

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLMOUCI

Filozofická fakulta

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Daniela Vojková

**Film Adaptations of the Novel *Pride and Prejudice*
by Jane Austen**

Bakalářská práce

Studijní obor: Angličtina se zaměřením na aplikovanou
ekonomii

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Ema Jelínková, Ph.D.

Olomouc 2011

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne

.....

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my supervisor Mgr. Ema Jelínková, Ph.D. for her guidance, patience, and valuable advice, with which she provided me while I was writing my thesis.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. An Interaction Between Literature and Film.....	3
2.1 Why Adapt (Not Only) Jane Austen.....	7
2.2 Without Pride and Prejudices – Criticism of the Adaptations.....	10
2.3 Transformation of Jane Austen for the Screen.....	16
3. Pride and Prejudice – the novel.....	19
3.1 Background and Origin of the Novel.....	19
3.2 Acceptance of the Novel.....	20
4. Pride and Prejudice on the Screen.....	21
4.1 The Overview.....	21
4.2 The Early Adaptations.....	24
4.3 BBC Adaptations.....	25
4.4 The Latest Adaptation.....	27
5. Study of the Adaptations.....	28
5.1 Specific Elements of Each Adaptation.....	28
5.1.1 The 1940 Film.....	28
5.1.2 The 1980 BBC Mini-Series.....	35
5.1.3 The 1995 BBC Mini-Series.....	38
5.1.4 The 2005 Film.....	43
5.2 The Importance of Being Darcy.....	51
5.3 Becoming Elizabeth Bennet.....	58
5.4 The Comparison of Selected Scenes.....	63

5.4.1 The Beginning.....	63
5.4.2 The Ending.....	67
5.4.3 The First Marriage Proposal.....	72
6. Conclusion.....	77
7. Summary.....	81
8. Abstract.....	89
9. Bibliography.....	90
9.1 Works Cited.....	90
9.2 Cited Films and Serials.....	98
10. Compared Films.....	99
11. List of Enclosures.....	102

1. Introduction

“One doesn’t read Jane Austen; one re-reads Jane Austen.”

William F. Buckley, Jr.

It is beyond any doubt that Jane Austen represents one of the most popular, respected and beloved authors in the English language. Her novels are literary classics that have been translated into numerous languages and are cherished by all generations throughout the world. Austen’s almost two centuries old work is considered timeless, foremost due to her unique style of writing, based mainly on a brisk, effortless dialogue with funny, crisp rejoinders and unique, precisely portrayed characters. As an experienced Hollywood screenwriter, she manages to blend love, relationships, ironical humour and pleasantries with apt psychological remarks, and at the same time never lapses into a chocolate-box sentiment. With all this, it is hard to believe that the author belongs with her life into the 18th and the 19th century.

For decades, she has been an unflinching inspiration for filmmakers, who, without restraint, continue to adapt her books for the silver screen. The principal aim of this thesis is to analyze and further compare the film and television adaptations that have been made so far of her, what is probably the best-known and simultaneously the most adapted work, *Pride and Prejudice*. This analysis is subsequently followed by the interpretation of picked scenes. The final comparison shall consider the time of the particular adaptation’s origination.

Because adaptations based on celebrated novels have always drawn attention, the position of a movie picture tends to be complicated by certain, and definitely not negligible, expectations from the audience. In the first part of my work, I would like to give a general overview of such expectations, demonstrate possible advantages, disadvantages and key elements of interaction between film

and literature. I will also propose possible obstacles and challenges which filmmakers must overcome. The thesis argues that when adapting a classical novel, some alterations to the original are inevitable and even welcomed; as these alterations are part of a natural process of bringing period text closer to modern audience. Furthermore, the thesis also attempts to answer the questions, why is Jane Austen so widely popular among filmmakers, and what are the principal motives for it. The intention is also to outline a brief theoretical background for the study of the adaptations. Finally, I will provide several different methods and approaches when transforming a novel for the screen.

The main goal of the second part is to introduce the origin of the novel *Pride and Prejudice*. The chapter also mentions some of the early critical comments of the book and its acceptance after the publishing.

The last, however the most important and essential chapter is dedicated to *Pride and Prejudice* on screen. Firstly, the thesis is concerned with a general summary of the various types of adaptations of *Pride and Prejudice* that had been made in the past. Then, it divides the adaptations into films made for the big screen and those, which had been made for television. The work explores in detail the four currently available adaptations of the book and tries to dissect them more deeply. It questions to what extent the adaptations are authentic to the book, what alterations and omissions had been made, and what specific elements each adaptation has. Afterwards, the thesis focuses closely on the concrete scenes in adaptations in comparison with the book. These scenes include the beginning, the ending, and the first marriage proposal. In addition, it also concentrates on the significance of the actors portraying the lead characters – Elizabeth Bennet and Fitzwilliam Darcy, in terms of their performances and the impression they make on the audience.

All in all, the aim of this work is to objectively examine and evaluate the mentioned film adaptations and consider their faithfulness in comparison with the novel. The objective is also to substantiate, that as the film industry moves forward, serial and film adaptations of popular literature, and not

necessarily only the nineteenth-century novels, are presented to the current audience with changes that are inescapable and tenable.

2. An Interaction Between Literature and Film

The relationship between literature and film is to a certain extent very close. And the adaptation serves as a notional bridge between them. Since the birth of cinematography, filmmakers have been attracted by literature and dramatical works to transformation. But it is by far not only Jane Austen, who has been the source of inspiration for movies sponsored by large film studios and television. The last couple of decades have presented a large-scale expansion of literature classics adapted into film, and the number is still increasing. Further, in the last ten years, another connection of literature and film, and thus a new range of adaptations has been presented. This new connection is the fantasy and children novels which were made into blockbuster films. All of these have a great potential to attract the audience, especially because of their special effects, rich settings and evident ambitions which directly call for sequels, prequels and spin-offs.

Generally, the term “adaptation”¹ stands for a certain kind of transposition of a piece of work without considerable alterations or changes in the overall finish. The original theme, as well as its language and composition should remain unchanged and interpreted with the help of appropriate means. A film adaptation is about transferring a literal, possibly dramatical work into the final form of a movie picture.

Film and literature are two independent art forms, yet as was already mentioned, they share multiple characteristics. As Sue Parrill points out, the principal difference lies in “the additional elements of picture and sound in which the filmmaker may reveal theme and character and move the action forward

¹ From Latin *adaptatio*

by means other than language” (10). Christine Geraghty offers another view of the basic difference between novels and films:

Novels are verbal and use words while films are visual and rely on images; novels can express internal knowledge of a character, but screen adaptations have to imply feelings or motivations from a character’s actions since the camera is best suited to the objective recording of physical appearance. (2)

One of the other crucial differences is the concept of time when discussing a film and a book. George Bluestone comments on the chronological time: “The novel has three tenses, namely duration of the reading, duration of the narrator’s time and the span of the narrative events. The film has only one and that is the duration of the viewing and the time-span of the narrative events” (48-49).

Louise Flavin emphasizes a vital distinction when “translating” film and a motion picture. “We ‘read’ into film values, ideas, attitudes, concepts, and arguments beyond what is visually displayed. In the same way we ‘see’ in a novel the places, faces, figures, etc., that are linguistically presented. We read the film and view the novel” (5).

Flavin’s observation also in a sense indicates that to properly evaluate and appreciate a film, our attention is pointed towards different but no less important components of each of the two art forms. Nevertheless, some might still insist that film makes fewer demands, mainly on imagination and perception than a book does. Though Brian McFarlane states that, “on the page we have to ‘translate’ lines of black marks that constitute words, phrases, clauses and sentences into conceptual images,” there are always two sides of a coin. As he adds, “the film, if it is to make any serious impact on us, will require that we pay attention to the interaction of *mise-en-scène*,² the editing and sound” (16).

In his book, Timothy Corrigan states that the history of the relationship between film and literature is a history of “ambivalence, confrontation, and mutual

² *Mise-en-scène* is a French term, which literally means “put in the scene.” For a film, it refers to almost everything that goes into the composition of the shot, including the composition itself: framing, movement of the camera and characters, lighting, set design and general visual.

dependence” (1). It is not surprising then, that film theorists have tried to establish a taxonomy by which to categorize film adaptations. There are many different ways of making an adaptation, from almost a word-to-word transposition to the entirely loose adaptation which uses only several particular motives from the original work. Geoffrey Wagner has divided adaptations into three categories: “transposition,” in which the film directly follows the novel; “commentary,” in which the novel is altered slightly for purposes of film; and “analogy,” which uses the novel as a point of departure (222-226).

While most of the Austen’s work turned into movies are transpositions it is, especially nowadays, a very popular tendency, in an effort to reach a younger audience, to utilize the third form of an adaptation, that is analogy. To realize a modern version of an original story, is these days more than common. The screenwriter draws on parallels of plot and characters and the scene is set in a present day. As Jocelyn Harris suggests, modern film audiences include many young people “ignorant of Jane Austen, so directors often try to make their films universally attractive through visual detail and occasional modern reference, as we have seen” (50).

Among these types of adaptations which have been rather successful is for example Amy Heckerling’s *Clueless* (1995). It is based on Jane Austen’s *Emma*, which the critics generally praised. *Cruel Intentions* (1999), a modern version of Laclos’s eighteenth-century French novel *Dangerous Liaisons*,³ directed by Roger Kumble was also among those highly fruitful at the box-office.

Dudley Andrew came up with another division in relation between the film and the text into three modes, “borrowing, intersection, and fidelity of transformation” (98). This type of classification is more or less similar to Wagner’s sorting. Borrowing uses extensively the idea of an earlier text. In intersection, the original text is preserved to such an extent that it is intentionally left unassimilated in adaptation. In fidelity of transformation, the film is trying to measure up to a literary work.

³ Laclos’s novel has been adapted for the screen also in 1988 by Stephen Frears and in 1989 by Miloš Forman.

When adapting a nineteenth-century novel to a large or small screen, there exist also other type of approach that screenwriters and directors take. This approach depends principally on the visual style, purpose and on the way these appeal to the audience. Linda Troost describes them in this way: “(1) Hollywood-style adaptations, (2) Heritage-style adaptations, and (3) Fusion adaptations” (76). She also mentions the fourth category, “the Imitation,” which uses a novel’s plot and characters but updates the setting to focus on a modern-day highly structured society. We can say that imitation is comparable to the already mentioned analogy.

For example, among adaptations in Hollywood-style belong Nathaniel Hawthorne’s *Scarlett Letter* which was made into a film in 1995, starring Demi Moore as Hester Prynne. This film adaptation, which had not been well received by critics, is stylized to suit the American mainstream audience, where the story and the characters are visualized into more convenient, “polished” image, usually politically correct, with likeable, sympathetic protagonists. To the category of Heritage-style adaptations, which Eckart Voigts-Virchow describes as “recognizable by its high production values, exuding historicity and period authenticity,” (128) pertain adaptations made primarily for television, and which try to create the best authenticity as possible, even sometimes at the expense of an entertainment, which is, on the other hand not really their purpose. Even nowadays, when most of them proved their ability to truly engage, many prenotions rule this category of adaptations. As Sarah Cardwell states:

The group identity of tv classic-novel adaptations has led, somewhat inevitably, to pejorative judgments from scholars and critics. These prejudices include conservative, staid, and unimaginative programming in contrast with cinema’s more vibrant, eclectic, and innovative offerings. (181-182)

Regarding Fusion adaptations, fidelity to the novel is no longer the central point. What is important is an ability to connect with a wide range of spectators, tell a good story and show intriguing images. One could say that these types of adaptations intend to amuse the audience, but at the same time, try to keep certain rules and be faithful to the book as much as possible. Examples might

include Ang Lee's adaptation of *Sense and Sensibility* (1995), starring Emma Thompson and Kate Winslet or Douglas McGrath's *Emma* (1996) with Gwyneth Paltrow as Emma Woodhouse and Jeremy Northam as Mr. Knightley.

One of the key elements of a good film adaptation is undoubtedly a quality script, which on the whole creates the final impression of an adaptation. Parrill adds that "the screenwriter particularly shapes the way the audience will see the adaptation" (12). A good story is therefore also a crucial part of the final result of how the audience will view the film and the actors. Concerning the story, Timothy Corrigan comments on two different conventions of plots: "narrative causality," through which characters' needs and desires motivate events and actions, or a "parallel narrative structure" in which the private lives of the characters entwine with more public or social events (83).

Lastly, it might be useful to introduce basic functional narrative features of a motion picture, "the form and the content." The former can be extracted as the 'story' in terms of actions, causes and effects, and the latter refers to psychological states, attributions of character, description of location and so forth" (Whelehan 10).

2.1 Why Adapt (not only) Jane Austen?

IMDb records that between 1900 and 1975, there were more than 60 radio, television and stage productions of Austen's novels. The first film adaptation was made in the 1940. Since then, almost another 40 movie and television versions were made. Some of them more faithful to the original, some of them less. Some of them highly successful, some of them under fire of critics. Some of them will be remembered forever, some of them are easily forgotten.

But before we look closer at the possible reasons for success of Jane Austen's work, we must understand that film adaptations of literary classic novels, as was mentioned earlier, have become in recent years increasingly popular

with the audience. Let's mention Timothy Corrigan's three possible reasons for such a return:

(1) a reaction against contemporary filmmaking trends to diminish traditional plot and character; (2) a conservative or at least therapeutic turn from cultural complexity; and (3) a reflection of contemporary film audiences and their increasing concern with manner over matter. (72)

Austen's novels had been remarkably sequestered during the 1990's. Before that, until the 90's when a big boom of adaptations of her work was monitored, the 1940 feature film was the only theatrical release. However, in 1995, Ang Lee's *Sense and Sensibility* appeared, as well as the 1995 BBC mini-series of *Pride and Prejudice* and the BBC film *Persuasion* directed by Roger Michell. In 1996, Douglas McGrath directed the film adaptation of *Emma* and in the same year, television film *Emma* with Kate Beckinsale and Mark Strong was made. The Patricia Rozema's movie version of *Mansfield Park* with Frances O'Connor as Fanny Price was introduced in 1999. Such Austen's revival Christine Geraghty explains as a "combination of the classic adaptation's traditional emphasis on costume, landscape, and a familiar plot with a new exploration of a more modern sensibility" (33).

If the success of an adaptation is really massive, it may clearly increase the general demand for the book. As Brian McFarlane points out, "the notion of a potentially lucrative 'property' has clearly been at least one major influence in the filming of novels" (7). From his statement, we can understand that although it is not a rule, movies might raise an interest in public, who may be attracted to buy and subsequently read the book. Although authors like Jane Austen, whose novels have never been out of print since they were first published, do not actually need to support their readership circle, this subject leads us to a positive aspect about making film adaptations. It definitely contributes to the fact that the author does not disappear. As Sue Parrill observes, "it keeps a novelist alive" (8). Teachers have also testified that the films provide 'semi-literate' students a bridge to the novel. As Parrill indicates, "it is a 'gateway' to the novel and students are able to grasp the plot more fully, to engage on a deeper level with characters,

and to remember a greater amount of detail” (8). Of course, this polemic is deceptive and such opinions misleading, not only because students might assume that if there is a film, there is no need to read the novel, and as Parrill points out, “if the teacher uses a film only as a gloss on the novel, the student may not have an appreciation of the film as an independent work of art” (8). Such an uncertainty applies also to the fact that not everyone who enjoyed the film will automatically read the book. And though they may buy it, there is no way to track the number of those who have actually read the novel and possibly finished it.

But let’s get back to Jane Austen, who still remains one of the chief inspirations for filmmakers. We could consider Austen as the leading woman writer who grabs not only women’s attention as the audience but also men’s. Yet, it is still very surprising that even in the third millennium, many of us and not only women still prefer Austen against the competition of 3D technologies, action filled blockbusters and animated fairytales. What is more surprising, as Harriet Margolis states, “we are in a decade in which her name functions like a license to print money” (39). Why does Austen’s name seem to serve as a guarantor of such a success? Many writers have explored the reasons for the popularity of the film adaptations based on Austen’s work. As Julian North remarks:

Austen has become something of a conservative icon in a popular culture: a canonical author whose life and work signify English national heritage and all that implies of the past as an idyll of village life in pre-industrial society, of traditional class and gender hierarchies, sexual propriety and Christian values. (39)

Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield continues that “the concerns at the center of Austen’s plots – sex, romance, and money – are central concerns in our own era” (3). George Bluestone singles out Jane Austen’s novels as particularly well suited for adaptations, especially *Pride and Prejudice*. The attributes of her style are especially conducive to adaptation. “A lack of particularity, an absence of metaphorical language, an omniscient point of view, a dependency on dialogue to reveal character, an insistence on absolute clarity” (118).

In terms of subject matter, Bluestone also notes the remarkable “modernity” of Austen’s novels:

Jane Austen’s preoccupations are still very much with us. The world of *Pride and Prejudice* meets the requirements of Hollywood’s stock conventions and, at the same time, allows a troubling grain of reality to enter by the side door. It depicts a love story which essentially follows the shopworn formula of boy meets girl; boy loses girl; boy gets girl. (144)

This “modernity” leads us to another point of view, and that is the perspective of film studios and Hollywood production. As Sue Parrill writes, “adaptations of these novels can make sense. They tell good stories, which are still appealing” (3). Andrew Davies, the screenwriter of the 1995 BBC version of *Pride and Prejudice* answers the question, why is Jane Austen almost perfect to adapt: “Everything works. And not only just the plot, but if she said the apple trees were in blossom, you would be bang in the right month, all those kind of things work perfectly.”⁴ Harriet Margolis continues: “One reason Austen can deliver so many members of her potential audience is that the ideological worldview that she offers can be presented, however modified, in our own terms” (39). We can therefore suggest that however might the film industry change in the next couple of years or even decades, the potential spectators will always be interested in peeping into Jane Austen’s world – in a special way charming and engrossing, with memorable characters and most importantly, a happy ending. And it is good to know that there are still those, who will get back to the classic like Jane Austen.

2.2 Without Pride and Prejudices - Criticism of the Adaptations

Adaptations of books to screen will always be controversial. Everyone has their own ideas about how people should look, dress and behave, and no film crew will ever be able to please every fan completely. Although many sceptics will condemn

⁴ Deborah Cartmell, and Imelda Whelehan, “A Practical Understanding of Literature on Screen: Two Conversations with Andrew Davies,” *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*, ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 248.

the adaptation, even without seeing it first, their curiosity to know what happens when the characters appear alive in front of their eyes is greater. Each and everyone of us who goes to see a movie based on a book has certain expectations based on their own apprehension of the original text or the emotional response to it.

Besides that, many critics, publicists, writers, and scholars dedicate themselves to a more systematic study of the two media and their comparison. As Brian McFarlane points out, “it is an adaptation that in a relationship between film and literature persistently occupies the theorist, the critic, the reviewer, the buff and the ordinary filmgoer alike” (15). But we could hardly find a film adaptation which always fulfills all the possible demands and expectancy from those previously named. Certain objections and disagreements will always occur, from common impartial viewers, as well as literary critics. Among the most severe criticisms are probably the “Janeites,”⁵ who will always repine against them, irrespective of how justifiable it might be. Their protests may be shortened into a general phrase: “It was not as good as the book!”

So what makes a good adaptation anyway? Audience permanently compare the novel with the result appearing on the screen, though it is not possible to give any objective evaluation, primarily because of many other important factors that come into play. And the scale of the demands made on filmmakers is pretty comprehensive and complex. There are many assumptions against the adaptations. The general one is that a film can generally never reach the quality of a book. Film has always been viewed as a more shallow medium that cannot equal the intensity, subtlety and integrity of a novel.

Another problem arises, when the viewer starts to think about the fidelity to the original. Which is according to many critics the most tiresome issue. Harriet Margolis talks about “changes as marketing devices and capitulations

⁵ Janeites are people, who share their common interest in Jane Austen and manifest it by discussing her work and life, or travelling around places connected to her person. The term was first used by the critic, George Saintsbury, in an introduction to 1894 new edition of *Pride and Prejudice*.

to the conventions of late twentieth-century visual storytelling” (34). Sue Parrill summarizes it by saying that fidelity to the story, the characters, the ideas, and the language is the main criterion. Some critics feel that since the film is not exactly the same as the book, it is not only inferior, but amounts to criminal trespass” (7).

Timothy Corrigan describes fidelity as a “differential notion that purportedly measures the extent to which a work of literature has been accurately recreated as a movie” (31). Dudley Andrew further explains the relations of fidelity of adaptation:

Fidelity of adaptation is conventionally treated in relation to the “letter” and to the “spirit” of the text. The letter includes the characters and their inter-relation, the geographical, sociological, and cultural information providing the fiction’s context. More difficult is fidelity to the spirit, to the original’s tone, values, imagery, and rhythm. It has been argued variously that this is frankly impossible. (100)

It seems clear therefore that the subject of fidelity is an insidious one. The filmmaker cannot please all, and such a “fault” often results in general disappointment. So is it better to faithfully transform a literary work or is it better to just capture the spirit of the text? From the other point of view, remaining true to the original text cannot always be an assurance of a better result than if a screenwriter only borrows the “keystone” of a novel while modifying diverse shifts and alterations. The potential of the two media is dissimilar and the limits and possibilities are different. And we have to keep in mind that a movie should be made to be comprehensible to a mass audience. As Louise Flavin argues, “the demands of appealing to a large and diverse contemporary audience and turning a profit at the box office mean that the film must be altered, condensed, and modernized” (5). A story editor Samuel Marx defends adaptation and the changes done to the original text:

I do not see why people who are going to adapt books need to be that respectful of material that was written for the mind of the reader, not for movie producers who want to appeal to the eyes and ears of a movie audience. Because of the change in audience, other changes must be made. (32)

Peter Brooker also proposes that fidelity is not always a warranty of success and defends the opposite approach of screenwriters by saying that: “Fidelity can only mean literal repetition, and deluded because a judgement of success or failure is clearly dependent on differently situated strategies of interpretation” (108). All in all, it seems that the most apt conclusion when debating about fidelity is that written by Joseph Epstein:

Perhaps the time has come to lower our expectations about movies, the vast majority of which, let us face it, are on the level of comic books. True, every so often, through a concatenation of the mad and the inexplicable, everything comes together and a swell movie results. When it does, it doesn't figure to have anything to do with being faithful to the work on which it's based or for that matter on anything else. It's magic, baby, pure magic. (16)

In connection with fidelity, there is also another aspect examined in the adaptations. Jocelyn Harris suggests that it is necessary to ask an important question: “When we speak of fidelity to Jane Austen, whose Jane Austen are we talking about? Jane Austen's Jane Austen, or the individual reader's?” (45). And she continues: “If it is true that readers construct meanings, how can directors possibly be ‘faithful’ to every one of them? If no one reading can be ‘right,’ whose reading should directors follow” (45-46)? Which is an issue closely related to a general question of fidelity, rising with the individual apprehension and perception of what is passing on the screen while we are watching the film. As Brian McFarlane points out, “it is always a matter for the reader of responding to the words on the page in their varying degrees of complexity and verisimilitude” (23). In other words, what one sees, the other can see differently, thus our responses, feelings and notions vary, and we can suggest that it is impossible to oblige everyone.

Another concern which is a target of the criticism and which is connected to our individual visual sense is that the readers often form in their minds strong visual conceptions of the setting and characters so that in the final result, nothing will gratify them. As Sue Parrill observes, “readers visual conceptions of Elizabeth Bennet are sometimes so strong that no actress can live up to their expectations”

(7). And Timothy Corrigan adds that “a character’s appearance, which is originally grounded in words or in a reader’s imagination is a frequent source of confusion or dissatisfaction in measuring a film against its literary source” (81). So the choice of actors can be extremely important, mainly if the producers decide to invest in a big star, which might not always prove to be rewarding.

The next problem relates to the actual length of a movie. It is obvious that the scope of a novel does not invariably allow its detailed transcription into a visual medium. Moreover, every film adaptation is primarily based on the interpretation of the several people who work on the script. So there often occurs a situation, when is necessary to delete particular passages from the book or compress supporting or less crucial characters. Robert Stam addresses a problem of the approach towards characters in the original text: “Film adaptations have a kind of ‘Sophie’s Choice’ about which characters in the novel will live or die...adaptations tend to sacrifice ‘extra’ characters from novels” (71). Such omissions are on the other hand unavoidable, and in most cases, remissible. As Louise Flavin suggests, “reading a film teaches us to understand the implications of choices made by the film adapter in compressing a many-hour reading experience into a two-hour viewing of a film” (5). By contrast, among common parts of the movie belong flashbacks,⁶ which function as an explanatory device, so the audience can better understand the motives for actions or a plot, and offer a sort of introductory background to clarify a current situation. Many filmmakers also take a liking to adding scenes which do not take place in the novel at all.

