theme of recruitment they followed for past few years. The post war campaigns focused on how much the country needed to savour its victory, hard fought for and won at last, by being at home where life should be as comfortable it gets. By then, manufactures shifted their production to consumer goods and started marketing that the more you possess these provisions more you are close to the domestic ideal. Even while the recruitment campaign was on full steam, the advertisements used to drop hints of how the women, once the war over, will have undivided attention to homemaking which was even projected as a desirable and most appropriate lifestyle for women. For example, Thermos Bottle's advertisement campaign had a woman pouring coffee for herself at the factory in one picture contrasted with herself pouring coffee for husband and friends while she says: "This is what we are working for—the carefree home parties we used to have" (qtd. in Honey 123). Thus, "leaving her war job in favour of the home was shown as the woman worker's reward for a job well done" (qtd. in

Honey 123). While in war, the self-sacrificing self of working woman was projected as sexually appealing, but with the war commencing a more traditional ideal was to be deemed appropriate.

The maternal inclination was a bait in recruitment campaigns lead by Chester J. LaRoche, head of committee for War Advertising Council, whose war efforts in advertisement focused on personalizing the war experiencing to public in general and women in particular by portraying the soldier as somebody's brother, son or husband, thus inducing guilt if not providing assistance to him in action. The council capitalized on the separation couples had to undergo during war times, projecting it a possibility of growing apart, which if not checked, finetuning the woman's skill set to suit the husband's mission at that time, may cause in alienation and abandoning. Finding a war job was advised to be the best way to be in sync with the partner— a chance to be with the beloved and be of his use, hence relevant.

In fact, a William Wyler directorial that came out just a year before Stevenson's *Jane Eyre*, namely *Mrs.Miniver* (1942) could make for an encompassing example for what women stood for during the war. Mrs. Miniver has got both her husband and son at the warfront, fighting the Germans and assisting the British and if that's not enough, she herself is seen rescuing her home from a German soldier who managed to sneak in. She doesn't let her folks down and shows immense courage in fighting the enemy out but even in warring, her maternal side is on display as she shows concern over the soldier's injured arm and takes care of it. The war work wasn't contributing to reshaping women's functional roles in American life and society, rather only stretching on already established ideals careful not to disturb the balance. Even when war work was highly promoted, the authorities put up parallel between the housework and war jobs in how they are all same. "The plant's as bright

and cheery as my own kitchen" (qtd. in Honey 128) was one line used by campaign featuring a woman writing a letter to her husband away working. This kind of assurance was totally unwanted, because women were not totally unfamiliar with work other than homemaking, even though many weren't holding a regular one. The propaganda sort of bracketed every woman involved in war work as inexperienced on field and more importantly, the authority was not open to the idea that women and men are able to do same kind of work. Melva Baker, a scholar on wartime films, pointed out in her PhD thesis *Images of Women: The War Years, 1941-1945: A Study of the Public Perceptions of Women's Roles as Revealed in Top-Grossing War Films* (1978) how women were projected as a party in war against fascism and how defending the family against the flux caused by the unpredictable times, which was dubbed as domestic instability, was put as a principle of epic scale to be ardently followed by women. The ideal of freedom, as it was put to the woman of the era, was to be found in pursuit of unhindered time and space to nourish a family and taking part in war was to be understood a crusade to reclaim those romantic stations.

It wasn't an unsurprising stance that the war and its ideological apparatuses didn't intend to dislodge the Victorian model of the family or male-female dynamic even when the competence of women on field not being invisible. The home being decorated as the nation in minuscule, its nourishment was to be paralleled with nation building. Any service extended outside the immediate territory of the household, as it happened a lot during wartimes, were to be in defence of the fortified institution of the home and in extension, nation.

The late months of 1943, when *Jane Eyre* was being screened in theatres the war was reported to be over soon and the women who were on war jobs were being advised to be back home since their purpose of fielding the nation through their work

ceased to be of need. In the post war world, a woman of home and children was to be the ideal rather than a woman of outdoors. The novel *Jane Eyre*, as per certain critical opinions, didn't indulge the readers with any ideal mother figures who go by conformist value system to pose a guardian in the eponymous heroine's life. Except for Bessie, the kind maid at her aunt's, Miss Temple and the martyrlike Helen Burns at Lowood, it is shown a lonely ride for Jane. Adrienne Rich's argued in her "*Jane Eyre*: The Temptations of a motherless woman" (1973) that Jane's lack of a mother figure was adequately compensated by mother-like figures. But it was later questioned by Liora Brosh who points out in her *Screening Novel Women* that Jane's emotional requirements were never met with these figures as Miss Temple's detachment failed Jane, so did Bessie's occasional cruelty and Helen's self- denial. To further her expostulation, she extends that Charlotte Brontë wanted the presentation of the character Mrs. Reed to be a deconstruction of the Victorian maternal standards. Empathy and compassion, attributes conventionally associated with motherhood, aren't the biggest assets of Mrs. Reed, whose treatment of Jane had been inhuman. Mrs. Reed's maternal displays aren't presented noble or virtuous either, because her pampering of her children is excessive, isn't morally directed or visionary and her callousness towards Jane cancels any chance of redemption for her figure. Since any and every mother figure in Jane's life prove themselves as unsatisfactory, a maternal ideal remains unattainable for Jane and in thriving with that unattainability, she develops ambivalent attitude towards the role itself whenever she was asked to perform the role of one.

Adrienne Rich's 1970's thesis of strong woman bond nourishing Jane is directly in opposition with Brosh's late 2000's polemic. Both loads the same text with radically different connotations when it comes to describe the maternal sentiments

being played out in the text. When it comes to Jane herself, there aren't many instances in the text that pose strong cases of motherly displays. Her affection for the young ones is more often decided on how much of she can see herself in the person who are to be the receiving end of her emotions. Jane, for example, isn't fond of Adèle and she feels compassion for the girl when she learns that she is born out of wedlock. She has been typically distant and aloof towards any children she encountered, at school and other places. Brosh's postulations of Charlotte Brontë consciously undermining the ideal nature of motherhood is strongly positioned on such instances of Jane's disinclination for children.

The 1940's American society wouldn't have accommodated such dimensions of the novel while making an adaptation out of it. Statistics of heightened rates of divorce and concerns over children of separated parents were constantly doing rounds during the war, which were to be blamed on the women absent from home. Once the war subsided, support for the woman working outside home waned and though the tendencies mentioned were present even before the war, the nation, highly disturbed and volatile found a perfect target in working mothers to dislodge the blame on.

Stevenson's *Jane Eyre* (1943) plays with stark uses of antithesis in representing women. The many figures surrounding Jane, in whatever degree associated with her on woman-to-woman capacity, is restructured to suit the need for reassurance of motherly examples. The character of Mrs. Reed is often pitted against Bessie even in appearance. The angular Mrs Reed is the opposite of the plump Bessie in her temperament and her motives. The choice of Sara Allgood for playing Bessie in the movie was a move in the right direction to implement the intention of the filmmakers in establishing a maternal example; for the actress was seasoned in playing mothers in movies. Carolyn Dever, who is almost close to Brosh in her

theory, presented the observation that Jane worked the lack of any steady and healthy maternal figures to her advantage by decompounding the model Victorian womanhood and carving a path uniquely her own (*Death and the Mother from Dickens to Freud: Victorian Fiction and the Anxiety of Origins*, 31). But there isn't dearth of the homely and maternal in the 1943 adaptation and the narrative in different times has different vessels of characters to fill in the qualities mentioned. Helen Burns and Adèle are proclaimed to have liberated Jane, but the liberation in the 1940's couldn't be in contradiction with domesticity at any cost. Thus, the scene where Jane is shown door out to Lowood from Gateshead Hall is pictured powerful and tragic not only for the loss of home Jane had to experience but also for her banishment from a domestic ideal of life. The movie, in Brosh's view, choose to pilot from this very juncture and come to a sort of denouement when Jane is secured of a domesticated life.

As it is with the book the movie shows Jane's deportation to Lowood as terrifying. But there are many other reasons other than the penury that makes the place unendurable for the Jane and her mates who are forced to endure at the institution. The school isn't tolerant of any kind of dainty, delicate or feminine traces in its members. Helen Burns, who is more of a nun practicing self-abnegation is seen punished to walk in the rain with a board that declares her as 'vain'. The religiously affectatious authority of Lowood didn't deem it suitable for girls to put their appearance as a priority and girls are chopped off their hair but when it comes to Stevenson's movie version, the act of cutting the curls off is all the more emphasised and pictured unbearable for it erases feminine from those girls. Thus, when we are shown of Helen's death by consumption, the episode is not without figurative load where the Lowood is an antonym to femininity where Helen Burns' death could be

read as a death of the feminine itself. For an audience a generation later, the casting of a young Elizabeth Taylor as Helen Burns would have been more a meat of thought to chew on than the immediate audience of the movie of the 40's, but zeroing on a young Ms.Taylor for Helen's role, even then, was evidently a way to make Helen Burns look visually appealing.

While in Lowood, Jane gets castigated so often just like any other ward of the school. Jane is charged of being 'rebellious' but that trait of her or any juncture of her life where she could again display her defiant side is effectively ruled out from the movie. The movie chooses to concentrate on the Thornfield Hall dimension of Jane's life. Certain scenes and characters are scissored out to suit such a need— for instance, the Rivers family is completely absent and Jane's career at Lowood is not to be seen in the film. Orson Welles' Mr. Rochester is tall, dark and strong willed in its accentuated forms to be on heads up in his and Jane's relationship. Contemporary reviewers were not to miss this, as Bosley Crowther in his review of *Jane Eyre* in *New York Times* (1944) wrote about how the emphasis is not anymore on Jane as the story progresses at Thornfield. Crowther eyed on Jane's presence shrouded by Rochester's as 'strange' as she is often placed passive to a very strong Rochester. But even when the diegesis is centred on the Rochester and Jane dynamic, the romance is counterbalanced by the maternal. Sexual and romantic awakening are inextricably linked to reproductivity in the movie as it could be deciphered from a scene that was invented for the adaptation. The sexual undertones won't be lost on audience when they see Jane rescuing Rochester from the blazing bed but next, they get to see Rochester himself and Jane rushing to Adèle to make sure the girl is safe. This sequence is an addition to the scene in the novel. The scenario is mushy and it

emphasises the safe harbour of domestic circle, where any sexual or romantic arousing shall be anchored without fail.

Notwithstanding its focus on a romance, *Jane Eyre*, the movie of 1943, takes a seemingly conscious stand against making its heroine an erotic object; Instead, Jane is often presented and emphasized as plain. Rochester, on the other hand, is made an object of desire for Jane's gaze thus, by extension making Orson Welles the eye candy instead of Joan Fontaine. If we are to take Laura Mulvey's theorisation on the eroticized female body of the male gaze, the movie seems to be not on tow for not objectifying the woman of the film. Such a move is to be seen in the novel where the narrative is from Jane, the woman, and though the attraction had been mutual there isn't less vocalization of the same from Jane herself. Thus, we get to see the gaze from the opposite side in the novel when it is not Rochester but Jane casting the glance. It is not easy for Jane to look and long for Rochester, as it wasn't the norm by Victorian standards and the fact that Rochester himself prods Jane to be more participative in their relationship is a proof to the apprehension Jane might have experienced being self-aware of the passion she has for this particular man. As with the novel, Rochester's body is to be fancied more than Jane's in the film, which could be devoured as Jane sees him or even independent of Jane's vision. Because, Rochester's cast is built appealing not exclusively to Jane but abiding general standards of attractiveness. To have the power to sexually eye at her favourite object could have been a liberating experience for Jane but the movie tempers it down with placing Jane's occasions of gazing Rochester in the company of Adèle, the girl's presence toning down any upsurgence of passion.

Bertha Mason, the most destabilizing agent of Rochester's domestic circle in particular and the film's environment in general is stripped off her physicality,

limiting her presence to silhouettes, shrieks and moans, effectively evoking the gothic monster within the movie. But beyond a stylistic device, the decision to put Bertha in a phantasmic realm has, in no doubt, helped to ease the uneasy edges of Rochester's past, which conveniently puts him free of guilt for Bertha's condition. While situating Jane to the conventional and maternally consecrated, any stain on Rochester whom the narrative has chosen to associate with her will be disturbing the equilibrium. Rochester's sexual encounters are not to be detailed except for two parties— since the movie somehow has to account for Adèle, the reference to Cèline Varens is made and Bertha finds a slot for her narrative inevitability, but as an apparitional experience.

Stevenson's movie was to have cult status despite not winning a wider audience immediately. The audience were already treated with *Gone with the Wind* (1939) and *Rebecca* (1940) hence were not to be excited for another romance on the big screen. The movie's marketing as a gothic romance also may have contributed to a less enthusiastic viewership (Sadoff 79). But the film picked up and it has since been an unquestionable influence on any adaptation to follow. The beginning shots of the trailer of the movie were to be a perfect establishment of the movie being the latest in the line many adaptations of classics; the progression of a book of *Jane Eyre* in the trailer to the supposed pages of the work in the opening of the film were to assure that the movies origins, yet anyone acquainted won't sweat their brow to find out this isn't the case. Thus, by vehemently stating the book of the movie, paradoxically, it was being obscure about its origin. Purposefully or not, the sequence was cut to showcase the adaptation's non-exclusivity to the book imprint. Lisa Hopkins even makes a case on how the movie could actually be trying to "replace" even the text (Hopkins 55).

Franco Zeffirelli's adaptation of *Jane Eyre* to come out in 1995 was not amiss in crediting Charlotte Brontë as the originator for the movie, for though often credited as simply *Jane Eyre*, it was in actuality, *Charlotte Brontë's Jane Eyre*. But interestingly, the movie was not to miss paying homage to Stevenson's version too, with specific instances to note, as Hopkins points out, how its Helen's hair to be cut in both the films instead of Julia Severn's as it is in the novel. Yet the permeating of contemporary state of affairs into the movie is perceptible in the movie's references to its peer group adaptations.

Zeffirelli's choice of cast for *Jane Eyre* seem an almost resituating of the faces of BBC's adaptation of Jane Austen's *Persuasion* (1995). The heritage value of classic adaptations is unmissable and as per Lisa Hopkins, an unsure Zeffirelli, after the apparently shaky reception of his Shakespearean ventures of *Romeo and Juliet*(1968) and *Hamlet*(1990) was endeavouring to put a bait on it by positioning his movie with a Jane Austen adaptation, a constant favourite during the mid 90's. Apart from the overlapping with Persuasion, the casting decisions were remarkable for the choice of a not so English Charlotte Gainsbourg to play the very typically English Jane Eyre. As Hopkins would like to put it, the French Gainsbourg cast opposite an American William Hurt directed by an Italian was to put some weight on the already undisputed claim to *Jane Eyre*'s classic status, but beyond that, it could very well be understood a signboard to the interpreting of the work in a multi-cultural mosaic of not only diverse ethnic and national viewership but also of a culturally inclusive work of art in its compositional elements (Hopkins 57, 58).

The decade's fascination with heritage films were not to be discouraged for being unsuccessful. Nineteenth century novels, of women writers especially, were heavily favoured as they did commercially exceptionally good. Critics of Liora

Brosh's league have observed that this phenomenon can find an explanation in the age's interest in female bodies. The Victorian costumes clad women, though not novel a spectacle on screen, extended a fresh dimension of female sensuality in the wider contemporary context of the frequenting images of naked bodies. The erotically understated women of Victorian dramas were a foil to the explicitly sexual shots of female in movies like *Basic Instinct* (1992), to quote the example by Brosh herself (110). Hence the habit was to cloak than to unclothe with occasionally, even a case or two in movies where the heavily adorned costumes often diverted audience's attention from the body at all, as it happened with *Mansfield Park* (1999) (120). The solid-coloured body-hugging suits of the women in movies and various centerspreads which were in vogue, in contrast with these heritage dramas, were on a different course in being visually appealing. It is also an interesting find that these movies were providing a counterpoint not only to the sexually overt by their subtle eroticism but also to the ambiguous gender appearances in the likes of Calvin Klein advertisements. The extravagantly conventional choice of costumes was not to fail the heterosexual normativity as opposed to many contemporary campaigns.

