

## **GAPS IN PRACTICE OF LITERATURE INTO FILMS: ANALYSIS THROUGH SELECTED FILM ADAPTATIONS OF *MACBETH***

**Ritu Mohan,**

Ph.D. Scholar (English)

Department of Management and Humanities,  
Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering and Technology  
(A Govt. of India Established CFTI & Deemed University),  
Longowal, Dist.: Sangrur, Punjab, India

**Mahesh Kumar Arora,**

Associate Professor

Department of Management and Humanities,  
Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering and Technology  
(A Govt. of India Established CFTI & Deemed University),  
Longowal, Dist.: Sangrur, Punjab, India

### **Abstract**

The present paper discusses the interrelation of literature and films. Though both literature and films are different mediums and use separate techniques – they share a close relationship. Both affect each other, affect the society and affected by the society as well. When a director chooses a piece of literature for his/her film he/she has to face a lot of questions towards faithfulness or fidelity. The practice of literature into films however provides him/her with possibilities of insertion of his own creativity. During this process there arises some ‘gaps’ or ‘differences’ which are matter of exploration. These gaps or differences are discussed in this paper with instances from selected film adaptations of *Macbeth*. How these directors (belong to various culture, time and geographical locations) interpret and represent Shakespearean leitmotifs in their respective films set for their ‘target’ audience is discussed in brief. The selection of film adaptations for this paper is limited to *Macbeth* by Orson Welles (USA, 1948), *Throne of Blood* by Akira Kurosawa (Japan, 1957), *Macbeth* by Roman Polanski (UK, 1971), *Maqbool* by Vishal Bhardwaj (India, 2004), and *Macbeth* by Geoffrey Wright (Australia, 2006). While supplying the comments and findings on Shakespeare’s ‘afterlife’ through film-adaptations, some considerable suggestions towards the study of literature–film relationship are also given.

## Introduction

A novel or a short story selected by a director for filming offers a challenge to him to make the writer's work at least as powerful, as credible, as popular as appealing on film as it already is in its original literary form. The film medium, in this way, gives a good opportunity to a good director to present an alternative viewpoint to his viewers from what the novelist or short story writer originally did. This can be done through a slight shift of focus.

There could be a time-lapse between the time when the story was written and when the film is being made. There can be socio-economic-political changes taking place in the real life around. Neither the writer nor the filmmaker can do his 'work' in isolation with these changes. These situations and circumstances force the writer and filmmaker to 'see' and 'show' within a certain frame. The film, in fact, is a larger piece of work than a novel because a film uses the technological tools to bring the story alive on screen and create a living ambience through sound, light, actors, music, editing, dialogue, costume etc. It, therefore, limits the scope of the viewer to exercise his imaginative and creative powers unlike what the novel does to its reader. A film adaptation however, at its very best, is not lesser work of creativity than the original book. Of course literature expresses reality, but film expresses this reality in reality.

A reader's rejoinder to a literary work arises from the "gaps" that he discovers in the differing visions of a text. These "gaps" provide a reader an opportunity to make his own bridges. A number of texts bear more "gaps" than others and Shakespeare's plays bear an intrinsic pliability that makes them ample to an eclectic array of elucidations. A film director also tries to discover these "gaps" for he himself is a reader before becoming a director. In his role as a reader/audience he comes to know what a common reader/ audience want from a film when it is adapted from a celebrated text.

In this situation what should be done can be answered by George Bluestone's statement from his book *Novels into Films* where he says:

I have assumed, and attempted to demonstrate, that the two media are marked by such essentially different traits that they belong to separate artistic genera. Although novels and films of a certain kind do reveal a number of similarities...one finds the differentia more startling. More important, one finds the differentia infinitely more problematic to the film-maker. These distinguishing traits follow primarily from the fact that the novel is a linguistic medium, the film essentially visual. (1957: vi)

Bluestone thinks that when a moving picture approaches us openly through perception, language must be filtered through the screen of conceptual concern. It would outcome as an unavoidable desertion of novelistic components to the fact where the new formation has slight similarity to the source. Amidst his renowned opinions are that even the simplest linguistic tropes are challenging to transmit to film, that departing of textual characters is disappointing, that psychological situations cannot be as sufficiently characterized by film as by language, and that the novel has three tenses, the film only one.