Deborah Kaplan further mentions another challenge connected with the recent adaptations, especially when we have in mind films based on books by Jane Austen, which might become an easy target for high criticism. That challenge is “harlequinization.” By that term, she means “the mass-market romance, the focus on a hero and heroine’s courtship at the expense of other characters” (178). She continues that hero and heroine should be both “good-looking and sexy.” Clothes too, are of interest, not only as a means of bringing attention

⁶ Flashback is a transition (in literary or theatrical works or films) to an earlier event or scene that interrupts the normal chronological development of the story.

to the bodies of the hero and the heroine but as “objects of desire in their own right” (178). This is mainly caused by the fact that these types of movies which, aimed at women, are considered to be “chick flicks.”⁷ But we can suggest that this particular problem is connected primarily with the Hollywood-style adaptations, mentioned earlier. Although the chick flick genre is often criticized as mindless, sappy, and overly-commercialized fluff, these movies continue to be a powerful weapon in the hands of executive producers, generate significant profits and guarantee a sizable audience.

Before we start to upbraid for flaws, we have to keep in mind, when valuating an adaptation the adaptation’s origination. As Sarah Cardwell points out, “while in early adaptations it implied faithfulness to the words of the novel, later adaptors have become more concerned with conveying the ‘spirit’ of the source text” (193). We should remember the spirit of the time, actors, director, setting, music, all those individual elements which should somehow keep the film flowing smoothly without necessary questions. Dudley Andrew highlights the fact that “adaptation is a cultural practice; specific adaptations need to be approached as acts of discourse partaking of a particular era’s cultural and aesthetic needs and pressures” (19).

Opinions of the adaptations also depend on the structure and variety of the audience. A fierce admirer of the book has different ideas than just a viewer, who did not even read the book. Which leads us to another point that those who have read the book will be obviously much more critical. The problem is, although not particularly with Austen, that many movies are based on the novels which are unknown to the general public and are popularized only after the success of the movie version. There might even be cases when the audience has no knowledge that the film is based on a literary work at all. The expectations are thus not that great and it is anticipated, that most of the moviegoers will be probably satisfied with the result.

⁷ Chick flick is a slang term, often used pejoratively, for a film mainly dealing with content love, friendship, emotional scenes and designed to appeal to a female target audience. Examples include *Dirty Dancing* (1987), *Love Actually* (2003), *Pretty Woman* (1990) or *Titanic* (1997).

It stands to reason that the opinions on literature turned into films will always have their nit-pickers, who will defend the book in every circumstance. So instead of giving somebody the truth, we should rather as viewers of film adaptations, who watch with appreciation and with a critical eye, remove our prejudices, personal judgments, often immoderate criticism and lower our demands. Brian McFarlane's concludes this clash by saying that "the most helpful discourse is to explore how the literature-film connection deal with each other, rather than which came first and which is 'better' than the other" (28).

2.3 Transformation of Jane Austen for the screen

With any novel, there markedly occur different problems and challenges, when turned into a movie. Literature and film are different mediums and during the process of transformation, something is always lost. It will never be the same as the original work, but with the careful approach, new light can be shed on the result and open up new suggestions that bring new perspectives and new responses to the original source.

Pride and Prejudice has its own particular attributes which might be troublesome for filmmakers. These include foreshadowing of future happenings. The style of writing in *Pride and Prejudice* is very specifically aimed to uncover the development of the characters in connection with their behaviour and actions very slowly and gradually, subsequently followed by the detection of their motives and reasons for such a change. Film is generally much more recognizable in the aspect that a viewer in most cases knows what will happen next and why it happened. That is one of the charms a book possesses in comparison with a motion picture. But as we said, a book is not a film and the approach must be different. In literary work, we can only imagine what the character thinks or why he/she does this or that. In a film, it is the job of the actors to do this work for us, through speech, conduct and look. On the other hand, the "look" has a very important function in the novel. The way Austen describes, what is not said, through looks of the characters at each other and their facial expressions might

serve as the manual for actors. Overall, if a film is too see-through, it loses its suspense and a surprise. For this reason, it might be tricky for a screenwriter to keep the balance. We can best demonstrate this with Mr. Darcy's character. We cannot be sure of his feelings until he proposes to Elizabeth. But as we discover in the following chapters, when I will analyze each adaptation, some of them suggest and indicate much more clearly his attitude, and the audience is able to realize Darcy's feelings towards Elizabeth much sooner.

One of the most difficult problems facing the screenwriter who adapts one of Jane Austen's novels is that of writing a conclusion. In *Pride and Prejudice*, although it has a happy ending, the author tells readers about all the characters, rather than focusing on the cardinal couple. Which is not really convenient for a movie. Especially not for those made in Hollywood. All the adaptations discussed below handled the ending diversely. This applies also to the beginning. The very first line of the book is told by the narrator and after that, readers are taken to the home of the Bennet family. The main character, Elizabeth Bennet does not appear until the second chapter. Such an introduction also offers many possibilities on how to reproduce it in a film. Furthermore, the novel is told in free indirect speech, and the majority of happenings are viewed from the point of view of the main character, which is Elizabeth. As William Baker points out:

Austen's dialogue is used to convey attitude and perceptions about other characters. The narrator sets up the dialogue, at times reports it, using the third-person narrative. Dialogue, in addition to commenting on the perceptions of one character concerning another, is also revealing about a character. (378)

An important narrative device in a Jane Austen novel is the use of a letter as a means of communication. The most important twists in a plot occur while the characters read the letter, however, the book is not so depicted when we are about to learn the mental processes of the characters. Again, the movie is more expressive in this matter. Through this device, many characters may be developed in a film.

Also, the imagination of those who cast the actors must be largely vivid and at the same time complex. Austen is not particularly expressive regarding describing the physical appearances of her characters. As Deirdre Le Faye points out, it is part of Jane's technique, when introducing her characters, not to give "long descriptions of their physical appearance. Instead, we start by overhearing their thoughts and conversation and so begin to learn something about their nature" (152).

In *Pride and Prejudice*, of Mr. Bingley we only learn that he is "good-looking and gentlemanlike; has a pleasant countenance, and easy unaffected manners" (Austen 10). About Darcy we learn that he has "fine, tall person, handsome features and noble mien" (Austen 10). Of Elizabeth Bennet, in fact, no complete description is ever given, because most of the action is written by Jane Austen as it is seen through Elizabeth's own eyes. Of Elizabeth, we learn that according to Mr. Darcy, she has "fine eyes," (Austen 23) and is "equally next to Jane in beauty" (Austen 58). With most of the characters, we are told about their personal characteristics rather than their physical appearance, which might only complicate the decision making concerning the casting. Anthony Mandal suggests that "Austen's descriptions of her characters' physical attributes tend to be minimal; instead, she allows their moral characters to be revealed through their words" (28). The director of BBC *Pride and Prejudice* (1995) Simon Langton comments on choosing the right actors: "We were looking for wit, charm and charisma, but also for the ability to 'play' that period. It is a problem, because there are a lot of good young actors and actresses, but they are just very twentieth-century."⁸ The range of actor's abilities should be very broad. Besides acting skills, the actor should have, as the Langton said, the proper look. Ina Rae Hark points out that "the chief tasks facing the film-makers involve embodying the characters in actors whose material attributes do not offer a violent contradiction to the images generated in the typical reader's mind" (172). But not only in terms to fit in the period, but due to modern traditions, also in physical appearance. Because especially female audience might be reluctant to accept an unattractive main male character.

⁸ Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 15.

Since playing musical instruments, dancing, and reading books are essentially part of the book, it is interesting enough that we never learn from Austen what music is played on the piano, or to what music they dance at the balls, or what book the characters read. All of this is therefore the task that filmmakers face and depends on their imagination. In this regard, they are not bound so closely by the book, and they are thus permitted to improvise more. This naturally makes the work easier, as they can match their choice with their needs.

3. Pride and Prejudice – the novel

3.1 Background and Origin of the novel

Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* is surely her best known and among the readers most favourite novel. But the process of publication was at the beginning quite complicated, and Austen could not win proper recognition for this novel. She started to write the novel in the October of 1796 and finished it in August of 1797. She was then twenty-one years old. The original title of the book was *First Impressions*, which is a reference to a passage in her own favourite novel, Samuel Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison*.⁹ On 1st of November, 1797, Austen's father wrote a letter to a well-known London publisher, Thomas Cadell offering to send him the manuscript for consideration. His letter was quite short and rather vague – he did not describe the story in any way further, or state the nature of it – that it was comedy of manners. It is not very surprising then, that Cadell's clerk scrawled across the top of it.¹⁰ Fortunately enough, Jane was not discouraged by this refusal and did not take a dislike to it. She kept it to be read in the family circle. She started to write her next novel, *Sense and Sensibility*. On October 30th, 1811, the work was successfully but anonymously published – “By a Lady.” In 1812, Austen returned to the text

⁹ Deirdre La Faye, *Jane Austen: The World of Her Novels* (New York: Harry N. Abrams Publishers, 2002) 178.

¹⁰ James Edward Austen-Leigh, *Memoir of Jane Austen*, ed. Les Bowler, 2006, 25 Nov. 2010 <<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/17797/17797-h/17797-h.htm>>.

of *First Impressions*, made some alterations and contractions and changed the title to *Pride and Prejudice*. Jane probably found the neat phrase “*Pride and Prejudice*” in *Cecilia*, a novel by the successful contemporary authoress Fanny Burney, whose works Jane much admired.¹¹ She also shortened it at the same time, for in her letter of 29th January 1813 to Cassandra she mentions that she has “lop’t and crop’t”¹² the manuscript. London publisher Thomas Egerton of Whitehall had no doubt that this would sell well, and so on this occasion, bought the copyright from her for the sum of 110 pounds in the autumn of 1812. It was published at the end of January 1813, in three hardcover volumes, priced at 18s. It proved so popular that a second edition followed within a few months in November of 1813. The third edition was published in 1817. Jane’s name again did not appear in the front page and was said to be “By the Author of *Sense and Sensibility*.”

The action of *Pride and Prejudice* covers fifteen months, from the autumn of one year to the Christmas of the next. As Deirdre La Faye propose, “she probably envisaged it as happening in 1794-5.”¹³

3.2 Acceptance of the novel

The novel was received very successfully and had mainly positive reviews. Immediate reactions of readers to *Pride and Prejudice* echo subsequent ones, pointing to the novel’s enduring qualities and critical heritage. One of the earliest reviews was from the periodical *The British Critic* (1813): “The novel is very far superior to almost all the publications of the kind which have lately come before us.” *The Critical Review* from March 1813 approves the unity of the novel and its dramatic qualities: “There is not one person in the drama with whom we could readily dispense; – they have all their proper places...” *The New Review*

¹¹ Deirdre La Faye, *Jane Austen: The World of Her Novels* (New York: Harry N. Abrams Publishers, 2002) 178.

¹² James Edward Austen-Leigh, *Memoir of Jane Austen*, ed. Les Bowler, 2006, 25 Nov. 2010 <<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/17797/17797-h/17797-h.htm>>.

¹³ Deirdre La Faye, *Jane Austen: The World of Her Novels* (New York: Harry N. Abrams Publishers, 2002) 178.

from April 1813 says that “it is little more than a hasty plot summary and consciously avoids judgement.”¹⁴ The American critics were similarly enchanted. Carey and Lea’s 1832 American edition was noticed by the *National Gazette and Literary Register*, published in Philadelphia. The journal concludes its observations by noting, “if the American world will read novels, let us have those of which the moral is good, the text pure, and the instructiveness practical and domestic; entertaining and ingenious, but free from all poison.”¹⁵

Jane Austen herself was critical of *Pride and Prejudice*, writing in a letter to her sister, Cassandra, on February 4, 1813, that “the work is rather too light, and bright, and sparkling; it wants shade; it wants to be stretched out here and there with a long chapter of sense.”¹⁶

After Jane Austen’s death, Sir Walter Scott, a most astute critic, wrote in his journal on March 14, 1826, that he “rereads for the third time at least, Miss Austen’s very finely written novel of *Pride and Prejudice*. That young lady had a talent for describing the involvements, and feelings, and characters of ordinary life, which is to me the most wonderful I ever met with.”¹⁷

4. Pride and Prejudice on Screen

4.1 The Overview

Out of all Austen’s work, *Pride and Prejudice* has been the most popular with the film and television industry. In the following chapter, all the film

¹⁴ Mary Waldron, “Critical Fortunes: Critical Responses, Early,” *Jane Austen in Context*, ed. Janet Todd (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 85.

¹⁵ William Baker, *Critical Companion to Jane Austen: A Literary Reference to Her Life and Work* (New York: Facts in File Publishing, 2008) 403.

¹⁶ James Edward Austen-Leigh, *Memoir of Jane Austen*, ed. Les Bowler, 2006, 25 Nov. 2010 <<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/17797/17797-h/17797-h.htm>>.

¹⁷ David Gilson, and J. David Grey, *Jane Austen’s Juvenilia and Lady Susan* (London: UMI Research Press, 1989) 475. In William Baker, *Critical Companion to Jane Austen: A Literary Reference to Her Life and Work* (New York: Facts in File Publishing, 2008) 404.

and television adaptations of her novel are introduced. Most of Jane Austen's adapted work, as well as those on which this chapter is focusing are transpositions. They try to closely follow the story line of the novel. But since we earlier mentioned other types of adaptations, it is appropriate to briefly present those other types of adaptations which were made and are in some way linked to the plot of *Pride and Prejudice*.

Besides the traditional "true" film and television adaptations, two modern versions have arisen. In 2003, the American teen version called *Pride and Prejudice: A Latter-Day Comedy* directed by Andrew Black and set in present-day Utah University, starring Kam Heskin as Elizabeth and Orlando Seale as Will Darcy. The film has analogues for all the main characters of the novel, and for the main plot lines of the book. The second one is the Bollywood¹⁸ version entitled *Bride & Prejudice* (2004), directed by Gurinder Chadha with Aishwarya Rai and Martin Henderson in the lead roles. This film is set in present India with excursions to California and London. The narrative centers on a family of four sisters, all of whom are looking for husbands.

Popular comedy *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001), and the less successful sequel *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason* (2004), movie adaptations of Helen Fielding's best-selling novel, loosely rebuilt some characters and motives from Austen's novel. Set in present day London, the films tell about Bridget Jones (Renée Zellweger) and her circle of friends, who are all looking for the one right match. As in the book, Bridget meets Marc Darcy, a character who is directly inspired by *Pride and Prejudice*, portrayed in the movie by Colin Firth, who also represented the role of Darcy in the BBC television series from 1995, and finds him insufferable. Her opinion of him is supported by misinformation she hears from handsome playboy Daniel Cleaver (Hugh Grant), playing the Wickham character. As in *Pride and Prejudice*, the truth about Darcy eventually comes out, and she realizes that she loves him after all.

¹⁸ Bollywood is a blend of Bombay and Hollywood, and it is used for Hindi-language film industry in Mumbai, India.

One more motion picture can be mentioned in connection with *Pride and Prejudice*, and that is the box office hit *You've Got Mail* (1998), starring Tom Hanks and Meg Ryan. Nora Ephron, who is a devoted Janeite, wrote and directed this romantic comedy, which is a remake of *The Shop Around the Corner* (1940) with some parallels borrowed from *Pride and Prejudice*. Meg Ryan plays Kathleen Kelly, owner of a small children's bookstore, and Tom Hanks portrays Joe Fox, whose family owns a large chain of bookshops that is forcing little stores like Kathleen's out of business. They meet in an on-line chatroom and exchange anonymous e-mails; when they encounter one another in real life, not knowing that they are speaking with their e-mail friend, they clash like Elizabeth and Darcy. Moreover, *Pride and Prejudice* is Kathleen's favorite novel; that is directly referenced several times in the film.

Jane Austen herself served as an inspiration for a biographical movie called *Becoming Jane* (2007), starring Anne Hathaway as Jane Austen and James McAvoy, who plays Austen's love interest, Irish politician Thomas Lefroy, and who is believed to have provided an inspiration for the character of Fitzwilliam Darcy in *Pride and Prejudice*, although the truth of that story has never been confirmed.

The most recent adaptation inspired by Austen's novel is an unconventional four-part British television series entitled *Lost in Austen* (2008). The story follows a young woman (Jemima Rooper), living in present day London, who trades places with Austen's character Elizabeth Bennet (Gemma Arterton) and suddenly finds herself in the middle of the novel's plot, where she meets other characters from *Pride and Prejudice*.

In 2009, a peculiar best-selling book called *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* was published. It is a parody novel, certainly nothing for purists, written by Seth Grahame-Smith. The author inserts zombie references and action throughout the story. The altered classic opening line captures this idea: "It is a truth universally acknowledged that a zombie in possession of brains must be in want

of more brains.”¹⁹ In 2010, the prequel *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies: Dawn of the Dreadfuls* appeared, written by Steve Hockensmith. Due to a large success of the book, there have been many reports about turning the book into a blockbuster movie, however, according to IMDb, no such movie is in progress.

4.2 Early Adaptations

The very first adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice* was released by MGM²⁰ in 1940 as a black and white feature film. It is 118 minutes in length and directed by Robert Z. Leonard, an experienced director of romantic comedies and musicals.²¹ The movie is based on a screenplay by the American playwright and screenwriter Jane Murfin and the British novelist Aldous Huxley. Since Murfin was experienced in working in the genre, the film fitted well into the category of screwball comedies.²² Sue Parrill points out that “with its warring lovers, witty dialogue, class differences, opportunity for elaborate costumes, and comic minor characters, the novel lends itself to the broadly comic treatment of screwball comedies” (49). This adaptation borrows some of its features as well as some of the actors who were known to wider audience from other screwball or romantic comedies such as Mary Boland as Mrs. Bennet, Melville Cooper as Mr. Collins or Edna Mae Oliver as Lady Catherine de Bourgh. In keeping the film within the style of screwball comedies, the ad campaign for the film even warned, “Bachelors Beware! Five

¹⁹ Jane Austen, and Seth Grahame-Smith, *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* (Philadelphia: Quirk Books, 2009) 7.

²⁰ Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc., or MGM, is an American media company, involved primarily in the production and distribution of films and television programmes. MGM was founded in 1924.

²¹ His best-known work include *Ziegfeld Girl* (1941), *In the Good Old Summertime* (1949) or *The Great Ziegfeld* (1936). He was nominated for Oscar for his work on the last mentioned film.

²² The screwball comedy is a type of comedy that developed during 1930s and 1940s, nevertheless still popular nowadays. It is similar to a farce, and contains a romantic plot involving a mismatch usually caused by different class origin of the main characters. The notable element is a fast talking and repartee.

Gorgeous Beauties are on a Madcap Manhunt!”²³ This adaptation was highly successful at the box office as well as with reviews. Laurence Olivier as Mr. Darcy and Greer Garson as Elizabeth Bennet were the main stars. The movie was released on the 26th of July, 1940. When it opened at the Radio City Music Hall in August 1940, it drew the largest weekly audience during the month of August in the theatre’s history. During its four-week run there, it grossed \$1,849,000.²⁴ In 1941, the movie even won a well-deserved Academy Award in the category of Best Black-and-White Art Direction for Cedric Gibbons and Paul Groesse.

The next adaptation was a part of NBC’s *Philco Television Playhouse*. The black and white live hour-long drama was directed by Fred Coe. It was based on a screenplay by Samuel Taylor and was shown on January 23, 1949. It featured Madge Evans as Elizabeth Bennet and John Baragrey as Mr. Darcy. Baragrey had an undistinguished career in television, mostly in soap operas and crime dramas. The character of Jane Austen in this version serves also as the role of commentator. This version omits the characters of Charlotte Lucas, Mr. Collins, Lady Catherine de Bourgh, Mary and Kitty Bennet, Mrs. Philips, Georgiana Darcy, Colonel Fitzwilliam, the Forsters, and Captain Denny.

4.3 BBC Adaptations

The BBC production has so far created six *Pride and Prejudice* adaptations. The first film version is from 1938, 55 minutes in length and starring Curigwen Lewis as Elizabeth Bennet and Andrew Osburn as Mr. Darcy. The script was written by Michael Barry. This adaptation is usually forgotten about, and there is very little information available about it.²⁵

²³ Sue Parrill, *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2002) 49.

²⁴ Ibid. 56.

²⁵ BBC did not begin archiving its material till 1977. That explains high number of adaptations, as production created new versions instead of airing the old ones, and small amount of information about some of the versions.

The 1952 black and white version of *Pride and Prejudice* was adapted by Cedric Wallis and directed, as well as produced, by Campbell Logan. It was broadcast live from February 2 – March 8 of that year in six thirty-minute episodes and did not leave deeper mark in television history. Daphne Slater as Elizabeth and Peter Cushing as Darcy were the lead actors. This was the first television mini-series.

Another live black and white mini-series of *Pride and Prejudice* was aired on January 24, 1958. It consists of six half-hour episodes and was adapted again by Cedric Wallis. This version actually used the same adapted script as the 1952 version. The mini-series was directed by Barbara Burnham. Jane Downs played the role of Elizabeth and Alan Badel the role of Darcy.

The next BBC mini-series of *Pride and Prejudice* aired in September of 1967. It was directed by Joan Craft and based on a screenplay by Nemone Lethbridge. This version provided the audience with six half-hour episodes ending with a shot of Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth arriving at their home at Pemberley. Produced to mark the 150th anniversary of the death of Jane Austen, it was the first colour adaptation. The character of Elizabeth Bennet was played by Celia Bannerman, and the character of Darcy was portrayed by Lewis Fiander. Only four of the five Bennett sisters are in this adaptation. Mary does not appear here. Interestingly enough, the costume and makeup reflect the 1960s, rather than the novel's original setting. Due to its popularity, this version was shown again on the BBC in 1969. This adaptation used location shooting, including scenes set in Bath, Lalock Village and Dryham Park in Wiltshire.

Among the two BBC versions of *Pride and Prejudice* currently available for viewing is the 1980 five-episode dramatization adapted by a British novelist Fay Weldon. It was shown on BBC-2, beginning on Sunday, January 13, 1980 and runs 265 minutes. BBC Warner released this mini-series on dvd in August 2004. This version was directed by Cyril Coke and the main protagonists are Elizabeth Garvie as Elizabeth and David Rintoul as Fitzwilliam Darcy. Each episode opens with a watercolor tableau rendered in the style of Thomas Rowlandson, a famous caricaturist and a contemporary of Jane Austen. Also, this version was in 1981 nominated for two BAFTA Awards in categories Best

Costume Design for Joan Ellacott and Best Television Lighting for Dave Sydenham.

The last adaptation which has been made for television thus far, is a creation by one of the most successful writers and adaptors for television and cinema, Andrew Davies. It aired on September 24, 1995 on BBC/A&E in six one-hour long episodes. This version is widely celebrated and praised both in England and in the United States. It is directed by a television producer and director Simon Langton. Elizabeth is portrayed by Jennifer Ehle and Mr. Darcy is played by Colin Firth. An audience estimated at 10.1 million watched the final episode on the BBC, and about 3.7 million households in the USA watched the adaptation on A&E.²⁶ Many dvd editions of this version were released. A&E Home Video released the latest restored edition on dvd in April 2010. This adaptation won one Emmy award and got six nominations for BAFTA Awards, of which one was turned into a winner, for Jennifer Ehle's performance as best actress.

