DUDLEI FLORIANO DE OLIVEIRA

CINEMA, RELIGION AND LITERATURE:
REVISITING, RECREATING AND RESHAPING JANE AUSTEN'S *PRIDE AND PREJUDICE* AS A 21ST CENTURY COMEDY

PORTO ALEGRE

2012

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS
ÁREA DE ESTUDOS DE LITERATURA
ESPECIALIDADE EM LITERATURAS ESTRANGEIRAS MODERNAS
ÊNFASE EM LITERATURAS DE LÍNGUA INGLESA

CINEMA, RELIGION AND LITERATURE: REVISITING, RECREATING AND RESHAPING JANE AUSTEN'S *PRIDE AND PREJUDICE* AS A 21ST CENTURY COMEDY

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul para obtenção do grau de Mestre em Letras na ênfase Literaturas de Língua Inglesa

Mestrando Dudlei Floriano de Oliveira

Orientadora: Profª. Dra. Rosalia Angelita Neumann Garcia

Porto Alegre

2012

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank God for placing me in such a loving and caring family, and for giving me great personal and professional experiences over the past few years.

I would like to thank my great-grandmother, Benta de Oliveira, and my grandmothers, Maria Eva de Oliveira and Andira Floriano. Even if formal education was denied to them in their youth, they always made it a priority for my grandfather and for my parents, and this choice has lead to wonderful results.

I would like to thank my parents, Carlos William and Nara de Oliveira. They have always been extremely supportive through my academic experience, and, even if I had a hard time understanding their motivations, they always helped me choose not what was good, but the best for me.

I would like to thank my wonderful siblings. The boys, Leroi, Andrei and Iohan de Oliveira for their friendship because even though we have very different tastes and interests, that has never been an obstacle to our relationship. And my five sisters, Élie, Melanie, Jessie, Riuana and Raiane, who, just like the five Bennet sisters, are all very different, but add their particularities and personalities to the enjoyment we have as a family.

I would also like to thank my UFRGS professors and colleagues. Professor Rosalia Garcia has been wonderful as an advisor, always pushing me enough so that I could learn to improve, and always giving me enough freedom so that I could learn how to grow on my own. Professor Sandra Maggio, with whom I have a long time relationship (she used to teach my mother when she was pregnant with me), has always been a very open and supportive professor, trying her best to help every student she had. And Professor Elaine Indrusiak, who gave me a better understanding of the cinematographic world. I would also like to thank my former classmates DaniellyBatistela, for being a great friend and helper during the period we had classes together, Alan Noronha, the very first classmate I had contact with at UFRGS, and also Leila de Jesus, Alan Fear and Valter Fritsch, who joined the Master's program with me.

I would also like to thank my friends, Jeffrei Moreira, Marcelo Refatti, Thiago Farias and André Luiz Borba, who have been very supportive during the period of my thesis' development, and also very patient and understanding, because many times I had to refuse their company for the writing of my work. And I would also like to thank Chris Wade, a long-time US American friend

and BYU student, who has been very kind in sending me some imported books that were helpful to my work.

I would also like to thank many of my professors from FURG, who were extremely important for my literary and linguistic studies, such as Rubelise da Cunha, Tacel Leal, Luciani de Oliveira, Mateus Pereira, Mauro Póvoas, Maria Cristina Brisolara, Oscar Brisolara, Marilei Grantham, Artur Vaz, José Fornos, Antonio Mousquer, Raquel Souza, Sylvie Dion and Rossana Böhlker.

I would like to thank Andrew Black, the movie director, for his idea and determination in creating the movie, despite all the struggles, and for being very receptive to me, replying to my e-mails with questions about the movie.

I would also like to thank professor Any Raquel and Alexandre Fritzen, for helping me, through music, to cope with the challenges of academic life.

And finally, I would like to thank immensely CNPq for the scholarship, which was of tremendous help during my Master's course.

Resumo

As obras de Jane Austen são extremamente populares tanto entre leitores comuns e estudiosos de literatura desde a época em que foram publicados, no início do século XIX até os dias de hoje. Tamanha popularidade foi responsável por inúmeras obras de arte, especialmente na literatura e no cinema, que foram ou implicitamente ou explicitamente influenciados pela obra de Austen. Um de seus romances mais adaptados é *Orgulho e Preconceito*, talvez seu romance mais lido, estudado e adaptado. Um dos motivos para tal apreciação é provavelmente resultado dos valores morais que Jane Austen expõe em seus romances. Estes valores, mesmo duzentos anos mais tarde, permanecem importantes e de grande valor, especialmente na era pós-moderna, quando o excesso de liberdade e alternativas parecem deixar a humanidade mais desprovida de um suporte seguro na vida. Esta é a razão que permite um fã de Austen encontrar na religião um possível diálogo, onde, em um mundo cheio de incertezas, certos códigos morais são as certezas a que alguém pode se segurar. Em 2003, Andrew Black dirigiu o filme *Pride and Prejudice: a latter-day comedy*[1], uma transposição moderna do romance de Austen, no qual os personagens vão à igreja e estudam em uma universidade religiosa. Meu trabalho busca estabelecer uma relação entre o livro de Jane Austen, o filme de Andrew Black e as questões sobre moralidade e religião, e como o romance e o filme estabelecem uma conexão não apenas em seus elementos de ficção como personagens e enredo, mas principalmente no que diz respeito a uma das possíveis mensagens finais em ambas obras.