The fidelity deliberation is crucial to the adaptation inquiry. From audiences to critics, fidelity is a preliminary idea for scrutiny of adaptations. Approximately each critic on adaptation starts with suing that other critics are wedged in a too artless dialogue that entails complete fidelity. It is quite difficult however to find a contemporary critic who vigorously advocates the notion that fidelity is obligatory.

This approach possibly crawls into a tête-à-tête but for the maximum portion, neither present critics nor audiences appear to entail complete trust in adaptation. Hence what is more

important question here is how and why dissimilarities take place in the source text and its filmic adaptation? If a film adaptation is not truthful to the source, what are the reasons behind that? There exists a substantial relationship between literature and films. But it is fact that this relationship is limited due to certain differences. Scholars have identified the grounds behind this difference. While studying those grounds it can be recognized why adaptation manoeuvres the audiences and why it is repeatedly put on trial by the critics. In order to understand this literature–film difference properly, we can start with the choice of audiences and a list can be made of the causes behind it.

In his thesis titled “Adaptation of Novels into Film: A Comprehensive New Framework for Media Consumers and Those Who Serve Them”, submitted in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Neil Hollands provides that there are four major types of these reasons. The four major types of differences are: Personal; Creative; Formal and, Environmental. These four major types, according to him, can further divided into 14 sub–categories. The personal difference may vary from audience to audience. The creative differences stem from the writers and the filmmakers. Formal differences are raised from the nature of customary forms of literature and feature film.

The fourth major reason – the environmental is maintained by the outer world. Hollands further classifies these reason where he discusses three personal differences, one creative difference, six formal differences, and four environmental differences (2002: 29). All these factors highlight the audiences’ beliefs towards a film adaptation. Since films are made primarily for the audiences it in necessary to study the audiences’ side before discussing the critics’ point of view. The personal differences are simple. They depends upon specific choice and, as Hollands notes, are based on “the majority of individual situations, there is no comparison of book with film because an individual only experiences one of the two forms” (ibid). The statistical study on this is the assessment of combined averages, not specific creating straight assessments. In these circumstances, if any comparison is found, it is due to the second–hand interpretations from the media or other individuals. As a result it may happen that many audiences/readers sidestep a film if they have read the text or vice versa.

The second type of personal differences is that some audiences/readers have a wide preconception for or against a certain work – either film or book. It can emerge from social elitism, common inclination for reading or watching, convenience of entrée; force to use each media in individual’s societal milieu, superior instructions about one type of media, incapability to use one media or the other, etc. (ibid. 31). The third type of personal difference can come from one’s personal expectations. It comes from, as Hollands writes, “dissonance between our fantasy version of the work and the second version of the work we experience” (ibid). This difference is really important because when one goes for a book first and creates mental images of some of the characters that considerably vary from those later come across in the film. However it cannot be denied that sometimes he finds the characters of that film superior than those of his own. On the other side, an audience may feel a sense of loss if he goes for the film first and he finds the characters reduced in the novel the film is based upon.

The second major difference is the creative difference which is related with the fidelity debate. Several differences occur between text and film because “fidelity is not always the intention of the adapter” (ibid. 32). While adapting a novel or play according to a particular culture the whole film may go in a different direction. The director may focus on some key incidents of the novel or he may alter the plot or characterization.

For example in Akira Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood* there is only one witch in spite of the three witches of Macbeth. Critics comment that Kurosawa used Lady Asaji (the Lady Macbeth figure) as the second witch. The film considers Lady Asaji responsible what all happened in the film. It is of course Kurosawa's own point of view. Hence the creative differences are usual in an adaptation.

Formal differences – the third major differences – arise from difference in the traditional forms of literature and film for “literature and films have different signifying systems” (ibid. 34). A play or novel pact in words, films in imageries. The films are sensitively influential whereas literature is more intellectual. A novel needs dynamic imagination of scenes and characters, while films entail only passive directness to details of image and sound. In other words, the words are enigmatic but the image is apparent.