4.4 The Latest Film Adaptation

Sue Parrill notices that "it is surprising that after the filming of *Pride and Prejudice* in 1940 – a film which was very successful at the box office – no other film adaptation of an Austen novel was made for theatrical release until 1995" (5). Fortunately, for the admirers of the adaptations of *Pride and Prejudice*, in 2005, the most recent feature film was made. It is a creation of the young British director Joe Wright, runs 127 minutes, and the premiere in the United Kingdom took place on 16 September, 2005. It then spread also to other European countries and of course to the United States. This version had been made under the auspices of big Hollywood studio Universal. The film was also produced by its subsidiary company Working Title Films, which is closely connected with the genre of heritage cinema. The budget was around 28 million dollars

²⁶ Jack Kroll, "Jane Austen Does Lunch," *Newsweek* 18 Dec. 1995: 66-68. qtd. In Sue Parrill, *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2002) 61.

and the worldwide gross was about 120 million dollars. The motion picture features popular young actress Keira Knightly as Elizabeth Bennet and a British actor Matthew Macfadyen as Mr. Darcy. The script was written by Deborah Moggach. This version is celebrated chiefly for its visual aspect that presents the romantic rustic atmosphere of the Regency era, using British realism rather than the picturesque view known from some of the early adaptations. This adaptation is of course available on dvd in many editions. It was nominated for four Academy Awards, including Keira Knightley for Best Performance by an Actress in a Leading Role, as well as several BAFTA nominations.

5. Study of the Adaptations

5.1 Specific Elements of Each Adaptation

So far, I have introduced all the adaptations that had been made. Now, I would like to analyze four of them in more detail, since only four versions are currently available for the audience to watch. These include two BBC mini-series, from 1980 and 1995, and two film versions, from 1940 and 2005.

It might be argued that for a novel with such a variety of settings and characters, in order to cover all the story properly, the mini-series format is the most suitable. On the other hand, as I will present, a film adaptation also has its advantages, and therefore, it is not right to reprobate them. The main goal of this chapter is to evaluate the degree of the success of the adaptations, judged in terms of authenticity and fidelity to the novel, and in terms of the performances, script writing and vision of the director.

5.1.1 The 1940 Film Adaptation

The inspiration for making this film arose with Harpo Max, an American comedian and actor when he attended a 1935 performance of *Pride*

and Prejudice: A Sentimental Comedy at St. James's Theatre in London, dramatization written by Helen Jerome. The studio's first choice for the part of Darcy was Clark Gable; the production had to be postponed, however, due to the death of the producer Irving Thalberg. Then, Laurence Olivier became a hot screen property, after his performances in *Wuthering Heights* (1939) and *Rebecca* (1940). For the role of Elizabeth was initially considered Vivien Leigh. The director who both Olivier and Leigh favoured was the very able George Cukor.²⁷ MGM was reluctant to cast his real-life lover against him, so Gable was re-cast by Olivier and the lead woman role went to Greer Garson, newly arrived from England. She was hardly a stranger to Olivier. Olivier as producer/director of a 1935 London play called *Goldon Arrow*, had been Garson's mentor, giving her one of her first breaks, and in fact predicting in a curtain speech that she would become a star.²⁸ But not everyone was apparently satisfied with the result regarding casting. When the filming ended, Aldous Huxley made a comment on the acting in the film: "The principals were so bad; the supporting cast was very good."²⁹ Sue Parrill suggests that "his low opinion of Olivier and Garson was not that of most contemporary reviewers, and indeed it is difficult to understand how anyone could call Laurence Olivier's acting bad" (50).

Generally, the 1940 adaptation undoubtedly corresponds to the period when the movie was made. It reveals Hollywood's cavalier tendency and it is designated to strengthen the British and American alliance.³⁰ That was mainly caused by the war, which has naturally effected actors but mainly a script. And as H. Elisabeth Ellington points out, "allusions to Britain's wartime status pepper the screenplay" (104). Ellen Belton continues that 1940 adaptation sets out to reaffirm the ties between British and US society by infusing the world

²⁷ Cukor directed such classics as *Gone with the Wind* (1939), *The Wizard of Oz* (1939), *The Philadelphia Story* (1940) or *Adam's Rib* (1940).

²⁸ Rachel M. Brownstein, "Out of the Drawing Room, Onto the Lawn," *Jane Austen In Hollywood*, ed. Linda Troost & Sayre Greenfield (Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1998) 13.

²⁹ Sue Parrill, *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2002) 50.

³⁰ Linda V. Troost, "The Nineteenth-Century Novel on Film: Jane Austen," *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*, ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 76-77.

depicted in the film of Austen's novel with associations and values that are understood as essentially American and democratic in character" (180).

As was mentioned before, this film is the only adaptation which could be regarded as a screwball comedy. One of the elements and shifts which were made to come near this genre is the class distinction between Elizabeth and Darcy. We can demonstrate this, for example, on the scene at the Assembly Ball where Elizabeth first meets Darcy. In the sequence where she overhears him talking to Bingley, who persuades him to dance with Jane's younger sister, Darcy only utters: "She looks tolerable enough. But I'm in no humor tonight to be of consequence to the middle classes at play."³¹ Whereas in the novel, he says: "She is tolerable, but not handsome enough to tempt me; and I am in no humor at present to give consequence to young ladies who are slighted by other men" (Austen 11). As Ellen Belton points out, "the weight of Darcy's refusal has effectively shifted from his judgment of Elizabeth's personal qualities to her social origins" (180).

Also the visual style is undoubtedly connected with a screwball comedy. This is accomplished mainly with the help of costumes. According to Edward Maeder, Adrian, the costume designer, asked Leonard to place the film in a later time than the time of the novel, perhaps around 1830's, so that the costumes might be "more opulent than those in *Gone with the Wind* (1939)."³² They feature tight bodices, waists, huge puffed sleeves, cuffs and billowing hooped skirts. The women's hats are large shells which frame the women's faces. But as Christine Geraghty observes, the costumes in this adaptation are "excessive even for a historical romance and endlessly distract from the narrative in order to please the eye" (36). Sue Parrill notices that "costumes in the 1940 adaptation are glamorous, especially in the dance scenes, but it also enables to achieve comic effect of the film" (55).

Another change come to light with the Netherfield Ball. In this adaptation, the Garden Party at Netherfield Park, held on the 1st of May. In the book, the Ball

³¹ *Pride and Prejudice*, Robert Z. Leonard, MGM, 1940.

³² Sue Parrill, *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2002) 55.

at Netherfield takes place on 26th of November (Austen 201). The decision to radically shift the season and the place is therefore a considerable difference in comparison with the novel. This was done “probably to avoid visual monotony.”³³ The exterior shots are heavily decorated with paper flowers to give the romantic impression of Britain as a garden perpetually in bloom. The score evokes Olde England by excerpting tunes like the sixteenth-century madrigal ‘Now is the Month of Maying’ and the eighteenth-century song ‘Flow Gently Sweet Afton’ to evoke a pleasant, rural past. The May Day party at Netherfield also “idealizes the British common people and reminds the spectator of common British pastimes, such as dancing around a maypole and shooting a longbow, and reminds the viewer of the charm of British rural traditions.”³⁴ During the Garden Party, Darcy rescues Elizabeth from Mr. Collins and invites her for some practice shooting in archery. She scores three bulls’-eyes in a row. George Bluestone suggests that this scene foreshadows a future relation, because “Darcy has underestimated her and Lizzy’s archery skill graphically demonstrates her ability to compete with Darcy on an equal level” (139). Like this particular scene at the Netherfield Garden Party, a similar scene which foreshadows a future relation is the carriage race between the Bennets and the Lucases on their way to Longbourn. Beyond the fact, that this scene does not take place in the novel, and is very amusing, it has more than an entertaining function. It nicely shows the competition between the Bennets and the Lucases which exists throughout the novel. In the book, Mrs. Bennet has always some mocking remarks about the Lucases, and this particular scene demonstrates as Blustone points out, “an exact forecast what is to come.” First, the Lucases’ carriage overtakes the Bennets’, but finally, it is Bennets’ carriage that wins. If we compare this to the social context, at first, the Lucases take the lead when Charlotte marries Mr. Collins, but in the end, when Jane marries Mr. Bingley and Elizabeth marries Mr. Darcy, the Bennets have unshakable social advantage. As Bluestone notices, “the screenwriters have been able to ‘see’ what is not in the book” (138).

³³ George Bluestone, *Novels into Film* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003) 138.

³⁴ Linda V. Troost, “The Nineteenth-Century Novel on Film: Jane Austen,” *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*, ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 76-77.

Because the film has considerably less amount of time to tell the whole story, much needs to be omitted, suppressed or changed. In this adaptation, Georgiana and the Gardiners do not appear on the screen, as well as the entire Pemberley sequence is left out, and therefore Darcy writes no letter after his proposal to Elizabeth. Some characters, which are not crucial to the film are dropped. In the novel, Bingley has two sisters, in the film, only one. Mr. Collins has been changed from clergyman to Lady Catherine's librarian, but he is still the same ingratiating and officious toady that he is in the novel. Also the Assembly Ball and the Lucas Lodge Party are fused. While in the book, Darcy asks Elizabeth to dance there, in this version, he asks Sir William to be introduced to Miss Bennet at the Assembly Ball. She declines by saying: "I'm afraid that the honor of standing up with you, Mr. Darcy is more than I can bear. Pray, excuse me."³⁵ At that moment comes the Wickham and asks Elizabeth to dance with him, and she, in front of Darcy accepts. When she wants to introduce him to Darcy, Wickham says: "Mr Darcy and I have met before." Darcy answers: "We have indeed and walks away."³⁶ In the book, she meets Wickham in Meryton, while accompanying Kitty and Lydia who want to see the officers there, and it is also there where Darcy meets Wickham after they arrive on horses with Bingley. The consequence of this merger is as Sue Parrill observes that "Darcy goes in minutes from being disdainful of Elizabeth to being intrigued by and attracted to her. These alterations occur during the Assembly Ball, which combines material from the first sixteen chapters of the novel and compresses two dances into one" (53).

Similar situation, where Darcy's feelings alter conversely, takes place at the Netherfield Garden Party. When Lizzy starts crying after Mary's poor performance and after Caroline Bingley's insults, Darcy comforts her, sympathizes with her and suggests: "Shall we call it quits and start again?"³⁷ But before Lizzy answers him, Darcy suddenly notices the ill-mannered behaviour of her family and realizes that he acted too rashly by taking Lizzy to the dancing-hall. It almost

³⁵ *Pride and Prejudice*, Robert Z. Leonard, MGM, 1940.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*

seems that he wants to get rid of her. This rapid change might mean that he cannot easily swallow his pride and overlook the social distinction between them.

On the other hand, the 1940 version adds many lines which are not in the novel. But here, it surprisingly sounds very natural. It does not seem to change any essential meaning if we compare it to the original. As George Bluestone points out, it sounds like “the kind of thing which Jane Austen might have said” (131). Let’s show some examples. There are many comical scenes, mainly in the form of dialogues between the characters. Except from the carriage race, in the beginning when Mrs. Bennet gets back from Meryton with her daughters, she debates with her husband about how many daughters they have and what a disadvantage it is, and he responds: “Perhaps we should have drowned some of them at birth.” Another such scene is when Jane falls ill, stays at Netherfield and Lizzy goes to visit her. When all the Bennet family sits at home around the table, Mary asks how much longer are Elizabeth and Jane going to stay at Netherfield. Her father answers: “Well! We’re hoping Elizabeth can manage to catch a cold of her own, and, stay long enough to get engaged to Mr. Darcy! Then, if a good snowstorm could be arranged, we’d send Kitty over.”³⁸ Or when Lady Catherine visits Lizzy at Longbourn, the Bennet’s parrot starts to scream, “Oh, my poor nerves,” which is one of the favourite’s line of Mrs. Bennet in the book. But this scene does not take place in the novel. Here, however, it is a very comic addition which, although it only emphasizes the lighter spirit of the movie, it does not seem to affect the more serious nature of the situation. Christine Geraghty suggests that “the parrot contributes to the noise that indicates the importance of the soundtrack in creating the bubbling commotion and anticipation that runs through the film” (37).

Bluestone further adds that a number of lines have been added to establish continuity between the disparate events which have been joined in a single sequence. “Bingley’s comment on the absence of malicious gossip in Jane; Elizabeth’s comment on the insolence and bad manners of London – these have no precedent in the book” (130).

³⁸ *Pride and Prejudice*, Robert Z. Leonard, MGM, 1940.

Ellen Belton also acknowledges, that one of the most important themes of the film is the “middle-class solidarity” (183). While in the novel, there is a clear distinctive relationship between Jane and Elizabeth who spend significant amount of time together, either in their bedroom or as they often share private moments when they confide to each other, the film places “considerably more emphasis on family cohesiveness and unity of purpose” (183). Belton sees in this “unity” already mentioned influence of British and US relationships and compares it to other films made in that time. As she comments:

The 1940 *Pride and Prejudice* takes an approach to US-British relations that is necessarily overt, but, just as the transformation of Bogart’s Richard Blaine in the 1942 *Casablanca* repudiates the selfishness and shortsightedness of the “America first” doctrine, so the emphasis on British egalitarianism and family unity in this film offers a powerful subliminal argument for Anglo-American solidarity in times of crisis. By sentimentalizing the British family, the film also underscores the importance of subordinating individual self-interest to the common good, thus countering the arguments of the defenders of isolationism. (186)

In connection with the character of Jane, the audience cannot help but notice Jane’s flirtatious nature. Whereas in the book, she is very serene and shy and as Austen’s writes, “Jane united, with great strength of feeling, a composure of temper and a uniform cheerfulness of manner which would guard her from the suspicions of the impertinent,” (Austen 19) in the movie she seems to have quite the same temper as her sisters. This is well illustrated in the scene where Jane goes to Netherfield to dine with Caroline Bingley and Mrs. Hurst. While in the book, it is her mother, who is the chief initiator of her going on horseback, and Jane would “much rather go in the coach,” (Austen 26) in the movie, it seems that Jane actually agrees with her mother’s plan and it looks like she actually hopes that she could stay there, not caring if she falls ill or not. Which is also demonstrated right afterwards, when she is lying on the bed and tries to draw Bingley’s attention by winking at him and turning her face to be seen in profile, so her beauty may excel.

What is also different in this adaptation, is the quick pace of the scenes and dialogues, which are throughout the film kept light, bracing and funny. These

are the essential signs of screwball comedies and can be noticed especially in the relationship between Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth. Olivier and Garson have surely great chemistry, but all of those scenes which are dramatic in the book, are in the film kept in a very subtle manner. Therefore, while in the book, we are not aware of Darcy's feelings towards Elizabeth until he proposes her in Hunsford, in this film, the disdain that Darcy feels is barely minimized and Darcy and Elizabeth rather squabble.

If we move towards the end, it is not Elizabeth who tells Darcy about Lydia and Wickham's elopement. It is Darcy when he comes to visit her at the Longbourn and tells her that he himself discovered this and offers his help. This scene also substitutes for the omitted letter, since it is here, where Darcy tells Lizzy about the Wickham's true nature. She declines to accept his help but when he is leaving, we can observe that Elizabeth's feelings start to make an immediate turn. After Darcy's departure, she tells Jane that she loves him.

To summarize this film, Ellen Moody, a Lecturer of English language at George Mason University, condenses the character of this adaptation by saying that the 1940 film "maintains an importance as a social event. It was made for a mass audience, was widely-distributed and liked, and thus set a precedent of treating Austen as a screwball comedy."³⁹

5.1.2 The 1980 TV Mini-Series

Referring to screenplay for the serial, Fay Weldon, the screenwriter of the series said: "I hope it makes *Pride and Prejudice* accessible to those who might never have read the book and pleasurable for those who know it well."⁴⁰ The British screenwriter Fay Weldon really did not experiment and rather decided to work with what she had – the original text. Thus, this version seems to be the most

³⁹ Ellen Moody, "Many Novel-Readers Feel Called Upon To Read: On the Latest Oxford *Pride and Prejudice*." *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 23 July 2008, 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/926.html>>.

⁴⁰ *Trivia for Pride and Prejudice (1980)*, The Internet Movie Database, 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0078672/trivia>>.

faithful from all of the others. It copies most of the dialogues from the book and alterations and modifications are rare. It does not add too many extra scenes or lines. There are more discussions and less drama. But it respectfully tells Austen's story. Those, open to changes, so the movie gets "fresh spirit," were probably dissatisfied. This version aims to satisfy that part of the audience, who appreciate the book and are against any variations. Adherence to the original language is grand, but as was suggested in the beginning of this thesis, it is not a rule that a change equals an error. And when a text is delivered plainly and punctually to the screen, it might not seem natural, even if the adaptation is based on such a great writer like Austen.

As I mentioned, this version is very faithful to the book, so the number of modifications is small. Some sequences in this film are reduced. Interestingly, the reduced scenes involve the central couple, Elizabeth and Mr. Darcy. For instance, in the scene at the Netherfield Ball, the dialogue between Darcy and Lizzy while they are dancing is shortened. In the adaptation, the scene ends with Elizabeth's remark that Wickham "has been so unlucky as to lose your friendship,"⁴¹ while in the book, the scene proceeds until they are for a moment interrupted by Sir William, and then the dialogue continues when Lizzy tries to trace Darcy's character, since she "may never have another opportunity" (Austen 76). Whereupon he replies: "I would by no means suspend any pleasure of yours," and they separate. Similar reduction also occurs when Darcy first visits Elizabeth at Hunsford.

Among noticeable differences also belongs the fact that the character of Jane, here portrayed by Sabina Franklyn, has darker hair in comparison with Elizabeth. Though Jane Austen did not describe the physical appearance of Jane in the book, later, in the adaptations, the filmmakers inclined to picture Jane, probably in the view of her mild temper, as a blonde, presumably to highlight her vulnerability. So Rosamund Pike, who portrayed Jane in *Pride & Prejudice* in 2005 film version, and Susannah Harker, who played Jane in BBC mini-series in 1995, both have fair hair, and thus create a nice contrast to Lizzy.

⁴¹ *Pride and Prejudice*, Cyril Coke, 2.episode, BBC, 1980.

Also, in this adaptation is an omission of the scene where Mary plays the piano at the Netherfield Ball, and her performance is not received with much success. However, this sequence is not completely overlooked. It is actually inserted at the Assembly Ball, where Mary performs. In the book, after her performance at the Netherfield, to prevent her from playing another piece, Mr. Bennet interferes and says: “That will do extremely well, child. You have delighted us long enough. Let the other young ladies have time to exhibit” (Austen 81). This adaptation is the only instance where this remark is actually said by Mrs. Bennet, but at the Assembly Ball.

One of the added scenes in this version is when Mr. Collins, after Elizabeth refuses his marriage proposal, asks Charlotte to marry him. In the book, we learn about their engagement from Charlotte after it is already arranged, but here again, as in the only adaptation, we can see the process of the proposal, which takes place in the Lucases’s garden. There is a further particular not very well considered scene, after Elizabeth finds out about Lydia and Wickham’s elopement. In the book, she discovers this while reading the letter from Jane in the inn at Lambton and where Darcy surprises her with his visit and finds her in nervous breakdown. In the adaptation, however, she runs to Pemberley herself, to confess with this “news” to Darcy, which is not exactly a realistic alteration, since Pemberley is definitely not an easy distance from Lambton.

Because the 1980 adaptation is the first to be filmed largely on location, the setting is not so rich as in the other adaptations. Ellen Belton also notices that the 1980 BBC version “is constrained by the limits imposed by the relatively primitive video techniques of the time, so it makes it less interesting to compare with the 1940 and the 1995 versions” (175). Pemberley is also criticised in this adaptation. When Mr. and Mrs. Gardiner visit Pemberley, they argue about the architectural style of the building. Later, they find out from Mr. Darcy, that it is a Jacobean house. The 1980 BBC adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice* used for the Pemberley footage shot at Renishaw Hall, which is a stately home in Derbyshire.

Linda V. Troost suggests:

Since the 1980 production makes Pemberley a Jacobean house, generally, this version does not fit especially well with what Austen presents in the novel. The overall effect of the Pemberley is serious; it is overwhelmed and weighed down with 'heritage products' to make a point. (81)

That is not really helpful, considering the fact that Pemberley is the key sequence in the novel when Elizabeth starts to admire Darcy, and as she herself later admitted, she must "date her love on him from first seeing his beautiful grounds at Pemberley" (Austen 288). Austen describes Pemberley as "a large, handsome stone building, standing well on rising ground, and backed by a ridge of high woody hills" (187).

To summarize it, the audience should remember that this adaptation is the first "real" mini-series, and therefore the first big attempt to transfer and compress the book into 265 minutes. It was made under difficult circumstances, with a smaller budget, less refined production values and most importantly, fifteen years earlier, before the next, more sophisticated mini-series adaptation appeared.

5.1.3 1995 TV Mini-Series

The success of this six-part television serial is a notable achievement in the sphere of tv mini-series. The energy and cadence of the story is great, lively, amusing and so engaging, that those who have prejudices over the boring and dull BBC mini-series, might be well surprised what good script and great acting assembly can achieve. Sue Birtwistle, the producer of the mini-series declares that "the goal was clear – to remain true to the tone and spirit of *Pride and Prejudice* but to exploit the possibilities of visual storytelling to make it as vivid and lively a drama as possible."⁴² Many new elements are found in this version. The adaptation was directed by Simon Langton, who has a long and distinguished

⁴² Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 2.

career with BBC television, has directed number of TV drama series, and his dramatization of the novel *Smiley's People* was nominated for Bafta. Andrew Davies, the version's screenwriter, comments on his approach to writing dialogue for *Pride and Prejudice*: "I think that Austen's dialogue is not completely naturalistic, but rather something like real speech, and alludes to it, but is more elegant and more pointed. So the aim was to keep the dialogue vivid, not terribly artificial if it were spoken now."⁴³ Davies managed to lace together all the pertinent dialogue scattered about the chapters into cogent conversations without resorting to anachronistic modernisms. This allows the series to flow seamlessly and in a very satisfying manner, which is an essential prerequisite if the viewer should spend six hours watching the mini-series.

Though generally most alterations are by many viewed as drawbacks, surprisingly, this adaptation is praised exactly for its certain modifications that do not correspond with the book, but evidently seem to occur in the right place at the right time. It is therefore clear, that the approach was not so much constricted.

On the contrary, Andrew Davies was open to changes and in response to the question, why add scenes which are not in the book, with a lucid response said: "What is the justification of spending money if you're just going to produce a series of pictures alongside the dialogue of the novel? You have to offer an interpretation of the novel."⁴⁴ More liberties are taken with the story, though Austen's general plot remains unaltered. The characters act less reserved, more like 20th century personalities than proper ladies and gentlemen of the Regency era. Not to say that anyone behaves in a wildly or in an inappropriate way – only that they are not quite as restrained and reserved as in the Austen novel or in the 1980 version. New scenes are written specifically for the character of Darcy, to show him as a more dynamic and emotional character. Davies argues that he has not done a version about Mr. Darcy but he suppose in showing that "Darcy's desire for Elizabeth is the motivation of the plot, he perhaps pushed it a bit more to being a story about Elizabeth and Darcy, rather than a story about

⁴³ Ibid. 13.

⁴⁴ Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 2-3.

Elizabeth.”⁴⁵ The character of Darcy and his performers in all of the adaptations will be examined in this thesis more closely in the following subchapter.

What is really appealing about this adaptation are the characters. All of them are displayed proportionally, each of them has its place, and to each is devoted an accurate amount of time. Since in the book, we see most of the action through Elizabeth’s eyes, we cannot imagine precisely all the characters’ thoughts and mental processes in their minds. Here, everything fits together. The close relationship between Elizabeth and Jane is evident, as well as the skittish character of Lydia, easy manipulated Kitty, wise Mr. Bennet, droll Mrs. Bennet, and philosophical Mary.

One of the characteristic features of this adaptation is, that it offers many flashbacks – to better understand and visualize precedent events and to make deeper impression of the incidents, such as when Elizabeth reads a letter from Darcy. One flashback also presents an event which is not dramatized in the book and is connected with Darcy’s 15-year-old sister Georgiana, who is seduced by George Wickham. As Davies says, “I decide to show this in a flashback so we could see this innocent girl, and view Wickham in a completely different light from how we’ve seen him before.”⁴⁶

One of the added scenes in the serial, which is not directly positioned in the novel, takes place after the Assembly Ball, when Darcy, Bingley and his sisters comment, or rather criticize the local people and their low social status and bad manners. Especially when Caroline Bingley states that Lizzy is considered to be a local beauty rather than Jane, Darcy answers: “She a beauty! I should as soon call her mother a witt.” This line actually appears in the adaptation, as well as in the book, after Elizabeth and the Gardiners leave the Pemberley, (Austen 207) where they were invited by Mr. Darcy, and Caroline again, starts to maligns her appearance and character. She remembers that he dropped this remark about her before. However this time, when Caroline insinuates that Elizabeth seemed

⁴⁵ Ibid. 4.