Palavras-chave: Jane Austen – *Orgulho e Preconceito* – Cinema – Intertextualidade – Religião – Andrew Black

[1] O filme não possui título ou versão oficial em português, mas sua tradução livre seria *Orgulho e Preconceito: uma comédia dos últimos dias*.

Abstract

The works of Jane Austen are extremely popular both among average readers and literature scholars from the time they were published, in the early 19th century until today. Such popularity has been responsible for innumerous works of art, especially in literature and cinema, that were either implicitly or explicitly influenced by Austen's work. One of her most adapted novels is the 1812 novel *Pride and Prejudice*, which is perhaps her most read, studied and adapted novel. One of the reasons for such appraisal has probably to do with the moral values Jane Austen exposes in her novels. Those values, even two hundred years later, remain important and of great worth, especially in the postmodern era, when the excess of freedom and alternatives seems to make humanity more deprived of a secure ground in life. This is the reason that allows an Austen fan to find in religion a possible dialogue, where, in a world full of uncertainties, some moral codes are the certainties one can hold onto. In 2003, Andrew Black directed a movie entitled *Pride and Prejudice*: *a latter-day comedy*, a transposition of Austen's novel to a modern setting, where the characters are themselves churchgoers and students at a religious university. My work is aimed at establishing a connection between Jane Austen's novel, Andrew Black's movie and the issue of morality and religion, and how the novel and movie establish a connection not only in terms of fictional elements such as characters and plot, but mainly in regards to one of the possible final messages in both works.

Keywords: Jane Austen – *Pride and Prejudice* – Cinema – Intertextuality – Religion – Andrew Black

“Tenho medo de escrever. É tão perigoso. Quem tentou, sabe. Perigo de mexer no que está oculto – e o mundo não está à tona, está oculto em suas raízes submersas em profundidades do mar. Para escrever tenho que me colocar no vazio. Neste vazio é que existo intuitivamente. Mas é um vazio terrivelmente perigoso: dele arranco sangue. Sou um escritor que tem medo da cilada das palavras: as palavras que digo escondem outras – quais? Talvez as diga. Escrever é uma palavra lançada no poço fundo.”

(Clarice Lispector, in *Um Sopro de Vida*)

Note on the *corpus*

The *corpus* of my work consists of an independent movie directed by Andrew Black, entitled *Pride and Prejudice: a latter-day comedy*, produced in 2003, based upon Jane Austen's 1812 novel *Pride and Prejudice*. The movie has two versions: one for the screen and one for DVD. Since I have not had the opportunity of watching the movie on screen, throughout my entire work, whenever I refer to the 2003 movie, I shall be referring exclusively to the DVD version.

Summary

Introduction

"Como começar pelo início, se as coisas acontecem antes de acontecer?"
(Clarice Lispector, in *A Hora da Estrela*)

It is a truth, literarily acknowledged, that readers both from the 19th and 21st century must be in want of a good story.

When considering novels, plays and movies that are recognized as having a good story, we could mention Shakespeare's plays, which deal with subjects that still concern humanity as a whole; or Walt Disney animated movies that can touch people of all ages through their metaphorical fantasy. Both examples for plays and movies are what the general public as well as critics consider to be "good". Why? Perhaps because such works can still please and dialogue with people from different generations even after many decades or centuries. Such is the case of English author Jane Austen, whose novels remain as well-received nowadays as they were back in early 19th century England.

Despite the fact that Austen wrote several works, she is best known for a group of six novels, including the timeless *Pride and Prejudice*, both at the time of its publishing and today, considered "a very superior work"[2]. One of the reasons that confirms such an affirmation is the fact that "readers can still turn to it, more confidently than to almost any other novel in the [English] language, for sheer enjoyment". (LITTLEWOOD, 1999, p. v)

I became interested in Jane Austen's work, especially *Pride and Prejudice*, because I, just like Elizabeth Bennet or Catherine Morland, had to overcome certain prejudices and some pride. From a very early age, I have always been very fond of reading. Whenever I could, I would read mostly adventure books aimed at young teenagers, such as the popular book collection *Série Vagalume*. Unfortunately, only very few of my classmates had the same reading habit, which always made me feel a good judge of books, at least among my peers. One day, however, I realized I had read, if not all, most of the books from the collection, and, having the desire of reading new books, I asked the librarian for suggestions. She suggested a novel by Danielle Steel, an exponent of "chick-lit"[3]. I borrowed the book and read it, and I was either thirteen or fourteen years old, not a very suitable age for the reading material. Yet, I read it and found it entertaining, but was sure I did not wish to read any other type of "chick-lit" for the rest of my life. Growing up,

[2]From Anabella Milbank (later Lady Byron) to her mother, May 1st, 1813 (ELWIN, 1963, p. 159);
[3] "Chick-lit" and "chick-flick" are popular expressions that refer to, respectively, literature and movies targeting at a female audience, usually with plots that combine love and comedy in a lighter tone.