Literature uses metaphor, allegory, alliteration, phraseology, syntax, etc. Films, on the other hand, use camera angle, editing, special effects, songs and, dance (ibid). Here it is a chief question that whether or not these diverse set of devices can be used to produce works with a collective outcome. If it is considered that there are huge dissimilarities among the above mentioned signifying systems, it will prove the strong contrasts between literature and film. But some observers find that literature is practically close to films at least in its purpose. The point here is that through his novel or play a writer tries to present an image. Thus the purpose of both is same – to show the image – a clear image. In both a novel and film the characters experience feelings and ideas – they don't just talk and think about them.

It is worth notable that the imageries of both a film and a text are treated mainly in a perspective of meaning and their practice in description is crucial to connotations. Therefore what should care about is not the signifying system but what is signified finally. Consequently the audiences/readers would not have any problem if both film and text have different means but they serve the same ‘meaning’.

The example of *Maqbool* can be considered here. After a lot of alteration in plot and characterization of *Macbeth*, *Maqbool* was admired by spectators as well as critics for it exhibits the essence of its source text that the over ambitiousness always invites sufferings and sleeplessness resulting in death. The stain of sin cannot be washed with any cleanser. The second type of formal differences is based upon the “length and, correspondingly capacity of novels and films” (ibid. 36).

A long book is to be presented in a limited ‘filmic’ time span. The description given in a long paragraph can be shown just in few seconds. On the other side, a short incident can take several minutes. The events of a book may be rearranged in filmic presentation. Some of them could be skipped while some new events may be incorporated to strengthen the narrative. The dialogues may be repeated or to be used at different situations. It depends on the director when a character – taken from book – will die, or may happen that he will not die at all. The director can convey a special message through his film.

For example, in his *Macbeth* film Polanski includes a brief scene as he shows Donalbain visiting the witches' place. It reflects how Polanski identifies man's real nature. Donalbain is depicted with incapacity in one of his legs, a weakness that might lead the viewer guessing a disappointment of character in the king's youngest son. At the time when Malcolm is declared as the Prince of Cumberland by Duncan, only Macbeth is not disappointed. As the camera focuses on Donalbain's expressions, he is intensely envious to his brother and his plans of future can be read on his face. On inserting this concluding extract, Polanski demonstrates the idea that the role of evil is persistent and will end never.

The third kind of formal differences stem from the notion that “novels are mostly an individual creation, while films are created by an industry” (ibid. 38). A film is a result of collaborative efforts. This collaboration includes both the on–screen and off–screen efforts. The actors try to live the characters of the book on–screen. The cameramen, makeup–men, light–men, lyrists, musicians, singers and other off–screen capacity help those actors in their intention. They all try to show on screen what a director want from them. If this collaboration discontinues somewhere, a film fails in creating an impression on the viewers. They in turn go for the book instead of watching one more adaptation. In a play or novel, on the other hand, it is only the author who is responsible for everything.

The fourth major formal difference, as Hollands continues to classify, is that “novel and film handle point of view differently” (39). In a book, point of view can vary from first to third person, from partial cognizance to sagacity. In a film, on the other side, a camera cannot focus on every direction at one time. It does not however mean that a film is one dimensional for the actions of characters of a book is executed through voiceover narration.

For example, we perceive one account of the scene while watching something different. It is done in a dialogue of feelings articulated loudly and, in monologue while an actor talks to the camera. A film–editor edits the scene in way that a close–up of an actor’s face signifies that the subsequent scene is derived from his reminiscences. If the camera demonstrates the actor’s face and/or change in eyes’ movement, succeeding a look at a particular object, it indicates that the actor/character is thinking about that object.

In this way, a close–up shot of an actor’s bodily movements or change in facial expressions can depict the emotional situations. Besides, music/songs help in the description of internal emotions of the actor/character commendably. One more formal difference what Hollands suggests is “the different way novel and film handle tense” (40). It is fact that a play is written three tenses while a film is shown in only one. Even when the film starts with flashback, it goes in present tense. The change in tenses in a film is shown through voiceovers, costumes, background setting, etc.