The 1950's, 60's and 70's weren't so eager about nineteenth century novels and there hadn't been many installations of them apart a few. Liora Brosh finds explanation for such a lack of enthusiasm on the domestically content nature of the 50's and the experimental streak in films during the 60's and 70's. The 80's and 90's though, were to see increased possibilities in British heritage drama as an export item. These two decades saw diversified sources of economic profits by the help of the new and improved media. VCR and DVD players became household items and through cable networks, entertainment became more viable. To make the most of newly available platforms of spectacle, distribution companies made sure that they release

the movies in as many possible. The exhibition of movies to take place by making it available in every media one after the other; thus, after its release in cinemas, it will be available in VHS or DVD, then to cable networks for television. The adaptations were thus to get reproduced on a multiple number of media for multiple times and with such exposure the profitability of the selling of addenda of the movies were taken into notice-the screenplay in print, magazines and also film-based merchandise (*Screening Novel Women* 111). Along with the proliferation and convenience of platforms, cross national collaborations were also on the boom, though by no means it was a new phenomenon- even the 1943 released *Jane Eyre* was such a venture. As for Zeffirelli's movie, primarily funded by Rhodesian producer Dyson Lovell and supported by the Weinstein brothers, had a cross Atlantic cast and a very British scriptwriter with Hugh Whitemore.

Just when this cultural inlay was being commonplace in movie making, the societal and domestic map of both the US and UK weren't to remain fixed. The gender and family normativity were in a state of flux which could be, in different perspectives, understood either fluidic or unstable. The number of single women was on rise and rather than the traditional arrangement of families of married partners, other domestic scenarios were becoming common and getting accepted too. But, the recently sprung culture of talk shows in American television like Jerry Springer's were in allegiance to securing marital bonds and vouching for gender delineation. Counselling and educating were happening, at times in consultation with popular psychologists, in no little measures in these programmes. The Oprah Winfrey show, for example, appointed Dr. Phil McGraw as the resident psychologist in 1998. The stupendous success of *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* published in 1991 was token that the compartmentalisation of genders was still very much a case to

vouch for in pop culture. As such, the heritage dramas produced in 90's drawing on a more traditional and pronounced definitions of gender didn't occur out of the blue. Their nostalgic value gave the spectators a romanticized idea of a world where gender normativity wasn't contested quite contrary to the world at present hence cherished. On the other hand, researching the cases of divorces was a meeting ground of contradicting opinions as sociologists often differed with each other on how necessary and acceptable the phenomenon is. While authors like Barbara Dafoe Whitehead was to put forward a strong case against divorces in her *The Divorce Culture* (1997) and argued that it is often selfish drives direct the course of action to divorce which sacrifices the wellbeing of children involved, sociologist Demie Kurz was trying to explain how and why women choose to get divorced even on economic hardships in *For Richer, For Poorer:Mothers Confront Divorce* (1995).

Indeed, children were very much part of the discourse on divorce and concerns on child hood trauma over broken family were genuinely distressing for women who had to opt for divorce and society in general. The issue's sensitive nature couldn't have been overlooked and such a knowledge wouldn't have left movies untouched. The first glimpse we get of Rochester in Zeffirelli's *Jane Eyre*, is as a painting of his childhood accompanied by Mrs. Fairfax's quite sympathetic narration of a how he had an unfair upbringing, how he was gentle when he was little and his strange ways can be attributed to his unhappy state of being. There is a tonal difference in Mrs. Fairfax's introduction to Orson Welles' Rochester in the 1943 version where her narration gives out sort of warning and mystery which, we have to agree, not in disagreement with the general temperament of the movie. But what strikes important is that it feels, the empathy in former's account might have sprung from her understanding of his childhood. Jane's childhood is a subject of the text by Brontë

herself hence doesn't normally go unrepresented in any movie version, but to seek similar experiences from Rochester was a fresh venture and it should be attributed to the concern over children's trauma of the decade. Even with Jane's childhood there are added layers in Zeffirelli's version. The movie begins with Jane's red room experience and it is interesting to note that the same was eschewed in the earlier adaptation by Stevenson.

By 1990's feminism reached on a state of flux. Theorists, informed by post modernism identified that gender categories are to be understood only in relation with each other and any assertion of the gender roles is achieved through performance. Through iterated expressions and enactments of particular behaviours and clothing choices that are in accordance with the accepted patterns each individual informs of their gender. Though society's validation is unavoidable, the playing out of roles isn't fixed but open to conflict and alteration. On a wider context, the universality of womanhood or manliness was also rejected because its meanings are to be perceived locally on the specificity of its location, time etc. More importantly, feminism got self-reflexive and implicitly dialectic. This tendency was in display whenever movies were to be adjudicated in feminist lenses. Critics contradicted on how to perceive the presumed crystallization of gender identities in heritage dramas— while Janice Doane and Devon Hodges in *Nostalgia and Sexual difference*(1987) argued that by banking on and accentuating sexual differences the narratives of such movies resist feminism, Devoney Looser in her essay "Feminist implications of the silver screen Austen" (1998) found that adaptations like those of Jane Austen's feminist because how women sisterhood are shown and how the men of these movies aren't afraid to show off their emotions.

Zeffirelli's Rochester isn't in dispute with this theory as his vulnerability is on display throughout the movie. Orson Welles' portrayal of the 1943 version had heavy Byronic undertones. His overbearing demeanour is strongly founded on Brontë's text, but the adaptation made a choice to emphasize these features. Jane's dynamics with Rochester is almost verging on submission and her occasional eyeing of him, which ideally a reversal of roles in gender performance, doesn't give Jane any control in her alliance with Rochester. But William Hurt plays him softer and when we see him saying out loud his love for Jane just after their wedding called off, most interestingly it follows with a demand to her say she loves him. His proclamation serves an example for Hurt's Rochester being of smoother edges when compared to Orson Welles's. As Lisa Hopkins explains, such a demand to profess a dear one's love is generally associated with womenkind, which when allotted to Rochester, gives him an unconventional and most importantly, feminine charm ("The Red and the Blue" 59). Yet in line with the heritage drama traditions of the decade, the film doesn't seek to blur the lines of gender normativity explicitly though Brontë's text would have provided the makers with resources for such an experimentation. The gypsy scene of the novel, where Rochester dresses up as a fortune teller, apparently to test Blanche Ingram and to get close to Jane is not to be seen in both the film versions. Such an episode might have felt an aberration to Rochester's heavily masculine aura and the cross-dressing might have occurred to the makers of adaptation of 1996 where the carefully crafted gender identities might shake which wouldn't be ideal for its genre. Zeffirelli's movie has maintained the softening of Rochester's crude fringes throughout the narrative to not to get it limited to the Jane and Rochester arc only. Hurt portrays Rochester as a man of melancholy whose temperament isn't haughty or furious, but rather agitated; he assures everyone including Bertha that he means no

harm. Bertha, meanwhile has a face in the movie unlike the 1943 version and in providing her with a physicality, the movie was taking a plunge to deal with the racial dimensions of the novel.

By the 90's it was assured that Bertha's presence shouldn't have to be limited to shrieks for discourses on the colonial and ethnic nuances of the novel in general and Bertha in particular were doing rounds. *Wide Sargasso Sea* by author Jean Rhys was published three decades back (1966) and not long before to the release of Zeffirelli's *Jane Eyre* was adapted into film (1993). It was almost a rule of thumb for adaptations on *Jane Eyre* to restrict Bertha's screen time. Stevenson's version decided on the total absence of her corporeality to accentuate the horror part, but Zeffirelli uses it for distress and anxiety. While *The Sargasso Sea* adaptation employed Karina Lombard, whose half-Lakotan ethnicity was an understated interpretation of the novel's racial dimension, Zeffirelli casted a very pale Maria Schneider as Bertha Mason but her brother Mason is portrayed by a justifiably mixed Edward De Sousa. De Souza especially is a great device in racial ambivalence because the actor who is of Portuguese Indian and English descent, has played characters of a varied racial spectrum— an English painter to an Arab Sheikh in a career spanning almost four decades. Zeffirelli hasn't used any mention of Bertha's creole ancestry, nor her nymphomania, but of her hereditary illness. Most importantly, when compared to Brontë's text, she isn't malicious though volatile. Lisa Hopkins would put that, though we aren't to be guided to an exploration of Bertha's colonial links or her racial tapestry, she would, for all her actions couldn't be called evil and that points to the demand of the director to be politically correct:

> It is doubtless for similar reasons of political correctness that the treatment of Bertha differs significantly from that of the book. The question of

> race receives only the lightest of touches – Mason, seen only briefly, is a very light-skinned black, but Bertha herself is distinguished primarily by her pallor – and there is no mention at all made of her nymphomania, nor of Rochester's assertion that he would continue to love Jane in such circumstances but cannot love Bertha. There is thus nothing in the film to direct our sympathies away from her, and when we first see her, indeed, she looks more pitiable than anything else, cowering close to the fire as if she is cold. Though we are left in no doubt that she is violent, it is by no means so clear that she is malevolent; it would seem absurd to hold such a creature responsible for her actions. ("The Red and the Blue" 60)

Zeffireli's use of Jane's voiceovers quite notably, take a halt at the scene where she finally gets to meet Bertha. If Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* infamously described Bertha as a "clothed hyena" (250), Zeffirelli saves Jane from the trouble as Jane is allowed to be aloof and distant from presenting Bertha on screen. While dehumanizing Bertha is a necessary task for the narrative arc of Jane and Rochester to flourish, it is no longer in good taste for a post-colonial audience whose intelligence is well informed of Bertha's origin and Victorian prejudices towards creoles. Thus, even though Bertha is still maintained as the bone in Rochester's throat, centre to a marriage that he can't dissolve and a puzzle that shall be solved at any cost, she herself can't anymore be accounted for the misery she is put in.

Perhaps the most visually evident and expressive of the Bertha Masons of the movies in discussions, Rochester's wife is allowed to close-up shots in Zeffirelli's version. The lighting on the occasion of Bertha's introduction is even and equal with every character on board and this device doesn't favour putting Bertha in a shadow

accentuating her mystery. It is a device that Stevenson was heavily dependent on while presenting— or hiding—Bertha in his movie. Her attack on Jane is placed right after Rochester's description of their ill-fated marriage and his rather indelicate comparison of both the women in his life. Bertha's anger gets validated here unlike the novel, where she attacks Rochester on entering her room seemingly without any provocation. By reorienting the plot elements, Zeffirelli is according a favourable and understanding perception of Bertha.

Zeffirelli's choice of Maria Schneider as Bertha Mason is noted by some critics as intriguing as Schneider's tryst with cinema was highly controversial. Kirsten L. Parkinson in "Mrs. Rochester's Story: Franco Zeffirelli's Adaptation of "Jane Eyre"" (2015) comments how Schneider's casting provides for an "intertextual commentary" of a "sexualized history"(24). Schneider's claim to international reputation was from Bernardo Bertolucci's *Last Tango in Paris* (1972) where she saw herself aflame in a plot designed by Bertolucci to aggravate the tension in his narration. Bertolucci and Marlon Brando, the lead of the movie, conspired to shoot a non-consensual rape scene which caused Schneider a breakdown. The subsequent innuendos Schneider had to face once the film got released was hard for her to handle and in a vicious circle of events, she committed herself to drugs for relief but that spiralled to many suicide attempts. She even had a short stint at an asylum in Rome where she checked herself in to be with her partner Joan Townsend who was admitted there on account of schizophrenia. Schneider's legacy of pain does add a metanarrative moment in Zeffirelli's movie.

As already mentioned, the director isn't making Rochester linger over many charges on Bertha Mason but anyone familiar with *Jane Eyre* the novel, the paratexts like *Wide Sargasso Sea* or the critical output of Gilbert and Gubar wouldn't easily be

dismissive of at least some of them. The sexual promiscuity she was accused of is totally on the basis of Rochester's accounts and Bertha herself isn't given a chance to explain herself in the novel for her irrationality and insanity. Schneider's position just after *Last Tango in Paris* had been of a confusing reputation where the nude scenes landed her sudden fame but she herself found the situation uncomfortable and abhorring and least convenient to explain her ordeal. She found her feet in place to describe the event and the resultant trauma many years later only which, though somewhat late, didn't fail in its intentions and invited condemnation for Bertolucci. Though running the risk of being charged of over indulgence on personal history of an artist which is extra to the narrative, it is really intriguing and nearly impossible not to see how a subtle layering of self-reflexivity is made possible by Zeffirelli by his casting decision (we may never know if it was intentional or coincidental).

Most adaptations have restrained themselves from the possibilities that extends and redirect their attention from anything other than the Jane and Rochester romance, but an increasing grasp on the question of Bertha's origins and an understanding of her condition was demanded by the contemporary discussions on post-colonial issues. That kind of sensitivity poses a hesitant stance to Blanche Ingram, whose descriptions parallel with Bertha in physicality— Bertha and Blanche shared, as per Rochester's descriptions, "tall, dark and majestic" (*Jane Eyre* 260) features. Blanche's eyes were called "oriental" (137) and her complexion "dark as a Spaniard" (147) and she had "raven ringlets"(137), yet she is almost a blonde in both the screen versions. In Patricia Ingham's opinion, Elle Macpherson's casting has some purpose to function; a foil to Charlotte Gainsbourg's Jane as the former's six-foot-tall supermodel frame emphatically announces the latter's "lack of conventional beauty" (*The Brontës* 239). If placing a contrast indeed was the function in employing

Bertha's character, Zeffirelli has the game on point because Macpherson, known as 'the body' and with record number of cover shoots for *Sports Illustrated Magazine*, was quite simply the 90's ultimate beauty icon. It also encapsulates the spirit of heritage movies in being an alternate to the erotic bodies on display on various covers and centerspreads— while heritage cinema has a representative in Jane, the decade's popular tastes are mirrored with Macpherson. But as already noted, Macpherson's appearance was not to correspond with Brontë's descriptions.

On the other hand, Zeffirelli's version slightly point out at her family's sources of money as from Jamaica and in doing that, though casting Elle Macpherson who isn't raven at all, possibly made a reference to certain Victorian stereotypes about the colony inhabitants, which otherwise wouldn't have featured at all. Victorian distaste for people in colony, even whites settled there as part of the colonial mission, especially women didn't escape *Jane Eyre*, the novel. In being someone with a strong colonial background, Blanche qualified for most of the prejudices British maintained against their lot, most frequently as nouveau roturier; Rochester's testing of Blanche and subsequent disavowal of her on the charge for her eyeing his money would have sounded so natural for a British of Brontë's time.

The next in line big scale *Jane Eyre* adaptation was to come in 2011 directed by Cary Fukunaga, a seventies born from California whose introduction to Charlotte Brontë's classic was through the 1943 movie with Joan Fontaine and Orson Welles. The movie's release coincided with another adaptation from the Brontë spectrum— *Wuthering Heights* by the former Dogma 95 associate Andrea Arnold. Both Fukunaga and Arnold, by their career record wouldn't have been the most suitable of candidates to work on an adaptation of nineteenth century classics. Yet they did it and it was interesting to see how their campaigns met with certain charges of "déjà vu", which

made Christine Langan of BBC Films to roll up her sleeves in defence (Conrad). in fact, Fukunaga himself has joked about how it is an almost unwritten law that Jane Eyre be made every five years (qtd. in McGrath). Apart from the much-venerated transcendentalism of classics which is an always-on-aim arrow in approving every new adaptation in line, the latest *Jane Eyre*'s producer Alison Owen would point out that with *Jane Eyre* adaptations, it is relatively cheap with its scantily populated narrative and bare minimum need of costumes. Her pragmatic wisdom over production isn't a surprisingly novel one because market and economic forces governing and deciding choices has been, quite honestly, our scoop for any discussions on adaptations of any era. Production costs has always been a crucial factor in figuring out an adaptation. But Owen also puts it that, as for *Jane Eyre*, the story is all the more resonating with the modern readers for its narration is satisfyingly chick-lit (McGrath).