I heard about Jane Austen and that she was often referred to as the precursor of "chick-lit" – therefore, I was never interested in her work at all. My logic was: if reading a 20th century bestseller was a shallow experience to my taste, then reading the same type of work produced two hundred years earlier would probably be a boring experience.

Thus, just like Elizabeth Bennet, who believed she could trust her feelings blindly, or like Catherine Morland, who believed her reading background to truly express the outside world, I believe I felt similar inclinations. If I had a good reading background, when compared to my peers, I imagined I knew how to judge which books were good or not, even before reading them.

The point, however, is that, Jane Austen remains, even after two centuries, an extremely popular, printed and studied author. But how is it possible that a novel that presents a society where women would marry mostly for financial survival be popular in the 21st century, many decades after Feminism emerged as a powerful movement in Western society, at the same time that marriage has lost much of its religious and social power? One of the main reasons for *Pride and Prejudice's* current success is that, besides discussing social manners and 19th century British law concerning women, the novel's most relevant discussions have to do with human feelings of love, friendship, sisterhood, parenthood, and of course, pride and prejudice. A good example of how Jane Austen's works still have a great impact in our contemporary society is the so-called "Austen-mania", the social and artistic phenomenon that began in the late 20th century, in which Jane Austen's novels have been broadly read, republished and adapted on screen, television and even received modern adaptations in literature.

When a 21st century reader peruses the pages of Jane Austen's novel, the enjoyment and identification one achieves is not to any need the reader might have to marry for convention, as did Charlotte Lucas, but probably because the reader faces similar doubts to the ones Elizabeth Bennet faces when trying to meet "the man of her dreams". This situation is not so different from Mark Twain's quote, when he states that "a successful book is not made of what is in it, but what is left out of it" (TWAIN, 1990, p. 36), once Austen's novels are not "self-help" books aimed at supporting women through their romantic struggles, but, as shown in Karen Jay Fowler's novel of 2004, *The Jane Austen Book Club*, they allow contemporary readers to "interact with the entire dramatis personae of [her] novels in an intricate postmodern cotillion."[4]In other words, 21st century readers of Jane Austen can relate their struggles to the struggles her characters face, learn with their mistakes and in the end, enjoy the fact that they have learned something with Austen's characters, in the same way that people learn with their friends.

[4] DISCH, Thomas M. In: FOWLER, Karen Joy. *The Jane Austen Book Club*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 2004;

A good example of how some elements of Austen's novel remain meaningful to our 21st century Western society as they were at Austen's time is the 2003 independent film *Pride and Prejudice: A Latter-Day Comedy*, which presents some of the main characters of the novel as single adults at a US University, in the 2000 era, a time when women are independent and can succeed financially without the need of a male partner. Nevertheless, the novel deals mainly with female characters in search of a husband because of financial reasons (such as the Bennet sisters, who might lose their house and income upon their father's death).Thus, how is it possible for a movie with characters in such a different society and time "to be faithful to the spirit (…) of the original text and, at the same time, to be a cogent and unified work in its own terms"? (MAST, 1982)

Furthermore, it is important to notice that this 2003 movie could be considered a cinematographic adaptation of the novel in at least three ways. First, the traditional book to screen adaptation, considering that the movie borrows from the novel identical elements, such as the title, the plot, and character names. Second, the movie goes through a process of historical adaptation, once the novel took place in 19th century England, in an countryside village, whereas the movie has a 21st century US University as its main scenario. And third, the adaptation process is not only a historical one, but also a cultural and religious adaptation, once the movie does not take place at just any US college or university, but at Brigham Young University, in Provo, Utah, where students expect to receive "an education in an atmosphere consistent with the ideals and principles of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints"[5], also known as "the Mormon Church".

It was this movie that made me become interested in Jane Austen. As a matter of fact, it was my very first contact with her. Once, at a friend's house, she happened to have the movie on DVD, which she had brought from a trip to the United States. At first, I do not remember establishing a connection with Austen, until I saw her name during the opening credits. During the very first minutes of the movie, I was sure that Wickham would be the hero and Darcy the villain, because that is what would often occur in similar movies and books. Also, they were portrayed very similarly to the novel, making not only Elizabeth, but also the public, perceive Wickham as very pleasant and Darcy as very unpleasant. My surprise was to realize that there is a plot twist in the movie that made me interested in Austen.

And since my aim in this work is to establish a connection between the novel and the movie, in this thesis' first chapter, *Palimpsests: adapting, borrowing and recreating*¸ I will deal mainly with the theoretical concepts concerning intertextuality. Considering that my work has in

[5]From *Church Educational System Honor Code*. In: Brigham Young University Undergraduate Catalog, 2010-2011;

its core corpus Jane Austen's 1812 novel *Pride and Prejudice* and Andrew Black's 2003 movie *Pride and Prejudice: A latter-day comedy*, approaching the subject of intertextuality is of vital importance.