⁴⁶ Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 11.

to “improve on him” after some time and that he even “thought her rather pretty one time,” this once, when he is deeply in love with Elizabeth, replies: “Yes, but that was only when I first knew her, for it’s many months since I have considered her as one of the handsomest women of my acquaintance” (Austen 208). After which Caroline pauses.

As well as the 1940 adaptation, this series tries to profit from the wittiness of the novel and thus adds some funny scenes. An example is when Mr. Collins accidentally gets a view of Lydia in her petticoat on the stairs, while deciding what to wear for the Netherfield Ball. When she notices Mr. Collins, Lydia and Kitty start to giggle.

This adaptation is also the only one, where the scene encompassing the first sighting of Lady Catherine remains unaltered as it is in the book. Elizabeth, along with Mr. Lucas, Maria Lucas, Charlotte Lucas and Mr. Collins are invited to dine at Rosings Park. In the book, as well as in the adaptation, Mr. Darcy is not present, so when Lady Catherine discusses with Elizabeth her accomplishments, and asks about her age and sisters, he is not there. In all other adaptations, Darcy is present.

One modernization in this adaptation embodies the added physical movement of the characters. From the very first scene, they are all portrayed as very bodily competent. Davies highlights how important were the backstage scenes for him, especially with Darcy and Bingley because “they seem terrifically stiff and buttoned up the whole time; audience get no sense that they are living, breathing, feeling people inside so we decided to show them going riding, and shooting and fencing.”⁴⁷

Other scenes which are not in the novel include Mr. Collins’s presence after Lydia and Wickham’s elopement. In the book, he only sends the letter to Mr. Bennet in which he is sorry for them. But in this adaptation, Mr. Collins, shortly after

⁴⁷ Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 5.

sending his letter, arrives in person to “support” the Bennets. This added sequence might suggest the different attitude of the Bennet sisters towards Mr. Collins, because during this scene, it is particularly noticeable the bond between sisters Elizabeth and Jane, who did not ask him to come, hence do not want him there. In the meantime, we can perceive that Mary sympathizes with him and defends him. In the scene, where Mr. Collins, Elizabeth, Jane and Mary sit next to each other, whereas Elizabeth and Jane accept Mr. Collins’s defamatory expressions of sympathy with a great deal of silent indignation, Mary seems to appreciate them. When Elizabeth and Jane stand up to hasten his leaving, Mary continues to sit, as if she wished he would stay. Jane and Lizzie are visually bracketed together and distanced from the other women in their family. As Ellen Belton signifies, “this visual separation underlines the distinctness of their point of view and imparts greater significance to their feelings and desires” (188).

In contrast to “bracket” Jane and Elizabeth together, is the camera shooting of Darcy and Elizabeth. In the first half of the mini-series, those two are almost never together in a single scene, and when they are, then with a clear design and that is to emphasize barriers and differences between them.

What is stressed in this adaptation are the musical accomplishments of the women characters. Elizabeth Bennet’s musical abilities are described as “pleasing, though by no means capital” (Austen 21). Yet, her performances are considered more agreeable than those of her younger sister Mary. As Annette Davison observes:

In the BBC’s 1995 adaptation, Mary’s assiduous skills in performance are contrasted with the easy confidence and musicality of her sister, Elizabeth, Georgiana Darcy, Miss Bingley and Mrs. Hurst. The distinction is made most obvious when, after Mary’s solemn and mannered performance of a Handel song at the Netherfield Ball and her father’s censure of the second song, Mrs. Hurst produces a dazzling and exuberant performance of Mozart’s Rondo ‘Alla Turca.’ (216)

William Baker agrees by saying that “Mary becomes the subject of ‘derision’ among the Bingley sisters” (402). In the book though, the performance of Mrs. Hurst at the Netherfield Ball does not take place.

This adaptation also adds a series of montages which are particularly effective. One of them occurs when Elizabeth sits in a carriage on her way back to Longbourn, emotionally disturbed after Darcy's proposal. She looks out the carriage window, sees Darcy's face and hears him saying: "You must allow me to tell you how ardently I admire and love you."⁴⁸ Then the face disappears and we hear the thunder of the carriage wheels. As Sue Parrill comments, this scene "helps to convey how much Darcy's expressions of love will stay with her until they overcome all of her resistance" (75). A similar montage also appears when Elizabeth is waiting for news of Lydia after her elopement. She gazes into her mirror and sees Darcy, uttering the words with which he parted from her in the inn at Lambton: "I have stayed too long. I shall leave you now."⁴⁹ These montages probably try to emphasize the depth and gradual change of Elizabeth's feelings. It might also mean that it is a way for Elizabeth to accommodate and inwardly give vent to her emotions. As Ellen Belton suggests: "It would not be plausible or appropriate for Elizabeth to voice these feelings to another character, so these visual effects are translated into a series of images" (191).

5.1.4 The 2005 Film Adaptation

The trailer for this motion picture came with the idea that it is a film "from the beloved author, Jane Austen" but also that it is "the story of a modern woman."⁵⁰ That is to a certain degree very true, and those, who have seen the movie, could not disagree.

⁴⁸ *Pride and Prejudice*, Simon Langton, 3. episode, BBC, 1995.

⁴⁹ *Pride and Prejudice*, Simon Langton, 5. episode, BBC, 1995.

⁵⁰ Christine Geraghty, *Now a Major Motion Picture: Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2008) 16.

The 2005 *Pride & Prejudice* really focuses “primarily on Elizabeth Bennet’s own emotional journey, her maturation and offers us a largely uncluttered narrative centered on the heroine. Simply put, the film offers the tale of a young girl on the cusp of womanhood who falls deeply in love, a theme with timeless romantic appeal.”⁵¹

Those are the words of Catherine Stewart-Beer, who hit the nail right on the head. The 2005 film was directed by Joe Wright. It may seem that the producers risked much when they offered such an ambitious project to the young, then 32-year-old Brit, who had experience only with several television projects. Those projects were nevertheless very successful and received three BAFTA nominations. But it was not until he made a costume drama, *Charles II: The Power & the Passion* (2003), that he was considered for his first full-length picture, the *Pride & Prejudice*. This suggests that, although this is the most recent adaptation and at present the most modern one, it is done with the admiration for the book and its devotees. To reach a wider and more youthful audience, and as Linda V. Troost says, “the audience that actually goes to movie theatres, who will gravitate toward a film that looks superficially like *Pirates of the Caribbean* crossed with *Wuthering Heights*” (87) was undoubtedly another reason for selecting Joe Wright as director. Before making the movie, Wright had never read Jane Austen’s novel, never even seen an Austen adaptation made since 1940, and could declare himself decidedly uninterested in the Jane Austen Franchise.⁵²

There are of course, again, apparent changes and many characters were condensed. When the screenwriter has two hours to tell a story which covers three hundred printed pages, there is no other option. When asked why to make another adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice*, Joe Wright said: “I think it is a story that

⁵¹ Catherine Stewart-Beer, “Style over Substance? *Pride & Prejudice* (2005) Proves Itself a Film for Our Time.” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/stewart-beer.htm>>.

⁵² Carol M. Dole, “Jane Austen and Mud: *Pride & Prejudice* (2005), British Realism, and the Heritage Film.” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/dole.htm>>.

deserves telling over and over. I think it's like a fairy tale really, I think it's something we enjoy hearing."⁵³

The movie uses long camera shots, mixed with a discreet editing. The use of the zoom on a character's face during a highly emotional moment is executed very well and helps heighten the emotional effect. The art-set decoration captures the spirit of the time well. The score is nice, but not over-used. Thanks to the dynamic cinematography, the film almost pulsates with life. This adaptation has a fresh spirit and is evidently made to capture the attention of the young audience. The script was written by Deborah Moggach, popular British writer, who wrote sixteen novels and several short stories. Upon her work on *Pride & Prejudice*, she comments:

I tried to be truthful to the book, which has a perfect three-act structure, so I haven't changed a lot. It is so beautifully shaped as a story – the ultimate romance about two people who think they hate each other but who are really passionately in love. I felt, 'If it's not broken, don't fix it.'⁵⁴

Emma Thompson did an uncredited and unpaid re-write of the script. She receives a "Special Thanks" credit at the end of the film. One of the two scenes that she wrote was the scene in which Charlotte Lucas tells Elizabeth Bennet that she will marry Mr. Collins. The other one is the scene in which Elizabeth Bennet tries to tell Mr. and Mrs. Gardiner and Darcy about Lydia's elopement with Wickham.⁵⁵

The first visible difference which attracts the attention of the audience is, as Pamela Demory points out, "more earthly portrayal of the Bennet family home – complete with pigs, chickens and mud" (143). The previous adaptations did not make the social distinction so obvious. Why Joe Wright decided to go this direction?

⁵³ *An Interview with Joe Wright*, RopeofSilicon, 26 Dec. 2010

<<http://www.ropeofsilicon.com/features/2005/joewright/index.php>>.

⁵⁴ *Pride & Prejudice Companion Book*, Working Title Films, 11 Jan. 2011

<<http://www.workingtitlefilms.com/media/prideBooklet/index.htm>>.

⁵⁵ *Trivia for Pride & Prejudice (2005)*, The Internet Movie Database, 11 Jan. 2011

<<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0414387/trivia>>.

He explains:

I got excited about new ways to film the story which I don't believe have been done before. I wanted to treat it as a piece of British realism rather than going with the picturesque tradition, which tends to depict an idealized version of English heritage as some kind of Heaven on Earth. I wanted to make *Pride & Prejudice* real and gritty – and be as honest as possible.⁵⁶

As Carol M. Dole observes:

The realism is all over the film. Throughout the film, the mundane and even sordid details of life are almost everywhere evident; a pig is seen in the passage, and Darcy awaits his fiancée amidst the chickens – only Pemberley, the ultimate heritage landscape and nostalgic icon of old England is presented differently.⁵⁷

Also, the depiction of the balls in this adaptation is rather different. Wright's commentary cites the influence of John Hughes⁵⁸ and *Grease* in the assembly ball sequence, for instance; he designed the bleacher-like seating so as to suggest a dance in the gym.⁵⁹ Catherine Stewart-Ber adds that "the assembly at Meryton is recreated here as a true rustic hoe-down, a riot of swirling movement and sweaty bodies, wigs askew, accompanied by jaunty, folksy music – seemingly most un-Austenlike." But with that, she also acknowledges that, "there is altogether something quite refreshing and remarkably unstuffy in this particular take on Austen's society."⁶⁰

To streamline the story, the writers chose to limit the Mr. Collins role and almost eliminate the Wickham role. This is unfortunate and causes the movie to lose

⁵⁶ *Pride & Prejudice Companion Book*, Working Title Films, 11 Jan. 2011 <<http://www.workingtitlefilms.com/media/prideBooklet/index.htm>>.

⁵⁷ Carol M. Dole, "Jane Austen and Mud: *Pride & Prejudice* (2005), British Realism, and the Heritage Film." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/dole.htm>>.

⁵⁸ John Hughes directed popular 1980's films *Sixteen Candles* (1984) and *The Breakfast Club* (1985).

⁵⁹ *Pride & Prejudice Companion Book*, Working Title Films, 11 Jan. 2011 <<http://www.workingtitlefilms.com/media/prideBooklet/index.htm>>.

⁶⁰ Catherine Stewart-Ber, "Style over Substance? *Pride & Prejudice* (2005) Proves Itself a Film for Our Time." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/stewart-beer.htm>>.

some of its insight into human character. But as Joe Wright states, “the story is obviously about Elizabeth and Darcy, following them, and anything that detracts or diverts you from that story is what you have to cut.”⁶¹

Let’s now look at some particular changes in this adaptation from the original text in the book. One of the most striking changes is, that many scenes take place outside rather than inside as it is in the book. Most importantly, the first marriage proposal and the ending which I will further analyze in the following subchapter. However, I will mention the scene where Wickham tells Elizabeth “his version” of what happened between him and Darcy. In the novel, this scene is acted out at the Mr. Philips’s, but in the film, this get-together is eliminated, so the conversation between Lizzy and Wickham takes place right after their first meeting in the Meryton shop, while they are outdoors and while Elizabeth rests by a tree. Similar tendency can also be seen in the scene where Lizzy declines Mr. Collins’s marriage proposal. In the book, this sequence takes place in Mr. Bennet’s library. In the film, however, this important interior scene is transferred to the outdoors. Elizabeth dashes to the lakeside, and Mrs. Bennet, with a gaggle of geese at her heels, races after her; then Mrs. Bennet runs back to the house to drag Mr. Bennet down to the lake to talk to Elizabeth. Laurie Kaplan observes that:

The library, which signifies Mr. Bennet’s refuge from his wife and daughters and their activities of daily living, becomes a setting that emphasizes the separation of husband/wife roles in the Bennets’ marriage. That he stays secluded in his library when his favorite daughter is being encouraged by her mother to accept an unacceptable suitor reinforces a negative view of the father figure, of Mr. Bennet’s penchant for excluding himself from real life, and foreshadows his lack of concern when Lydia is to go to Brighton. While the library offers Mr. Bennet escape, there is the accompanying suggestion that he is boxed into this room by his unequal marriage. Austen turns Mr. Bennet’s library, a room that resonates with positive metaphoric significance, into negative space.⁶²

⁶¹ *Feature Interview with Joe Wright*, MovieFreak.com – The Film Palace, 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.moviefreak.com/features/interviews/joewright.htm>>.

⁶² Laurie Kaplan, “Inside Out/Outside In: *Pride & Prejudice* on Film 2005 .” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/kaplan.htm>>.

She also points out that while the filmic scene provides an opportunity for Mr. Bennet to “strike a Byronic pose against the gorgeous watery background, the same scene exposes Mrs. Bennet, who is not a runner, to ridicule: with her petticoats flapping, she is visually and aurally equated with the quacking geese.”⁶³

Other inside out change comes when Lizzy visits with the Gardiners Pemberley. In the book, she runs into Mr. Darcy while she is on a stroll in the garden, here, she is viewing inside of the house when she starts to hear the sound of the pianoforte. She follows it and then peeps into one of the rooms where she sees Georgiana playing, and Darcy listening to her. They notice her and Elizabeth runs away. Also, in the book, she does not meet with Georgiana until Darcy comes with her to the inn at Lambton.

In connection with Mr. Bennet, we can notice that he is given more space than he gets in the book. Scenes which include his presence, but the novel does not, cover Mr. Bennet’s attendance at the Assembly Ball and also before Mr. Collins’s unsuccessful attempt to propose Elizabeth. We could suggest that this scene particularly highlights the bond between father and daughter. Lizzy, who relies on him, is dissatisfied when he leaves her in the room alone with Mr. Collins, and we can see the expression on her face with which she practically begs him not to go.

We can also register that some lines were shifted, and sometimes they are even said by other character. For instance, the scene where Mr. Collins gushes his compliments to Lady Catherine de Bourgh, it is Lizzy who asks him whether these compliments “proceed from the impulse of the moment, or are the result of previous study?”⁶⁴ Whereas in the book, it is Mr. Bennet who says this line to him (Austen 55). This change had been made most likely to stress Lizzy’s outspokenness. This is well illustrated also in the scene at the Assembly Ball, after she overhears Darcy’s disdain to dance with her. While in the book, she does not fight back, in the film, there is an added scene when Jane, Bingley,

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ *Pride & Prejudice*, Joe Wright, Focus Features, 2005.

Mrs. Bennet, Darcy and Elizabeth are talking, and Mrs. Bennet starts to praise Jane for her beauty and says that “when she was fifteen, there was a gentleman so much in love with her that he wrote some verses on her, however, did not make an offer.” Elizabeth’s immediate remark on the subject is: “I wonder who first discovered the power of poetry in driving away love!” Darcy reaction is: “I thought the poetry was the food of love.” Elizabeth responds: “Of a fine, stout love. Everything nourishes what is strong already. But if it is only a vague inclination, one poor sonnet will kill it.” And Darcy asks: “So, what do you recommend to encourage affection? and Lizzy’s reaction is: “Dancing. Even if one’s partner is barely tolerable.”⁶⁵ This scene obviously indicates that Lizzy wanted to show Darcy that she heard him, but does not care for him. She turns around and walks away with the triumphal smile on her face. Interestingly, this conversation about poetry does appear in the book, but in a different scene – when Mrs. Bennet and her daughters come to Netherfield to visit Jane, who is ill and they are debating in the salon with Mr. Bingley, his sisters and Darcy (Austen 37).

Even this adaptation does not forget to imply some original “innovative” scenes, which are not in the book. The character of Mr. Collins, brilliantly portrayed by Tom Hollander and Mr. Bingley played by Simon Woods, appear to have quite different air above them. For example, Mr. Collins’s remark during the dinner: “What excellent potatoes. It’s many years since I’ve had such an exemplary vegetable,”⁶⁶ is added in comparison with the book. As Ellen Moody observes “for the first-time we get a film which presents Mr. Collins sympathetically as a misfit.”⁶⁷ Or the added scene where Mr. Bingley comes back to Netherfield with Darcy and after their departure, Bingley rehearses with Darcy how to propose to Jane, which also points out that here, Bingley is “remodeled” to a rather comedic-looking lubber with a bright red hair.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ellen Moody, “Many Novel-Readers Feel Called Upon To Read: On the Latest Oxford *Pride and Prejudice*.” *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 23 July 2008, 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/926.html>>.

Finally, I would like to highlight one particular and memorable scene from the movie which does not take place in the novel. This scene, that is a mere dream and which seems to be an image take-over has a visual function, and serves well to characterize Elizabeth's emotions and state of mind. It also expresses her feelings of despair and sorrow, although in a very unconventional way. The scene that I am pointing out is a nonsensical but dramatically beautiful shot of Keira Knightley's Elizabeth, standing alone on the edge of an extremely high and vertiginous rock face in Derbyshire, overlooking a magnificent scenic feast below her. This scene follows the sequence of Elizabeth, who is upset by Darcy's marriage proposal, and before she goes to sleep, she tells Jane that she met Darcy but concealed his proposal and denies that they talked about Mr. Bingley. She is taciturn, a teardrop flows down her face. In the next shot, we see only light, as if it were behind eyelids. The music starts to play. Then a shot of Elizabeth's closed eyes follows. Now, she is standing on the cliff. The music slowly ceases. In the next scene, we see Elizabeth and the Gardiners watching the landscape. Susan Fraiman acknowledges that this long shot represents Elizabeth's "elevated, securely privileged position in Wright's film."⁶⁸ Catherine Stewart-Ber sees in this scene even more, as she notes that:

It is a stunning, magical evocation of Wright's strong stylistic brand of Postmodern Romanticism, more resonant perhaps of Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* than of a work by Jane Austen, who parodied society's attachment to the picturesque and lampooned the cult of sensibility, most notably in *Sense and Sensibility*.⁶⁹

Also Ellen Moody observes the resemblance of this sequence with the last scene in the 1992 *Wuthering Heights*, with Ralph Fiennes as Heathcliff and Juliette Binoche as Catherine Earnshaw.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Susan Fraiman, "The Liberation of Elizabeth Bennet in Joe Wright's *Pride & Prejudice*." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.31, NO.1 (Winter 2010), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol31no1/fraiman.html>>.

⁶⁹ Catherine Stewart-Ber, "Style over Substance? *Pride & Prejudice* (2005) Proves Itself a Film for Our Time." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/stewart-beer.htm>>.

⁷⁰ Ellen Moody, "Bliss it is to spend your life as Mrs. Darcy." *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 21 Nov. 2005, 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/308.html>>.

Christine Geraghty adds:

This scene seeks to elevate the relationship between her and Darcy to a timeless romance, referencing not only the gothic traditions associated with the Brontës rather than Austen but also that reaching for extremes of feeling that had made *Titanic* (1997) so successful as a Hollywood romance. (37)

5.2 The Importance of Being Darcy

The transition of character of Fitzwilliam Darcy from the book to the screen requires a very specific and careful approach and might have posed even more of a challenge for the filmmakers. In the original text, in comparison with Elizabeth, not much space is devoted to his description neither of physical appearance, state of mind or the emotional changes he goes through. And the actor must manage to represent both Darcy's sides – his attempt to maintain social restraint while evidencing emotional expression. All adaptations represent the Darcy's character differently and all of the actors portray him diversely and uniquely. I will compare their attitude towards their role, their performances, how that effects the film as a whole and the impression they make on the audience.

Let's begin with the 1940 version. As we said, this version is in itself very specific. Olivier's interpretation does not really remind us of Austen's Darcy or as Ellen Moody notes, "nor a modern macho male: the conception is closer to the gentleman Ashley Wilkes as a type in *Gone with the Wind*."⁷¹ We can see that Olivier's Darcy does not behave arrogantly and curtly, as in the other adaptations Darcy certainly acts, he is not proud enough and seems to be the same person throughout the entire movie, therefore it is hard for the audience to dislike him. He is a more down-to-earth Mr. Darcy. He always acts politely and speaks in a warm and gentlemanly manner and does not show any marks of having

⁷¹ Ellen Moody, "Never Underestimate the Capacity of the BBC Costume Department." *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 23 Dec. 2006, 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/570.html>>.

completed the transformation that Elizabeth induces in him in the novel. Darcy should not candidly admire Elizabeth until he starts to struggle with his feelings and cannot hold them any longer. Sue Parrill points out that “Olivier may be the most expressive of those who have played Darcy on film and television” (51). As Ellen Belton adds, “in the MGM version, film moments in which attraction seems about to vanquish resistance occur from the very beginning” (193). While in the novel, as well as in the other adaptations, we can observe that the process of overcoming such resistance is prolonged and difficult.

The 1995 version is by many often considered as “Darcy version” and right after the series aired on television, it ignited Darcymania or so called the “Darcy effect” in Britain. This, according to Esther Sonnet means that “the contemporary historical literary adaptation has become a site of licence for female visual/sexual pleasure” (58). Jennifer Cruise summarize it by saying that “*Pride and Prejudice* has remained unchanged, except that Darcy now looks like Colin Firth” (3). This all was caused mainly by the Fitzwilliam’s Darcy character, who has been expanded significantly and to whom belongs goodly credit for the success of the adaptation, besides a great supporting cast of course. In reference to the period beauty requirements, Darcy’s character experiences subtilization and glamorization compared to earlier BBC serial versions of *Pride and Prejudice*, which only served to heighten its attraction. As Mireia Aragay and Gemma López point out, “Colin Firth’s new-man Darcy is allowed to express weaknesses, doubts and emotions which the late twentieth century constructed as desirable in a man and which would have been unthinkable in Austen’s milieu” (207). In this adaptation, we are given greater insight into Mr. Darcy’s private struggles. His longing for Elizabeth, shown through his lingering looks purveyed to the audience through cardinal information about mental changes inside his character and which enable us to look into its interior. Lisa Hopkins ascribes also other significant function to the “looks” and that is: “They build up a powerful erotic charge” (114). Ellen Belton suggests that “it is in fact the reciprocal gaze of Elizabeth and Darcy that actualizes their relationship and makes visible the phases of its development” (188). Through most of the first episode, Darcy says little and looks disapprovingly at everyone who is not a member of his group. He spends a lot of time looking out of windows,

as if to distance himself from people whom he considers his inferiors. However, he also spends time observing people, especially Elizabeth, whose disregard for him piques his interest. This indicates that the emphasis on eyes is very important and not only from Mr. Darcy's side. Colin Firth comments on its significance:

The cheeky look Elizabeth gives to Darcy when she rejects to dance with him is I think the first trigger for Darcy's falling in love with her. Darcy was used to looking at other people like that, but was not used to being looked at like that himself. So at that moment, I think he becomes intrigued by her, which I suspect, is the first time he has ever been intrigued by a woman.⁷²

We can suggest that this is probably the moment when Darcy starts to realize that he is attracted to Elizabeth, but at the same time tries to repress his feelings. As Ellen Belton observes, "their gradual discovery of one another is enacted through looking rather than through physical proximity or even through dialogue; their looks often speak more truthfully and completely than their words" (190). Firth also stresses that "what Darcy doesn't say is as important as what he says or does."⁷³ Elizabeth's unexpected stay at Netherfield during Jane's illness proves to be the perfect occasion to develop this portrait of Darcy. As Aragay and López note, "in several separate added scenes, Darcy's scopophilic gaze is highlighted" (207). For example, when Lizzy steps into the billiard room by mistake to find Darcy, who fixes his eyes on her. Or the scene when Darcy gazes from an upper window at her and at Jane's carriage as they leave Netherfield. As they further add, "what these episodes have in common is the camerawork, which 'frames' Darcy as an object of desire, almost an *objet d'art*⁷⁴ for the female spectator" (207).