In addition, another formal differences suggested by Hollands are “formal differences in the methods we use to experience novel and film” (42). Earlier it was used to say that a book provides a chance to its reader to stop or start anywhere, while a film was supposed to be seen in a single sitting. But the facility of pause and resume (including rewinding) overcame it. It was also said that the real enjoyment of a novel/play can be achieved only through continuous reading and we know that sometime we find a text so interesting that we finish it in just single sitting.

Nonetheless it cannot be ignored that some (if not all) books provides intellectual and meaningful experience if they are read in solitude (no or less discussions during reading). A film, on the contrary, could be more gratifying during group viewership. The common point among them is that after both the experiences – reading a book and watching a film – we like to discuss about them. After the above discussion it can be found that in some situations the formal differences may be much notable for film–critics and authors rather than the audiences; it is fact that these differences provides a platform to study the mechanism how literature and films work and thereby affect the adaptation literature a lot.

The fourth and last major types of differences suggested by Hollands are Environmental differences. The first environmental differences are Economic differences, which require that “most films aim at a mass audience, while books can be targeted at a demographic group” (43).

A work of literature can make money only if is bought by millions of readers. A film however can make the same (or more) amount of money only easily.

Needless to say, film making is of course a big-budget job, but book publishing also needs a lot of money. A book may be written for a set of readers. Even if the book is written for a common reader, it cannot be expected that the book surely will get a mass readership. Most of the films (if not all, e.g. art films) are produced with an entertainment point of view. Therefore a film producer hires popular director(s), cinematographers, actors, musicians, lyricists and, other supporting staff, approaches to film distributors in order to ensure mass spectatorship. Even piracy, a colossal problem affecting every producer at present, helps in boosting the viewership. The second type of Environmental difference are based on that “the whole films are happier and glamorous than novels” (44).

It is common among the directors of adaptations that they simplify the plots, glamorize the characters, and insert the romanticism/melodrama with a happy ending. An author does not necessarily oversimplify the plot and other events if doesn't not feel it from inside. He tries to show what he wants indeed. A film director, unlike an author, shows what the audiences want. The third kind of Environmental difference is that “conditions in the publishing or film industries can affect adaptations” (45).

The hunt for turnover is resulted as huge differences in many adaptations. In order to decrease in cost, some essential characters may be changed or reduced to a small role. It also may happen that an additional character can be created to incorporate an unfitting but popular actor (star) to boost the collection at Box-office. It is also observed that the media firms which runs both – the film company and publishing house as well – publishing novels of ‘filmic’ nature and creating ‘novelizations’ of films.

The fourth type of Environmental differences stem from “conditions in the socio-political environment that affect the content and acceptance of adaptations” (46). It is associated closely to the idea which is discussed previously, as repeatedly industry acuity of the socio-political atmosphere regulates adaptation more than that real setting. The readers and spectators therefore must have cognizance of environmental differences for these differences can control what is accessible to them. They should also make themselves aware about the working style of media firms and information agencies.

All the four major (fourteen in all) differences identified by Hollands foreground the choice of audiences and their approach towards literature and its film adaptations. This approach is the ground on which a film director makes changes. These differences in the choice of audiences affect the whole adaptation process at large.

Notwithstanding all these dissimilarities there exists a substantial association between literature and films. It cannot however deny that among film critics there is a tendency of aiming on differences while writing about film adaptations. Despite the differences that occur due to alterations in plot, characterization and language, an adaptation will be called successful if the ‘core’ of source text is not missing.

Almost all of the adapters of *Macbeth* have tried to maintain the soul of the play. Geoffrey Wright, for example, presents three school-girls as three witches. One may object on this alteration that how far it is right to portray adolescent girls as witches. But as the film proceeds, the girls show their reality. They made an orgy with Macbeth and instigate him to murder his Boss. One can understand that if these girls are roaming in graveyard in school time, they are looking for their target of that day.