Chick lit, as documented, had its beginning in the late 1990's when it started to engage British women first, later the United States and then the world beyond. With *Bridget Jones's Diary* (1996) by Helen Fielding heralding a model for the genre, it was defined as literature produced by young women writers with young women as target readers. Paddling through the highly demanding world that often frustrates the lead of the story, women in chick lit is seen balancing a career, seeking relationships that doesn't compromise her sense of independence, putting a cynical approach— an attitude that's often the contribution of failures in her past experiences. The lead's life in chaos often gets sorted by the end, which more often than not features an epiphany. The genre has assured set of connoisseurs and has secured its place as a safe bait in movie adaptations too. While *Legally Blonde* (2011) and *The Devil Wears Prada*

(2006) are marked examples for chick-flicks, a casual google search will fetch us the 2005 adaptation of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* also in the list.

While Charlotte Brontë's work is reputed to be darker than Jane Austen's and has claims to a gothic landscape, Owen's conviction in the former as chick lit prods her into thinking that *Jane Eyre* wasn't served right by the movies. Owen is not pleased with the casting choices for Jane in *Jane Eyre* movies till date as a girl in "pre-womanhood" (qtd. in McGrath) shall be the ideal and for the same, becomes the justification for Mia Wasikowska's selection for the lead in the movie. She was 19 years when the film got made and as per suggestions from the novel, Jane Eyre was of the same age. The claim and effort to emphasize the movie as a chick lit adaptation wasn't lost on audience. A review by Georgina Young-Ellis on Fukunaga's *Jane Eyre* for the website *Chicklit Club* begins with the declaration "*Jane Eyre* is one of the original chick lit novels" and ends with a fantasy and a question: "Curl up with it on a rainy night and get swept away through the heath on the moors. What chick among us doesn't love that?" A very post-1990's phenomenon that chick lit has been, it sure did find some meat in a story that goes back to the early nineteenth century.

Owen's visions are true to her time as it had been with the plans David O. Selznick, Samuel Goldwyn and the likes had for their movies in their era. Her choice of Fukunaga for the director is equally founded in her need for a director who won't be intimidated by English history. A thirty-three years old American citizen of mixed Japanese and Swedish origin, he had only one film made before *Jane Eyre*; *Sin Nombre* was shot in Spanish and dealt with illegal immigration to the United States. Owen was previously associated with *Elizabeth* (1998), a movie that was directed by Indian Shekhar Kapur. Her decision favouring Fukunaga was also because of his cultural distance from Britain. This preference of Owen sounds all the more

interesting because it comes from an English producer who is producing a movie out of a novel that's been quite literarily quintessential English cannon, under the feature film department of British Broadcasting Corporation. While the director was from the continent across the Atlantic, the lead woman was from Australia down under and the main man was a German-Irish. Well, a mix in production of movies, even British, weren't something new but if we are to compare the campaigns of the movie with those of the 'heritage dramas' of the 1990's there's a marked change. Mary Selway, the producer for *Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights* (1992) made a point to advertise the film's authenticity to details and realism (Shachar 103) and Franco Zeffirelli, the director of *Jane Eyre* (1996) trotted in the same path by his claim on how the movie "approaches the novel through an aesthetics of 'fidelity' stemming from his careful attention to 'the period' and 'place' and his 'abiding love of British culture" (qtd. in Sadoff 81).

As for Fukunaga, his reverence of Robert Stevenson's version is quite vocal as he has already acknowledged the adaptation his first encounter with the narrative. Stevenson's movie presented itself as it was ripped from the novel with Orson Welles's Rochester dominating over the meek Joan Fontaine. But Fukunaga finds inspiration in the movie because it doesn't fail maintaining a fine balance between the period romance and horror (qtd. in McGrath). Fukunaga's adulation for the 1943 adaptation is strongly connected to the emotional value as it was part of a childhood experience of movie watching and growing up. Christine Geraghty, in explicating Catherine Grant's idea of "recall" (Grant 57) has commented on how an adaptation might bring attention to its literary source as well as other adaptations in different media. She expands on the point on how "in many cases, some of this referencing will be made in the publicity material and reviews, which ensure that the audience is alert

to the fact of adaptation." (Geraghty 4). Fukunaga's referencing to Stevenson's *Jane Eyre* is well documented in publicity campaigns. We have come to a bunch of movie makers whose visions on classics are influenced by their engagements with adaptation than the source novel and most importantly they aren't worried about accepting it-rather they would own it because this experience is quite characteristic, though not exclusively, of the post millennial world.

The 2011 adaptation of *Jane Eyre* takes a different route in narration as it begins in medias res with Jane running away from Thornfield to the moors to be rescued by St.John Rivers. An episode often chucked out of the narrative; the Marsh End section thus gains an unprecedented significance in the adaptation. As Jane recovers from her storm inflicted weakness and illness her story unfolds in flashbacks. The point of origin for Jane's story is envisioned as the Thornfield Hall, where she goes back to eventually and once she manages to get back, it feels like she has come back to her childhood home (Han ,256). As per certain reviews, the new *Jane Eyre* movie presented a heroine who "withstands strong crosswinds of feeling and the buffeting of unfair circumstances without self-pity, but also without saintly selflessness" (Scott) but at the same time it doesn't ceases to be primarily about the relationship of Jane and Rochester. The novel and the adaptations that preceded were not different in the formula, but this time the permutations are slightly different. The love triangle that's quite established for the *Jane Eyre*, the novel's narrative has been of Jane, Rochester and Blanche with Jane's feelings often sensing the danger of heartbreak variedly manifesting in sadness and at times in stoic acceptance. But Fukunaga's adaptation, though it does feature Blanche Ingram (who is raven haired for a change and unlike Zeffirelli's version, not from a family with wealth from Jamaica), focuses on another triangle consisting Jane, Rochester and St. John. While

the absence of the latter and his family from the earlier versions limited the experiences for Jane, Fukunaga's version doesn't negate her of that opportunity. Jane finds life on her own after parting with Rochester in gaining a job at a village girls' school and inheriting a fortune. Even at Thornfield, we don't see a teary-eyed Jane hypnotically persuaded to say a yes to Rochester's proposal, as it had been in Stevenson's version, but instead Rochester convincing her about her being his equal and to use her will to determine her destiny in lending her hand in marriage with him. The Jane of Fukunaga's adaptation is given the agency to exercise her choice and that doesn't limit to Rochester's proposal. When she gets back to the burnt Thornfield, it is with understanding of her love for Rochester prevailing over St.John's offer of a life together. Stevenson's Jane didn't get that opportunity.

When it comes to Bertha Mason, the movie has similar plans of the Zeffirelli version. She is named, granted physicality and portrayed lunatic; yet there are differences. When we get to see Bertha for the first time, Rochester doesn't indulge audience with the pronouncements on Bertha's sins or madness, instead Grace Pool describes her violent temperament. Her reporting plays in the background like a distant announcement from a faraway place or a different dimension. If somebody is to interpret this tactic a device in harmlessly introducing a controversial yet unavoidable terrain, they couldn't be nonsensical. Even when Rochester explains himself after the event, Bertha Mason is by no means called a creole in the movie and her lunacy not declared hereditary. The narrative of Fukunaga's adaptation takes care to not to exploit Bertha Mason more than a necessary element to the story. Her existence is the much-needed tension in their otherwise stable tale of relationship. The audience can't be prodded away from their affection for Jane and Rochester's union

and for that, it is necessary to discredit Bertha and the movie has chosen only select elements for the task.

As for the horror value of Bertha's figure and shrieks, it is almost none in the movie though Fukunaga's revered adaptation by Robert Stevenson heavily depended on her to achieve the effect. The awareness and sympathy on Bertha's life have developed many folds over the years that, Fukunaga couldn't have possibly attempted to take the same measures as Robert Stevenson. Fukunaga does infuses references to supernatural, witchcraft and horror in the movie but they are limited to Rochester's often seemingly playful remarks on Jane's bewitching of his horse or may be young Jane's experience in the red room. With the later especially, the director doesn't "eliminate Brontë's supernatural Gothic touches, but to provide a rational explanation for them" (Rodriguez). Jane is petrified with the black smock puffing out of the chimney, but with the well-lit, very normal setting and interior of the room, there seems no intention to petrify the audience. Instead, they might very well presume the occurrence caused by some animal or some sort of block in the chimney. Thus, it seems that Fukunaga's intention is in encouraging "the viewer to witness Jane's fear but not necessarily to share it" (Rodriguez). The trailer released for the film emphasized on the gothic quotient, but when in comparison with the Stevenson movie, it doesn't do much and as per one report on an interview/analysis done with Cary Fukunaga for the movie, "though it flirts with horror, Fukunaga's *Jane Eyre* invests wholeheartedly in its love story" ("Cary Fukunaga, Leading 'Jane Eyre' Toward the Dark"). Six decades and many adaptations after, the publicity machine still finds the romance the most reliable aspect of the novel.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Trajectory of *Wuthering Heights* Adaptations.

In 1978, a nineteen years old Kate Bush, released a single which topped the UK Singles Chart for four weeks and earned her the credit of the first female artist to get the place with a self-written song. It was her debut and if to take account the lore surrounding the song, Bush did have more than one hundred songs written before she taking the plunge to release any, but zeroed on "Wuthering Heights" which she wrote approximately in 1977. The single wasn't limiting itself to post-punk music enthusiasts, as it had a lot of "curiosity value" (Losseff 227) by its reference to Emily Brontë's sole book. To put it as concisely as possible, while making the song, Bush herself was refining her cultural literacy by producing a song that relied on an artefact's legacy, but while doing that, her single was adding itself to the brackets *Wuthering Heights* has set in cultural history, revamping the *Wuthering Heights* lexicon for coming generations (Mathews). The song made a crucial alteration to the narratorial view point of the novel. It has Cathy carrying the agency to her story though in phantasmic form as the song froze but extended the moment when Cathy's spirit pleads to Lockwood to let in and thus "Wuthering Heights", the song qualified to be a parallel text for *Wuthering Heights*, the novel. The single was very much the 70's— over the top, body contortions of the artist, colour filters and fog—yet it was in Hila Shachar's words, "a metaphor for the manner in which *Wuthering Heights* retains its cultural presence in Western culture the love of 'home' as a sense of belonging, identity and cultural inheritance" (*Cultural Afterlives and Screen Adaptations of Classic Literature* 6).

Interestingly, Bush wasn't acquainted with the book as a reader, but rather saw the BBC miniseries made from it in 1967 (Shachar 6), wrote the song in one night and her lyrics were sort of a spin off from Catherine Earnshaw's dialogues in the series. In shifting the point of view of the text, Bush was toppling the authority of the narrative produced by Emily Brontë by handing over the power to Cathy to tell the story and in relying on an adaptation and not its source text for the narrative itself she was establishing herself as a symbol for many whose memory of the story is established by the later works on it, not the progenitor itself.

The William Wyler directorial Hollywood adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* of 1939 established such a viewership and tradition that the novel's narrative and cultural connotations often started to get dictated by the movie's course of events and interpretation. It set up a design and character tonalities that the later adaptations preferred to follow and as time went by, sort of established itself as a touchstone, often in a position to boast as the 'meaning' and 'end' of Emily Brontë's text itself. The sway Wyler's *Wuthering Heights* commanded was tremendous that it was estimated around 22,000,000 people watched the movie by 1948 with a close enough 18,000,000 views claimed by Stevenson's *Jane Eyre*. But this "iconic power" the movies, especially *Wuthering Heights* wielded was not to be counted on its fidelity to source text (Ingham 228).

The 1930's were the heights of studio system, a centralised set up of movie production which spanned almost 30 years, from 1920's to late years of 1950's. The studios were omnipresent and controlled every single aspect of movie production with a single place to channelise all the activities, standardised working patterns and regulated models for movie making. Such a system would credit the producer for the movie. The directors, being in contract with the producers to produce stipulated

number of movies wouldn't get treated better than a hired employee unlike today, where individual films demand individual collaboration. The Big Five of studio system, namely Paramount, 20th Century Fox, Warner Bros, Metro Goldwyn Mayer and RKO pictures were absolutely autonomous because along with production, they were distributing their own films and could screen movies in their own theatres. Universal, Columbia and United Artist, known as the Little Three, didn't own theatres but could do distribution along with production. Some giants of producers like Samuel Goldwyn and David Selznick, who produced the *Jane Eyre* of 1943, could survive in the system with their production studios though Goldwyn used to distribute his movies through United Artists since his studio didn't do distribution.

Wyler's *Wuthering Heights* was shot in between the Munich Crisis and September Campaign with an awareness to the mass audience's taste. Cinemas were now frequented by more and more people and the grim life of the war ridden world generally made people averse to any further gore on screen; their preferences were with love stories with a happy ending. *Jane Eyre* did have one, but *Wuthering Heights* was a non-scorer in the department and to compensate that, the movie showed Cathy's ghost unite with Heathcliff's, nonetheless not saying much about how things transpired in between Catherine's demise and Heathcliff's death. In fact, as per the opinions gathered in the preview show for select audience, producer Samuel Goldwyn even insisted on altering the actual ending of the movie. It was tradition to do a screening of the movie before the actual release in Hollywood those days and apparently, the people gathered for *Wuthering Heights* weren't happy with movie's climax. Heathcliff and Cathy's ghosts walking to Penistone Crag with Nelley's voiceover was the preferred ending for the movie as dictated by Goldwyn over Wyler's original shot of Heathcliff's body lying on the snow- implying his death

while following Cathy's ghost—two birds flying. Goldwyn decreed that he didn't "want to look at a corpse at the fadeout" (Madsen 186).

Goldwyn was very specific and blunt in his opinions on changes to effect on *Wuthering Heights* to make it appealing; he put it that audience were not to fall "for a capricious, irresponsible girl or a hate-filled man bent on revenging his miserable childhood" (qtd. in Ingham 229). Thus, the movie was cleansed out of any possible sources of unacceptability; Hareton's troublesome equation with Heathcliff, the latter's disgust to young Cathy which almost verges on brutality and his possible necrophiliac tendencies. The movie managed to stay out of such events by shelving the next generation arc of *Wuthering Heights*; The narrative preserved Catherine and Heathcliff's tale only. Goldwyn couldn't have compromised on the spectacle and for that, visual tropes of extreme nature were employed. While Heights was to be this bleak workhouse sort of a place, Thrushcross Grange was placed in utter contrast with fancy interiors, cosy balconies and its generally gleeful environment to which the likes of Heathcliiff could glance only through the windows. Historically savvy audience were apparently in line with Brontë enthusiasts in being unhappy about the anachronous placing of architecture. One member of the Brontë society even wrote after the release of the movie: "The Linton's house perplexes one. Neo-Italian architecture and eight flunkeys were not found on the moors." (qtd. in Ingham 231). But Goldwyn was not to flinch in his choices—neither in architecture, nor in Merle Oberon's often not so Georgian costumes.

H. Mark Glancy has opined that the 1930's Hollywood maintained a fascination for British culture which reflected in the industry's production of 'prestige' films (*When Hollywood Loved Britain* 74), movies which "drew strong foreign earnings" and "often had some claim to cultural value" (69). Endorsement of

British culture and its artefacts were to be understood in the politically volatile context of impending world war when, establishing a united front and tradition between the US and the Britain were considered a national cause. *Wuthering Heights* (1939) share such a legacy with other Hollywood films which opted for an English subject like *David Copperfield* (1935), *Fire Over England* (1937), *Pride and Prejudice* (1940) and many more. Thus, as much these movies were trying to be pleasing and engaging to the mass audience with endearing imagery of escapist fantasies, their production of the spectacle was in accordance with the demands of the grand scheme of contemporary politics. *The New York Times*' rather dramatic account of *Wuthering Heights*'s production can vouch for how much a movie made in war ridden times couldn't do without absorbing a sense of alarm the age give rise to:

> Heathcliff was peering out across the moors and screaming, 'Cathy, come to me! Cathy, my own!' while there beyond, in a corner of the stage, muted when the set's microphone was alive, a tiny radio was tuned to one of Hitler's more portentous harangues. Between each take, between Heathcliff's heartbreaking cries and cornflake flurries of the studio-made gale, cast, director and crew were sprinting to the radio corner where a little property man with a knowledge of German was standing in newfound dignity, haltingly translating phrases that might have spelt war, but did not. Truly, 'Wuthering Heights' was hewn in a wild workshop, in the literature of the screen as in literature. (qtd. in Shachar 41)

Terry Eagleton clarifies how studying English became cultural pursuit, a mission in affirmation during the 30's. "English literature rode to power on the back of wartime nationalism", says Eagleton (qtd. in Shachar 46) but more interestingly the

idea of English studies became an extended metaphor for western civilisation itself, which stood against "political bigotry and ideological extremism" (qtd. in Shachar, 47). The contrasting tones of Heathcliff's cries and the German announcements on the radio, rightfully signifies how English literature were posed a shield against the sword of fascism. It was also to be noted that, in waving English literature in anti-fascist spirit, Hollywood was clear in establishing America as the location where this transformation of something typically English into a universal, unifying entity can happen.