So clearly, "looks" in this adaptation paint a thousand words. But what is equally important in this adaptation are images, and not only in connection with visual

⁷² Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 101-102.

⁷³ Dinah Colin, "Behind the Scenes – Pride and Prejudice – Colin Firth." *A&E Television Network* 7 July 1996. qtd. In Sue Parrill, *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2002) 61.

⁷⁴ *Objet d'art* is a French term, literally translated as "object of art" or "piece of art."

equivalence of the text but also as Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield point out, “these images inescapably change the emphasis” (6). So, we are now moving to the famous “wet”⁷⁵ scenes in the film, which are added to this version and do not take place in the novel. Chronologically, the first one appears when Darcy gets out of the bath at Netherfield and looks down out of the window at Elizabeth playing with the dog. Cheryl L. Nixon observes that in this scene, “each character’s natural self is revealed and removed from his or her constraining societal role, enjoying an unguarded moment and reveling in bodily pleasure” (32). The second one comes when Darcy splashes himself with water, baring his throat and chest, after spending the night writing the letter to Elizabeth after she has refused him. And the third takes place when Darcy, determined to cool off after a ride following a fencing lesson, dives into the pond on his estate in Pemberley, disrobed down to breeches and a thin white shirt. Is Darcy’s dive an expression of his feelings for nature, for home, society, or for Elizabeth? The screenwriter of the series, Andrew Davies describes this scene as “a brief respite from duty, and from the tumult of his tormented and unhappy feelings.”⁷⁶ Troost and Greenfield claim that this part indicates more about “our current decade’s obsession with physical perfection and acceptance of gratuitous nudity, so the image carves a new facet into the text” (6). But as Davies adds, “I didn’t realize how erotic it was going to be.”⁷⁷ Cheryl L. Nixon suggests that Darcy’s dive can be read as “an expression of a Romantic bond with nature, a celebration of the home where he can ‘strip down’ to his essential self, a cleansing of social prejudices from his mind or as a rebirth of his love for Elizabeth” (24).

A noticeable additional sequence that precedes the scene where Darcy swims in the lake and which covers his turn to physical exercise – an intense fencing match after Elizabeth rejects his marriage proposal, which is according to Nixon an expression of his “continuing love and not exorcising of it” (32). Or as Pamela

⁷⁵ Erica Sheen, “‘Where the Garment Gapes’: Faithfulness and Promiscuity in the 1995 BBC *Pride and Prejudice*,” *From Page To Screen: Adaptations of the Classic Novel*, Ed. Robert Giddings and Erica Sheen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999) 22.

⁷⁶ Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 5.

⁷⁷ Deborah Cartmell, and Imelda Whelehan, “A Practical Understanding of Literature on Screen: Two Conversations with Andrew Davies,” *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*, ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 246.

Demory puts it, “he is trying to exercise Elizabeth and her ‘fine eyes’ out of his mind” (139). Nixon also acknowledges that Darcy engages “in a roster of physical activities throughout the entire film” and sees it as incapability to “physically contain nor verbally express his inner emotional battles which create a cinematic form of self-expression, a dialogue between his mind and body” which is, however, absent from the novel (31). Yet, this scene also suggests something else. As Lisa Hopkins observes, “these scenes show the modern viewer that gentlemen did more than just dance, pose in drawing rooms and shoot wildlife” (116).

To conclude what these additions reveal, Nixon comments:

It shows what the twentieth-century audience do not like about Austen – the male hero. What was good enough for her female heroines to make them fall in love with them is obviously not good enough for us; the films must add scenes to add desirability to her male protagonists. (23)

Regarding Colin Firth’s performance, critics, as well as the audience generally agree that he was born for this role and that he perfectly captured all the different character’s qualities and is utterly convincing. His looks, and especially his eyes, say so much of the complexity of his character and his feelings. Jocelyn Harris compares Firth’s Darcy to a Byronic hero. Colin Firth as Darcy “broods, smolders, and glowers like a true Byronic hero, his tousled hair brushed forward, his stock holding his proud head high, and his coat-front cut away to reveal the interesting trousers” (50). Cheryl L. Nixon agrees by saying: “With his “smoldering eyes that stare deeply into middle space, he is convincingly reimagined as a vaguely Byronic hero, a brooding loner who can neither physically contain nor verbally express his inner emotional battles” (31).

While, Laurence Olivier’s portrayal of Darcy is too likeable, David Rintoul’s performance might arouse exactly the opposite feelings in the audience. Rintoul reveals little variation in demeanour throughout the film. When initially introduced, his angular, expressionless face and the stiffness of his body posture seem to work perfectly. He really presents an unbending and aloof nature

of his character. Nevertheless, when his character finally is supposed to bend, Rintoul appears incapable of expressing any feelings, less so the positive ones. Darcy is supposed to have a distant manner, but underlying that pride and haughtiness, he should display goodness and affability. Rintoul's Darcy, however, lacks that transformation, magnetism and personal appeal and therefore the audience cannot sympathize and concur with Elizabeth's affection for him so well. Ellen Moody adds:

While it's true there was a mistaken decision to direct David Rintoul in a way that kept him stony faced, a proud aristocrat who has trouble socializing, his face does melt more than once, registers disdain, hurt, embarrassment, attempts at conversation, gradual change from someone who only sees himself to someone who realizes he must show he knows his is not the only consciousness worth knowing and pleasing.⁷⁸

Evidently, Rintoul's portrayal is not so congenial as Olivier's and he is not as openly emotionally vulnerable as Colin Firth's Darcy, but as Ellen Moody suggests:

David Rintoul is eager not to show he loves, but that he is not so mean as to resent her, but as he tells her when they come together in the last long scene, he soon then understood he loved her – for having woken him up to other people. And once he gets to take his tall hat off in the final long walk, he's as soft, gentle and laughing as any Elizabeth might want.⁷⁹

Sue Parrill comments that “since Rintoul is a gifted actor whose portrayal of Hamlet was much praised, it is possible that his emotionless portrayal of Darcy represents a directional choice” (66).

Casting Matthew Macfadyen into the role of Darcy was surely a risk, because he was not so familiar to the wider audience.

⁷⁸ Ellen Moody, “Lyrical Melodrama.” *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 12 July 2007, 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/711.html>>.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

Joe Wright stated:

I wanted a big strong, manly man, not some pretty boyband type. Matthew, unlike many actors, was not afraid to be disliked by an audience at the beginning of the story; we have to dislike him because we are seeing him through Lizzie's eyes. And we grow to love him as Lizzie does.⁸⁰

Sarah Ailwood highlights:

In the 2005 *Pride & Prejudice*, the director "similarly foregrounds the Byronic features of Darcy's personality, as he is constructed in Austen's novel, to present him as a Byronic hero who is driven solely by his love for Elizabeth and whose love can enable Elizabeth to achieve the independent selfhood she so desperately seeks."⁸¹

Macfadyen's Darcy is vulnerable, shy, lonely and confused behind his stiff manners, especially when it comes to unravel his true emotions to a woman he is bewitched by. As Catherine Stewart-Beer observes, "unlike Austen's livelier hero with his abrasive clever wit, Macfadyen's Darcy is often struck dumb with love, bewitched... body and soul."⁸² His curtness comes from social inadequacy rather than arrogance, yet he is believably compelled by his social standing to regard decorum and propriety in a wife's family as significant in his choice of a bride. He managed to convey Darcy's inner struggle over his feelings for Elizabeth as well as Darcy's two side characters. His capitulation to Lizzie is therefore more plausible. Macfadyen's performance combines almost boylike and youthful embarrassment linked with the desire and strength of a man. It almost seems that he really does not know what to do with himself. This great man, in both stature and standing, seems so very tiny in Elizabeth's presence.

⁸⁰ *Pride & Prejudice Companion Book*, Working Title Films, 11 Jan. 2011 <<http://www.workingtitlefilms.com/media/prideBooklet/index.htm>>.

⁸¹ Sarah Ailwood, "What Are Men to Rocks and Mountains? Romanticism in Joe Wright's *Pride and Prejudice*." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/ailwood.htm>>.

⁸² Catherine Stewart-Beer, "Style over Substance? *Pride & Prejudice* (2005) Proves Itself a Film for Our Time." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/stewart-beer.htm>>.

Matthew Macfadyen said in an interview:

Darcy is “a young man who is still grieving for his parents. He’s from an ancient family and has this huge responsibility, but... he’s still trying to work out who he is and how to be in the world. It’s not news to him that he has a taciturn, awkward disposition – he just can’t help himself.”⁸³

Keira Knightley said in an interview about his co-star:

Matthew’s a man who is alluring in the mode of Richard Burton, with a bit of Alan Rickman. You need to see that kind of rugged beauty in Darcy, knowing that here was a man who walks across fields, climbs trees, and very much manages his own estate. With Matthew, you can see that etched across his face, yet he’s also got this extraordinary vulnerability.⁸⁴

5.3 Becoming Elizabeth Bennet

Elizabeth Bennet, whom Jane Austen herself considers as “a delightful a creature as ever appeared in print,”⁸⁵ is the main protagonist of the *Pride and Prejudice* and one of the most prominent female characters in English literature. At the age of “not one and twenty” (Austen 130), she is the second eldest of five daughters of the Bennet family and outranks the other girls in favour of their father, because in his eyes she “has something more of quickness than her sisters” (Austen 6). Though the information on her physical features is sparse, a bright light is shed on her character. As Julia Wilhelm states, Elizabeth is a heroine who “disregards the conventions of society, rebels against the unequivocal social pressure of her time and does not accept the stipulated conditions” (35). To find a perfect actress to portray Elizabeth’s character is not an easy job. The performances

⁸³ *Pride & Prejudice Companion Book*, Working Title Films, 11 Jan. 2011
<<http://www.workingtitlefilms.com/media/prideBooklet/index.htm>>.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ William Austen-Leigh, and Richard Arthur Austen-Leigh, *Jane Austen, Her Life and Letters A Family Record*, ed. Thierry Alberto, 2007, 25 Nov. 2010
<<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22536/22536-h/22536-h.htm>>.

are in each adaptation very different and the actresses vary both in looks and in the way of their presence on the screen.

In the adaptation from 2005, there is a clear endeavour to depict Elizabeth as a very modern, young woman. In terms of looks and performance, the adaptation renders Knightley/Elizabeth little more than a pleasing visual image, which also bolsters her youthfulness. Keira Knightley matches to the 2005 picture of an acknowledged female film star, however, to what extent is she able to represent conventional type of the Austen's heroine is the question. She is a very latter-day beauty, with vernal, immature face, thin figure, large, wide eyes, high cheekbones, and a broad, rather square mouth. Her performance depends on the use of silent closeups to show the expressiveness of her eyes and face; her mouth is often slightly open as if she is caught at the point at which emotion is being experienced but not articulated. Joe Wright claims that when he was casting the role of Lizzy, he was not initially keen on assigning the part to Knightley. "I thought she was too beautiful to play Elizabeth. I saw other actresses, but they all said what they knew you wanted to hear. I couldn't find the spirit of Lizzy.... but Keira had this incredible liveliness of wit and mind, and independence of spirit."⁸⁶

While filming the movie, Knightley was 19 years, she therefore became the youngest Elizabeth Bennet ever. One of the producers, Tim Bevan said that it was an intention to cast actors who would correspond with their age to what is in the novel. "We wanted to present the story as it was written, casting actors at the ages Jane Austen indicated."⁸⁷ By casting Knightley, Jen Camden suggests that "the filmmakers choose to capitalize on her appearance and celebrity to generate interest and ticket sales for the film."⁸⁸

⁸⁶ *P&P (2005) Actors*, P&P (2005) Forum Info, 11 Dec. 2010
<<http://pridenprejudice.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=general&action=display&thread=60#ixzz1BhVLiku4>>.

⁸⁷ *P&P (2005) Actors*, P&P (2005) Forum Info, 11 Dec. 2010
<<http://pridenprejudice.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=general&action=display&thread=60#ixzz1BhVLiku4>>.

⁸⁸ Jen Camden, "Sex and the Scullery: The New Pride & Prejudice." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010
<<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/camden.htm>>.

Knightley's Lizzie is therefore very different – a bright, fiery, effervescent and expressive girl. Although very young, she does not lack an inner warmth and beauty, which are qualities that Elizabeth should definitely possess. In her interpretation, Lizzie is outspoken, forward-thinking and rebellious. As Christine Geraghty notices:

When she does speak, Knightley adopts a light, flat tone with a modern handling of language. In the early scenes, she is sharp and decisive, but under the pressure of emotion, her voice becomes more breathy and tentative, a way of expressing the fact that what she is saying is often at odds with what she is feeling. (38)

But as she subsequently admits, this portrayal might be contraproductive. “In the context of a classic adaptation, with its emphasis on literary language and well-known phrases, this delivery can be understood as fresh and modern, but it runs the risk of seeming inappropriate and anachronistic” (38).

The fact, that Elizabeth is in this adaptation characterized as a modern young woman is supported also by other factors – such as costumes. As Geraghty observes, “this is a costume drama but not one in which the beauty and texture of the costume is foregrounded as one of the film's pleasures” (38). The women's costumes particularly contrast, rather than make beautiful, as they are for example in MGM's 1940 version. So, the Bennet girls often wear clothes that are pretty but comfortable. For Knightley especially, the difference between costume and modern dress is consistently lowered. She does not wear bonnets or ribbons and she slouches around in either earthy greens and browns or plain cream and white instead of having pastel gowns on, used for young women in many costume dramas. Her hair is constantly mussed and often escapes from her chignon. Her appearance is very tomboyish and it definitely reveals something about her rebellious nature. As Geraghty points out, “along with this goes a physical freedom of movement, as Elizabeth is consistently shown walking alone in the countryside” (39).

In the 2005 adaptation, Elizabeth's youthfulness is essentially connected with her, as Catherine Stewart-Bier notes, “maturation,” which is also sparked

by her simultaneous erotic awakening, as demonstrated by her response to Darcy's first touch of her hand as she leaves Netherfield Hall, and later, after Darcy proposes, they almost kiss whilst quarreling."⁸⁹

Jen Camden shares similar and pertinent observation, regarding images which are remarkable, but which do not appear in the text. Camden mentions the addition of "touch."⁹⁰ In the film, the moments of physical contact between Elizabeth and Darcy are obscured: the sun rises between them as they almost kiss, reducing them to silhouettes; the first proposal scene ends in a near kiss, but Darcy pulls back; and their first touch, when Darcy hands Elizabeth into the carriage, is a close-up of hands that seem almost disengaged from each actor's body. As additions to Austen's text, they might be considered comparable to the "extra Darcy" scenes of the 1995 *Pride and Prejudice*. While the scenes added to the 2005 production also illuminate the sexual subtext of Austen's novel, their effect is to redirect desire from Darcy to Elizabeth.

The biggest contrast to Knightley's youthful portrayal is surely formed by Greer Garson. She was thirty six years old when filming the movie. Christine Geraghty points out that "Greer Garson was considerably older than the Elizabeth of the novel, and this maturity was useful in establishing the basic intellectual equality between the couple, despite their social differences" (38). Nevertheless, Garson did not look her age and adds her character a different, mature beauty and has none of the girlish traits we see in the 2005 adaptation. Sue Parrill states that "British actress Greer Garson plays Elizabeth Bennet broadly, with the bold looks and casual manners of a modern woman – like those of other actresses of the screwball genre" (52). Ellen Moody sees her casting to be intentional. "They wanted to make Elizabeth a strong woman – and this was the era of strong women in films, 40's types such as Rosalind Russell, Jean Arthur or Katherine

⁸⁹ Catherine Stewart-Bear, "Style over Substance? *Pride & Prejudice* (2005) Proves Itself a Film for Our Time." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/stewart-beer.htm>>.

⁹⁰ Jen Camden, "Sex and the Scullery: The New *Pride & Prejudice*." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/camden.htm>>.

Hepburn.”⁹¹ And Rachel M. Brownstein comments, “enjoying Greer Garson’s perfect features and glassy composure, the camera persuades us to forget she is a decade or so older than Elizabeth Bennet” (14).

Jennifer Ehle was in age somewhere between Garson and Knightley, and was 26 during the filming. Ehle was initially afraid that she would not be cast, due to the fact that she was originally blonde and Elizabeth was portrayed as a brunette. It would have been easier if they assigned the role to a visually more corresponding actress. Nevertheless, she got the part, so the dark hair she wore during this production was a wig. Ehle also confessed to having difficulty with the dialogue, calling it “harder to learn than Shakespeare’s,” because “the sense of the line comes at the end of it and also the lines are much longer.”⁹² All the same, her performance is vivacious and at the same time cogitative with carefully-controlled body language. Ehle portrays Elizabeth as witty, thoughtful and expressive, in spots prone to unwavering judgments without all the information. As Sue Parrill points out, her interpretation of the role reflects “not only her own manner of portraying the character but the way in which the screenwriter perceived the character, because Andrew Davies wanted a physically lively and active Elizabeth” (63).

Regarding the costumes Ehle wears in the series or generally, the way all women are clothed in this adaptation, Linda V. Troost observes that “Elizabeth was dressed to enhance her sexuality, not something BBC viewers were accustomed to in dramatizations” (84-85). The audience can therefore often notice that Elizabeth and her sisters wear bodices and low necklines. Costume designer Dinah Collin comments on creating wardrobe for Elizabeth: “Overall, I wanted a nice, straightforward look that was pretty but not fussy.”⁹³ and she adds that

⁹¹ Ellen Moody, “Never Underestimate the Capacity of the BBC Costume Department.” *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 23 Dec. 2006, 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/570.html>>.

⁹² Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 13.

⁹³ Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 52.

“we wanted to ensure that the clothes would look attractive to a modern audience.”⁹⁴

Finally, we are moving to Elizabeth Garvie, who is a bright and lovely Elizabeth with sparks in her eyes and a sweet smile. Her portrayal is more placid and her behaviour more tempered. Her Elizabeth is delicate and she articulates language actually taken from Austen’s book, not simplified or shortened. Garvie effectively conveys the intelligence and the humor of Lizzy. On the other hand, in scenes which are supposed to be really dramatic, her Elizabeth lacks emphatic stubbornness and occasionally, her performance is more sedate, unlike Ehle’s or Knightley’s. She recites her lines with vanishing agitation and excitement. The costumes Garvie is wearing are also less distinctive and more conservative than Garson’s, Ehle’s or Knightley’s. She also usually carries a parasol in her walks.

5.4 The Comparison of Selected Scenes

In this last subchapter, I will examine three selected and probably most distinctive and important scenes, which are all showed differently in all of the adaptations. All are tailored to convey specific messages to the audience, reflect the unique approach and vision of the director, and reflect the need to present the story and the characters the way the filmmakers had in mind. These scenes include the beginning of the novel, the books’s ending, and the emotionally intense first marriage proposal.

5.4.1 The Beginning

In short, the book opens at the home of the Bennet family, the fictional Longbourn House in the village of Longbourn Hertforshire. Mrs. Bennet, who has five

⁹⁴ Ibid. 53.

daughters, hears that a nearby county estate has been “taken by a young man of large fortune from the north of England” (Austen 5). Generally, the first chapter encapsulates Jane Austen’s style, themes, and modes of characterization. This is demonstrated in the very first, widely known line of the novel: “It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune must be in want of a wife.” As William Baker suggests, the opening sentence makes an emphasis on “singularity, gender, male gender, marital state, and need” (382). Which are basically the main points of the novel.

This first Hollywood adaptation from 1940 opens with a long shot of a lively village street and the instruction, “It happened in Old England in the village of Meryton...” The camera follows with a drawing Meryton and of a country house, representing Longbourn. Now, we move to a shot of the town of Meryton. The camera pauses over the public street and the mild bustle of people running errands, before moving inside a shop where Mrs. Bennet, Jane, and Elizabeth are conferring with a shopkeeper about muslins. H. Elisabeth Ellington states that “for budgetary reasons, Austen’s numerous outdoor scenes are in this adaptation kept to a minimum, but the filmmakers cleverly suggest the outdoors through the use of windows” (94). Then, Mr. Bingley and Mr. Darcy appear outside in a carriage which generates a flurry of speculation about their marital status and their income. Greer Garson’s Elizabeth is located in the very thick of these. The scene ends with Mrs. Bennet gathering up her other three daughters and hastening home so that Mr. Bennet can be the first to call on Bingley. Moving in unison down the street, their mother in the lead, all of them clothed in similar dresses and stiff bonnets, Elizabeth is not particularly indistinguishable from the rest. Ellen Belton points out that “the unity of the family group, rather than the individual merits of any of its members, dominates this opening sequence” (184).

The 1980 adaptation opens with a series of water colors after the manner of Thomas Rowlandson, a famous satiric artist contemporary with Jane Austen. The very first shot offers a distance view of the Bennets’ house. A girl rushes out of the house, across the garden to a man on a coach. She speaks to him, then runs back, where she is awaited by the girls standing on the stairs and says:

“I know who is moving into Netherfield Hall.”⁹⁵ Then, the camera cuts to a shot of Elizabeth and Charlotte entering the drawing room. The first sentence of the novel spoken by the narrator is in the 1980 version Elizabeth’s response to Charlotte Lucas.” And it is the same conversation in which Charlotte states her opinion, which appears in Chapter 6 of the novel, that “Happiness in marriage is entirely a matter of chance,” and “it is good to know as little about the defects of the other as possible” (Austen 20).

Each installment of the 1995 adaptation opens with a close-up of satin, brocade and lace fabric, fabric-covered buttons, and a female hand with needle and thread poised to embroider on the fabric. As Parrill notices, “this introduction makes clear that we are about to enter a woman’s world” (61). The opening piano notes of each episode exemplify Jane Austen’s spirit: playful, elegant, engaging. Carl Davis, the composer of this series comments on choosing the right music: “I tried to pick up the essence of the book – its wit and vitality.”⁹⁶ The 1995 adaptation begins with Darcy and Bingley on horseback galloping across an English field toward Netherfield park. They stop to discuss whether Bingley will sign the lease. Then the camera turns toward Elizabeth, who is watching both of the men from the top of a hill but she is too far to hear what they say. As Mireia Aragay observes:

This beginning makes Elizabeth the subject of the gaze within the diegesis,⁹⁷ but also equally importantly, invites the viewer to share her point of view. This is relevant in so far as it is the beginning of the construction of Darcy as the object of desire of the female spectator. (206)

The first sentence of the novel in this adaptation occurs when Elizabeth jokes about Mrs. Bennet’s report to Mr. Bennet that Netherfield has been taken

⁹⁵ *Pride and Prejudice*, Cyril Coke, 1. episode, BBC, 1980.

⁹⁶ Sue Birtwistle, and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (London: Penguin Books, 1995) 65.

⁹⁷ Diegesis is an analytic term used in modern narratology to designate the narrated events or story.

by an “eligible bachelor with five thousand pounds a year.” Elizabeth’s words are: “A single man in possession of a good fortune must be in need of a wife.”⁹⁸

Joe Wright’s 2005 film version begins with the sound of early morning birds and a long view of the English countryside at dawn. The sun is rising. The effect is of a gentled wilderness – neither farmland disciplined by hedgerows nor the harsh gloom of Brontë country. We hear the rolling notes of a simple, classical-sounding piano melody. The twenty-first-century score is by Dario Marianelli, but as Susan Fraiman points out, “it channels early Beethoven to locate us in a semblance of Austen’s England, a place of genteel country houses and politely passionate courtship rituals.”⁹⁹ The camera now cuts to a shot of Elizabeth in motion, on her way home to Longbourn. She is reading a book. Fraiman suggests that “this scene characterizes Lizzy as not only a walking but also a reading kind of girl, and it establishes her point of view as the predominant one.”¹⁰⁰ She also views this scene as an endeavour to “distinguish her from the family inside,”¹⁰¹ and that is why the film first locates Elizabeth out-of-doors; to mark her, against social and familial norms, as an outsider. If we compare this placement of Elizabeth to that suggested by the 1940 movie, instead of being positioned in the gendered world of husband-hunting and female rivalry, she is remaining apart.