There is a reciprocated advantage that literature and film gain from each other's existence. They support each other to approach a mass viewership. The film succours the book discover new readers in a new generation. Through this practice a writer can become a part of social site for long time. It would not be wrong to say that Shakespeare is in existence through the translations and adaptations of his plays. After 400 years if he is still contemporary, adaptations have contributed at large in it.

Time and Technology are major factors for development of a film through with an old play is reimagined and repurposed. They bring the plays or parts/scenes of the plays into vivacious rendezvous. It may, however, sometimes collusive, sometimes striking engagement with what have been shaped from those plays with the passage of time. There are several advantages of analyzing Shakespeare's plays and their film adaptations as a candid arena of scholarship underneath the canopy of Shakespeare studies. As Rudolf Arnheim asserts for both film and film criticism itself:

The contemporary film critic, must, since he deals with such new things, operate in just the opposite manner from the paleontologists, who deals with the ancient. He must pre-construct film art from occasional fossilizations, from impressions of sometimes not very noble parts; the laws of construction with which the films of future will perhaps, in happy moments, completely comply must also be applied to contemporary film. The "Shakespeare of film" is yet to come, but the laws of his work already apply today. Without exception. Even to good films. (1997: 194)

The reason why Shakespeare's plays remain to have a universal influence even after four hundred years is that readers and spectators world-over can understand and transmute the plays to suit a specific locale. It can be understood that the supreme testimony of Shakespeare's widespread entreaty is the vast range of critical and innovative versions of Shakespeare that have accrued over the past four centuries. This huge organization of work, which comprises dramas, poetries, novels, short stories, movies, enactments, painting, and abundant quantities of literary criticism, is usually recognized as Shakespeare's "Afterlife" (Flaherty 2011: 3).

To study Shakespeare's afterlife is to study in what means Shakespeare links historic and national borders as every succeeding generation has made his plays their individual. A study of Shakespeare's Afterlife shows that the temperament to construe and reshape cultural communication in one's personal image could be a mutual humanoid retort that unintentionally discloses cultural dissimilarities as well as matches. Scholarship in Shakespeare's Afterlife is about more than just understanding Shakespeare – they are about understanding understandings of Shakespeare. Critical and social reactions to Shakespeare can be read in discourse with Shakespeare's work themselves.

*Macbeth* is a tragedy about how power destroys people who don't deserve it and are not ready for it. In both– Shakespeare and all the film versions of *Macbeth* it is seen that links between power and gender are retained but portrayed differently in order to cater to a contemporary audience. In all of the productions studied (for this paper), the meanings and values expressed are the same (greed, guilt and ambition) but the medium of production is adapted to the audience (in order to cater to the respective social contexts).

The contemporary progressions in film adaptations of Shakespeare are obstinately apocalyptic by nature. They repeatedly follow the dichotomous sense of "previousness" and "aftermath" innate in apocalyptic scholarship. After assessing the relationship between Shakespeare's plays and their contemporary screen versions, we find a radical departure from

20<sup>th</sup> century appropriations of Shakespeare. Those appropriations often (if not always) tend to be “faithful” or “close” to their source texts.

The reasons behind are strong ones among them the Political and Economic are major. Still, while studying the developing adaptation approaches and cultural concerns, Shakespeare’s film assists as an expedient preliminary notion as far as the analysis of the treatment of certain ideas (like previousness” and “aftermath) is concerned. In order to redefine and reconnect the Elizabethan aesthetics and echoes to contemporary milieu, the recent adaptations present new methodologies of production and interpretation according to modern culture.

Whereas Welles transforms Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* into an Expressionistic morality play and Kurosawa transmutes it into a Japanese parable, Roman Polanski’s *Macbeth* takes Macbeth at his own words. ‘Life ... is a tale ... signifying nothing.’ The polish director transforms the tragedy into a cruel and absurd nightmare that perpetually repeats itself. Like his countryman Jan Kott, Polanski presents us the world as a never–ending cycle of gratuitous violence and murder determined by an inscrutable ‘Grand Mechanism’ of whose central metaphor is blood and whose agents are demons in human form.