Robert Lawson Peeble's makes an analysis in his essay "European Conflict and Hollywood's Reconstruction of English Fiction" (1996) that the rocks where so often Cathy and Heathcliff's escapades are to, stands for an Eden for both where they can be at peace, a place where they are unharmed by the social divides that restrict them. Penistone Crag, as it is called validates every wish Heathcliff and Cathy has for themselves and each other. Cathy wants Heathcliff to run away make riches and rescue her. Heathcliff doesn't entertain the idea of going away, but he does precisely that to come back rich a few years later. In his pursuit of fortune, America proves lucky for him as it is reported in the movie by Nelly to Edgar. Such a mention never occurs in the novel, nor the place Heathcliff goes to is implied by any hints, but the movie chose to be explicit about it and through it suggests America as a land where dreams are fulfilled, more importantly, class distinctions are collapsed. By synchronising the traditions of the English with the success story of one among them who embody the ethos of American dream, Wyler and Goldwyn transfigure their movie version of *Wuthering Heights* to a site where both nations unite.

America wasn't short of British talent to use in Hollywood. As what Robert Lawson-Peebles would like to call it, there was a "colony" ("European Conflict and

Hollywood's Reconstruction of English Fiction" 4) of British artists stationed at US, which included Aldous Huxley, Robert Stevenson, Laurence Olivier, Merle Oberon and Joan Fontaine who wished to go back to Britain once the war broke out, but were told that "they were serving their country more effectively in Hollywood."(5). Surely in explaining the moral obligation of the expatriates located in United States, which they were said to be fulfilling in no lesser measure, Winston Churchill's House of Commons speech on 18th June 1940 could be of help.

> The Battle of France is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization […]. The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this island or lose war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age […]. Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, 'This was their finest hour.' (qtd. in Lawson-Peebles 2)

Churchill's oratory never went haywire and this particular one just added to his legacy. But a slight detail juts out as an example of his political acumen in mentioning United States into his country's equations. As Britain's Prime Minister, he wanted United States to join hands with his country on their course against Germany and the British artists involved in Hollywood were being part of that scheme which

their homeland and United States made an ideological and symbolical weapon by making movies that signified a shared Anglo- American tradition.

Apart from being war inflicted, the world at large was weighed down with economic depression during the 1930s and the implications aren't lost on the makers of movies. The contrasting constitutions of Heathcliff and Cathy in their regard towards material acquisitions is explained by critics like Liora Brosh as a reference to Depression era cultural politics. Heathcliff isn't quite the covetous guy as some references in the novel may hint at; he doesn't snatch Hindley's horse, rather it is the opposite in the movie. His scheming of getting his son and young Cathy getting married and by that benefitting in acquiring property is missing in the movie for the simple fact that the second generation is completely absent from the adaptation. But even after his return from exile, being rich, the movie's Heathcliff is quite vocal about his material possessions' value only so much in satiating Cathy's wishes. But, as per Brosh, Cathy's wishes, were to get pronounced and adjudged as thoroughly materialistic in the movie when in comparison with the novel where she "desires to embrace culture in a broad sense, in terms of genteel refinement, education, social propriety, and taste" (*Screening Novel Women* 38). The validity of such an analysis which places Cathy's decision to marry Edgar in the novel elevated for her taste for sophistication and gentility is a little shaky though, for it seems more logical to comprehend her choice of Edgar as a counteractive one; She couldn't have afforded to degrade herself by marrying Heathcliff though she has full knowledge of her mismatch with Edgar. Her marrying Edgar does fetch her refinement, but ultimately it was led by her sense of necessity to marry into security and stability, not any desire for cultural elegance. Her choice of Edgar can be discerned a very practical, neither commendable, nor outrageous act born from her understanding of social traditions.

But Brosh has got certain facts right, as in her observation about Wuthering Heights and Thrushcross Grange shown in stark opposition in the movie, contributing to an implication that Cathy and Edgar are of different social strata, though in the novel that's not the case. Cathy's wish to inhabit a social environment appropriate to her class prompts her decision to marry Edgar, but when translated onto the screen, it feels like the greedy desire of a social climber. Brosh's quoting of a scene from the 1943 movie adaptation on how the makers use Cathy's transformation to mark the paradox of femineity during Depression is on point. Cathy negates Nelly's compliment on her beauty when, ironically, she is indulging in admiring her own reflection in the mirror. She insists that it is her brain rather than her appearance to be counted on. But as we see, her gaze on the mirror and self-absorption doesn't shrink even while she is disagreeing with Nelly. This moment encapsulates the underlying contradiction of Depression era ideal of womanhood where the camera isn't shy of making most of Merle Oberon's glamour but at same time explaining the woman's act of dressing up as vanity. It was no secret that Goldwyn chose not so period- apt costumes for Merle because they looked good her, as her beauty was a great selling point for the movie.(39,40).

In a general sense, Brosh's argument "the marriage plots of nineteenth-century British domestic fiction" acknowledging the "complex economic, social and sexual desires of its female characters" while "Depression era adaptations create domestic ideals that separate marriage from economics and excessive sexuality" (44) is acceptable. Wyler's *Wuthering Heights* limit the narrative to polarities where Cathy and Heathcliff's torment is limited to her prioritising money over love. But such a picturization wouldn't have sounded illogical to the audience of depression era, especially if they weren't formerly introduced to the novel. Depression made earning

a herculean task for the population, especially for men, whose suitability was dependent on their economic potential. At such times, a woman's berating and negation of a man on his inability to earn would have brought sensationalised responses from the crowd and Goldwyn surely must have known to channelize it.

Goldwyn was never less of a business man for not being associated with any studio. Well, the Metro-Goldwyn- Mayor did feature his name because Goldwyn Pictures, his former company, was acquired by Marcus Loew but Goldwyn never really was involved in its operations and went on with his Samuel Goldwyn Productions. His priority for visual and emotional splendour was often at the expense of temporal and factual accuracy. *Wuthering Heights*, the adaptation, reports the timeframe for the main events of the story to be 1800's while the fashion, by Goldwyn's wish, was of 1840's, yet at times quite modern even for the 1840's. As for his muse, Merle Oberon, Goldwyn was careful about not to spill much about her controversial ethnicity. Merle's biography as put forward by the studios often pronounced Tasmania as her place of birth and kept mum about her parents' Indian subcontinent connections. Many states of USA, especially the southern ones, then had anti- miscegenation rules in action and as a large chunk of the audience belonged this part of the nation, Hollywood wouldn't have gone against them by entertaining any idea that questions racial purity. Merle and her producers didn't go against the grain and went on with a convincing and fake account of her life that implied a caucasian origin for her. Both Goldwyn and Wyler, though not much to hide as Merle, were not to step back from populism as they went on Americanising their names from very European Schmuel Gelbfisz and Wilhelm Weiller respectively.

Besides, Hollywood then, was adhering to Motion Picture Production Code, a vehicle for censorship established by Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of

America. Known quite conveniently but forcefully as Hays Code, after Will H. Hays, first president of MPPDA, the guidelines came to effect by 1934 after complaints received from different quarters about the sexual and moral licentiousness on and off screen of cinema. Hays Code, as instructions in 'ethical presentation of entertainment' was strict in banning so many possibilities of representations in cinema such as racial mixing and prescribing the course and conclusion of the narrative. Miscegenation was an absolute no-no, scenes of passion and intimacy prohibited, references to homosexuality were considered perverse and even a theme of revenge were not to be allowed as it deemed to encourage violence. Actors with separate racial background were not allowed to pair on scree as per the anti-miscegenation stand of the code. Its most notorious example was the passing over of Chinese- American actress Anna May Wong for the female lead in *The Good Earth* (1937) for the male lead was to be played by Paul Muni, a white actor.

The casting decisions apart, Hays Code, with its one-dimensional approach to representations of human conditions, contributed to a series of movies which shoehorned audience to a black and white understanding of good and evil where complications and complexities were shored off. Heathcliff's enigmatic background was not to come forefront as it had the potential to disturb the equilibrium Code prevailing times aspired for. Even the rare references to Heathcliff's racial makeup like Cathy's declaration of Heathcliff's parents being a Chinese emperor and mother an Indian queen doesn't prod much curiosity because it is posed as a child's fancy running wild. If Emily Brontë's audience had reservations about Heathcliff (even Charlotte Brontë had) the adaptation was to procure justifications for every aberrant behaviour of Heathcliff, thus never making him less likeable. The movie proved to be contributing to be everyone's benefit; the actors were rewarded both in popularity and

in the academy and *Wuthering Heights*, the novel, itself experienced an increase in circulation. Patsy Stoneman put: "Brontë Society Transactions for 1939 noted that more copies of *Wuthering Heights* were sold in the three weeks after the first showing of the film than in any five-year period since the book was published" (Stoneman 155). The movie thus designed a template for *Wuthering Heights* to fit in which, in actuality a contribution of Hollywood's immediate reality, influenced general perception of the novel which gained further strength from it being the most accoladed of the adaptations that ever got made from *Wuthering Heights*.

The 1970 British adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* directed by Robert Fuest with Timothy Dalton and Anna Calder-Marshall kept the narrative to Heathcliff and Cathy as did the Wyler directorial. But quite ironically in its paralleling with the earlier instalment, the film established its contrast and distinction. Both films maintained same plot choices but to different emphasizes and effects. Fuest envisioned the movie not a comforting spectacle but a "gothic romance with Dalton's Heathcliff a triumphant example of its menacing swashbuckling hero" (Haire-Sargeant 181) and he insisted on such catchlines for his advertisement campaigns too; "The power, the passion, the terror of Emily Brontë's unforgettable love story"("Wuthering Heights 1970", *IMDb*), read a poster. Fuest's focus on being true to the genre and delivering the expectations of his target audience didn't win many hearts from the critics whose issues were with its thorough physicality and brutality. Nevertheless, the movie did good at the box office though slightly lower than the mark the producers American International Pictures, who were able to make big money with low budget movies in their earlier projects, would set for themselves.

The 1970's were tough especially for Britain with economic crises. Thus, American capital was more than welcome in producing movies. An American

counterpart to the British Hammer film productions, AIP focused on specific trends in movies, such as horror and teenage dramas, that were commercially proven profitable with low budget in making. The genre horror wasn't anything new in British soil; as per Film historian Jonathan Rigby, horror is typically British just like how Westerns were essentially American. He was of the opinion that Britain's connection with the horror genre was thoroughly disregarded in any studies or research (12). Fuest's *Wuthering Heights* had elements of horror and was true in colour of an AIP production in its preferences and presentation catering to a young audience. Co-founder of the company, Samuel Z. Arkoff, an entertainment lawyer relied on output from film exhibitors to navigate to the focus group of teenagers as adults were prone to find entertainment with television than with the younger lot. Arkoff even decided on a formula for movies that target young adults by expanding letters of his moniker— 'A' for Action (implying drama), 'R' for Revolution (unconventional quality), 'K' for Killing (violence), 'O' for Oratory (punchlines), 'F' for Fantasy (playing by audience's imagination) and the last 'F' for fornication (sexuality) together constituting his surname. AIP took a chance with prestige films for the success of Paramount's *Romeo and Juliet* (1968), directed by Franco Zeffirelli, was a success with both young and the elder generations. *Julius Caesar* (1970) with Charlton Heston and Diana Rigg, which they decided to take up the distribution of, didn't fare well- both at the movies and with the critics but Arkoff and Louise M Hayward, the overseer of AIP productions in UK, were convinced that the trend will eventually favour them and *Wuthering Heights* fitted the bill for their next in line.

By 1950's new discernments of archetypes and melodrama of the movies came about thanks to the development and application of psychoanalysis providing explanations and understandings for representations of human conditions especially

masculinity. Inadequate father figure, as it was shown in *Rebel Without a Cause* (1955), was one such huge give away to tormented and conflicted masculinity. Susan Hayward name such a class of fragile masculine characters “male weepie” (*Cinema Studies* 217) with sociological explanations to their trouble in confusion of new world, insecurity over women’s newfound economic independence with their entry to workforce, and the ongoing cold war between US and USSR which seriously affected any and every vision of peaceful post-war life. The trope appears in 1970 *Wuthering Heights* too with Hindley’s grudge towards his father on bringing home his possibly illegitimate son. The movie assumes some damage that might have occurred to the Earnshaw household with Heathcliff’s arrival for Mrs. Earnshaw is immediate and vocal in suspecting Heathcliff her husband’s son. Hindley’s rage towards Heathcliff thus gets validated with his mother’s suffering acting as a foundation. Hindley’s case often gets highlighted over Cathy. The latter could have been in a similar fix with Hindley by Heathcliff entering the familial equations, but nonetheless seems unaffected. This contradiction finds solid reasons in the adaptation than the novel, with Mrs. Earnshaw’s concern over her son’s legally deserving inheritance toppled over by her husband’s illegitimate offspring. At the same time Cathy, not included in the case for her gender, doesn’t have much stakes involved in her proximity and attitude for Heathcliff. Hindley’s fury is quite symbolically condensed in the scene where he fumes at Heathcliff for causing his fiddle to be broken while Cathy and Nelly who were expecting similar gifts aren’t seen giving any loud reactions. Heathcliff on the other hand, suits the role of the outcast, albeit a romanticized one, which as a character type excited the young audience with its most glorified icons in Marlon Brando and James Dean. Brando’s Stanley Kowalski in *A Streetcar Named*

Desire (1951) became a cult and Dean immortalised the titular rebel in *Rebel Without a Cause*.

Both Timothy Dalton and Anna Calder-Marshall practically launched their film careers with *Wuthering Heights* and when they were cast for the roles, were not past twenty-five. Unlike Olivier and Oberon of *Wuthering Heights* (1939), Heathcliff and Cathy of this particular adaptation benefits from the proximity to the real age group of the protagonists of the novel. Obviously, the casting choices were conscious for both movies as the producers knew on what all elements to bank on in their respective films. While *Wuthering Heights* (1939) was pitching on star power, side-lining age factor as not so important, the 1970's would find the aspect crucial. Production houses of B-films, the low budget commercial motion pictures, largely played the field with unknown actors but with only those who were found appealing to their target audience as relatability was an important aspect. Cathy and Heathcliff's love feels young and vigorous in Fuest's movie when compared to Wyler's film. Brontë though, often giving away her characters' age in late teens and early twenties, didn't exhibit any intention in attributing the wildness and passion in her leads' romance to age specific adrenaline rush, but Fuest manages to do that for his film's benefit. The 1970's pronounced the 'early adults' of greater sources of energy, a force to be reckoned with, as recent exhibitions of their potential to protest were well on display in late 60's to 70's. Western European countries saw a series of upsurgences dominated by students, with its most dynamic display at France where students joined hands with workers, yielding such power which could have possibly knocked down the Government.

In the movie, parents are shown the authority figures that incite rebellion in these early adults. Hindley is not in awe or in affection for his father who has done

some serious harm to the family bringing Heathcliff home, whose parentage he doesn't deny in strong terms. When Cathy asks her father why can't he be a good man, even though in good spirits and as a tit for tat for his slight complain over she not being a good girl, it doesn't feel undeserving for Mr.Earnshaw of Fuest's movie. The oppression from parental figures takes a vicious circle with Hindley's taking charge of Wuthering Heights. He is no better to Cathy than what his father had been to him and she resents Hindley's coming back home. Heathcliff and Cathy, already outlaws for the former's gypsy/illegitimate status and the latter's unruly nature, channel their frustration towards Hindley to repudiate his control. The general gloom of the premises of Wuthering Heights caused by Hindley gets a further dimension by his denial of Nelly. Nelly's adolescent attraction to Hindley wasn't entirely unreciprocated and didn't lack encouragement. Cathy's excitement for Hindley's return is predominantly for Nelly than anticipation for her sibling's return after a long time. Her exhilaration appears a typically teenage gesture over fresh love and that feeling is quite relatable to the intended young audience of the movie. With Hindley's maturing, he negates Nelly and marries Frances, thus destroying the innocence of young love and establishes himself all the more undesirable for the early adult audience.