For the title of this chapter I have chosen the term palimpsest, conveyed by Gerard Genette, which is, by definition, "a written document, usually on vellum or parchment, that has been written upon times, often with remnants of erased writing still visible." (GENETTE, 1997) Therefore, my aim in this chapter will be to enumerate and discuss some different forms of adaptation, considering that adaptation is not the mere process of transposing a novel into a movie, but is a very broad concept that includes a vast list of possibilities, as noticed by Julie Sanders: "variation, version, interpretation, imitation, proximation, supplement, increment, improvisation, prequel, sequel, continuation, addition, paratext, hypertext, palimpsest, graft, rewriting, reworking, refashioning, re-vision, re-evaluation" (SANDERS, 2006, p. 3). Since the possibilities of intertextuality are so many, I will work with some of its main forms that are part of our day-to-day experiences, and always have been, even if they go unnoticed.

In the second chapter, entitled *Jane Austen and Religion: a possible match (?)*, I shall venture myself into a risky field: to establish a connection between Austen's work and religiosity. Such an attempt might seem dangerous because although The Church of England was an important part of Austen's society, as well as of the characters in her novels, religiosity was not itself an issue. Rather, the church was an important institution that would highlight and reinforce some of the same moral values that Austen would defend in her writing. Quoting Gilbert Riley, he says:

> "In a thin sense of the word, […] every novelist is a moralist who shows us the ways or *mores* of his characters and their society. But Jane Austen was a moralist in a thick sense, that she wrote what and as she wrote partly from a deep interest in some perfectly general, even theoretical questions about human nature and human conduct." (RILEY, 1968, p. 106)

Austen's heroines and heroes, for instance, have to overcome certain flaws in order to find true happiness. Those faults and their respective redeeming processes are in harmony with the teachings one will come across in any Christian church, including that of Austen's time and society (as well as that of her characters). What Austen aims in her "comedies of manners" is to show readers that ultimate happiness in life can come as a consequence of well made choices, based on moral principles. Those moral principles, however, can only be beneficial, according to Austen, if balance, good judgment and common sense are involved. Mr. Collins, for instance, who is a faithful clergyman, knows and tries to live according to certain principles. What makes him a ridiculed character, nevertheless, is his lack of common sense. On the other hand, what allows the

protagonists, Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth, to find true love is that, despite the fact that they already lived in accordance to certain values, they need, throughout the novel, to get rid of certain shortcomings and make room for common sense and good judgment in their behavior.

Thus, the connection I intend to make between Austen's work and religion is that both share a common purpose, helping people to understand that life should be guided by certain moral codes, which will be helpful in important life choices leading to happiness. But since I will be working with a movie that takes place in the 21st century, the main questions I would like to propose are: What role does religion play nowadays? Does it play any significant role at all? What is there in Austen's novels that appeals to a worldwide reading public? Why are they well accepted within a religious western public, such as in the movie recently mentioned and in other Christian-based works, such as Debra White Smith's novel *First Impressions*[6].

In the third chapter, entitled *Relocating Jane Austen: from Longbourn to Provo*, I plan to work with the movie itself. In order to do that, I intend to resume some of the theories approached in the first chapter, in order to better analyze which types of intertextuality the movie makes use of. Although the term "modern adaptation" is the one most associated with the movie I will be working with, there are different terminologies and definitions that can also refer to the adaptation process of the movie, and I plan to elicit those that are important to the movie itself.

Another aspect I want to develop is the relationship between novel and movie, focusing on the relocation of characters, plot, place and culture. For such, I shall discuss not only the way that the characters have been transposed (such as the five Bennet girls, who are no longer five sisters, but five roommates at the university campus in the movie) but also why some characters have been removed from the movie version (such as Mrs. Bennet and Lady Catherine De Bourgh), the similarities between events in both (for instance, some romantic encounters are only possible because social gatherings and unexpected meetings happen), the change in elopement scenario from Gretna Green to Las Vegas and the change not only from a geographical point of view, but also in temporal, religious and cultural terms.

[6] Debra White Smith has written a series of six novels, each of them based on a novel by Jane Austen. The settings are contemporaneous, and portray characters in similar situations to that of Austen's novel. *Pride and Prejudice* is *First Impressions*; *Sense and Sensibility* is *Reason and Romance*; *Mansfield Park* is *Central Park*; *Northanger Abbey* is *Northpointe Chalet*; *Emma* is *Amanda*; and *Persuasion* is *Possibilities*.

1. Palimpsests: adapting, borrowing and recreating

> *"[The poet] is not likely to know what is to be done unless he lives in what is not merely the present, but the present moment of the past."*
> (T. S. Elliot, in *Tradition and Individual Talent*)

In the 21st century, when most of the population has access to different media, such as books, movies, television, the internet, e-books and other electronic media devices, despite one's economical or geographical situation, everyone is somewhat familiar with the word "adaptation". Indeed, many people will just come in contact with certain novels because they have had an opportunity to watch a movie, a TV show, an animation or another cultural medium that is said to be "based upon" a certain book. As Linda Hutcheon argues,

> "[…] adaptation is the pleasure of accessibility that drives not only adaptation's commercialization but also its role in education. […] teachers and their students provide one of the largest audiences for adaptations. Many of us grew up with the *Classics Illustrated* comics or the animated cartoon versions of canonical literature. Today's young people are just as likely to interact with CD-ROM adaptations for either children's or adult literature." (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 117)

The excerpt above shows that, from an early age, "these media have also increased our appetite for and delight in stories" (*idem*, p. 114). The reason for such appetite and delight comes, according to Hutcheon, from "difference as well as repetition" (*idem*). There is a feeling of "confidence that comes with the sense of knowing what is about to happen" (*idem*) combined with one's expectations for surprise and novelty. Such is the example of two major box-office successes, James Cameron's *Titanic* and Mel Gibson's *The Passion of Christ*. Even though everyone that went to the theater already knew that in the end there would be a shipwreck and that Jesus Christ would die, people were anxious to see personal reading of each director.