The next shot shows the Bennets’ property, which Elizabeth approaches from the back by crossing over a moat with ducks flocking in the muddy water. Soon we come to an open doorway, and here, the paths suddenly diverge. We are offered the view of the interior where Kitty and Lydia hurtle by in a fit of giggles. Mary is playing the piano. Lizzy, before entering the doorway looks over her shoulder and through the leaded panes, hears Mr. and Mrs. Bennet conversing within. And Mrs. Bennet speaks the first words of the dialogue: “My dear Mr. Bennet, have you heard? Netherfield Park is let at last? Do you not want

⁹⁸ *Pride and Prejudice*, Simon Langton, 1. episode, BBC, 1995.

⁹⁹ Susan Fraiman, “The Liberation of Elizabeth Bennet in Joe Wright’s *Pride & Prejudice*.” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.31, NO.1 (Winter 2010), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol31no1/fraiman.html>>.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

to know who has taken it?”¹⁰² The first line of the novel does not appear in this adaptation.

5.4.2 The Ending

The 1940 version has a very unexpected twist at the end and differs quite markedly from the novel. After Elizabeth rejects Darcy’s proposal and goes home to Longbourn where she finds that Lydia had eloped. Within minutes of her arrival, Darcy appears to offer his assistance in recovering of Lydia. He then tells Elizabeth about Wickham’s attempted elopement with his sister. After Darcy leaves, she tells Jane of his earlier proposal, and tells her that she loves him. As Parrill points out, “this kind of swift reversal of feeling is not uncommon in screwball comedy, but it does represent a drastic change from the novel. Because Jane Austen shows the reader how Elizabeth’s heart and mind undergo a gradual change over the course of several months” (54). In the novel, Lady Catherine has always assumed that Darcy would eventually marry her homely daughter, Ann. In an epilogue, we are told that Lady Catherine finally comes to a grudging acceptance of the marriage, however, before that happens, she is bitterly opposed to Darcy’s lie with Elizabeth, and she does everything in her power to stop it, including a visit to Longbourn to try, unsuccessfully, to dissuade Elizabeth. In the film, she visits Elizabeth in an attempt to dissuade her from marriage. She even threatens to cut Darcy off without a cent if Lizzy persists – “marry him and you will be poor.”¹⁰³ Elizabeth rebuffs Lady Catherine, refusing to promise anything. But it turns out that Lady Catherine is actually an emissary for Darcy to test Elizabeth’s affection and character. Outside the Longbourn house, we see Darcy sitting in a carriage, waiting for his aunt. Lady Catherine gives her blessing to the match, saying “she is the right for you,”¹⁰⁴ and sends him into the house. Lester Asheim suggests that one possible explanation for this change in the character is that Edna May Oliver “wanted to remain the gruff but good-hearted curmudgeon she was used

¹⁰² *Pride & Prejudice*, Joe Wright, Focus Features, 2005.

¹⁰³ *Pride and Prejudice*, Robert Z. Leonard, MGM, 1940.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

to playing and that the public expected her to play” (qtd. in Bluestone 142). But this transformation might have another explanation. As Ellen Belton observes, “it is hard to read as anything less than the capitulation of the British aristocracy to democratization and social equality” (183). And Rachel M. Brownstein agrees by saying that “together with the formal constraints of Hollywood comedy, politics was responsible for changing Lady Catherine’s mind about Elizabeth” (15). Bluestone also suggests that “the film-makers wanted an unequivocally happy ending. Since Lady Catherine ultimately accepts the marriage in the novel, why not show it in the film’s denouement?” (142-143). The final sequence of the MGM adaptation focuses on the realization of the shared wishes of the Bennet family, all of whom have been shown to subscribe to the goal of marrying off all five Bennet daughters. The final shot of Elizabeth and Darcy shows them kissing on a bench in the garden and the camera cuts to Mrs. Bennet, who is observing the event while hanging out the window in the library. In the very last scene of the film, we see that two unmarried daughters remain. Mary, who is playing the piano, singing, a young man standing over her shoulder, accompanying her on the flute and Kitty, who stands with Denny together, looking pleasantly happy. Mrs. Bennet immediately sizes up the situation and urges Mr. Bennet to find out their financial status. And it is Mrs. Bennet, who utters the film’s last words: “Think of it. Three of them married, and the other two just tottering on the brink.”¹⁰⁵ As Bluestone suggests:

Mrs. Bennet final flourish may betray a confidence more apparent than real, for in the novel we do not learn what happens to Mary and Kitty. Yet here, the screenwriters might properly defend their choice because it indicates a remarkable power of projection into Jane Austen’s artistic sensibility. (143)

The scene with Lady Catherine is pretty much the same in the book as in the 1980 adaptation, though the conversation does not take place in the garden but in the drawing room. However, this adaptation completely eliminated the scene where Darcy asks Lizzy’s father for her hand, which is followed by Elizabeth’s dialogue, in which she expresses her love for Mr. Darcy to her father in his library. That is definitely a pity, since Lizzie is Mr. Bennet’s

¹⁰⁵ *Pride and Prejudice*, Robert Z. Leonard, MGM, 1940.

favorite daughter and throughout the entire book, we can observe how strong their bond is. In the series, Lizzie only receives a note from Darcy and after that, the camera cuts to a shot where we can see Elizabeth and Darcy walking together in the countryside. Whereas in the novel, they are also accompanied by her sisters and Mr. Bingley. Here, they are alone. Lizzie gives thanks to Darcy for Lydia and after he asks if her feelings are still the same as they were, she tells him that her feelings have changed. During their conversation, Darcy also says that he has given his permission to Bingley to marry Jane and that it was “absurd and impertinent of him”¹⁰⁶ to doubt Jane’s affection for Bingley. The scene ends with Elizabeth’s words: “To be sure, you know no actual good of me – but nobody thinks of that when they fall in love.”¹⁰⁷ Which are the lines that do not appear until the penultimate chapter in the book, thus, after their engagement. The camera slowly moves away and from the distance, the audience can see Darcy and Elizabeth embracing. But the adaptation closes with Mr. and Mrs. Bennet at home. She rejoices over the marriage of three daughters and exults over Lizzie’s brilliant conquest, saying: “What pin money!”¹⁰⁸ Mr. Bennet opines philosophically: “But for what do we live but to make sport for our neighbors and to laugh at them in our turn.” And he tells Mrs. Bennet that “if any young men come for Kitty or Mary, send them in, for I am quite at leisure.”¹⁰⁹

The 1995 serial adaptation finishes similarly as the book. After Lady Catherine de Bourgh arrives in Longbourn, she wants to talk to Elizabeth. This adaptation is actually the only one which sticks to the original text, where the dialogue takes place in the Bennets’ garden. After insulting Lizzie, Lady Catherine leaves Longbourn. Then, Bingley and Darcy come back to Netherfield and also visit the Bennets. Bingley proposes to Jane the same way as in the novel, and the walk where Darcy and Elizabeth reconcile with each other also parallels the book. The 1995 version also includes the scene described in the novel, but omitted from the 1980 version, in which Mr. Bennet meets with Elizabeth after

¹⁰⁶ *Pride and Prejudice*, Cyril Coke, 5. episode, BBC, 1980.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

she became engaged. Here, Mr. Bennet is concerned that Elizabeth may have accepted a man she does not love. He says that he would hate to see her unable to respect her partner in life. Elizabeth reassures him that she does love Darcy. The final scenes of the 1995 version show a double wedding, with Darcy and Elizabeth and Bingley and Jane standing before a beaming minister. Then, outside of the church Darcy and Elizabeth get into one carriage and Bingley and Jane get into another. As the carriage pulls away from the church, Mrs. Bennet comments to Mr. Bennet that they are blessed to have three daughters married. In the final frames, Darcy and Elizabeth exchange an enamoured look and an anticipated kiss, which confirms the romantic nature of their attitudes to each other. As Ellen Belton suggests, “this ending confirms the primacy of the romantic relationship over other claims and valorizes the drive toward individual self-fulfillment and gratification” (186). She further adds:

The ending reflects the late twentieth-century assumption that the needs and desires of the individual take precedence over other values and that the utopian ideal realized in the final shot creates a private space for Elizabeth and Darcy’s passion, a space that visually excludes the intrusions of society. (194)

Finally, in a transference of an exterior scene to an interior space in the 2005 film adaptation, Lady Catherine comes to call upon Elizabeth Bennet at Longbourn. Lady Catherine actually arrives so late that the family must be aroused from their bedrooms. She mentions the Bennets’ small garden, but instead of walking in the novel’s “prettyish kind of a little wilderness on one side of their lawn,” (Austen 271) Lady Catherine meets with Elizabeth in the drawing room. From then on, the similarities with the book end. And the changes are worth looking at more closely, in tandem with Austen’s original text. In this version, the outdoor scene in which Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth express their love for each other does not take place during their pleasant stroll to Meryton. Instead, it takes place right after Lizzie’s and Lady Catherine’s dispute. Lizzie cannot sleep and early in the morning, before the dawn, she decides to take a walk. When she enters outside, there is a heavy fog everywhere. Suddenly, she sees Mr. Darcy, her partner in love and in insomnia, who comes to meet her halfway. He joins her and they talk. After Elizabeth thanks him for his part in Lydia’s recovery,

Darcy replies: “Surely, you must know it was all for you. You are too generous to trifle with me. If your feelings are still what they were last April, tell me so at once. My affections and wishes are unchanged, but one word from you will silence me forever.”¹¹⁰ In Austen’s text, this passage continues:

Elizabeth, feeling all the more than common awkwardness and anxiety of his situation, now forced herself to speak; and immediately, though not very fluently, gave him to understand, that her sentiments had undergone so material a change, since the period to which he alluded, as to make her receive with gratitude and pleasure his present assurances. (Austen 282)

In this adaptation, Elizabeth remains silent, while Darcy continues: “If, however, your feelings have changed, I would have to tell you, you have bewitched me body and soul, and I love, I love, I love you. I never wish to be parted from you from this day on.”¹¹¹ In response to this declaration, Keira Knightley’s Elizabeth kisses his hands and says: “Your hands are cold.”¹¹² Jen Camden observes that this comment and gesture “reminds the viewer of the marble statue of Darcy in the gallery at Pemberley.”¹¹³ Christine Geraghty suggests that when Darcy emerges out of the mist to claim Elizabeth in the final, hopeful dawn are highly romantic compositions that serve to “emphasize not only that this relationship is driven by fate but also that it is positioned in nature, outside society” (40).

The camera then cuts to the next shot where we can see Lizzie, who impatiently hovers in front of her father’s library, where Darcy is talking to Mr. Bennet. When he comes out, Lizzie goes to her father. On Mr. Bennet’s puzzled questions, she confesses that she loves him and also reveals what he has done for Lydia. Mr. Bennet gives his consent and says that “he could not have parted with her, to anyone less worthy,” and he delivers the final words of the movie: “If any

¹¹⁰ *Pride & Prejudice*, Joe Wright, Focus Features, 2005

¹¹¹ *Pride & Prejudice*, Joe Wright, Focus Features, 2005

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ Jen Camden, “Sex and the Scullery: The New *Pride & Prejudice*.” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/camden.htm> >.

young men come for Mary or Kitty, for heaven's sake, send them in. I'm quite at my leisure."¹¹⁴ That is how the international version of *Pride & Prejudice* ends.

But the 2005 movie has also the distinction of actually having two different endings. The alternate ending was made solely for the United States and was probably part of the promotional strategy. In the American version, the scene where we see Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth sitting and talking about their relationship, with Pemberley reflected in the lake at night behind them climaxes with a mutual kiss. Evidently, this ending inclines to signify a more romantic facet of the movie. As Christine Geraghty points out, the US ending "completes the transfer of the romance" (39). Whereas the international viewers have the chance too see a film more similar to the genre of heritage cinema. As Carol M. Dole observes, "British viewers, assumed to prefer the tasteful restraint of the heritage film, were left to end with Mr. Bennet calling for more suitors."¹¹⁵ We can therefore suggest that this approach demonstrates the fact that today's film market tries to satisfy all the different potential audiences.

5.4.3 The First Marriage Proposal

The last scene which we will examine more closely is the first marriage proposal. Darcy's offer makes Elizabeth angry in the novel, as well as in the film. She does not see Darcy as someone who realizes his own becomingness, but sees him rather as a shell of her own feelings towards him. And Darcy perceives Elizabeth in the same way. He also, by different means, attributes to her his own longings as for instance during his first marriage proposal. As he himself later admits, he believed, that Elizabeth wished to become his wife and was waiting only until he popped the question. Darcy assumes that a girl, who does not have enough financial resources, undoubtedly will accept the offer from the man who has more than plenty. Elizabeth during his proposal realizes that at that moment, she is not

¹¹⁴ *Pride & Prejudice*, Joe Wright, Focus Features, 2005

¹¹⁵ Carol M. Dole, "Jane Austen and Mud: *Pride & Prejudice* (2005), British Realism, and the Heritage Film." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/dole.htm>>.

physically present for him. When Darcy speaks, it seems that he performs his own inner monologue with himself rather than talking to her. The passion which Elizabeth arouses in him does not confirm that he perceives her at that very moment as an independent, present person.

Let's now compare how this scene was transformed in the adaptations. All of them, except the 2005 adaptation are more or less faithful to the form and content of this particular sequence. In the novel, Darcy proposes to Elizabeth in a room at Hunsford Parsonage. Pleading a headache, Elizabeth had stayed away from an evening at Rosings, and she used her time alone to review the contents of all the letters she received from Jane.

The 1940 film makes this scene very specific, especially in the way it makes Elizabeth superior. In this adaptation, the scene begins when Lizzy gets back to Hunsford where she is welcomed by Charlotte, who is there in comparison to the book, where she pays a visit to Lady Catherine with her husband, Mr. Collins. Elizabeth confides to Charlotte that she has just been told by Colonel Fitzwilliam about Darcy's intervention to separate Mr. Bingley and Jane. Charlotte tells Lizzy that Mr. Darcy is waiting for her in the study. She does not want to see him, but for Charlotte's sake, she eventually agrees. Now the camera moves to the Darcy, waiting in the study. Elizabeth enters the room. They bid each other good morning and Darcy offers Elizabeth a chair. Elizabeth behaves icily and indifferent. Laurence Olivier's Darcy is in this adaptation relatively calm. We can clearly observe that he does not fight his feelings towards Elizabeth, but rather considers how to declare himself. Then takes place the similar dialogue as in the book. Darcy renders his profession as foregone conclusion, in the way that he just cannot help himself nor do anything with it. As Ellen Belton points out, "Darcy is drawn to Elizabeth and makes very little effort to resist succumbing to her charms" (193). He kisses Elizabeth's hand. When he tells her "I love you,"¹¹⁶ Lizzy immediately, with great astonishment reacts: "Do you know, what you're saying?"¹¹⁷ And Darcy replies, "Yes, my darling. I'm asking you

¹¹⁶ *Pride and Prejudice*, Robert Z. Leonard, MGM, 1940.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

to marry me.”¹¹⁸ Whereupon Elizabeth gets up. After Lizzy rejects him, Olivier’s Darcy is speechless. While Elizabeth is talking, we can notice that he often opens his mouth or points his finger as if he wants to say something but never actually says it, as if he does not know how to defend himself, or it even seems that he doubts his judgment. This is actually noticeable, when Elizabeth mentions what he has “done” for Mr. Bingley. In the novel and the other adaptations, he does not question his right opinion, on the contrary. He has “no wish of denying that he did everything in his power to separate his friend from her sister and he rejoices in his success” (Austen 149). It is not until Elizabeth mentions Mr. Wickham, when Darcy admits no error from his side. When their dialogue ends, Darcy politely wishes her health and happiness as in the book and leaves.

Generally, with reference to the year of the movie origination, Darcy is in this scene, as in the others, very chivalrous and his manners always civil. He offers Lizzy a chair, kisses her hand and regardless of being rejected, wishes her only the best. When Darcy leaves, Garson’s Elizabeth looks miserable and her expression suggests that she blames herself for not finding out his character. At the same time, she hopes that he would not have done all those things she blames him for.

In the 1980 adaptation, the scene begins when Mr. Darcy unexpectedly rushes into the drawing room where Elizabeth is writing a letter to Jane. He immediately asks her if she is well and Elizabeth replies: “Tolerably so.”¹¹⁹ Garvie’s Lizzy is taken unaware and staggered, but at the same time not really distressed because she remains seated. When Darcy declares his feelings to her, Elizabeth says that she is sorry that “she has occasioned pain in anyone, it was unconsciously done and she hopes it will be of short duration.”¹²⁰ But while in the novel, it seems that Elizabeth says that because she is trying to keep a certain level of decorum and remain calm, in the adaptation it almost looks like that she is rather sorry for him than mad at him, at least in the beginning. Darcy starts to raise his voice.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ *Pride and Prejudice*, Cyril Coke, 5. episode, BBC, 1980.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

Now, Lizzy stands up. Elizabeth Garvie's portrayal is probably the most tranquil from all the other ones. When she is talking to Darcy, she is not really angry, but more likely talks to herself as if to solidify her judgment of him. David Rintoul's Darcy is upset, but in the end, he says goodbye and wishes her health and happiness and then quietly leaves.

The 1995 BBC adaptation begins as well as in the novel with the arrival of Mr. Darcy at Hunsford, where Lizzy is alone as she tries to rest because of her headache. Darcy's profession of love or more precisely, Colin Firth's portrayal is resolute and decisive. He is very nervous and the viewer can see Darcy's inner struggle which he is going through. Tone of his voice is firm. It makes a resolved, almost angry impression, rather than a loving one. Sue Parrill points out that "Firth manages to suggest the intensity of Darcy's struggle between his love for Elizabeth and his proud reluctance to ally himself with her family" (75). After Elizabeth rejects him, he is overtaken by surprise and prostrate. He did not expect such a reply. In the scene, we can also notice that Darcy's and Elizabeth's face do not appear in the same frame until the moment when Elizabeth stands up to rush his departure.

The 2005 proposal scene differs significantly from the original text because the sequence is relocated outside. In the scene preceding, Elizabeth learns at the church from Colonel Fitzwilliam about Darcy's intervention in the relationship between her sister and Mr. Bingley. The scene begins with an extreme long shot of the landscape. We see the dark edges of the forest and the small figure of Lizzie running across a stone bridge that curves over the narrow end of a lake. Rain streams down. Camera cuts to a medium close-up of a large stone monument, here Elizabeth stands, catching her breath, her wet coat flapping around her legs. Darcy appears, also drenched from the rain. He professes his love, and asks her to marry him. She is surprised and affronted. They argue. The rain is pouring steadily, visibly, all around them. When Lizzie mentions Mr. Wickham, Darcy moves towards her. They argue even more intensely. The camera moves forward as well to close-up shots of their faces. The scene culminates when the quarrel suddenly ends. Darcy's eyes move across her face, he leans towards her, as he wants to kiss her, but then stops. He excuses

himself and leaves. Elizabeth's expression is melange of amazement, confusion and she evidently tries to comprehend what has just happened. In contrast to the 1995 version, both Elizabeth and Darcy stand opposite each other. While in the serial adaptation, we can clearly observe that it is Darcy's presence that is dominant, in the film, it is actually Elizabeth, who expressively displays her emotions and rage. As Laurie Kaplan observes:

Austen ironizes moments of strong feeling by containing the characters in rooms that are super-charged with emotions, or by placing them in natural settings and showing their manners. In this *tête-à-tête*,¹²¹ the setting of the scene in a small interior space has the effect of heightening the drama because there is no means of emotional relief – except for Darcy to leave. The contained space of the setting conveys intimacy, but Darcy and Elizabeth are boxed in by four walls and social conventions requiring good behavior.¹²²

So, the audience might ask the question, why was the scene moved from inside to outside if it pulls apart the imagistic structure Austen so carefully set up by placing this sequence indoors? Mary M. Chan suggests that “the outdoor setting, the dramatic music, the pouring rain and the near kiss are more keeping with a smaller romanticism that becomes increasingly evident in the film.”¹²³ Kaplan sees in this scene a resemblance with Peter Kosminsky's *Wuthering Heights* (1992). “The film takes this intimate interior scene and sets it in a picturesque landscape that relies on the weather to convey torment and agony. Darcy and Elizabeth shout above the thunder and rain – like Heathcliff confronting Catherine on the Yorkshire moors.”¹²⁴

As was suggested earlier, this scene is among many other ones which were relocated from indoor to outdoor. The director Joe Wright's intention probably

¹²¹ From French (“head-to-head”); *tête-à-tête* is a private conversation, familiar interview or conference between two people, usually in an intimate setting.

¹²² Laurie Kaplan, “Inside Out/Outside In: *Pride & Prejudice* on Film 2005.” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/kaplan.htm>>.

¹²³ Mary M. Chan, “Location, Location, Location: The Spaces of *Pride & Prejudice*.” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/kaplan.htm>>.

¹²⁴ Laurie Kaplan, “Inside Out/Outside In: *Pride & Prejudice* on Film 2005.” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007), 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/kaplan.htm>>.

was to make the atmosphere more interesting, appealing and as creative as possible. But Kaplan claims that “in this adaptation, the indoor/outdoor scenes and the metaphoric subtexts have been rearranged haphazardly and inconsistently, and the result is a filmic spectacle that lacks a formal aesthetic structure.”¹²⁵

6. Conclusion

The aim of this bachelor thesis was to demonstrate the complex and multiple relationship of film and literature and its diffusion in the contemporary cinema. I illustrated that it is necessary to look at this in cooperation from different angles. It is essential to remember that although film and literature are to a certain extent conformable and share many characteristic features, we should understand them as separate art forms.

In the introductory part I specified the term of film adaptation. The typical attribute, especially nowadays, is that the number of them is continually increasing. Screenwriters draw inspiration from unending literary classics. Also children books and the fantasy genre are highly successful as sources of inspiration. When speaking about reciprocal dissimilarities among film adaptations and books, we have to keep in mind that the attention paid to a book is different from the one paid to a movie. So the negative attitude towards films is absolutely unjustified. Still, many viewers are convinced that a literary piece is deep and complex, in contrast to the shallow and superficial film version which only has an entertaining function. The fact is that when reading a book, our imagination has to be more vivid, but while watching a film, we have to perceive many elements that a book simply does not possess. This confirms that both of these cultural phenomena function diversely.

In the next part of my work, I analyzed the basic systematic division of film adaptations. Which means that filmmakers have many options how to deal with a literary piece and the approaches to them are individual. They can turn

¹²⁵ Ibid.

to transposition which is more or less a transcription of an original or they can resort to loose adaptation which only borrows the key components. This type is called an analogy and is widely popular nowadays. The goal is simple – to get closer to the younger audience. There are certain parallels with the book and the story takes place in the present day. The outcome of this chapter is that even these modern variations can be both fruitful and of high-quality. As a result, there can be plentiful kinds of movie and television adaptations and all of them should be counted in, no matter what style or approach is being used.

In the following section, I dealt with the notable popularity of the novels by Jane Austen. Especially in the 1990s, the interest in her stories has increased. Austen as a writer is optimal material for adaptations. Beyond the truth that her novel *Pride and Prejudice* has been many times named as the best book ever written or the most influential one, this work is the perfect example of a timeless romance. Nothing is exaggerated or missing, every part is immensely convincing. People want to read it again and again; just for pleasure. This serves also to the adaptations, viewers see them repeatedly – on television as well as on dvd. The fondness for this book has undoubtedly a lot to do with the characters, who are recognizable in any society and the issues in it are still surprisingly topical. The readers of Austen's novel and the audience of the adaptations love the fact that her characters are people that are discernible even nowadays. Naturally, the protagonists look and act in each version differently and there are noticeable distinctions in the way they speak, the way they dress. However, regardless of each adaptation's origination – whether it is 1940, 1980, 1995 or 2005, all of them have the potential, appeal and the message – the general view of the matters which we can find in the book has not changed much from the beginning of the 19th century. These themes are universal – marriage, the generation gap, social pressure, suffering one has to undergo in order to find true love. These issues are part of our lives and have a deep emotional impact on us.