Maria Sejio Richart observes in her PhD thesis that Fuest's *Wuthering Heights* follow the traditions of Gainborough Melodramas, racy costume movies with thrilling narratives which could flock audience—especially women—to theatres. The movies which are known after the film studio's name—Gainsborough Picture, were visceral, unabashed entertainment with guilty pleasure. Founded in 1924, Gainsborough Pictures got momentum in 1940's after its acquisition by producer J. Arthur Rank, with a series of films including *The Man in the Grey* (1943) and *The Wicked Lady*

(1945), mostly adaptations of novels by female writers. The studio had moth-life popularity lasting only 3 to 4 years from 1943, but nonetheless created a legacy for films which were happily and willingly imprudent. Branded as films of bad taste by the critics, yet heavily popular with the audience, Gainsborough Melodramas offered audacious getaways from war time crises. The sexual energy of Gainsborough dramas was undeniable and as per Richart's analysis, Fuest's *Wuthering Heights* follow similar pattern. As it is with the text, Cathy was in love with Heathcliff and chooses Edgar later, and Isabella is adamant in her attraction towards Heathcliff. But the layers produced by the movie on its own accord provides it with ample scandalous potency. As per suggestions, the possibility of Heathcliff being Earnshaw's son is not altogether denied and that provides extra tension to Cathy and Heathcliff's relationship as incestuous. Isabella's fascination for Heathcliff and his reciprocation are quite carnal in nature and even Nelly is not left out as an inactive agent in the adaptation as her attraction towards Hindley is in full light. If these are not enough, the movie provides for Cathy and Heathcliff to make love on a riverside and strew some shady probability of Heathcliff being her child's father. It is interesting to note that a similar approach to femineity as visible in Fuest's *Wuthering Heights* can be found in Wyler's adaptation. Wyler's Cathy negates entertaining beauty as the parameter of perfection and forces her rhetoric in support of intelligence all the while bejewelled and admiring her own reflection in the mirror. In similar fashion, though the women of Fuest are sexual and open about their physical desires, coinciding with the character sketches of Gainsborough classics like *The Wicked Lady*, they meet with punishment in the end. On the other hand, all though the narrative arrangement makes sure these women are repressed by the climax, the films were designed to indulge its viewers with sexual excess. In Molly Haskell's opinion, "absolutist labels that

exclude a wide range of affective feelings and behaviour" ("The Sixties", *From Reverence to Rape: The Treatment of Women in the Movies*) were the norm with 1970's idea of female sexuality:

> There is only sexual liberation or nonliberation, either/or, nudity or full dress. And when women were "liberated" on the screen—that is, exposed and made to be sexually responsive to the males in the vicinity— it was in order to comply with male fantasies or, in the viragoes of Ken Russell or Robert Aldrich, to confirm men's worst fears.
>
> (Haskell, "The Sixties")

The second wave feminism and its manifesto were understood in simplistic and jejune terms and this caused a paradox in cinematic absorption of contemporary debates. The 1970's, as per Haskell, understood women's liberation in sexual terms and in her own words, in "the modern film and fiction, which are meant to represent an advance over the Victorain ones, it is inconceivable that a woman could live, thrive, even enjoy life without being "laid" at least four times a week" (Haskell, "The Sixties"). At the same time, while the women's sexual pursuits were put wide and open for the audience to chew on, the movies made sure the viewers see it mere fantasy and nothing else. When these women pronounced as promiscuous or, in much simpler terms, wild, are punished by the end of the movies, it reinforced the idea that their experiences were not in compliance with the real world. By following such a pattern, movies could up their entertainment value and at the same time safeguard themselves from the accusations of polluting the population with thoughts of going astray. The tendency of misplacing unabashed sexual behaviour as sole token of empowerment, at the same time censoring and punishing such woman with sexual excess, gave away a sort of double bound contradiction and hypocrisy of our cultural

spaces to women. Thus, even with the presence of passionate and demanding women on screen, Lin Haire-Sargeant's observation how it feels that "the magic triangle of sex is all male-Heathcliff, Hindley, Edgar-with female Cathy, Isabella, and Nelly often sidelined as trophies in the males' strutting competitions for alpha position ("Sympathy for the Devil" 180) doesn't seem invalid.

The 1970's were comparatively non-restrictive towards violence and the movie has dollops of it. To complement the rough and physical narration of the story, Fuest has his location aspect on point— he shot the movie at Yorkshire moors. Apart from the obvious choices in story modifications, there are subtle hints in aspects like costume designing that specify the time when the adaptation was made. As Lin Haire-Sargeant puts: "The women's hair is ratted up and varnished smooth. Men's coiffures are early Beatles. Costumes—solid-colored, generally clean, always unwrinkled—are probably polyester" ("Sympathy for the Devil" 179).

If the 1970 adaptation stuck to the tradition of dealing exclusively with the first generation of Emily Brontë's text- though with additions and modifications of course- the 1992 movie set up a larger canvas to accommodate the whole of the story. Produced by the British wing of the American film producing firm Paramount, this Peter Kosminsky directorial was named *Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights*. The authoress' name featuring in the title had to do with hurdling a copy right issue as Samuel Goldwyn owned the name *Wuthering Heights*. Still, once the movie rolls, the modification in the title seems justified for unlike the last two adaptations in discussion, this movie has Emily Brontë herself as the narrator. The author lending the narratorial voice was, if not a tradition, not less than a trend in the heritage movies of the 1990's. Francis Ford Coppola had the author's voice featured in *Bram Stoker's Dracula* (1992) and Kenneth Branagh followed the lead with *Mary Shelley's*

Frankenstein (1994). In Kosminsky's movie, Sinead O'Connor plays Emily Brontë who, upon the discovery of a dilapidated Wuthering Heights starts writing about the mansion and its inhabitants when she felt some undefined source whispering to her. Hila Shachar, focusing on this revelation by Brontë in the movie and developing on Patsy Stoneman's argument that such depictions of the authorial figure promote a "romantic genius" (qtd. in Shachar 100) puts that, the figure of Emily Brontë in the film exemplifies the case of authors posing as vessels to be filled up by well-cooked soups of narrative where the importance of context in creation in sacrificed for the ideal of transcendence.

But the books chosen for adaptations were also often pieces of heritage. The author himself/herself involved as a physical presence also did the job in authenticating the work's place as a cultural inheritance (Shachar 101). But as a paradox in play, the emphasize on cultural inheritance, which locates the text as the property of a particular location coexisted with multicultural involvements in the making of the movie. Of course, as already stated, this wasn't a new phenomenon at all and it might also be argued that a cross cultural interest in any work is confirmation to its sublime status. Apart from the American investment in production, the movie featured French actress Juliette Binoche as Cathy, in which she preceded Charlotte Gainsbourg of Jane Eyre. The movie makers appointed Japanese Ryuichi Sakamoto as the background composer too.

Yet, casting director and co-producer for the movie Mary Selway was on records for emphasizing and publicising 'authenticity' in making the adaptation. While she lauds Emily Brontë's text for its universal and timeless quality, it was specified to the point to making it a selling point for the movie that the shoot happened at North Yorkshire (Shachar 102). According to Shachar, this contradiction

summarises the schism Heritage films of 1990's experienced in being true to the idea of transcendentalism associated with the text at the same time not being forgetful of the specific contexts from which the story was produced from (102). In short, the adaptations were lauded for a universal content but at the same time couldn't have violated the regional element and contexts of the story because for the audience of the 1990's, both were equally important.

The thrust on authenticity bordering on a fixation and probably fetishism was quite vocal with Franco Zeffirelli, director of the 1996 version of Jane Eyre, too as he is quoted in Shachar about his professed "love upon British Culture" and specificity on "the period" and "place" (105) firmly establishing the "template" to heritage films (Shachar 105). The effort from the makers of *Wuthering Heights* 1992 was not only to recreate the space as it should have been in the novel's temporal settings, but also to draw attention to the fact that the movie was in shot close to the Brontë Parsonage Museum (Shachar 105). Adaptations of 1990's in general and *Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights* (1992) in particular were not to miss the relic value the classics held for the contemporary audience. The attempts to make adaptations of nineteenth century fiction in the decade were not to only because of their timeless story and emotions but also because these texts were valued as treasure. Sashaying an awareness about the same while making and marketing the movie would be more rewarding because it helps to connect the adaptation on an advanced level with the audience by stroking their soft spots for inheritance and nostalgia. Adaptations in general, time and again showed a responsibility to recreate the book's context and also attempts in connecting with an audience who are of a distant universe away from the environment of the book. These adaptations of 1990's were locating themselves to an idea of the past that was very contemporary— a past that was cultural memory and

a celebrated entity and thus were parading themselves as relevant to the audience of the era.

But, though the idolization of past crystallized as heritage properties were prevalent, the value systems of the time of adaptations were far away from the time placement of the text in consideration and this is another dimension of heritage film. The attempt in accommodating forces of past and priorities of present often culminate in interesting results as it happens with the depiction of religious figures in the movie. In Peter Kosminsky's *Wuthering Heights* universe, religion isn't a deciding factor in character's lives. Heathcliff and Cathy are often seen scoffing at Joseph, who is the staunchest Christian of the lot. The pair is shown giggling at dining table during prayers much to Joseph's anger. Brontë's readers wouldn't have found the episode in good taste but for the 90's it wouldn't be more than a joke to laugh at. Kosminsky's depiction though, is not to be confused as an attempt in making a laughing stock of a religion, rather to show the underwhelming effect of religious bodies over the community. Nelly, as a pious Christian, advises Heathcliff to get a Bible when concerned over his recurrent visons of Cathy's ghost, but Heathcliff doesn't pay much attention to it. Besides, instead of being an imposing authority, church is shown to be really vulnerable with figures like that of the priest who marries young Cathy and Linton. His shivering hands are proof that he was forced in the act.

The 1970's were fascinated with cults and driven by pagan beliefs which made occasional appearances in Fuest's version of *Wuthering Heights*. In Celtic fashion, wind carries the dead Heathcliff's spirit away. Heathcliff is able to see Catherine's ghost in his deathbed at the rocks waiting as a vampire. The ghost as vampire was in consistency with the Hammer horror films and was in contradiction with the redemptive nature of the after-death episode in 1939 film version. Nature plays a

paratext in Fuest's version especially during events of death in pagan fashion while with the 1992 adaptation, nature is more a controlled than a controlling entity which never grows beyond and above the power of the individuals. One particular scene of the 1992 movie stands out in symbolising the aforementioned treatment. Heathcliff and Cathy run around the stones and taking a moment, Heathcliff says Cathy he can make nature tell her future. He asks her to close her eyes and says that when she opens them if she is to see the day bright, so shall be her future and if its wind and storms, so shall be it. Cathy opens her eyes to agitated skies and weather and asks Heathcliff what had he done. Its notable that, Cathy instantly calls it out as Heathcliff's doing rather than the nature going hullabaloo. The scene was an original as it wasn't an episode featuring in the novel and it kind of sums up how nature as an agency is differently handled in the movie when compared to 1970 instalment as the Peter Kosminsky's adaptation follows a more anthropocentric approach. The natural forces aren't accentuating or orchestrating the narration— there are no dark clouds when Catherine is dead or a storm when Heathcliff opens her coffin— but would rather let the drama unroll for the characters involved and be a spectator, just like Emily Brontë's narrator figure.

Cathy asking Heathcliff what did he do reveals another aspect of the narrative preferences of the movie—the story centres around Heathcliff. The movie unabashedly states the same occasionally as in closing moments of the movie when it focuses on Heathcliff's tombstone with Emily Brontë in the background talks about him still walking on the moors. This scene when in comparison with the endings of both 1939 and 1970 versions stand out because of the singularity of Heathcliff's figure. Wyler's Nelly is seen correcting Lockwood from calling Cathy and Heathcliff's spirits as ghosts careful in not violating the Christian essence of the Hays

Code ruling times and wish for their good times together, while in Fuest's version, Heathcliff joins Cathy after death and they are seen running excitedly on the moors. As reported by Ken Green, the Marketing Director of United International Pictures which did the distribution of the movie, the decision to concentrate on Heathcliff was a very conscious one:

> We already knew that people were aware of the novel *Wuthering Heights*. Also, a lot of people were aware of the Laurence Olivier film of the 1940s. However, despite this awareness, not everyone who knew about the book had read it . . . They remember the image of the scene on the moors, which they have probably seen on the television . . . Most people remember that it is a romantic novel and also a classic . . . From our research we found that the film played especially well to female audiences (as expected). We thus decided to concentrate on the idea of the story being a romantic adventure. [. . .]
>
> [B]ecause we felt that women were an important part of the audience we made two decisions – firstly to make the character of Heathcliff and the actor who plays him, Ralph Fiennes, central to the campaign and secondly, when it came to putting the trailer together, we would use a woman's voice for the trailer . . . We wanted to present the character of Heathcliff to be charismatic and intriguing to the audience. On the poster design, Heathcliff (Fiennes) is the main visual element. (qtd. in Shachar 92)

Green's account does have some interesting elements in how he points out the 1939 film by William Wyler as male-centred. He explains that the makers and the campaign wanted to make Heathcliff and Ralph Fiennes the central point of attraction as it was with Heathcliff and Laurence Olivier in the earlier one. But still, even for

Green's argument that the movie was aspiring to match what Olivier has done to the movie, Fiennes's Heathcliff stands unmatched with Olivier's, not because it falls short in the attempt, but it outdoes the latter. If Olivier's Heathcliff became this charming guy of an eternal romance, it was with proper backing of the script in which he is portrayed a man struggling to overcome an unjust world and loses for other's doings. Fiennes' Heathcliff on the other hand projects himself as very much his own man as he is his society's product. The difference here is of how much of one's own man these both are. While Olivier's surroundings fail him, he is still understood as endearing but Fiennes's Heathcliff has shades of grey in his character and by owning his own self, he seems both abhorring and appealing at the same time. If the passion he possesses and the intensity in his actions remind of Orson Welles's Rochester in Robert Stevenson's *Jane Eyre*, the comparison doesn't extend much because if Welles's Rochester benefited from his pairing with a maternal and accommodating Jane Eyre, Fiennes' doesn't have that but still he manages to retain audience's attention.

Kosminsky's Heathcliff is layered in his composition and there's no dearth of moments in the movie where his conflicts are laid bare in its full intensity—The scene when young Cathy visits Linton at Wuthering Heights is an instance. Heathcliff locks the door and takes the key in hand in order to stop Cathy from going back to the Grange and get her married to his son. Cathy gets slapped when she confronts Heathcliff to get the key back and when she starts pleading the camera shifts to Heathcliff's face to show every single contortion of his face muscles. His eyes tear up when Cathy asks him hadn't he loved anybody in his life, but the next moment they freeze and we see him kicking Cathy with a proclamation of his detest for her. The moment predated many Ralph Fiennes performances to come as Lin Haire-Seargeant

puts: “virtuosic cosmic evil of Fiennes’s Nazi in *Schindler’s List*, the all-for-love moral myopia of his title character in *The English Patient* –both are anticipated here.” (“Sympathy for the Devil” 185). Indeed, Steven Spielberg chose Fiennes as Nazi Amon Goeth because he noticed the “sexual evil” in him when he watched a tape of *Emily Brontë’s Wuthering Heights*.(Shaw).