The statement that "a bestselling book may reach one million readers, (…) but a movie or television adaptation will find an audience of many million more" (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 5) is accurate for many reasons. Of course, there are different reasons for someone to choose to watch TV instead of reading a book, but one of the main reasons might have to do with time. Whereas someone might take from a few days to several months to read an entire novel, he/she could experience the same (so adapted, thus different) story within a couple of hours. Thus, even if we have an ideal reading public who reads at least ten books per year, chances are that this same

reader will have an opportunity to watch at least 50 movies in the same year (if we consider that he/she would take nearly a month reading each book and watch at least one movie every week, with a two-month and two-week gap, respectively).

But one could argue that watching many movies is not the same as watching good movies, nor reading many books is the same as reading good books, and that is true. Not only that, but that the "movie is not as good as the book". However, I argue that movies are a product of their own that need no comparison with other works for judgment of value, in the same way that no comparison between James Joyce's *Ulysses*and Homer's *Odissey* is needed for judgment of value. My argument is that a movie, being an adaptation is, according to Hutcheon"a derivation that is not derivative – a work that is second without being secondary. It is its own palimpsestic thing." (*idem*, p. 9).

A good way to better understand how an adaptation can be "second without being secondary" is to take a look at some of the great artists of the so-called "Universal Art" or "Universal Literature" (meaning Western Art or Western Literature). We can think of William Shakespeare in literature, George Friedrich Handel in music and Michelangelo in painting. It is an indisputable fact that these three artists, as well as many others, have been importantly and extensively influential for the foundation of some basic values in their areas both in their age as well as in ours. Since I am saying their work is still important today, the logic would be for me to mention the works that were based upon the Shakespeare, Handel and Michelangelo's works. Though I do not, intend to discuss the works that were influenced or adapted from Shakespeare, Handel and Michelangelo, I would like to refer to the sources these three artists got inspiration from in order to accomplish their work.

First of all, it is important to understand that we often talk about movies or soap-operas that were based on the works of Shakespeare as if his plays were an original source text. Indeed, they are source texts that are widely adapted into different media, but the question of originality might not be as accurate as we like to think. *Hamlet*, for instance, which is perhaps his most studied tragedy, was based upon

> "a figure from Danish legend dating back at least as far as the twelfth-century (…) [and] the immediate source for Shakespeare's play is thought to have been a lost play now known as *Ur-Hamlet*, possibly written by Thomas Kyd. Influenced by Seneca's tragedies, Kyd was instrumental in securing a place for the revenge drama on the English theater." (WELLER, 2005, p. 3)

Thus, the claim that many will defend is that Shakespeare's plays are good but movies based on them are not as good because they might lack elements considered essential in the

original work. For instance, in the cinematographic version of *Hamlet* in which Mel Gibson plays the hero, the political conflict between Denmark and Norway is not present, an event in the play that increases its tragic feeling. Whenever we see TV ads for a soap-opera that will portray the story of rival families and forbidden love, our immediate response is probably to think that the TV producers lack creativity since they are not producing something new, but rewriting Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. The point, however, is that not even Shakespeare himself escaped the rewriting process, since *Romeo and Juliet* was not his original idea, but came from "Arthur Brooke's narrative poem *The Tragical History of Romeus and Juliet* (1562, which was in turn derived from a late-fifteenth-century Italian novella." (*idem*, p. 311). Thus, the statement by T. S. Elliot that "no poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone" finds its canonical foundation on Shakespeare. The reason for scholars and readers to claim his works as some of the best literary productions ever to be written in the Western World cannot be based on the common (and often wrong) concept that his works were great because they were original, but because, being adaptations, they combined the repetition of already known stories with the difference of innovation in language and theater performance as well as on new political, ethical and religious concepts.

If we look for a definition for the word "adaptation", the American Heritage Dictionary gives us four different possibilities: (1) the act or process of adapting, (2) the state of being adapted, (3) a composition recast into a new form and (4) an alteration or adjustment by which a species or individual improves its condition in relationship to its environment. The first two definitions are not explanatory enough if one does not know what the verb "to adapt" means. Luckily, in the same column in the dictionary we find the entry "adapt" that is defined as "to make or become suitable for a specific use". Now, if we combine this definition along with definitions (3) and (4) for "adaptation", we can better understand Shakespeare's genius. His genius lies not in creating a totally new story, but in (1) recasting an already existent work into a new form, (2) altering or adjusting individual works to improve their relationship to their environment (or the Elizabethan theater audience) and (3) making certain works suitable for a specific use (that of performing). As Gerald Mast suggests, "the burden for [Shakespeare] becomes the wholeness and integrity of [his] artistic interpretation, not [his] loyalty to the original" (MAST, 1982, p. 280). The reason that made Shakespeare famous and acclaimed is not his fidelity to the works he got inspiration from, but on his own "artistic interpretation", as well as his capability to "make [them] suitable for a specific use".