Finally, the story of *Pride and Prejudice* is so cherished because it is basically a Cinderella story and these types of stories have remained persistently favoured for hundreds of years. There is this wonderful heroine Elizabeth Bennet, who after

a long time and despite of all the initial prejudices and obstacles finds her dreamy prince charming Mr. Darcy. That is the real core of the success why so many women readers, regardless of age, identify with Elizabeth. The spell of *Pride and Prejudice* functions universally and the influence on both readers of the book and the audience of the film and television versions have the potential to remain strong.

In the next subchapter, I focused on the criticism of the adaptations. I pointed out the fact that there is always someone who will compare a film with a book, no matter what. It is clearly impossible to find an adaptation which would satisfy everyone and which would, at the same time, meet all the possible requirements of satisfying all the views and ideas. The adherence of the adaptations to the book is in the centre of critical attention. Nevertheless, this criterion is useless because of many reasons. A book is too voluminous and complex. There is also mental adherence – which encompasses the overall rhythm and atmosphere of the original. Majority of the alterations are tenable also because contemporary audience is not familiar with the culture and the customs of the Regency era. Obviously, not only is it impossible to truly and fully transfer a book to the silver screen but it is not a guarantee of a swell result. Furthermore, what is the point of making a movie version which is absolutely the same as the literary piece. Lastly, the success of an adaptation has usually nothing to do with the adherence to the original.

Particularly in case of *Pride and Prejudice*, it is perceptible that the influence of the book on the audience is so big that each and every one of them has the feeling that they own the story and that they are the authors. Of course, film must often eliminate the less crucial characters and scenes but these omissions are remissible. On the other hand, an adaptation offers modifications which the book does not have, for example flashbacks. One way or another, we should not criticise the adaptation in advance. Rather, we should get rid of any antipathy and personal prejudices and before we judge which one is better, we should explore the relationship between the film and literature.

In the last chapter, I focused on the adaptations of *Pride and Prejudice*. Most of them are simple transpositions, but with regard to high popularity of the less accurate versions, I also touched on the other films which are to a certain degree connected with the novel. Then, I presented all the versions which have been made so far. It covers two film and six television adaptations. Afterwards, I focused on their specific elements.

The 1940 film shows components of a comedy. The dramatic scenes are limited to a minimum. It has the quick pace. Many scenes were added, yet all of them fit into the story perfectly. Family unity is also a significant feature of this adaptation. The 1980 tv mini-series is very adherent to the original text. The dialogues are very similar and the modifications are rare. The overall impression from the adaptation is influenced by the low-budget production. All the same, we have to remember that this version is the first true mini-series. The series from 1995 is considered to be the best of all. The combination of a good script, the actors and the scenery works superbly. The character of Fitzwilliam Darcy was broadened. The dialogues are fresh but do not cause any anachronisms. The 2005 movie version is the most modern one. This adaptation focuses particularly on the main heroine Elizabeth Bennet and the development of her character. The most striking change in comparison to the other adaptations is the social image of the Bennet family and the plain costumes.

Then, I closely focused on the character of Fitzwilliam Darcy and his individual performers. Laurence Olivier is chivalrous and too polite. It is hard not to like him. Colin Firth is convincing as impassible Mr. Darcy as well as in his transformation. He is presented as the Byronic hero. David Rintoul is very restrained. This on one hand is an advantage but his turnover is in comparison to the other actors less believable. Matthew Macfadyen is sensitive and rather confused than arrogant.

In case of Elizabeth, Keira Knightley is modern, young and expressive. Greer Garson is the oldest of all the other actresses, but she fits into the time of the adaptation's origination and does not look her age. Jennifer Ehle is brisk, vigorous

and quickwitted Elizabeth. Elizabeth Garvie is gentle, elegant and moderate, mainly in the way she expresses her feelings.

In the last chapter, I compared individually picked scenes. The ending of the 1940 adaptation is very different. The character of Lady Catherine is presented as the person who eventually helps Darcy and Elizabeth. The 1995 mini-series has romantic potential and shows the double wedding and the final kiss. The most recent film adaptation even has two endings – one specifically aimed at the American audience.

All in all, this thesis has presented a brief overview of the interaction between literature and film. The coupling of the two has given and still gives rise to many theories and different approaches towards literature as well as film. I chose a treasured novelist Jane Austen whose work is widely popular with filmmakers to demonstrate this noteworthy reciprocal interference. I showed the process of adaptation and its result on her most famous novel, *Pride and Prejudice*. The final conclusion infers that the film and the novel remain separate conceptions, each achieving its best results by exploring the unique and specific properties and depending on many consequential factors and circumstances of the origin.

7. Summary

Předmětem této bakalářské práce bylo zachytit spletitý a mnohvrstevný vztah filmu a literatury a jejich vzájemné prolínání v současném filmovém průmyslu. Snažila jsem se demonstrovat, jak je tato vzájemná spolupráce často komplikovaná a že je na ni třeba nahlížet z několika hledisek. Je důležité si zapamatovat, že i když si jsou film s literaturou do značné míry podobní a sdílejí řadu charakteristik, je třeba tyto dva umělecké fenomény nezaměňovat a uvědomit si, že každý představuje něco trochu jiného a je nezbytné je od sebe důsledně oddělovat a vnímat je samostatně.

V úvodní části mé práce jsem definovala pojem filmové adaptace. Typickým rysem zejména dnešní doby je neopomenutelný fakt, že adaptací vzniká velké množství. Jakoby už dnes scénáristé nedokázali sami vymyslet nic originálního a tak se uchylují k návratům za osvědčenou literární klasikou. Filmoví tvůrci se samozřejmě neinspirují pouze u klasických autorů. Obrovské popularitě se dnes těší kupříkladu dětské knihy a zástupci fantasy, což zapříčinilo, že se tyto adaptace na motivy pocházející z tohoto druhu literatury staly výnosným businessem a mocným nástrojem v rukou producentů a velkých filmových studií. Dále jsem se ve své práci zabývala vzájemnými odlišnostmi mezi filmovými adaptacemi a knihami, s tím, že jsem se zaměřila na zdůraznění základních rozdílů - od elementární diference, která tkví v přidání zvuku a obrazu, až po složitější zachycení chronologického času, které je u obou těchto forem podstatně odlišné. Důležité je si uvědomit, že jak u filmu, tak u literatury upoutává naši pozornost pokaždé něco jiného. I v souvislosti s tím jsem se snažila vyvrátit obecnou a dle mého názoru neopodstatněnou negativní zaujatost vůči filmu ze strany obecnosti, se kterou jsem se často setkávala a setkávám. Jedná se především o zavádějící a zjednodušující přesvědčení, že film klade na diváka méně nároků na soustředění než kniha na čtenáře. Je sice pravda, že když čteme, naše představivost musí pracovat na plné obrátky, ale i v případě sledování filmu, pokud na nás má nějak zapůsobit, je naopak zase nezbytné vnímat mnoho prvků audiovizuálního charakteru, které na druhou stranu není potřeba rozeznávat při četbě literatury. Což jen potvrzuje, že každá z těchto uměleckých forem funguje poněkud odlišně a na diváka, resp. čtenáře zkrátka působí každá z nich jinak, po svém.

Film a literatura na sebe vzájemně působí již odnepaměti a navzájem se ovlivňují a prolínají, čemuž jsem se věnovala v další části své práce a zmínila v ní základní systematické rozčlenění filmových adaptací. To znamená, že při své práci mají filmoví tvůrci několik možností, jak se s problematikou adaptace literárního díla vypořádat. Buďto se mohou uchýlit k „*transpozici*“ – opisu, anebo si naopak zvolí adaptaci volnou, která se původním literárním dílem inspiruje jen minimálně a vypůjčí si z ní pouze základní myšlenku. Tento typ se nazývá „*analogie*“ a v dnešní době je nesmírně populární. Cílem tohoto postupu je přiblížit se „na dostřel“ mladému publiku. Scénárista tak zakomponuje do nové verze

paralely z původního díla a děj jednoduše zasadí do přítomnosti. Tyto adaptace jsou divácky velice atraktivní. Přesto, že doslovně nekopírují knihu, úspěch se nevyklučuje s kvalitou a i z tohoto „moderního“ pojetí mohou vzniknout skutečně výborná filmová díla. Samozřejmě, že adaptace lze rozdělit i podle jiných kritérií než dle věrnosti vůči předloze. Přístup filmařů se liší v závislosti na zemi, kde adaptace vzniká a neméně podstatný je i samotný filmový záměr a tvůrčí přístup. A tak se často setkáváme s tím, že v USA – Hollywoodu je film patřičně upraven dle amerických měřítek, čímž je zpracovávána a zobrazovaná látka přizpůsobována cílové skupině – tedy těm, kdo na film mají přijít do kina. Svá specifika mají stejně tak i adaptace, které vznikají pro účely televize. Každá adaptace je pak samozřejmě ovlivněna řadou dalších souvisejících faktorů jako jsou rozpočet, herecké obsazení, doba vzniku, atd. V reálném životě tak může existovat bezpočet filmových verzí jedné literární předlohy a všechny mají „právo na život“, přesto, že budou muset bojovat s předsudky a snášet často nemilosrdnou kritiku ze strany laické, ale i odborné veřejnosti.

V další části své práce jsem se pak s přihlédnutím k výše uvedenému zabývala nevídanou popularitou filmových adaptací spisovatelky Jane Austenové. Snažila jsem se nastínit, v čem tkví, dle mého, tato úspěšnost a proč právě ona stále budí takto nebývalý zájem ze strany filmových producentů. Zmínila jsem také fakt, že Austenová, resp. její dílo, byli zvláště vyhledávaným „zbožím“ v 90. letech, kdy byl zaznamenán velký boom v souvislosti s její osobou a s adaptacemi jejích knih se doslova „roztrhl pytel“. Kromě faktu, že je její kniha opakovaně vyhlášována v různých žebříčcích popularity jako ta vůbec nejlepší a má nebývalý vliv na své čtenáře, je tento román také ideální ukázkou nadčasového romantického díla. Vše do sebe dokonale zapadá, nic nechybí ani nepřebývá. Čtenáři se k této knize vracejí stále znovu a znovu; čistě pro potěšení. To samé platí i pro filmové a televizní adaptace. Diváci je rádi vidí opakovaně a to jak na televizních obrazovkách či na dvd. Tato neutuchající obliba je zapříčiněna především precizně vykreslenými postavami a dialogy, které lze zasadit i do dnešní doby. Postavy se potýkají s problémy, které se dotýkají nás všech. Samozřejmě, jednotliví protagonisté se v adaptacích výrazně liší a to jak ve fyzickém vzhledu či projevu. Ať je ale řeč o verzi z roku 1940, 1980, 1995 nebo 2005, žádná nepostrádá potřebný potenciál zaujmout a také jistou

univerzálnost. Témata jako manželství, generační rozdíly, společenský nátlak, touha najít svou spřízněnou duši a pravou lásku jsou, jakkoliv přizpůsobené současným trendům, stále aktuální a nadčasová a nalezneme je v životě každého z nás. Konečně, příběh *Pýchy a předsudku* není vlastně nic jiného než variací na klasickou pohádku o Popelce. Stejně jako Popelka i Elizabeth musí ujit dlouhou cestu a překonat mnoho nástrah, aby našla své štěstí a prince na bílém koni, pana Darcyho. A právě to je oním jádrem úspěchu – bez ohledu na věk se mnoho čtenářek ztotožňuje s postavou Elizabeth a prožívají s ní veškeré vzestupy i pády. Kouzlo *Pýchy a předsudku* a vliv, který má toto nesmrtelné dílo na čtenáře i diváky adaptací, s námi proto zůstanou navždy.

V návaznosti na dané téma, jsem dále uvedla důvody, proč je dle mého názoru dobré a vhodné její dílo vůbec adaptovat. Jedním z těch nejdůležitějších je skutečnost, že autor a povědomí o něm ani po mnoha letech nezaniká a filmy tak dokáží držet osobu spisovatele „naživu“ i pěknou řádku let po jeho/její smrti. Studentům pak může filmová adaptace posloužit jako pomocné lano a často jim pomáhá knihu lépe a rychleji pochopit. V následující kapitole jsem rozebírala hlavní příčiny kritiky adaptací. Tato problematika je velice široká a proto jsem se zabývala jen těmi hlavními a nejčastějšími výhradami ze strany publika. Poukázala jsem na fakt, že se vždy najdou tací, kteří budou film v porovnání s předlohou kritizovat, ať se děje, co se děje. Navíc bychom jen těžko hledali filmovou adaptaci, která stoprocentně naplní představy diváka o té jediné „správné“ adaptaci.

Základním předmětem kritiky se stává bezesporu věrnost vůči předloze. Snažila jsem se tedy vysvětlit, co v mých očích vlastně ona „věrnost předloze“ znamená a dále jsem zdůraznila, že je nemožné toto kritérium splnit, protože v knize existuje příliš velké množství souvislostí – postavy a jejich prolínání, dále geografické, sociální a kulturní zázemí a v neposlední řadě kontext knihy jako takový. Pak přichází na řadu i tzv. věrnost „duševní“, která zahrnuje celkové vyznění, atmosféru a rytmus původního literárního díla. Nejen tedy, že v podstatě nelze pravdivě přetřansformovat knihu na plátno, ale i kdyby byla taková adaptace sebevíce podobná předloze, není to vždy záruka (nej)lepšího výsledku. Souhrn možností a schopností filmu a literatury je odlišný. Proto není divu, že se většina

odborníků shoduje na tom, že věrnost vůči předloze je jen nafouknutou bublinou. Pokud je totiž film úplně stejný jako předloha, nemá smysl film vůbec vytvářet. A především, pokud je film ve výsledku skutečně povedený, ve většině případů je to z úplně jiných důvodů a věrnost vůči předloze s tím často nemá nic společného. Je také důležité mít na paměti, že každý čtenář a divák si vytváří své vlastní představy o tom, jak mají postavy vypadat, jak se mají chovat či kdo je má na plátně ztvárnit. Naše reakce, postoje, názory a dojmy se liší od člověka k člověku.

Obzvlášť v případě *Pýchy a předsudku* je patrné, že se kniha čtenářů dotýká v takovém měřítku, že každý z nich má pocit, že jim příběh svým způsobem patří a že oni jsou vlastně autory knihy. I když film musí často vyřadit z dějové linie méně důležité postavy a scény, vzhledem k délce filmu jsou tato záměrná opomenutí opodstatněná a omluvitelná. Na druhou stranu, i film nabízí možnosti a modifikace, kterými kniha často nemůže disponovat (viz např. pojetí práce s flashbaky). Dalším trnem v oku kritiků může být přetvoření filmu do podoby tzv. harlekýnové romance. Filmy na motivy děl typu *Pýcha a předsudek* se obecně řadí do žánru, jehož cílové publikum tvoří především ženy a v dnešní době tento fakt umocňuje i to, že představitelé hlavních rolí jsou velice často obsazováni a upravováni dle současných měřítek „krásy“, a to převážně proto, aby se zavděčili publiku, které to svým způsobem očekává. Na závěr této kapitoly jsem poukázala na skutečnost, že bychom se měli naučit filmové adaptace nekritizovat, zbavit se předsudků a osobních antipatií a raději vztah mezi literaturou a filmem prozkoumávat, spíše než soudit, která z těchto kulturně uměleckých forem je lepší.

V další části této práce jsem zmínila, že styl psaní Jane Austenové může, myslím si, způsobit filmařům nemalé potíže. Oříškem se může zdát kupříkladu nedostatečný popis fyzického vzhledu postav. Mnoho podstatných prvků v knize nenalezneme vůbec a je třeba, aby si je filmaři domyslely a následně také dotvořili.

V poslední kapitole jsem se věnovala samotnému románu *Pýcha a předsudek*. Toto dílo je bezesporu nejznámější a mezi čtenáři nejpoblárnější ze všech děl

Jane Austenové. Zaměřila jsem se na popis procesu zrodu knihy a neopomenula jsem zmínit i rané recenze. I když většina adaptací *Pýchy a předsudku* jsou transpozice, vzhledem k popularitě i méně „věrných“ adaptací jsem neopomenula ani ostatní filmové počiny, které jsou v nějaké souvislosti s tímto románem spojeny. V další podkapitole jsem představila jednotlivé adaptace *Pýchy a předsudku*. Do dnešní doby to zahrnuje dvě filmové a šest televizních, mezi nimiž jsou i mini-série. Poté už jsem se konkrétně věnovala čtyřem vybraným adaptacím, jelikož právě ty jsou oproti ostatním v dnešní době dostupné a lze je tedy dnes bez problémů zhlédnout. Jedná se o dvě mini-série a dva celovečerní snímky. Všechny zmiňované verze mezi sebou dělí poměrně široká časová prodleva a tak bylo o to zajímavější je srovnávat. V souvislosti s tímto faktem je třeba pamatovat právě na dobu vzniku, jelikož ta neodmyslitelně dotváří celkový dojem a zážitek diváka.

V návaznosti na to jsem se zaměřila na specifické prvky jednotlivých adaptací – v čem se liší od předlohy, jaké jsou jejich největší přednosti a naopak, co mohlo být uděláno jinak, popřípadě lépe. Ze snímku z roku 1940 je patrné, že je velice podobný žánru komedie, jisté charakteristiky ho pojí i s fraškou, dramatické scény jsou eliminovány na minimum. Dále se vyznačuje rychlým tempem i dialogy. Také jsem neopomněla poznamenat skutečnost, že výrazný vliv na tuto adaptaci měla i válka, která značně upravila scénář. Mnoho scén bylo do tohoto filmu přidáno. Ale jak jsem demonstrovala na příkladech, všechny z nich působí velice přirozeně, některé z nich dokonce podhalují, co Austenová možná sama napsat zamýšlela. Rodinná pospolitost a soudržnost jsou také zvláště viditelným a charakteristickým rysem adaptace.

Televizní mini-série z roku 1980 se oproti tomu obsahově blíží knize nejvíce. Kopíruje dialogy totožné s předlohou a modifikace literárního textu se zde téměř nevyskytují. Tato adaptace je ovlivněna především nízkými náklady na výrobu, které se zřetelně promítají do celkového dojmu. Ačkoliv výprava není tak detailně propracovaná, je třeba pamatovat na to, že se jedná o první mini-sérii v pravém slova smyslu.

Televizní série z roku 1995 je potom považována za tu vůbec nejvydařenější a to z mnoha důvodů. Snoubila se v ní kombinace skvělého scénáře, herců i výpravy. Nabízí spoustu nových prvků a přidaných scén, pro které je dodnes chválena diváky z řad odborné i laické veřejnosti. Postava Fitzwilliama Darcyho zde byla podstatně rozšířena. Dialogy se drží předlohy, přesto jsou ušity na míru dnešnímu divákovi, především z důvodu lepší srozumitelnosti. Tyto úpravy nicméně nezpůsobují žádné anachronismy.

To filmová adaptace z roku 2005 se svým zpracováním dle mého názoru blíží soudobému publiku asi úplně nejvíc. Nejen z hlediska obsazení hlavních postav, ale také zasazením, pojetím a dialogy. Tato verze se soustředí především na hlavní hrdinku Elizabeth Bennetovou a její cestu k „dospělosti“. U této adaptace nelze nepochválit propracovanou výpravu, hudbu a kameru. Nejvýraznějšími změnami oproti předloze je pak rozhodně sociální vyobrazení rodiny Bennetových. Adaptace skutečně nic nepřikrášluje a nabízí realistický pohled na společenské vrstvy tehdejší doby. To se týká i kostýmů. Nepřehlédnutelnou změnou je pak transformace většiny scén. Venkovní sekvence jsou často nahrazeny těmi, které se odehrávají uvnitř a naopak. Což se odráží i v jejich pojetí. Nemálo odborníků si také všímá jisté obrazové podobnosti s filmem *Na Větrné hůrce*, ze kterého čerpá inspiraci pro výpravu i jednotlivé scény.

Poté jsem se ve své práci blíže zaměřila na postavu Fitzwilliama Darcyho a jeho herecké představitele. Laurence Olivier je galantní Darcy, vždy zdvořilý a je těžké si ho neoblíbit. Svě city k Elizabeth projevuje příliš brzy a zřetelně. Colin Firth dokáže přesvědčivě ztvárnit obě stránky Darcyho – když si snaží zachovat společenský odstup a zároveň zápasit s city, které chová k Elizabeth. Jeho Darcy je zde představen jako byronský hrdina – především díky vnitřní bitvě kterou svádí se svými pocity a která je pro diváky nepřehlédnutelná. David Rintoul je velice odměřený a chladný Darcy. Což je na jednu stranu velice výhodné, ovšem ve chvíli, kdy by ho měla Elizabeth začít obdivovat a diváci by k němu měli začít projevovat jisté sympatie, je jeho transformace v porovnání s ostatními představiteli málo uvěřitelná. Matthew Macfadyen je citlivý Darcy, spíše zmatený než arogantní. Neví, jak se svými city naložit a zda je dát najevo.

Nyní se dostáváme k samotné Elizabeth Bennetové, stěžejní postavě celého románu a jejím hereckým představitelkám. Keira Knightley je moderní, mladá Elizabeth, s prostými šaty. V této verzi je hlavní hrdinka představena coby nespoutaná, expresivní a rebelantní dívka, co na srdci, to na jazyku. Greer Garson je ze všech představitelk Elizabeth nejstarší. Nicméně její zralá krása tu není na překážku, a to i vzhledem k faktu, že na svůj věk vůbec nevypadá. Jennifer Ehle zvládne vyjádřit širokou paletu pocitů. Její Elizabeth je duchaplná, briskní, temperamentní, činorodá a bystrá. Elizabeth Garvie je elegantní, jemná, sympatická a umírněná Elizabeth.

V poslední kapitole této bakalářské práce jsem porovnávala jednotlivé vybrané scény. Všechny se vůči předloze výrazně liší. Adaptace z roku 1940 se opět snaží upozornit na jednotu a soudržnost rodiny, na rozdíl od verze z roku 2005, která se naopak snaží co nejvíce do popředí umístit hlavní hrdinku. Série z roku 1995 se soustředí na rozmanitost postav a tímto zobrazením se snaží zbavit jednotvárnosti. Zakončení nejstarší adaptace probíhá v porovnání s knihou velmi rozdílně. Postava Lady Catherine je oproti předloze kladná, a je to právě ona, kdo nakonec pomůže Darcymu a Elizabeth ke společnému štěstí. Mini-série z roku 1980 se odlišuje tím, že je zde vynechán rozhovor mezi Elizabeth a jejím otcem. Finální scéna 1995 série má romantický potenciál a zobrazuje dvojitou svatbu a polibek ústřední dvojice. Nejnovější celovečerní verze opět mění prostředí a usmíření Darcyho a Elizabeth se koná venku za rozbřesku. Tato adaptace nabízí jako jediná dva konce. Pro potřeby amerického publika byl natočen alternativní závěr, někteří diváci ho ale považují za příliš kýčovitý. První žádost o ruku v adaptaci z roku 1940 opět potvrzuje fakt, že Darcy pociťoval náklonnost k Elizabeth již dříve. V 1980 sérii tato scéna probíhá velice podobně jako v knize. Mini-série z roku 1995 je taktéž velice podobná předloze. Colin Firth působí rezolutně, Jennifer Ehle ho stejně neoblomně odmítne. V této adaptaci jsou oba hrdinové vyobrazeni jako skutečné protipóly. Film z roku 2005 se potom opět odlišuje nejvíce. Odehrává se venku za deště. Ačkoliv změna scény dodává filmu na emocionální intenzitě, ne všem divákům a kritikům se tato změna lokace zamlouvá.

Při finálním srovnání všech komparovaných adaptací jsem dospěla k závěru, že každá z nich má své pro a proti a i když mini-série z roku 1995 zůstává, nejen z hlediska divácké úspěšnosti, ale také díky jedinečnému zpracování, stále nepřekonaná, při konečném hodnocení je třeba brát v úvahu řadu vedlejších faktorů, jako dobu vzniku adaptace, rozpočet a v neposlední řadě i individuální představu režiséra a scénáristy. Žádnou z těchto verzí tudíž není správné zatracovat či naopak vychvalovat a nazývat ji ve všech ohledech špatnou či dobrou. Každá z nich klade na diváky jiné požadavky a vytváří rozdílné dojmy. Stejně tak si každá adaptace bezpochyby nalezne své příznivce a to jak v řadách kritiků, obdivovatelů Jane Austenové, milovníků její knihy, tak i „obyčejných“ filmových fanoušků.