As per Sarah E Fanning, characters like Heathcliff stand out from his nineteenth century counterparts because his capacity to be engulfed by greater emotions. She quotes Nelly’s description of how Heathcliff of the novel “groan[s] in…sudden paroxym[s] of ungovernable passion” (qtd. in “‘A Soul Worth Saving’, Post-Feminist Masculinities in Twenty-First-Century Televised Adaptations of Jane Eyre and Wuthering Heights” 75) as example. According to her, this tendency gives makers of adaptations to be experimental with the presentation of his behaviour so as to fit with contemporary outlooks towards romance. She quotes Paisley Mann while mentioning about the recent televised adaptations, as how they depict the struggle of “post-feminist filmmakers…to construct a hero who is at once volatile and vulnerable” (qtd. in “‘A Soul Worth Saving” 75). Both these aspects can be seen residing in Kosminsky’s Heathcliff in his passion for Cathy and his love-hate relationship with Hareton, Hindley’s son. His scheme to avenge anybody who is dear to people who ever hurt him finds a halt with Hareton as Heathcliff starts developing fatherly feelings for him, who is often posed a double for Heathcliff himself for his orphan status, an emotion that he definitely lacked for his own son, Linton. Along with the term postfeminism gaining currency in popular culture during the 90’s where varied definitions and understanding of feminist discourses along with its intersection with post modernism, post structuralism and post colonialism, discussions on masculinity’s correspondence with contemporary developments in feminism also

emerged in academic and non-academic circles. The postfeminist masculinity as per Genz and Brabon, is a "melting pot of masculinities, blending a variety of subject positions.. as well as a chameleon figure still negotiating the ongoing impact of feminism on his identity (*Postfeminism; Cultural texts and Theories* 143). Claire Monk, who was to notice the postfeminist men's representation in cinema noted down that the theme of masculinity in crisis and "post-feminist male panic, and the resultant mix of masculinist reaction and masculine self-scruitny"("Men in the 90s. 157) have been dominant with British cinema of the 90's.

The tortured and tormented Heathcliff's body is often a site of violence; either by others or self-inflicted. He is seen entering a party at Heights which doesn't go well with Hindley and the resultant show of brutality is on the show in the movie. Upon Cathy's death, we don't see Heathcliff howling down the moor as it is in the novel but him smashing the glass on the door to get into the room where her body is laid. But as much we see him paining, his attitude to others is seen as the same- to Isabella particularly. If Heathcliff's consistency of emotion towards Cathy makes him a romantic figure, he is at the same time despised in no less measures for his violence towards Isabella.

Peter Kosminsky's movie came out a time when discourses on sexual harassment and domestic violence were gaining momentum. In America, Clarence Thomas vs Anita Hill case of 1991called forth some heavy media attention, where the latter accused the former, U.S. Supreme Court Nominee and her former employer of sexual harassment. The World Conference on Human Rights held in 1993 at Vienna observed domestic violence a human rights concern. Subsequently United States passed the federal law of The Violence Against Women Act in 1994. In Britain, The Part IV of Family Law Act of 1996 became the first of its kind to be a comprehensive

measure of dealing with domestic violence. An adaptation coming out that age couldn't have eloped such developments and the violence in marriages were not to be put in an impassive light in its depiction.

There's undeniably a nostalgia that's in operation with Kosminsky's *Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights*. As it has been discussed about the movie's participation in heritage drama category, the invoking of the sentimentality on a cultural treasure is already there in the movie unmissably evident. But beyond that, certain instances do throw some light to a longing and sense of loss to a world that is represented by the elder generation. When the movie nears its close, as we see Hareton and Cathy happy together, we hear Emily Brontë's voiceover in which she emphasizes that the happiness is at the cost of three lives of a generation. The camera pans to show three grave stones and then stops on Heathcliff's while Brontë tells the audience about Heathcliff still walking. It seems that the scene condenses the conflict between the contemporary disproval of masculine sadism and the routine glamorisation of the same, which still hasn't left the scene completely.

The film's obsession with Fiennes's charisma, in playing Heathcliff with sadistic tendencies which aren't easy on the eye, is largely compensated by its women's redemption. The film employs the second generation as a double to the first—a factor that's all the more evident with Cathy the daughter, for both the mother and daughter are played by Juliette Binoche. When the elder Cathy succumbs to the conflicts of her passion, the younger finds light at the end of the tunnel. Her forced marriage to Linton ends by his death and she is treated no better than a maid at the Heights, yet in her companionship with Hareton she finds fulfilment.

The question of Heathcliff's ethnicity is left for dialogues to decide than to portrayal. He is called a gypsy in contempt, mostly by Joseph and Hindley. But

Fiennes' Heathcliff is as white as it gets when it comes to racial background. Francine Prose of *The New York Review* commented on the outrageousness of the black wig sitting atop on Ralph Fiennes's head to make him look like a gypsy. The closest we get to the ethnic group is when Heathcliff and Isabella stop by a gypsy camp while eloping to get some water. Kosminsky thus continue the tradition of letting Caucasian actors play the racially ambivalent Heathcliff. The movie flaunted a multicultural mosaic in the continental heroine and an oriental music composer but casting a man of colour would have been a ground breaking change which, left unattempted, looks disappointing. Corrinne Fowler of University of Leicester draws on the possibility of a black heritage for Heathcliff and comments how "generations of Anglophone literary critics overlooked the impact of slave-trading and slave produced wealth in Yorkshire" She extends how a late 1970s Latin American audience could accept a television adaptation called *Cumbres Borrascosas* (1979) with a Heathcliff of mixed-race ethnicity because slavery was still very raw and fresh in their cultural and "historical memory" ("Was Emily Brontë's Heathcliff Black?") . Fowler's observations on how avoidance, one must suppose by design, to discourses on marginal elements'—racial, in this case— contribution to economic and cultural spaces may explain the casting of various adaptations of *Wuthering Heights*. The multitudinous probabilities of Heathcliff's origin in any case doesn't sit right with the dominant white spectrum, yet to push it further to its darker range wouldn't have gone well with the popular understanding, though facts may have suggested otherwise. Hence most conveniently, he is simply called a gypsy in most adaptations and his appearance becomes a site of contradiction. The 1992 depiction of *Wuthering Heights* serves no exception. Though the movie centres around Heathcliff, it is more of a romantic fixation that causes the same, not a critical scrutiny.

Andrea Arnold, the director of the 2011 adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* casted a black actor as Heathcliff and she is quoted by Fowler that her intention behind the choice was to "honour…his difference." ("Was Emily Brontë's Heathcliff Black?"). Initially conceptualised as a big commercial project with big names in acting department, *Wuthering Heights* got redeveloped once Arnold was fetched in. Arnold as a director wasn't many years old, but her work was appreciated at the Cannes and the Academy already. She did a facelift to the movie by casting relatively unknown faces and a style heavily indebted to the Dogma 95 movement of which she was a part of.

Dogma 95 had a quite sensational announcement of its beginning by its founding member Lars von Trier who showered pamphlets red in colour declaring the movement's manifesto on an amazed audience gathered at Le Cinema: Vers Son Deuxiéme Siècle Conference on March 13 1995 to mark and salute one hundred years of motion pictures. von Trier and Thomas Vinterberg conceived Dogma 95 as an alternate extreme to the high budget spectacles of cinema. It was a practice in "democratization of the cinematic medium" (Hjort & Mackenzie 2) as Trier and Vinterberg would explain it and they established a 'Vow of Chastity', ten commandments to Dogma film makers which are to be in strict compliance while making movies. The rules were against the use of props, background music, special lighting, filters, redundant action etc. and was strongly advocating for hand held cameras and an uncredited director. Andrea Arnold was part of von Trier's project The Advance Party Scheme where three directors were assigned with bare minimum information on a set of characters and situations whereby, they were supposed to direct one movie each employing the same set of actors. Arnold's first feature film *Red Road* released in 2006 was the product of this assignment which went on to win

Jury Prize at Cannes film festival. Her later projects including *Wuthering Heights* were not in strict adherence to Dogma rules, nonetheless a steady influence of the same is not hard to detect with the notable absence of background score except for a song by Mumford & Sons-that too with the credits. Besides, there is evident use of handheld camera and realistic lighting in the movie..

Seijo Richart observes that the *Wuthering Heights*— never really named in the film— gives the impression of a council estate (157). Council estates were structures of community living maintained and operated by local governing bodies. They came in operation with the Public Health Act 1875 by providing necessary living conditions and amenities for the neediest of the population. The significance of these structures grew during war inflicted years when steady bombing and other casualties made many homeless. The Earnshaw abode is very basic and functional to the point of an absolute no in luxury or comfort department in which it resembles the modern council estates. The Lintons are referred as "new people" (*Wuthering Heights*, 00:40:24-25) who have just moved in, quite unlike the novel where they were inhabitants of their Yorkshire estate as long as the Earnshaws (157). Arnold's style is at home with the picturization of the nature around with the use of handheld cams and natural lighting. Nature as an entity is overwhelming in the movie, not because it plays along with the passions and happenings of the characters as it was with Robert Fuest's adaptation of the 70's. It feels mighty because there's no use of extra effects to filter spectacle and the sheer rawness of the moors and the wind blowing is put in detail as they are.

One change that's predominant with the new adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* is the extended length the younger actors play when in comparison with its predecessors. Child actors are usually limited to the drama until the death of Mr.Earnshaw and with the introduction of Lintons on the scene, they normally are

grown up. Wyler's and Kosminsky's versions recruited actors who were around thirty and a slight deviation from this can be seen in Fuest's adaptation only, where even the actors playing grown up Heathcliff and Catherine were in their early twenties. But in Arnold's version, Heathcliff, Catherine and Edgar stay in their teens up to Edgar's proposal to Catherine and the transition happens only with Heathcliff's return to moors. Cathy's confession to Nelly about the proposal she got from Edgar, her conflict over Heathcliff and Edgar, thus, it feels a young adult dilemma at coming-of-age transition where the convictions and worldly wisdom don't often go hand in hand. Yet its tone isn't soft but rather gritty which often gives you the impression of a post-apocalyptic world "a hundred years after a nuclear strike" (Bradshaw). Thus, though the content is from a nineteenth century novel about an eighteenth-century couple, the movie's packaging isn't of a period piece but much like a modern tale of survival which shows a blend of Young Adult energy with post- apocalyptic gloom. The movie has a handful scenes of nudity and sex but they aren't put for pleasure or excitement and it is in line with Dogma film making manifesto. Dogme films were against superficial emotions spicing up the experience of cinema as it makes movie watching an event of illusion. The movie also doesn't attempt an assuring ending for the adaptation which is consistent with the major British and Hollywood adaptations. Even the movies which end the narrative with Catherine's death usually serves a comforting view to the afterlife of characters where they will be united in joy. Here though, Heathcliff's life after Catherine is lonely and critics have commented on its tone as "oddly cold" (Raphael 36).

In a talk with *The Guardian*, Robert Bernstein, who is the producer of the movie remarked that "The Twilight factor is extremely helpful to Wuthering Heights" (qtd. in Child). It is interesting to note that the media during the production progress

of the movie presented reports with headlines that said how *Wuthering Heights* was getting "Twilight'ed" (Finke) under new director, much thanks to the leads being teenagers. The same reports equated the casting director's search for actors for the movie a hunt for Kristen (Stewart), Robert (Pattinson) and Taylor (Lautner). The reviews of the movie wouldn't be unanimously agreed on its effect being similar to Twilight saga, but what stands out is how the producer himself not objecting to the reference.

There are recurring references to Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* in Stephanie Meyer's blockbuster series and the novel is even mentioned as the lead character Bella's favourite book. The publicity had been so productive that publishers HarperTeen decided to re-release *Wuthering Heights* with the new cover with a declaration on it that says "Bella and Edwards Favourite Book"(qtd. in Eve). The occasions where Bella is making comparisons with Catherine and Heathcliff 's relationship to her own are also not few in number. The emphasized connection in *Twilight* to *Wuthering Heights* had been instrumental in skyrocketing the latter's sales and it shall not be wrong in assuming that it might have benefitted other way around too. The enduring legacy of *Wuthering Heights* as a passionate fair in romance which has wide readership would have been of benefit to *Twilight*. There are provisions that allow the extension of the connection that is presumably shared by *Wuthering Heights* and *Twilight* if we are to look at Wuthering Heights 'reworkings' like *Heathcliff: Vampire of Wuthering Heights* (2010) by Amanda Paris in which Heathcliff is turned to the undead seeking revenge for his unrequited love. Heathcliff's positioning as a vampire sounds grounded on his deep reserves of passion and capacity for stone-cold revenge. But according to Richard Davenport-Hines, Heathcliff's fixation on acquiring wealth and seizing property can also be connected with the vampire figure.

Karl Marx in *Das Kapital* used a simile in explaining capitalism as how it feeds on its preys like vampire (qtd. in Davenport- Hines 252). Davenport-Hines would locate an age's concern over capitalism over the figure of Heathcliff. When it comes to Arnold's adaptation, as we get to see Cathy licking Heathcliff's wounds, it is not difficult to import some vampire remembrances to that particular instance from the Twilight series. The Twilight series is celebrated and very fresh in popular memory. Dedicated Twilight fans often engage in finding parallels with Emily Brontë's work and the makers of *Wuthering Heights* (2011) found in it an opportunity to further the movie's viewership. Thus, the new adaptation, it seems, to be shaped and influenced by not only its source text's legacy but also of a recent work which is a blockbuster and packs references to the former.

By Arnold's explanation, Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* is "gothic, feminist, socialist, sadomasochist, Freudian, incestuous, violent and visceral. Trying to melt all that together into a film is an ambitious and perhaps foolish task" (qtd. in Raphael 36) Her expression on the improbability of such an adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* notwithstanding, the statement looks refreshing for the identification of various layers of the novel which certainly weren't the priorities for any director to make an adaptation of it. *Wuthering Heights* was typically associated with a canonical domain or if to be grounded, as a romance. The adaptation, as it was reported to have started with big names in the industry, presumably, wouldn't have had any other vision regarding the novel when it was to begin, but with Arnold on board things changed. But as per Arnold's own admission, her take on Emily Brontë's story could have got accepted because the general frustration the producers had over a project which was taking forever to be materialized; they simply wanted it to get done (Dale). Her take on adapting a novel is that it is "luxury" as it is not that difficult to

find “stuff” (Dale) for the screenplay in an adaptation as it is with an original screenplay. She admittedly hasn’t read *Jane Eyre* till date, got initiated to *Wuthering Heights* through its adaptations— a not so surprising similarity with *Jane Eyre*’s (2011) director Cary Fukunaga here— and because of that, her expectation about the novel was it to be a typical romance, when she actually started reading it. Linda Hutcheon has provided a categorization of audience for adaptations “knowing” and “unknowing” among them (*A Theory of Adaptation* 120,121). With ‘unknowing’ audience, who are initiated to the narratives through adaptations, the concept of priority, usually associated with the source text, is effectively toppled. It is interesting to note that some of such ‘unknowing’ audience, maturing as filmmakers, turn to making adaptation of the same text which they came to fathom through earlier adaptations.

Arnold’s training in film making is from an anti-establishment movement which quite radically sought to ‘purify’ the excesses and indulgences in movies. Her viewers were never really the kind who would devour crumbs of heritage-proud instalments. Consistent with her tradition her adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* had a limited release and was in contrast with the contemporary *Jane Eyre* adaptation with Mia Wasikowska and Michael Fassbender in the scale of its publicity campaigns. *Wuthering Heights* (2011) wasn’t really chaste in the department as it did enjoy fair share of media attention but in comparison with *Jane Eyre* it was nothing much and by Arnold’s record, this movie might have been one of the most commercially natured movies of her oeuvre. One can assume that her detachment from the popular cinema and its profit-oriented demands saved her from diluting a fresh vision of *Wuthering Heights*.

Still, even if we are to take Arnold's interpretation that the film got done because the producers didn't care by word, the prospect of such a movie getting made itself alerts us of a change in sensibilities for *Wuthering Heights* in popular vision. Kim Lyon's *The Dentdale Brontë Trail* was out and about by 1985 and experts like Christopher Haywood were also publishing about the Heathcliff's possible ancestry in late 80's. By 2010, Adam Low had his documentary *A Regular Black: The Hidden Wuthering Heights* got released in which it was suggested how Mr.Earnshaw's business in town could be slave trading or in slave produced products like tobacco and how the singularity of the name Heathcliff, both a surname and a first name is in consistency with naming traditions of slaves.

Corrine Fowler assumes that Arnold's choice of a black actor to play Heathcliff might have happened by chance. Quoting from Arnold's many interviews, Fowler puts that the many descriptions of Heathcliff— variedly as gypsy, lascar, Chinese-Indian— may have prompted Arnold to decide on acknowledging his difference, and casting a black actor was one among many choices. Indeed, Arnold was not bent on making Heathcliff black as she could have casted a Roma gypsy as Heathcliff if only, she could have got positive response from the community (Richart 449). Her search then extended to Yorkshire actors of mixed ethnicity which then zeroed on James Howson and Solomon Glave as the elder and younger Heathcliff respectively. But Fowler's assumption of Arnold not familiar with black history of the locality is contradicted in Arnold's interview with Austin Dale. She does mention how her knowledge on Liverpool's slave port along with various references in the book the reason in not negating the possibility of a black Heathcliff. In Arnold's own opinion, its lack of research or "laziness" (Dale) in not assuming Heathcliff a black.