The same is true of Handel and Michelangelo. Albeit expressing their arts through different means, both share a similar source: the Holy Bible. One of the most famous musical compositions

of all times is Handel's oratorio *The Messiah*. At the same time, some of the most admired paintings in the world are Michelangelo's frescoes in the Sistine Chapel. The reason for the endless admiration towards Handel's music and Michelangelo's art is not because they were able to create works of art that were totally new, but because they were able to give new meaning to the already canonical biblical texts and because of their artistic ability in creating works that are regarded as masterpieces unanimously.

Handel did something somewhat similar to the concept of *bricolage*, conveyed just a few centuries later, during the modernist artistic movement. In *The Messiah*, Handel borrows the lyrics for his songs from biblical verses. The aria *I know that my Redeemer liveth*, for instance, comes from the book of Job, chapter 19, verse 25. The chorus *For unto us a child is born*, perhaps the most performed and famous one after *Hallelujah*, comes from the writings of Isaiah, chapter 9, verse 6. Although short – 7 lines long – this verse, when borrowed and reshaped by Handel, gave life to a 4 minutes long chorus. This was possible because Handel was able to arrange and rearrange the different lexical elements of the Isaiahan verse in a way that would fit his purpose: turning a literary text into music[7]. What is more, Handel did not just compose melodies and harmonies from random verses that he found to be beautiful. Rather, in order to create a three-part oratorio, he rearranged verses, along with Charles Jennens, from different biblical books in a way that each part would deliver a certain meaning: in the first part, the music tells us about the Messiah's birth and its ancient prophecies, the second about his suffering, death and resurrection, and on the third and final part, His triumph over death and sin.

The Bible is a collection of books that are arranged in two main chronological parts – the Old and New Testaments, the first one containing a report of the events that took place with the Hebrews before Christianity, whereas the second part contains a report of the birth of Christianity and its growth. Thus, one would be led to think, from a linear-logical perspective, that the oratorio's second part, that deals with the Messiah's sufferings on earth would not contain any verses from the Old Testament, since it contains mainly the history of the Hebrew people centuries before Christ's birth. However, we will find passages from the Old and New Testaments in the three parts of the oratorio, dislocated from their original context into a new one, giving it a new meaning, despite their first chronological aspects.

[7] By saying that the Bible is a literary text, I base my statement on Robert Scholes' citation: "A fiction is a made-up story. This definition covers a lot of territory. It includes the homemade lies we tell to protect ourselves from scrutiny, and the casual jokes we hear and re-tell as polite (or impolite) conversations as well as great visionary works of literature like Milton's *Paradise Lost* or the Bible itself. (…) The Bible is fiction because it is a made-up story. This does not mean it necessarily lacks truth. Nor does it mean that the Bible may not contain fact." (SCHOLES, 1991, p. 121)

The same is true of Michelangelo's frescoes in the Sistine chapel. His works are not acclaimed for depicting events that were unknown or inexistent at his time, but because of his artistry on biblical stories that were well-known both by the priests and church-goers. Of course, since the priests were able to read and most church-goers were not, the objective behind those paintings was probably different for each public; whereas the priests would be able to appreciate the narratives they had already read, the largest part of the illiterate population would be able to, through the visual arts, learn and better visualize the stories they might never have the chance to read about. But, as vast and rich as the Sistine Chapel ceiling may be, he could not but paint only a few parts of the Bible. It is because the Bible is a collection of different books, written by different people, from different ages and cultures, containing more than a thousand pages and two thousand years of history, it is not a book that contains only narratives that can be easily transposed into a visual medium. Besides the stories it contains, many of its books contain poetry, such as the books of Psalms or Proverbs, the group of laws and rites that were meant to be followed by the Hebrews, such as the ones found in the books of Deuteronomy and Leviticus, or letters from the Apostles to the early Christians, concerning the new doctrine established in the New Testament, such as the epistles written by Paul.

The textual genres just mentioned are not as easy to be transposed onto a painting as the narrative genre is (though it is not impossible), and even when they are, they might not cause the same commotion to the public's senses as a story would. For instance, if Michelangelo were to portray the Hebrew laws themselves, it may have been just as dull as if a contemporary painter were to paint a certain paragraph of a country's constitution, specially for the people during Michelangelo's time, who were illiterate in their majority. Not only that, but in order to paint something concrete, that would represent a biblical story (and not a doctrine or commandment, once they are abstract ideas), Michelangelo would not paint something such as the Ten Commandments themselves, but rather Moses delivering them to the Hebrew people, or ordinary people either obeying or disobeying the Ten Commandments.

Thus, Michelangelo had to make a selection as to what stories he would decide to represent, given that they are many throughout the entire Bible, and in what manner they would be depicted. The entire book of Lamentations of Jeremiah, for instance, has been abridged in a single picture, with its nuclear message, that of the Jeremiah's sorrows over Jerusalem's destruction, or the Book of Genesis, that was represented in tens of different images.