To underpin this message, Polanski adds an epilogue to the play. We see an abandoned stone ruin in the pouring rain and hear the sound of sour bagpipes and discordant strings which we recognize as the signature tune for the Wired Sisters. A rider approaches and lifts his hood; it is Donalbain, Malcolm’s disenfranchised and crippled brother. Curious about the sounds he hears, he dismounts and limps around the ruin in the direction of smoke and keening emanating from the witches’ cave. Cut to the rider–less horse: dissonant chimes and a heavy drum grow louder as the credits appear on the screen. The murderous cycle can begin again. The witches have virtually the final word. Like everything else in this film, they are concretely real. Despots may come and go, but the witches will remain, and they live in a nearby cave.

The significant dramatic potential arising from the cinematic production of such a world exists in what it releases through its denial to express. In its liberation from intrinsic moral judgement, action is exposed to the irrational response of instinct. There is no uncertainty that Welles’s *Macbeth* finds his own action impulsively revolting and horrifying. Consequently, we are not presented with a *Macbeth* dissociated from us because of his action, but one who remains human because of his innate and emotional power; a *Macbeth* ‘who stumbles in his crime, but in whom we nonetheless sense an enigmatic stimulus of innocence and something like the possibility of elegance and salvation.

While it is true that Welles introduces the Christian stance both in spoken prologue and visually, there is not sufficient evidence to show that he really knew how to integrate it. Despite the inclusion of a character not part of Shakespeare’s play, the Holy Father, there is no cinematically strong Christian statement in the film. Indeed the film works much better without any such statement, for the symbols are too readily evocative of a traditional philosophy of morality and they are too dynamic in their associative power the Christian infusion in the film has a historic rather than a philosophical function.

Kurosawa’s film function within more strictly measured conventions than do Welles’s Shakespeare’s films, but their presentation of dramatic opposition is very similar in concept. The films of Welles and Kurosawa affirm their dramatic conflicts through naturally different spatial elements, and through the spatial development of distinct realms.

The portrayal of witches in Bhardwaj’s film as police officers is an acute satire on government and system. The policemen, of whom the principal and moral duty is to protect the citizens and terminate the criminals, they are indulged with underworld. They are working not



for public but for a gangster. They make predictions for him and suggest him how to play with system. And when an honest police officer tries to punish the gangsters he is transferred at a distant place. The local government help the underworld don in order to win the elections. In this way, the police, the criminals and, the government are jointly befooling the citizens.

The witchcraft and astrology is dominating instead of law and order. Bhardwaj's acute parody on criminals-police-politicians' nexus through *Maqbool* does not foreground the earthly truth of Mumbai only, all this is a common practice in several other parts of India. One more problematic point that *Maqbool* presents is that one at one place Muslims are considered as minorities in India, on the other hand they are the representative of underworld. Almost all the characters in *Maqbool* belong to Muslim community. They are fully bearded; wear traditional Muslim clothing and use heavy Urdu vocabulary. Even the film industry (Bollywood) is under their control.

Kurosawa is one of the few film-directors to adapt Shakespeare, whose filmic descriptions ensure the solidity and supremacy of Shakespeare's poetic imageries, who realizes his duty in transformation equally into a new culture and into a new medium. His *Throne of Blood* is well occupied with lyrical gesticulation, lovely structures, and theatrical influence. Kurosawa pledges the key leitmotifs and struggles of the movie, and presents a stimulating Japanese interpretation/appropriation of Shakespeare's image of the supernatural entities.

Kurosawa has attempted to maintain the nous of poetic within the dialogues. The cultural and situational changes made by him while translating the source text in order to fit it according to his culture does not spoil Shakespearean poetic. He has tried to make a linking amongst Shakespeare's (medieval) Scotland, medieval Japan and existing society. His portrayal of Lady Macbeth as Asaji equates her with the forest spirit. It appears they are the echoes of each other. Kurosawa displays that Asaji is darker and more ambitious than that of Shakespeare's. Kurosawa replaces only witch with the three of *Macbeth* – it seems she was already prepared for everything and just waiting for a signal from outside. She is free from any fear of consequences. She is nowhere shown having human (or womanly) emotions. She doesn't commit suicide at the end of the film for according to Japanese samurai tradition, committing suicide means retribution of one's sins or foul deeds. When she doesn't not bother about any magnitude of her activities, how she could commit suicide. Kurosawa in this way presents her as a full-fledge forth witch residing in a world where every debauched thing happen under feminine clout.