Yet, Arnold is not pushing the case for a black Heathcliff. She comments on how non-committal Brontë is about Heathcliff's origin. Her idea of the male lead of the story lies in his alienness but her work isn't trying to be periodically apt, with every temporal and spatial data on point to make it a historically accurate work that may provide an answer for Heathcliff's ethnicity. Sure, the place is Yorkshire moors and the clothes eighteenth century; but a black surviving in a white household and winning affection of a girl from landowner family, Isabella, so much so that they could effectively elope and make a living was improbable and near to impossible. The situation wouldn't have been easy for gypsies too, as Heathcliff was portrayed throughout the known Hollywood and British adaptations of the novel. But even with occasional abuses of Hindley and company citing Heathcliff's racial make, traditional adaptations gave little suspicion to the white community's general tolerance for Heathcliff. The 1939 adaptation inserted a very twentieth century ideal of America dream— Heathcliff getting to America and making it big, hence improving the social standing— while others are ambivalent about the source of income. As for *Wuthering Heights*—the novel—itself, a class and race conscious English society letting Heathcliff be itself isn't reassuring for the narrative's historical consistency. As much Emily Brontë herself was comfortable with playing with ambivalences about Heathcliff's ethnicity, the subsequent adaptations were confident in their contradictions of Caucasians playing a character who is throughout addressed as Gypsy. Arnold's adaptation is a change in wind in that it doesn't allow audience doubt about Heathcliff's race. Yet just like other adaptations it doesn't try to account for whatever acceptance Heathcliff enjoyed amongst a White society. But that issue is inherent with *Wuthering Heights*, the novel, and it can't be effectively undone.

The media attention and praise that surrounded Arnold's *Wuthering Heights* has to do with a great deal of amazement for seeing Heathcliff as black. Yet, from the many interviews Arnold gave and the production details available, her film's virtue lies in this very lack of amazement or celebration of casting a black actor for Heathcliff. Arnold's work rejects any kind of bedazzlement on the source text's repute and especially on its track record with adaptations. The latest addition in the long list of adaptors, whose exposure to the text may not necessarily be from the source text itself, Arnold has imbibed a sense of ease in dealing with it. Arnold's adaptation might have made a leap in comparison with its predecessors, but she herself might think of it as a small step— as the natural course of action. That quality defines and works as the unique selling proposition for the adaptation.

CONCLUSION

Even without any modifications in spatial, cultural, national or even temporal dimensions of a particular text, the many adaptations of a single text can present different motives and effects. Often the analyses on film adaptations, in channelling their energy to pit cinema against literature, knowingly or unknowingly ignore the role context plays in meaning making. Sometimes, even the most vigilant makes this mistake. In certain instances, the awareness on contextual demands and tensions is explicated only with regards to adaptations and that too to be used against the cinema in its dialogue with literature. Robert Stam's accusations on "aesthetic mainstreaming" of adaptations, as per Christine Geraghty, can be quoted as an example. Stam accuses the cinema as a "machine" which is motivated towards "mass-audience legibility" (qtd. in *Now a Major Motion Picture* 11) and the profit mindedness. Stam's description of the priority on moolah that drives the film makers in sticking to tried and tested narrative plans is described by Geraghty as a lapse from Stam, in alleging the market-driven approach and in extension a conformity to the mainstream to cinema only. The problem here is in effectively ignoring the fact that just like cinema, the texts that function as sources in adaptation, are also the products of various economic and social forces. Any preferencing of any form of textual exercise, be it the source text or the adaptations, isn't a productive endeavour in studying adaptations. The fidelity discourse or the search for faithfulness in adaptations privileged the source text over the adaptations. Further studies in the field have tried to debunk this fixation, but analyses that are simultaneously sensitive to context dependency of both the source text and adaptations, in researcher's opinion, should happen more in the adaptation studies.

The thesis thus has worked towards such an aim where both source texts and film adaptations are posed as products of various forms of social demands. The source text's understanding is done in its particular surroundings and in detailing the adaptations, there's no judgement of quality or equivalence bothering the study. Each of the adaptations considered in the thesis were made and marketed as loyal visualizations of the source text. Such claims are valuable only in choosing the movies for the study and there's no attempt to study their verity. Comparisons with the source text and different screen adaptations had been the most used technique in analysing adaptations. More often than not, commitment to such techniques is driven by the search for narrative consistency. The technique is made use of in the thesis, but narrative elements mentioned in the process are used as cues to understand different state of affairs contributing to the production of each text and even source text is not exempted from it. A well-advertised loyalty from the part of adaptations towards the source texts spur expectations of narrative congruity. But subtle reworkings and modifications occur as part of exercises in accommodating the changing times and demands. By taking figments of the narrative from the texts and placing it along with references of contemporary life, the operation in acclimation becomes evident.

When extended to the source text, such a scrutiny serves in finding sources for the production of the narrative. The texts subjected to thus an enquiry in the thesis, *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*, had been of classic stature in English literature. What all factors shall and will accord a particular text with classical status is worth a different thesis in study; loosely, a classic is a text which has proven its durability and has established itself relevant with succeeding generations. The rage over fidelity, on how much the adaptation shall be an effort in mimicking the narrative, is usually high in proportion to the repute the source text has. Thus, it is not at all surprising that the

adaptations of *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights* provoke heavy outcry from a large set of audience as not delivering to their expectations. The legacy hung on the text might very well be the deciding factor in selecting the text for the process of adaptation, but it can also prove lethal in generating pre judgemental disapproval for the same. The problem here lies in the perpetual prioritizing of the source text, the belief that the source text has provided us with a signified and the expectation that adaptation shall function a vessel to carry that signified. The obsession with such an absolute is rightfully challenged by lenience to intertextuality. But even messiahs of intertextuality, at times, have fallen prey to the overpowering dominance of the source text as it has happened with Robert Stam. Stam puts that "the source text forms a dense informational network, a series of verbal cues which the adapting film text can then selectively take up, amplify, ignore, subvert or transform" ("Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation" 46). According to Christine Geraghty, Stam hasn't let go of the concept of the source text functioning as the anchor in significance. This thesis has pulled source text out from forming such framework for analysis of adaptations. The source texts are acknowledged as the contributor to the narrative that later adaptations have fleshed on. But detailed analysis is done on both the source texts and adaptations to find out the forces-social, economic etc—that prompted the producers of both source texts and adaptations to decide on the choice of and emphasis or silence on various narrative elements.

The writers of the source texts in consideration Charlotte and Emily Brontë have the reputation of being aloof to the point of socially disconnected. But such declarations often are exaggerations of their introversion and exclamations on the passionate products their works had been. Terry Eagleton has done significant study on the Brontës which was informed by the control and influence contemporary

occurrences wielded over the family and in extension on their creative output. There are instances where the Brontës themselves came out in conformity with the popular and accepted norms of life and especially literature. Often in their prefaces to the works they are keen to substantiate their imaginative output in concurrence with the accepted notion of literature of their times. If we are to take account of specific events in narration and character presentation, it is not difficult to see how much the contemporary notions have influenced the Brontës' decisions in arrangements in plot. The mental malady of Bertha Mason that catapults the drama in *Jane Eyre* and the monomania Heathcliff of *Wuthering Heights* is said to have afflicted with, are all in accordance with 19th century understanding of insanity, which was affected by gender, race and class categorizations. There are references to the pseudoscience of physiognomy in both the works- the branch of study claiming authentic adjudication of a person's disposition was a 19th century development. *Jane Eyre* has effectively used Bertha Mason's creole status for her narrative use of being an alien creature that should not evoke any sympathy from the reader's part. The caricatures made on creoles reinstated the group being bad influence on the English and that understanding is employed in Jane Eyre for better effect. Similar kind of contextualisation is not lost on *Wuthering Heights*' Heathcliff whose mysterious identity had been a push for the work's repute. The research done on contemporary documents and studies on 19th century life, precisely Victorian, shed light on the Victorian sensibilities of the novels under consideration. The timeline of *Jane Eyre* suggests Regency era while *Wuthering Heights* spans the Georgian era, but with their respective authors attempting composition of the novels in the Victorian era for the Victorian audience, knowledge on the age's tastes and norms of acceptance becomes crucial in understanding the text. Here, the term 'understanding' isn't about ascertaining the

motives of the characters in their fictional habitat but rather about assimilating real, material considerations that prompted in positioning the narrative elements in how they are in the text.

Such an analysis is what is seen to be extended to the adaptations of both the texts detailed. If both the texts pertained to the compositional expectations of Victorian era, the points of reference with regard to the timestamps of adaptations, are varied and vast. The earliest of adaptations of both the texts are located in the second world war years. While the production details of *Wuthering Heights* (1939) give away the sense of alarm the war ridden time afflicted in the making of the movie, the post-war released *Jane Eyre* (1943) concentrates on women's journey back home once their need on war field got diminished. The enquiry consisting these two adaptations has traced the effects the war effected on movie making along with the prevalent traditions of code era Hollywood which the makers of cinema couldn't have done away with.

The classic adaptations served a kind of template for plot choices for adaptations coming up of the source texts. The provided narrative model still goes through the needed confirmation with the changing times and the 1970's adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* (1970) is provided as a case in point. The movie identifies early adults as their main audience and the locating of main characters to the age group has reasons beyond fidelity. It is made evident that the recent displays of power by student groups that could possibly even topple governments over Europe served a driving force in narrative decisions for the movie. It is also not that difficult to note, as per critics, Beatles aesthetics in styling of the characters.

The 1990's adaptations of the source texts have got their feet firm in the heritage drama category. Both Charlotte *Brontë's Jane Eyre* (1996) and *Emily*

Brontë's Wuthering Heights (1992) stressed on the 'authenticity' in visualizing the source texts. Again, the thesis hasn't concentrated on conducting any verifying of the meaning and prospects of the term 'authenticity' in comparison with the source text. The term stands important in the analysis in how the claim had sale value in the 90's. The makers of these adaptation chose to play to the sentimental and 'relic' value of the source texts, hence the emphasis on the name 'heritage dramas.' The thesis is curious and analyses the decade's fascination with heritage films and how changing gender and racial equations of the new age are reflected within them.

The most recent of the adaptations in consideration are released in 2011. The enquiry to the different clime the movies are produced to continues with these two also. Notably, there's an emphasized choice of the producing firms to let their films be helmed by directors who are not in emotional terms with English cannon. The classic era Hollywood adaptations of source texts have triumphed in cultural memory to such an extent that a large number of people find these movies the entry to the narrative of *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights* than the source texts themselves. The adaptors of the latest instalments of *Jane Eyre* (2011) and *Wuthering Heights* (2011), Cary Fukunaga and Andrea Arnold respectively, belong the list. Both Fukunaga and Arnold have, in their own admission, affiliation to the adaptations of the source text than source text itself. Though the source text still serves and acknowledged the basis of the movie, these directors find their source of nostalgic and even 'relic' value in adaptations. Catherine Grant's concept of "recall" (Grant 57) is valuable in the analysis of this particular instance in how the makers of adaptations are influenced by the source text narrative's different avatars in a variety of media and most frequently in other adaptations. But it also effectively dislodges the sacrosanct value that's attached to adaptations. The source text hasn't left the scene and it still is advertised

the anchor to adaptations but the filmmaker who has contributed to the experience network of the particular narrative, hasn't gathered his inspiration from an adaptation, hence toppling the concept of priority with regard to source texts.

Such an understanding of adaptations will be steady in hold with the metaphor of 'layering' used in explanation. Christine Geraghty has commented how "the metaphor is a productive one which allows for layers of different thickness and significance." (*Now a Major Motion Picture* 195). Thinking through layering allows for assimilating accumulation of deposits that happen in adaptations as one adaptation after another occur. The subsequent adaptations are not independent from the earlier one as layers, sometimes ghostly, of earlier attempts in narration might be found deep within. Once an adaptation is made and released, it influences the cultural memory of the narrative. The later adaptations, as they try to connect with and collect from the cultural memory, will pay attention to the earlier adaptations.

The layering process also seems to give a sound explanation to the deliberations happen in adaptations with regard to changing attitudes and a narrative which belongs to an earlier timestamp. Each adaptation put slides on the base of the narrative that are charged with contemporariness. This layering and the process of how these slides guide our point of view through them is evident with the cases of gender and race. These two aspects have claimed the primary attention of the thesis. But the enquiry is done not exempting the source narrative on which the slides build on. It is as important for the thesis to analyse the construction of the slate as it is to observe the layers which build on it. To equate adaptations with layers shall not be in the sense of understanding adaptations as inferior to the source narrative.

The processes in making adaptations are to be studied in connection with but separately from the scope of this thesis. Studies where the verbal signifier of the

source text is contradistinguished with visual nature of the cinema are frequent with regard to adaptations. The significance of the study shall be found in its attempt to open up adaptation studies to be free from evaluating tone and to be more analytical. Hila Shachar's use of the phrase 'cultural afterlives' on film adaptations of *Wuthering Heights* in the title for her book is a fit with the thesis's notion about adaptations. The adaptations act as additions to the book's legacy and when working with such a notion, adaptations are not put as lesser beings to the supreme source text. The bridge that connects source text and adaptations allow for two-way traffic. When adaptations do layer as mentioned earlier, the source text's longevity, relevance and collective memory on it gets redefined.

The reception process of adaptation is, it seems, allotted comparatively less degree of academic interest. It has a lot to do with the adaptation studies' preoccupation with the source text. The direction and objective in adaptation studies has been, for the longest time, traditionally set to analyse the commitment of the adaptation to the source text. As such, if at all the audience's reactions and response are to be taken in, it was only in rating adaptation's loyalty to the source text. But audience is never a unified entity and consists of people of differences. Their difference might be acknowledged in the varying score cards they might produce for a specific adaptation's fidelity. But reasons contributing to diverse responses haven't got its due to in academic queries of adaptation studies. Jacqueline Bobo's PhD thesis titled *Articulation and Hegemony: Black Women's Response to the Film The Color Purple* (1989) is a significant contribution in the said direction. Her research concentrated on how black women responded quite differently from the black male critics to Steven Spielberg's adaptation of Alice Walker's *The Color Purple* (1982). *Watching The Lord of the Rings: Tolkien's World Audience s*(2008) co-edited by

Martin Barker and Ernest Mathijs follows the footsteps of Bobo in working in similar territory. Martin Barker went further with his research interest and with similar minded academics co-wrote the *Alien Audiences: Remembering and Evaluating a Classic Movie* (2015) which focused on how audience engaged with Ridley Scott's *Alien* (1979). There is ample scope for research in this particular area which shall be identified and promoted for thorough exploration. Endeavours in investigations and attempts in theorisation of audience reception process are beneficial to film studies in general and studies in film adaptations in particular.

To put into perspective, the thesis's occupation with the adaptations of chosen texts of the Brontë sisters function as samples for the general interest in film adaptation studies. If to put a pun on the term 'adaptation' itself, the research has tried to explicate through the selected adaptations on how adaptations 'adapt', i.e., how they accustom with the changing times.

Works Cited

Allott, Miriam. *The Brontës: The Critical Heritage*. London: Psychology Press, 1995.

Andrew, Dudley. *Concepts in Film Theory*. Oxford UP, 1984.

Andrew, Dudley. "The Well-Worn Muse: Adaptation in Film, History and Theory." *Narrative Strategies: Original Essays in Film and Prose Fiction*, edited by Syndy M. Conger and Janice R. Welsch. Macomb: Western Illinois University, 1980, pp. 9-17.

Appignanesi, Lisa. *Mad, Bad and Sad: Women and the Mind Doctors from 1800 to Present.* London: Virago, 2009.

Austen, Jane. *Sense and Sensibility*. Edited by Kathleen James-Cavan. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2011.

Baker, Melva Joyce. *Images of Women: The War Years, 1941-1945: A Study of the Public Perceptions of Women's Roles as Revealed in Top-Grossing War Films.* 1978. University of California, PhD dissertation.