Therefore, what we can conclude from both Handel and Michelangelo is "that not only the best, but the most individual parts of [their] work may be in which the dead poets (the biblical prophets and apostles), [their] ancestors, assert their immortality most vigorously" (ELIOT, 1982,

p. 37). How many people would have missed the opportunity of knowing the biblical stories, had Michelangelo not portrayed them in the Sistine Chapel? How many people would not know the poetry contained in the Bible were it not for Handel matching them with music? Handel and Michelangelo did not steal or commit plagiarism with the Bible, but rather established a dialogue with a millennial source text, keeping "[it] alive, giving it an afterlife it would never have had otherwise" (HUTCHEON, 176).

But, if Shakespeare, Handel and Michelangelo (and I could cite many others, like Virgil, Homer, James Joyce), were praised for their works, that were not, in its strict sense, "original", why are some other artists, who work with other means of expression, not praised as well? As Gerald Mast puts it,

> "does one condemn Shakespeare or Chaucer for their alterations of their source materials, for their hammering the original Boccaccio story or Holinshed chronicle into the form they needed for their own particular concerns in that particular narrative?" (MAST, p. 280)

If the great classical writers and artists are "allowed" to borrow, adapt and recreate existing works of art, then why "in both academic and journalistic reviewing, contemporary popular adaptations are most often put down as secondary [and] derivative [?]" (HUTCHEON, p. 2) Hutcheon mentions "some imagined hierarchy of medium and genre" (*idem*, p. 3), by saying that

> "it does seem to be more or less acceptable to adapt *Romeo and Juliet* into a respected high art form, like and opera or a ballet, but not to make it into a movie, especially an updated one like BazLuhrmann's (1996) *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* [once it would be] 'lowering' [the] story." (*ibidem*)

The main question would then be what arts, media and artists would be considered superior and inferior in this "imagined hierarchy", and what lays beneath such a judgment of value. Since I will be dealing with cinematographic adaptation in my work, I would like to mention some reasons that made cinema an "inferior" art for a long time (which is unfortunate, if we look at the whole picture, once Sophocles' tragedies were never considered inferior to the myths, neither was Leonardo da Vinci's *The Last Supper* in comparison to the New Testament account of the supper Jesus Christ had with his apostles prior to his crucifixion).

If we consider the early development of cinema as a new medium and phenomenon, it is easy to understand why there have been difficulties for its acceptance as a "high art" form of expression. Whereas literature was already an existing form of expressions for thousands of years, well read and discussed both among critics and the general public, cinema had its start only in the

late 19th century. Its start takes place with the Lumiére Brothers shooting the movement of a train. In the following years, most movies that were made were much closer, in their content, to journalistic texts and photographs, and not to literary fiction. According to data from the period,

> "Around 1900, 87% of films were documentaries. In 1904 this rate decreases by half and it represents only 42%. In the same period, comedies and animated films would account for 50%, while dramatic narratives represented only 8% of the overall production." (ALLEN, 1977 apud PAECH, 2010, p. 99, my translation)[8]

Consequently, while literary texts would aim for a fictionalized world, many movies produced would depict real life events, such as crowning ceremonies in Europe, war conflicts and medical procedures, and they would be most likely be shot as they actually occurred, instead of representing it through artistic interpretation. When people started to get tired of watching the same events they could read about on the newspaper, film studios started to look for new ways of making movies, expanding the cinematographic industry. Thus,

> "from the early beginning of cinema, it had been noticed that the new art had the capability of narrating, with its own resources, a story previously told in novels and short-stories. Henceforth, the practice of turning a literary narrative into a filmic narrative spread to the point where a good number of movies currently have as their origin, not an original screenplay, specially created for the cinema, but a literary work"[9] (DINIZ, 2005, p. 13, my translation).

Since the literary work was seen as the starting point for a movie, cinema was not easily recognized as an art of its own, but rather as a "unidirectional [phenomena] – always moving from the literary towards the filmic – prioritizing the first over the second."[10] (*idem*, my translation). As a natural consequence of events, some of the first serious academic theoretical works that would approach the subject of adaptation from literature to cinema, had in its core the concept that the literary text was the primary product and the filmic the secondary one, judging movies not necessarily as a work of art on their own, but by the concept of fidelity. Not only that, but some of the most important pioneers in cinema and literature adaptation studies did not come from the

[8] "Por volta de 1900, 87% dos filmes eram documentários, em 1904 essa taxa diminui pela metade e fica com apenas 42%. Nesse mesmo período, comédias e filmes de animação já somavam 50%, enquanto as narrativas dramáticas representavam apenas 8% da produção total."
[9] "Desde o início do aparecimento do cinema, verificou-se que a nova arte tinha a capacidade de narrar, com seus próprios recursos, uma história anteriormente contada em romances ou contos. A partir daí, a prática de transformar uma narrativa literária em narrativa fílmica espalhou-se a ponto de boa parte dos filmes ter atualmente, como origem, não um *script* original, criado especialmente para o cinema, mas uma obra literária."
[10] "Fenômeno unidirecional – caminhando sempre do literário para o fílmico – e priorizando o primeiro em detrimento do segundo."

cinema studies area, but from the literary studies area, thus reinforcing the reason for the priority of literature over cinema.