Since Bhardwaj's *Maqbool* was full of popular Bollywood masala ingredients he inserts a romantic note while portraying Duncan as Abbaji. In almost every film adaptation of *Macbeth*, Duncan is murdered sleeping lonely. But in Bhardwaj's version *Maqbool* shoots him while sleeping with his mistress – Nimmi. For Nimmi is portrayed as mistress of both – Abbaji and *Maqbool*, she is behind almost everything. There is scene when she is suffering from madness, she asks *Maqbool* whether their love was scared. The point here is that it was 'love' (or 'lust') that murdered their sleep. *Maqbool* did everything for Nimmi and she did everything for *Maqbool*.

### Conclusions

Since there are no set rules with regard to adaptation of a literary work to cinema – the only rule that one can apply is that film is a different medium from literature and therefore has to be viewed as an independent entity. In fact it is not correct even to compare a film with the original literary piece and say that it has failed in comparison with the literary work. Rather the complexity and the intricacies of cinema as an audio-visual medium as opposed to a literary medium have to be borne in mind.

Their positive co-relations can provide new heights to both the literature and the film. Therefore, the significance of this transformation of a text's structure calls for an explanation, not from a purist's point of view but from the point of view of ideology and culture. Such questions from a sociological, cultural and ideological point of view do not remove the aura of art from films. But they permit a film maker to choose and to make change in the chosen piece of literature as part of the discourse of the society at a particular time. Once it is accepted the view that film and literature have their independent existence, with their individual discipline and logic and decoding of denotations and connotations then there would not be any problem in approaching the two media in right perspective. Then argument like what is original and secondary, how far the film adaptation has been true to the original work or/whether or not done justice to it – all this become redundant. The involvement of the two authors in making use of their respective media in expressing their thoughts most effectively becomes the focal point for a vital discussion.

The analysis of the selected film versions of *Macbeth* endorses that the political, artistic, and personal intensions of the different adapters are feasibly pertinent to the audience's interpretation. They are frequently recoverable, and their traces are evident in the text. The adapters generally feel some specific kinship or some connections with the creative disposition or obsessions of the author of the source text they pick to adapt; then they choose a certain medium in which to disclose that fluke of purpose. In the act of adapting selections are made centered on numerous aspects comprising genre concords, political engagement, and personal as well as civic history. These choices are made in an innovative as well as a revelatory framework that is philosophical, societal, chronological, ethnic, subjective, and aesthetic. It is also observed that extra-textual avowals of determination are included in film adaptations in order to round out the audiences' sense of the context of the creation.

### Works Consulted and Cited

- Arnheim, Rudolf. "Answer" in *Film Essays and Criticism*. Trans. Brenda Benthien. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.
- Baraunmuller, A.R. (ed.) *The New Cambridge Shakespeare: Macbeth*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1957.
- Fuery, Patrick. *New Developments in Film Theory*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000.
- Gaby, Rosemary. "Dunsinane, Mount Macedon: Geoffrey Wright's Melbourne Macbeth (2006)." *Australian Studies*. Vol. 4 (2012): 1–12.
- Hollands, Neil. *Adaptation of Novels into Film: A Comprehensive New Framework for Media Consumers and Those Who Serve Them*. Master's Degree. Thesis. April, 2002. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Macbeth. Dir. Geoffrey Wright. 2006. Film.
- Macbeth. Dir. Orson Welles. 1948. Film.
- Macbeth. Dir. Roman Polanski. 1971. Film.
- Maqbool. Dir. Vishal Bhardwaj. 2004. Film.
- Marowitz, Charles. "Cinematizing Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 22.2 (2004): 67–81.
- Rosenthal, Daniel. *Shakespeare on Screen*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth*. New Delhi: Peacock Books, 2008.
- Throne of Blood. Dir. Akira Kurosawa. 1957. Film.