Beja, Maurice. *Film and Literature: An Introduction*. London: Longman, 1979.

Beville, Maria. *The Unnameable Monster in Literature and film.* New York: Routledge, 2013.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of influence: A Theory of Poetry*. 2nd ed., Oxford UP, 1997.

Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. Berkeley; University of California Press, 1957.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Harvard UP, 1979.

Boyum, Jeff Gould. *Double Exposure; Fiction to Film.* Calcutta: Seagull Press, 1989.

Bradshaw, Peter. "Wuthering Heights – Review." *The Guardian,* 10 Nov. 2011, www.theguardian.com/film/2011/nov/10/wuthering-heights-film-review. Accessed 22 February 2020.

Brontë, Anne. *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall*. Edited by Herbert Rosengarten and Margaret Smith. Oxford UP, 1993.

Brontë, Charlotte. Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell. *Wuthering Heights and Agnes Gray*. Cambridge UP, 2013, pp. vii-xvi.

Brontë, Charlotte. "Charlotte Brontë's 1850 Preface to *Wuthering Heights.*" *The British Library*. Originally Published as Editor's Preface for the New Edition of *Wuthering Heights*. *Wuthering Heights and Agnes Gray*. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1889, pp xvii- xviii. www.bl.uk/collection-items/charlotte-bronts-1850-preface-to-wuthering-heights? Accessed 11 December 2019.

Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. Edited by Richard J. Dunn, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001.

Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Edited by Richard J Dunn, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003.

Brosh, Liora. *Screening Novel Women; From British Domestic Fiction to Film*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Calvino, Italo. "Why Read the Classics." *Why Read the Classics*. Translated by Martin McLaughlin. New York: Vintage, 2000, pp. 3-9.

Cartmell, Deborra, editor. *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation.* Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley- Blackwell, 2012.

Cartmell, Deborra and Imelda Whelehan, editors. *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen.* Cambridge UP, 2007.

"Cary Fukunaga, Leading 'Jane Eyre' Toward the Dark." *Morning Edition on NPR*, 11 March 2011, www.npr.org/2011/03/11/134426041/cary-fukunaga-leading-jane-eyre-toward-the-dark. Accessed 20 February 2020.

Cattrysse, Patrick. "Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals." *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, vol. 4, no.1, 1992, pp. 53-70.

Cecil, David. *Early Victorian Novelists: Essays in Revaluation*. London: Constable & Co., 1934.

Charlotte Brontë's Jane Eyre. Directed by Franco Zeffirelli. Miramax, 1996.

Child, Ben. "Andrea Arnold takes on Wuthering Heights." *The Guardian*. 20 Jan 2010, www.theguardian.com/film/2010/jan/20/andrea-arnold-wuthering-heights. Accessed 3 May 2020.

Christer Petley. "'Home' and 'this Country': Britishness and Creole Identity in the Letters of a Transatlantic Slaveholder." *Atlantic Studies*, vol.6, no. 1, 2009, pp. 43-61.

Cohen, Keith. *Film and Literature: The Dynamics of Exchange*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.

Conrad, Peter. "Jane Eyre and Wuthering Heights: Do We Need New Film Versions?" *The Guardian*, 20 Aug. 2011, www.theguardian.com/film/2011/aug/21/classic-novels-film-tv-eyre-wuthering. Accessed 10 May 2020.

Coetzee, J.M. “What is a Classic.” *Stranger Shores: Essays 1986-1999*. London: Vintage, 2001, pp. 1-19.

Crowther, Bosley. “ The Screen: Jane Eyre, a Somber Version of the Bronte Novel, With Joan Fontaine and Orson Welles, Opens at the Music Hall.” *The New York Times*, www.nytimes.com/1944/02/04/archives/the-screen-jane-eyre-a-somber-version-of-the-bronte-novel-with-joan.html. Accessed 10 May 2020.

Dale, Austin. “Andrea Arnold on the 'Luxury' of Adapting 'Wuthering Heights' and Working in Mud.” *IndieWire*, 3 Oct. 2012, www.indiewire.com/2012/10/andrea-arnold-on-the-luxury-of-adapting-wuthering-heights-and-working-in-mud-44473/. Accessed 12 May 2020.

Davies, Emily. *The Higher Education of Women*. Cambridge UP, 2010.

Desmond, John M and Peter Hawkes. *Adaptation: Studying Film and Literature*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006.

Dever, Carolyn. *Death and the Mother from Dickens to Freud: Victorian Fiction and the Anxiety of Origins*. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Doane, Janice L, and Devon L. Hodges. *Nostalgia and Sexual Difference: The Resistance to Contemporary Feminism*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Dodds, Hope. “Heathcliff's Country.” *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 39, no. 2, 1944, pp. 116–29.

Eagleton, Terry. “Emily Brontë and the Great Hunger.” *The Irish Review* (1986-), no. 12, 1992, pp. 108–119. *JSTOR*, www. jstor.org/stable/29735648. Accessed 4 April 2020.

Eagleton, Terry. *Myths of Power: A Marxist Study of the Brontës*. Anniversary ed., Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Eliot, T.S. "What is a Classic." *Selected Prose of T.S.Eliot*, edited by Frank Kermode. San Diago: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975, pp. 115-131.

Elliott, Kamilla. *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights. Directed by Peter Kosminsky. Paramount Pictures, 1992.

Esquirol, J.E.D, *Mental Maladies*. New York: Hafner Pub. Co, 1965.

Fanning, Sarah E. "'A Soul Worth Saving', Post-Feminist Masculinities in Twenty-First-Century Televised Adaptations of Jane Eyre and Wuthering Heights." *Adaptation*. Vol 10, issue 1, 2017, pp. 73-92.

Finke, Nikki. "New Wuthering Heights Gets Twilighted." *Deadline*. 17th Feb 2010, deadline.com/2010/02/new-wuthering-heights-to-get-twilight-ed-25551/. Accessed 27 February 2020.

Fish, Stanley. *Is there a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Harvard University Press, 1980.

Fowler, Corinne. "Was Emily Brontë's Heathcliff Black?" *The Conversation*, 23 Oct. 2020, theconversation.com/was-emily-bront-s-heathcliff-black-85341. Accessed 25 February 2020.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. London: Penguin, 1998.

Genz, Stéphanie, and Benjamin A. Brabon. *Postfeminism: Cultural Texts and Theories*. Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Geraghty, Christine. *Now a Major Motion Picture: Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.

Gérin, Winifred. *Emily Brontë: A Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Glancy, H M. *When Hollywood Loved Britain: The Hollywood "British" Film 1939-45*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

Glen, Heather. *The Cambridge Companion to the Brontës.* Cambridge UP, 2002.

Grant, Catherine. "Recognizing Billy Budd in Beau Travail: Epistemology and Hermeneutics of an Auteurist 'free' Adaptation." *Screen*, Volume 43, Issue 1, Spring 2002, pp. 57–73.

Haire-Sargeant, Lin. "Sympathy for the Devil: The Problem of Heathcliff in Film Versions of Wuthering Heights." *Nineteenth-century Women at the Movies: Adapting Classic Women's Fiction to Film*, edited by Barbara T. Lupack, Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1999, pp. 167- 206.

Han, Catherine Paula. "Picturing Charlotte Brontë's Artistic Rebellion? Myths of the Woman Artist in Postfeminist Jane Eyre Screen Adaptations." *Adaptation*, vol. 13, no. 2, August 2020, pp. 240–269.

Haskell, Molly. *From Reverence to Rape: The Treatment of Women in the Movies.* 3rd ed., Kindle ed., The University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Hartmann, Susan M. *The Home Front and Beyond*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.

Haynes, Kenneth. "Classic Vergil." *A Companion to Virgil's Aeneid and its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michel C.J. Putnam. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley- Blackwell. 2014, pp. 421-434.

Hayward, Susan. *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts*. Oxon: Routledge, 1996.

Heywood, Christopher. "Yorkshire Slavery in Wuthering Heights." *The Review of English Studies*. Vol.38. no.150, 1987, pp.184-198. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/515422. Accessed 15 January 2020.

Hjort, Mette & Scott MacKenzie, editors. *Purity and Provocation: Dogme 95*. British Film Institute. 2003.

Hofland, Barbara. *The Barbadoes Girl: A Tale for Young People*. New York: C.S. Francis & Co, 1852.

Honey, Maureen. *Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, Gender, and Propaganda during World War II*. University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.

Hopkins, Lisa. "The Red and the Blue: Jane Eyre in the 1990s." *Classics in Film and Fiction*, edited by Deborah Catrmell, I Q Hunter et al. London: Pluto Press; 2000, pp. 54-69.

Howitt, William. *The Rural Life of England*. South Carolina: Nabu Press, 2012.

Hutcheon, Linda and Siobhan O'Flynn. *A Theory of Adaptation*. 2nd ed., Oxon; Routledge. 2013.

Ingham, Patricia. *The Brontës*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Jane Eyre. Directed by Cary Fukunaga. BBC Films, 2011.

Jane Eyre. Directed by Robert Stevenson. Twentieth Century Fox, 1943.

Klein, Michael and Gillian Parker, editors. The English Novel and the Movies. New York: Ungar, 1981.

Kurz, Demie. *For Richer, for Poorer: Mothers Confront Divorce*. Routledge, 2013.

Lawson-Peebles, Robert. "European Conflict and Hollywood's Reconstruction of English Fiction." *The Yearbook of English Studies*, vol. 26, 1996, pp. 1–13. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3508640. Accessed 3 December 2019.

Leavis, Queenie D. and Frank R. Leavis. *Lectures in America*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1969.

Leitch, Thomas. "Adaptation Studies at Crossroads." *Adaptation*. Volume 1, issue 1, March 2008, pp. 63-77.

Long, Edward. *History of Jamaica*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Looser, Devoney. "Feminist Implications of the Silver Screen Austen." *Jane Austen in Hollywood*, edited by Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield. University Press of Kentucky, 2001, pp. 159–176.

Losseff, Nicky. "Cathy's Homecoming and the Other World: Kate Bush's 'Wuthering Heights.'" *Popular Music*, Vol.18, no.2, 1999, pp 227-240. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/853603. Accessed 20 September 2020.

Lupack, Barbara Tepa. *Nineteenth Century Women at the Movies: Adapting Classic Women's Fiction to Film*. Bowling Green State University Press, 1999.

Lyon, Kim. *The Dentdale Brontë Trail.* Dent: Lyon Equipment, 1985.

Madsen, Axel. *William Wyler: The Authorised Biography*. London: W.H.Allen, 1974.

Mair, Lucille Mathurin. *A Historical Study of Women in Jamaica 1655-1844*. Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press, 2006.

Mathews, Brendan. "On Kate Bush's Radical Interpretation of Wuthering Heights." *Literary Hub*. 13th Feb. 2019, lithub.com/on-kate-bushs-radical-interpretation-of-wuthering-heights/ Accessed 20 September 2020.

Mcfarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

Mcgrath, Charles. "Another Hike on the Moors for 'Jane Eyre'." *The New York Times*, 4 Mar. 2011, www.nytimes.com/2011/03/06/movies/06eyre.html. Accessed 20 May 2020.

Michie, Elsie. "Simianized Irish to Oriental Despots: Heathcliff, Rochester and Racial Difference." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1992, pp. 125–140.

Monk, Claire. "Men in the 90s." *British Cinema of the 90s*. Edited Robert Murphy. London: BFI, 2000, pp 156-66.

Mrs.Miniver. Directed by William Wyler. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1942.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, edited by Leo Brady and Marshall Cohen. Oxford UP, 1999, pp. 833-844.

Naremore, James, editor. *Film Adaptation*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2000.

Parkinson, Kirsten L. "Mrs.Rochester's Story: Franco Zeffirelli's Adaptation of Jane Eyre." *Literature/Film Quarterly*. vol. 43, no.1, 2015, pp.18-33.

Peebles, Robert Lawson. “European Conflict and Hollywood’s Reconstruction of English Fiction.” *The Yearbook of English Studies,* vol.26, 1996, pp. 1-13. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3508640. Accessed 2 May 2020.

Petley, Christopher. “ ‘Home’ and ‘this Country’: Britishness and Creole Identity in the Letters of a Transatlantic Slaveholder.” *Atlantic Studies*. vol.6., issue.1, 2009.

Porter, Roy. *Mind Forg’d Manacles: A History of Madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1987.

Prose, Francine. “The Taming of Wuthering Heights: by Francine Prose.” *The New York Review of Books*, 29 July 2020, www.nybooks.com/daily/2012/10/24/taming-wuthering-heights/. Accessed 10 January 2020.

Raphael, Amy. “Love will tear us apart.” *Sight and Sound*. December 2011, pp 34-37.

Rich, Adrienne. “Jane Eyre: The Temptations of a Motherless woman.” *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978*. Kindle ed., W.W. Norton & Company, 1995.

Richart, Maria Sejio. *Class and Gender identity in the Film Transpositions of Emily Brontë’s Literary Work.* 2013, 2013. University of A Coruňa. PhD Dissertation.

Rigby, Jonathan. *English Gothic: a century of horror cinema*. London: Reynolds and Hearn Ltd. 2004.

Rodriguez, Maddie. “Anatomy of a Scene: Jane Eyre's Red Room.” *Bookriot*. 15th Sept. 2015, bookriot.com/anatomy-of-a-scene-jane-eyres-red-room/. Accessed 2 March 2020.

Roy Porter. *Mind Forg’d Manacles: A History of Madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1987.

Sadoff, Diane F. *Victorian Vogue: British Novels on Screen*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation: A New Critical Idiom*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Scott, A. O. “Radiant Spirit Blossoms in Barren Land.” *The New York Times*, 10th Mar. 2011, www.nytimes.com/2011/03/11/movies/jane-eyre-starring-mia-wasikowska-review.html. Accessed 10 March 2020.

Shachar, Hila. *Cultural Afterlives and Screen Adaptations of Classic Literature: Wuthering Heights and Company.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Shaw, Jessica. “Ralph Fiennes before "The English Patient".” *EW.com*, 3 Oct. 1997, ew.com/article/1997/10/03/ralph-fiennes-english-patient/. Accessed 10 January 2020.

Shoard, Catherine. “Ralph Fiennes: Loosey-Goosey? 'I like That!'.” *The Guardian*, 26 Oct. 2015, www.theguardian.com/film/2015/oct/26/ralph-fiennes-spectre-interview. Accessed 10 January 2020.

Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and Culture in England, 1830-1980.* London: Virago, 1987.

Stam, Robert. “Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation.” *Film Adaptation*, edited by James Naremore. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2000, pp. 54- 76

Stam, Robert. “Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation.”, *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*, edited by Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Stam, Robert and Alessandra Raengo, editors. *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Stam, Robert. *Literature through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaptation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Stoneman, Patsy. *Bronte Transformations: The Cultural Dissemination of Jane Eyre and Wuthering Heights*. London: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1996.

Taylor, Ella. “Andrea Arnold Tackles An Iconic Love Story.” *NPR*, 9 Oct. 2012, www.npr.org/2012/10/09/162323619/andrea-arnold-tackles-an-iconic-love-story. Accessed 5 February 2020.

Tosh, John. *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2005.

Wagner, Geoffrey. The Novel and the Cinema. Rutherford, N.J: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975.

Whitehead, Barbara D. *The Divorce Culture*. New York: Vintage Books, 1998.

Winnifrith, Tom. *Brontës and their Background: Romance and Reality*. 2nd ed., Hampshire: The Macmillan Press LTD, 1988.

Woolf, Virginia. “The Cinema.” *The British Library*. Originally published in *The Nation and Athenaeum*. Volume xxxix, 3 July 1926, pp. 381-386.

Wuthering Heights. Directed by Andrea Arnold. HanWay Films, 2011.

“Wuthering Heights 1970”. *IMDb*. 16 December 2020.

Wuthering Heights. Directed by Robert Fuest. American International Pictures, 1970.

Wuthering Heights. Directed by William Wyler. Samuel Goldwyn Productions, 1939.

Young-Ellis, Georgina. “Movie Night: JANE EYRE (2011).” *Chicklit Club*, 2011, www.chicklitclub.com/janeeyre-movie.html. Accessed 25 April 2020.