8. Abstract

Má bakalářská práce se zaměřuje na vzájemné působení dvou důležitých forem umění současnosti – filmu a literatury. Cílem je analyzovat a porovnat adaptace románu *Pýcha a předsudek* spisovatelky Jane Austenové, s ohledem na dobu vzniku dané adaptace. Práce se dále soustředí na rozdíly, úpravy a společné prvky, které jsou typické pro vybrané adaptace. V druhé části práce krátce představuje proces transformace románu do filmové podoby a zároveň poukazuje na možné problémy, které mohou vzniknout v souvislosti s převedením románu na filmové plátno.

My thesis is focused on the interaction between one of the most important art forms of our time – film and novel. The aim is to analyze and compare adaptations of the novel *Pride and Prejudice* written by Jane Austen, considering the time of the particular adaptations's origination. The work is concentrating on the contrasts, modifications and common elements that are typical for the adaptations. In the second part, the thesis briefly introduces the process by which novels are transformed into films and also presents some issues in adapting the novel for the screen.

9. Bibliography

9.1 Works Cited

Ailwood, Sarah. "“What Are Men to Rocks and Mountains?” Romanticism in Joe Wright’s *Pride and Prejudice*.” *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007). 26 Dec. 2010 <http://jasna.org/persuasions/on_line/vol27no2/ailwood.htm>.

An interview with Joe Wright. RopeofSilicon. 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.ropeofsilicon.com/features/2005/joewright/index.php>>.

Andrew, Dudley. *Concepts in Film Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Aragay, Mireia, and Gemma López. “Inf(l)ecting *Pride and Prejudice*: Dialogism, Intertextuality, and Adaptation.” *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship*. Ed. Mireia Aragay. Netherlands: Rodopi Publishers, 2005. 201-222.

Asheim, Lester. “From Book to Film.” Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Chicago, 1949. 118-119. In Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2003. 142.

Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. London: Penguin Group, 1994.

Austen, Jane, and Seth Grahame-Smith. *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies*. Philadelphia: Quirk Books, 2009.

Austen-Leigh, James Edward. *Memoir of Jane Austen*. Ed. Les Bowler. 2006. 25 Nov. 2010 <<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/17797/17797-h/17797-h.htm>>.

- Austen-Leigh, William, and Richard Arthur Austen-Leigh. *Jane Austen, Her Life and Letters A Family Record*. Ed. Thierry Alberto. 2007. 25 Nov. 2010 <<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22536/22536-h/22536-h.htm>>.
- Baker, William. *Critical Companion to Jane Austen: A Literary Reference to Her Life and Work*. New York: Facts on File Publishing, 2008.
- Belton, Ellen. "Reimagining Jane Austen: the 1940 and 1995 film versions of *Pride and Prejudice*." *Jane Austen on Screen*. Ed. Gina Macdonald and Andrew F. Macdonald. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 175-196.
- Birtwistle, Sue, and Susie Conklin. *The Making of Pride and Prejudice*. London: Penguin Books, 1995.
- Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- Brownstein, Rachel M. "Out of the Drawing Room, Onto the Lawn." *Jane Austen In Hollywood*. Ed. Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1998. 13-21.
- Brooker, Peter. "Postmodern Adaptation: Pastiche, Intertextuality and Re-Functioning." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 107-120.
- Camden, Jen. "Sex and the Scullery: The New *Pride & Prejudice*." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007). 26 Dec. 2010 <http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/camden.htm> >.

- Chan, Mary M. "Location, Location, Location: The Spaces of *Pride & Prejudice*." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America V. 27, NO. 2* (Summer 2007). 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/online/vol27no2/kaplan.htm>>.
- Cardwell, Sarah. "Literature on the Small Screen: Television Adaptations." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 181-195.
- Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan. "A Practical Understanding of Literature on Screen: Two Conversations with Andrew Davies." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 239-251.
- Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999.
- . "Literature on Screen, a History: In the Gap." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 29-43.
- Cruise, Jennifer. "Introduction." *Flirting with Pride & Prejudice: Fresh Perspectives on the Original Chick-Lit Masterpiece*. Ed. Jennifer Cruise. Dallas: BenBella Books, 2005.
- Davison, Annette. "High Fidelity? Music in Screen Adaptations: Music in *Pride and Prejudice*." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 212-225.

- Demory, Pamela. "Jane Austen and the Chick Flick in the Twenty-first Century." *Adaptation Studies: New Approaches*. Ed. Christa Albrecht and Dennis Cutchins. New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2010. 101-149.
- Dinah, Colin. "Behind the Scenes – *Pride and Prejudice* – Colin Firth." *A&E Television Network* 7 July 1996. In Parrill, Sue. *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2002. 61.
- Dole, Carol M. "Jane Austen and Mud: *Pride & Prejudice* (2005), British Realism, and the Heritage Film." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007). 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/dole.htm>>.
- Ellington, H. Elisabeth. "A Correct Taste in Landscape: Pemberley as Fetish and Commodity." *Jane Austen In Hollywood*. Ed. Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1998. 90-110.
- Epstein, Joseph. "Reel Literature." *The Wall Street Journal*. 20 Nov. 2001.
- Feature Interview with Joe Wright*. MovieFreak.com – The Film Palace. 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.moviefreak.com/features/interviews/joewright.htm>>.
- Flavin, Louise. *Jane Austen in the Classroom: Viewing the Novel/Reading the Film*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2004.
- Fraiman, Susan. "The Liberation of Elizabeth Bennet in Joe Wright's *Pride & Prejudice*." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V. 31, NO.1 (Winter 2010). 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol31no1/fraiman.html>>.

- Geraghty, Christine. *Now a Major Motion Picture: Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2008.
- Gilson, David, and J. David Grey. *Jane Austen's Juvenilia and Lady Susan*. London: UMI Research Press, 1989. In William Baker. *Critical Companion to Jane Austen: A Literary Reference to Her Life and Work*. New York: Facts in File Publishing, 2008. 404.
- Harris, Jocelyn. "“Such a Transformation!”: Translation, Imitation, and Intertextuality in Jane Austen on Screen." *Jane Austen on Screen*. Ed. Gina Macdonald and Andrew F. Macdonald. ambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 44-68.
- Hark, Ina Rae. "The Wrath of the Original Cast: Translating Embodied Television Characters to Other Media." *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. London: Routledge, 1999. 172-184.
- Hopkins, Lisa. "Mr. Darcy's Body: Privileging the Female Gaze." *Jane Austen In Hollywood*. Ed. Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1998. 111-121.
- Kaplan, Deborah. "Mass Marketing Jane Austen: Men, Women, and Courtship in Two Film Adaptations." *Jane Austen in Hollywood*. Ed. Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1998. 177-187.
- Kaplan, Laurie. "Inside Out/Outside In: *Pride & Prejudice* on Film 2005 ." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007). 26 Dec. 2010
<<http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/kaplan.htm>>.

- Kroll, Jack. "Jane Austen Does Lunch." *Newsweek* 18 Dec. 1995: 66-68. In Parrill, Sue. *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2002. 61.
- Le Faye, Deirdre. *Jane Austen: The World of Her Novels*. New York: Harry N. Abrams Publishers, 2002.
- Mandal, Anthony. "Life and Works: Language." *Jane Austen in Context*. Ed. Janet Todd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 23-32.
- Margolis, Harriet. "Janeite Culture: What Does the Name 'Jane Austen' Authorize?" *Jane Austen on Screen*. Ed. Gina Macdonald and Andrew F. Macdonald. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 22-43.
- Marx, Samuel. "A Mythical Kingdom: The Hollywood Film Industry in the 1930s and 1940s." *Film and Literature: A Comparative Approach to Adaptation*. Ed. Aycock Wendell and Michael Schoenecke. Studies in Comparative Literature 19. Lubbock: Texas Tech UP, 1988. 21-32.
- McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- . "Reading Film and Literature." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 15-28.
- Moody, Ellen. "Bliss it is to spend your life as Mrs. Darcy." *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 21 Nov. 2005. 26 Dec. 2010
<<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/308.html>>.

- Moody, Ellen. "Many Novel-Readers Feel Called Upon To Read: On the Latest Oxford *Pride and Prejudice*." *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 23 Jul. 2008. 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/926.html>>.
- Moody, Ellen. "Lyrical Melodrama." *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 12 July 2007. 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/711.html>>.
- Moody, Ellen. "Never Underestimate the Capacity of the BBC Costume Department." *Ellen and Jim Have a Blog, Too* 23 Dec. 2006. 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.jimandellen.org/austenblog/570.html>>.
- Nixon, Cheryl L. "Balancing the Courtship Hero: Masculine Emotional Display in Film Adaptations of Austen's Novels." *Jane Austen In Hollywood*. Ed. Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1998. 22-43.
- North, Julian. "Conservative Austen, Radical Austen: *Sense and Sensibility* from Text to Screen." *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. London: Routledge, 1999. 38-50.
- Parrill, Sue. *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2002.
- P&P (2005) Actors*. P&P (2005) Forum Info. 11 Dec 2010 2010 <<http://pridenprejudice.proboards.com/index.cgi?board=general&action=display&thread=60#ixzz1BhVLiku4>>.
- Pride & Prejudice Companion Book*. Working Title Films. 11 Jan. 2011 <<http://www.workingtitlefilms.com/media/prideBooklet/index.htm>>.

- Sheen, Erica. "'Where the Garment Gapes': Faithfulness and Promiscuity in the 1995 BBC *Pride and Prejudice*." *From Page To Screen: Adaptations of the Classic Novel*. Ed. Robert Giddings and Erica Sheen. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999. 22.
- Sonnet, Esther. "From *Emma* to *Clueless*: Taste, Pleasure and the Scene of History." *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. London: outledge, 1999. 51-62.
- Stam, Robert. "Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation." *Film Adaptation*. Ed. James Naremore. London: The Athlone Press, 2000. 54-76.
- Stewart-Beer, Catherine. "Style over Substance? *Pride & Prejudice* (2005) Proves Itself a Film for Our Time." *A Publication of the Jane Austen Society of North America* V.27, NO.2 (Summer 2007). 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol27no2/stewart-beer.htm>>.
- Troost, Linda V. "The Nineteenth-Century Novel on Film: Jane Austen." *The Cambridge companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007 75-89.
- Troost, Linda, and Sayre Greenfield. "Introduction: Watching Ourselves Watching." *Jane Austen in Hollywood*. Ed. Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1998. 1-12.
- Trivia for Pride and Prejudice (1980)*. The Internet Movie Database. 26 Dec. 2010 <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0078672/trivia>>.
- Trivia for Pride & Prejudice (2005)*. The Internet Movie Database. 11 Jan. 2011 <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0414387/trivia>>.

Voigts-Virchow, Eckhart. "Heritage on Literature on Screen." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 123-137.

Wagner, Geoffrey. *The Novel and Cinema*. London: Tantivy Press, 1975.

Waldron, Mary. "Critical Fortunes: Critical Responses, Early." *Jane Austen in Context*. Ed. Janet Todd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 85.

Whelehan, Imelda. "Adaptations: The Contemporary Dilemmas." *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. London: Routledge, 1999. 3-19.

Wilhelm, Julia. *Appropriations of Jane Austen's "Pride and Prejudice" in contemporary British fiction*. Norderstedt: Grin Verlag, 2008.

9.2 Cited Films and Serials

PRIDE AND PREJUDICE; Robert Z. Leonard, MGM, 1940

PRIDE AND PREJUDICE; Cyril Coke, BBC, 1979

PRIDE AND PREJUDICE; Simon Langton, BBC, 1995

PRIDE & PREJUDICE; Joe Wright, Focus Features, 2005

10. Compared Films

Pride and Prejudice; USA, 1940. **Director:** Robert Z. Leonard. **Based on:** the novel *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen. **Screenplay:** Aldous Huxley, Jane Murfin (based on the dramatisation written by Helen Jerome). **Director of Photography:** Karl Freund. **Editing:** Robert Kern. **Original Music:** Herbert Stothart. **Art Direction:** Cedric Gibbons. **Costume Design:** Adrian. **Set Decoration:** Edwin B. Willis. **Cast:** Greer Garson (Elizabeth Bennet), Laurence Olivier (Fitzwilliam Darcy), Mary Boland (Mrs. Bennet), Edmund Gwenn (Mr. Bennet), Melville Cooper (Mr. Collins), Edna May Oliver (Lady Catherine de Bourg), Bruce Lester (Mr. Bingley), Edward Ashley (Mr. Wickham), Maureen O'Sullivan (Jane Bennet), Ann Rutherford (Lydia Bennet), Heather Angel (Kitty Bennet), Marsha Hunt (Mary Bennet), Karen Morley (Charlotte Lucas), Frieda Inescort (Caroline Bingley) ad. **Produced by:** Hunt Stromberg. **Production Company:** Loew's. **Distributor:** Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM). **Format:** 35 mm, black and white, 1.37 : 1, mono, english, 118 min. **Release Date:** 26. 7. 1940. **Version Used:** VHS, black and white, mono, english, 118 min.

Pride and Prejudice; VB, 1980. **Director:** Cyril Coke. **Based on:** the novel *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen. **Screenplay:** Fay Weldon. **Director of Photography:** Paul Wheeler. **Editing:** Chris Wimble. **Original Music:** Wilfred Josephs. **Costume Design:** Joan Ellacott. **Production Design:** Barbara Gosnold. **Cast:** Elizabeth Garvie (Elizabeth Bennet), David Rintoul (Fitzwilliam Darcy), Priscilla Morgan (Mrs. Bennet), Moray Watson (Mr. Bennet), Malcolm Rennie (Mr. Collins), Judy Parfitt (Lady Catherine de Bourg), Osmund Bullock (Mr. Bingley), Peter Settelen (Mr. Wickham), Sabina Franklyn (Jane Bennet), Natalie

Ogle (Lydia Bennet), Clare Higgins (Kitty Bennet), Tessa Peake-Jones (Mary Bennet), Irene Richard (Charlotte Lucas), Marsha Fitzalan (Caroline Bingley) ad. **Produced by:** Jonathan Powell. **Production Company:** British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Chestermead. **Format:** 16 mm, color, 1.66 : 1, stereo, english, 6 episodes, 265 min. **Release Date:** 13. 1. 1980 – 1. episode, BBC; **Filming Locations:** Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, England, UK. Rating: PG. Version Used: DVD, col., Dolby Digital, english.

Pride and Prejudice; VB, 1995. **Director:** Simon Langton. **Based on:** the novel *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen. **Screenplay:** Andrew Davies. **Director of Photography:** John Kenway. **Editing:** Peter Coulson. **Original Music:** Carl Davis. **Art Direction:** John Collins, Mark Kebby. **Costume Design:** Dinah Collin. **Production Design:** Gerry Scott. **Cast:** Jennifer Ehle (Elizabeth Bennet), Colin Firth (Fitzwilliam Darcy), Alison Steadman (Mrs. Bennet), Benjamin Whitrow (Mr. Bennet), David Bamber (Mr. Collins), Barbara Leigh-Hunt (Lady Catherine de Bourg), Crispin Bonham-Carter (Mr. Bingley), Adrian Lukis (Mr. Wickham), Susannah Harker (Jane Bennet), Julia Sawalha (Lydia Bennet), Polly Maberly (Kitty Bennet), Lucy Briers (Mary Bennet), Lucy Scott (Charlotte Lucas), Anna Chancellor (Caroline Bingley), Emilia Fox (Georgiana Darcy) ad. **Produced by:** Sue Birtwistle. **Executive Producer:** Michael Wearing. **Production Company:** British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Chestermead. **Format:** 16 mm, color, 1.66 : 1, stereo, english, 6 episodes, 300 min. **Release Date:** 24. 9. 1995 – 1. episode, BBC; **Filming Locations:** Buckinghamshire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, Hertfordshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Oxfordshire, Somerset, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, Wiltshire, England, UK. **Rating:** PG. **Version Used:** DVD, col., Dolby Digital, english.

Pride & Prejudice; VB, 2005. **Director**: Joe Wright. **Based on**: the novel *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen. **Screenplay**: Deborah Moggach. **Director of Photography**: Roman Osin. *Editing*: Paul Tothill. **Original Music**: Dario Marianelli. **Art Direction**: Ian Baile, Nick Gottschalk, Mark Swain. **Costume Design**: Jacqueline Durran. **Production Design**: Sarah Greenwood. **Set Decoration**: Katie Spencer. **Cast**: Keira Knightley (Elizabeth Bennet), Matthew MacFadyen (Fitzwilliam Darcy), Brenda Blethyn (Mrs. Bennet), Donald Sutherland (Mr. Bennet), Tom Hollander (Mr. Collins), Judi Dench (Lady Catherine de Bourg), Simon Woods (Mr. Bingley), Rupert Friend (Mr. Wickham), Rosamund Pike (Jane Bennet), Jena Malone (Lydia Bennet), Carey Mulligan (Kitty Bennet), Talulah Riley (Mary Bennet), Claudie Blakley (Charlotte Lucas), Kelly Reilly (Caroline Bingley), Tamzin Merchant (Georgiana Darcy) ad. **Produced by**: Tim Bevan, Eric Fellner, Paul Webster. **Executive Producer**: Debra Hayward, Liza Chasin. **Production Company**: Focus Features, Working Title Films. **Distribution in Czech Republic**: Bontonfilm. **Format**: 35 mm, color, 2.35 : 1, stereo, english, 127 min. **Release Date**: 5. 9. 2005 – London; 23 November 2005 – USA. **Czech Release Date**: 26.1. 2006. **Filming Locations**: Berkshire, Lincolnshire, Derbyshire, Kent, Wiltshire, England, UK. **Budget**: 28 mil. USD . **Rating**: PG **Version Used**: DVD, col., Dolby Digital, english, 1 disc: 127 min.

11. List of Enclosures

Enclosure no. 1: Transcription of the scenes comprising the regular and the alternative ending of the film *Pride & Prejudice* (Joe Wright, 2005).

EXT. LONGBOURN GROUNDS – DAWN

Mr Darcy appears through the mist and walks towards Elizabeth.

Elizabeth: I couldn't sleep.

Darcy: Nor I. My aunt...

Elizabeth: Yes, she was here.

Darcy: How can I ever make amends for such behavior?

Elizabeth: After what you have done for Lydia, and I suspect for Jane also, it is I who should be making amends.

Darcy: You must know. Surely you must know it was all for you. You are too generous to trifle with me. I believe you spoke with my aunt last night and this taught me to hope, as I'd scarcely allowed myself before. If your feelings are still what they were last April then tell me so at once. My affections and wishes have not changed. But one word from you will silence me forever. If, however, your feelings have changed, I would have to tell you, you have bewitched me, body and soul. And I love, I love, I love you. I never wish to be parted from you from this day on.

Elizabeth kisses his hand.

Elizabeth: Well, then. Your hands are cold.

They embrace, with their faces touching and the sun rising behind them.

INT. LONGBOURN HALLWAY – DAY

Elizabeth is pacing impatiently outside her father's library. She smiles to herself.

Mr. Darcy opens the door. Elizabeth rushes into the room.

Mr. Bennet (Off-Screen): Shut the door please, Elizabeth.

As the door closes, Elizabeth and Darcy watch each other intently.

INT. LONGBOURN LIBRARY – DAY

Mr. Bennet: Lizzy, are you out of your senses? I thought you hated the man!

Elizabeth: No, Papa.

Mr. Bennet: He is rich, to be sure. You will have more fine carriages than Jane.
But will that make you happy?

Elizabeth: Have you no other objection than your belief in my indifference?

Mr. Bennet: None at all. We all know him to be a proud, unpleasant sort of fellow, but this would be nothing if you really liked him.

Elizabeth: I do like him. I love him. He's not proud. I was wrong. I was entirely wrong about him. You don't know, Papa, if I told you what he was really like, what he's done...

Mr. Bennet: *What has he done?*

EXT. LONGBOURN – DAY

Mr. Darcy is sitting outside Longbourn with the animals, as Mrs. Bennet and Jane look on from behind a window. Darcy stands and begins pacing up and down.

Mrs. Bennet: But she doesn't like him. I thought she didn't like him.

Jane: So did I. So did we all. We must have been wrong.

Mrs. Bennet: It wouldn't be the first time, would it?

Jane: No

INT. LONGBOURN LIBRARY – DAY

Elizabeth and Mr. Bennet are still together. Mr. Bennet has heard of Darcy's involvement in the marriage of Lydia and Mr. Wickham.

Mr. Bennet: Good Lord! I must pay him back.

Elizabeth: No, you mustn't tell anyone. He wouldn't want it. We misjudged him, Papa, me more than anyone – in every way, not just in this matter. I've been nonsensical. He's been a fool, about Jane, about so many other things, but then so have I. You see, he and I are... he and I are so similar. We're both so stubborn.

Papa...

Mr. Bennet, along with Lizzy, is starting to cry.

Mr. Bennet: (Laughs) You really do love him, don't you.

Elizabeth: Very much.

Mr. Bennet: I cannot believe that anyone can deserve you, but it seems I am overruled. So, I heartily give my consent.

They hug.

Mr. Bennet: I could not have parted with you, my Lizzy, to anyone less worthy.

Elizabeth leaves.

Mr. Bennet: If any young men come for Mary or Kitty then for Heaven's sake send them in. I am quite at my leisure.

So ends the non-American version of *Pride and Prejudice*.

Now, this is the final scene of the US edition, also available as an alternate ending in international editions of the DVD.

EXT. PEMBERLEY – NIGHT

We see Pemberley, reflected in the lake at night. Mr. Darcy sits down next to Elizabeth.

Mr. Darcy: How are you this evening, my dear?

Elizabeth: Very well... although I wish you would not call me “my dear.”

Mr. Darcy: *[chuckles]* Why?

Elizabeth: Because it’s what my father always calls my mother when he’s cross
about something.

Mr. Darcy: What endearments am I allowed?

Elizabeth: Well let me think...“Lizzie” for every day, “My Pearl” for Sundays,
and...“Goddess Divine”... but only on very special occasions.

Mr. Darcy: And... what should I call you when I am cross? Mrs. Darcy...?

Elizabeth Bennet: No! No. You may only call me “Mrs. Darcy”... when you are
completely, and perfectly, and incandescently happy.

Mr. Darcy: *[he snickers]* Then how are you this evening... Mrs. Darcy?

[kisses her on the forehead]

Mr. Darcy: Mrs. Darcy...

[kisses her on the right cheek]

Mr. Darcy: Mrs. Darcy...

[kisses her on the nose]

Mr. Darcy: Mrs. Darcy...

[kisses her on the left cheek]

Mr. Darcy: Mrs. Darcy...

[finally kisses her on the mouth]

Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci
Filozofická fakulta
Akademický rok: 2010/2011

Studijní program: Filologie
Forma: Prezenční
Obor/komb.: Angličtina se zaměřením na aplikovanou ekonomii
(APLEKA)

Podklad pro zadání BAKALÁŘSKÉ práce studenta

PŘEDKLÁDÁ:	ADRESA	OSOBNÍ ČÍSLO
VOJKOVSKÁ Daniela	Olomoucká 98, Šternberk	F08295

TÉMA ČESKY:

Filmové adaptace románu Jane Austenové *Pýcha a Předsudek*

NÁZEV ANGLICKY:

Film adaptations of the novel *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen

VEDOUcí PRÁCE:

Mgr. Ema Jelinková, Ph.D. - KAA

ZÁSADY PRO VYPRACOVÁNÍ:

My thesis is focused on the interaction between one of the most important art forms of our time - film and novel. The aim is to analyze and compare adaptations of the novel *Pride and Prejudice* written by Jane Austen, considering the time of the particular adaptation's origination. The work is concentrating on the contrasts, modifications and common elements that are typical for the adaptations. In the second part, the thesis briefly introduces the process by which novels are transformed into films and also presents some issues in adapting the novel for the screen.

SEZNAM DOPORUČENÉ LITERATURY:

Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
Parrill, Sue. *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, 2002.
Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan. *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. London: Routledge, 1999.
Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan. *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Podpis studenta:

Daniela Vojtková

Datum:

15. 11. 2010

Podpis vedoucího práce:

Ema Jelinková

Datum:

15. 11. 2010