The concept of intertextuality could be defined by Sanders' words when she claims that "[intertextuality] is the relationship between literary texts and other texts or cultural references" (SANDERS, 2006, p. 162), or Allen's quote, when he says, in both literary and non-literary texts, "meaning becomes something which exists between a text and all other texts to which it refers and relates" (ALLEN, 2000, p. 1). In other words, intertextuality is the process of conveying meaning from a text not by reading only that text, but establishing relationship with other texts that relate somehow to the text we are reading. Nowadays, more than ever, the process of creating adaptations has become not only more evident, but more accepted, reinforced and praise. One of the reasons for that is perhaps that adaptations are responsible, in our era, for financial transactions involving billions of dollars. My point here is the fact that many people will often decide to buy or play a videogame, because it has been based on a movie they enjoy. Many others might only go to the movies because they are going to watch a film based on a book they have just read. Many copies of religious paintings are sold (such as da Vinci's *The Last Supper*) just because they represent a meaningful event for those who share a certain faith. And also, many people have decided to buy and read a certain book, just because they have had the opportunity of watching the movie on which the book was based. Therefore, when an artist decides to use a certain work from another artist as an inspiration for his/her own, the reason behind it might not only be a wish to remember and pay homage to an idyllic classical work, but also to get something in return, so that

> "we certainly cannot discount that, in our own time, choosing to adapt is still an economically motivated choice. Production companies have realized that success in one form can lead to success in another. (…) Anything can be adapted, if it is deemed profitable enough. (…) This is a time of intertextuality. Re-makes and covers are commonplace in the film and music industries and, perhaps more than ever, the popular arts are motivated by economics. Nothing is off limits and the issue of adaptation remains a prevalent concern. Cross promotion and merchandising are obviously all motivated by the potential for financial gain. Taking something that is already popular in one medium and adapting it into another much safer than taking a chance on something that is unproven." (BARCSAY, 2008, pp. 3-4)

In the following chapter, where I shall discuss the cultural context to which Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* has been transposed in the 2003 film *Pride and Prejudice: A Latter-Day Comedy*, I will talk more about the fact that, even for this independent production, the choice for such a novel was based both on a literary preference as well as on an economically motivated reason.

For now, I would like to focus on some concepts of intertextuality that will be necessary for my purposes. I say “some concepts”, because they are endless. As in the introduction, where I quoted Sanders, the ways in which an artist can adapt one work into another are innumerous and much more common that we know (or like to admit, once the word “original” often evokes a better idea than the word “adapted”). Furthermore, if I were to present and exemplify each one of them, not only this would not be possible (due to the genius of mankind, with its ongoing and never-ending wit and creativity) but it would always be an “unfinished work”.There are, however, certain concepts and definitions that will be more helpful for my purposes than others. Since I have neither enough time nor paper to write on, I shall use the following pages to present some theories on intertextuality that will be necessary in order to better analyze the novel and movie I am working with.

To start with, I would like to call attention to both the title of this work and to the title of this chapter. In the title of the work, I have used the verbs “to visit”, “to create” and “to shape” with the Latin prefix “re”, turning them into the verbs “to revisit”, “to recreate” and “to reshape”. According to one of its dictionary definitions, the prefix “re” means “again: *rebuild*”. When using the word “rebuild”, one obviously infers two primary aspects: (1) something was once built and (2) it shall be built again (or at least remodeled). When we talk of buildings that need rebuilding or remodeling, what comes to our minds is usually an idea of changes that will occur in a building’s facilities or appearance, while keeping most of its structure unaltered. If we were to use this engineering example as a metaphor for literature, we could state that certain narratives, when remodeled, might have major differences in their elements, such as characters, but will maintain similar traces in its main structure, which could include the themes and motifs within the story. The examples I have mentioned in the beginning, of Shakespeare’s ideas for his tragedies, were remodeled by Shakespeare, becoming part of a new genre, with new symbols and linguistic devices, but with some of its main features kept alive.

Since I am working with Jane Austen, the type of remodeling her work has gone through by the hands of different authors is somewhat similar to that of a house. A house that will go through a remodeling process will keep its most important aspects in the same manner. The remodeling, nevertheless, might bring some change as to the size of some rooms, decoration that will suit a new desired aesthetic style and maybe extra doors, closets and windows that will propitiate a more practical life style for the house’s owners. Despite those changes, the house will remain pretty much the same. In the same manner, the 2003 movie I am working with does, as the title proposes, revisit, recreate and reshape *Pride and Prejudice*, never trying to build something totally new or different on top of the already existing narrative.

As for this chapter's title, I have used the words "palimpsests", "adapting", "borrowing" and "recreating". Actually, "palimpsests" belong to the chapter's main title, whereas the other three verbs are part of the subtitle. This is not by chance. My purpose in using this term is to cite Gennete's theory on intertextuality. He uses the example of a palimpsest, which is, according to its dictionary definition, "a manuscript, usually of papyrus or parchment that has been written on more than once, with the earlier writing incompletely erased." Many times when we watch plays, movies or soap-operas, we often have the feeling that we might be having a déjà vu, or that we may have already seen that movie before. To our surprise, the story we are currently experiencing has just had its premiere, so it would not have been possible for us to have seen it before. But then, we feel relieved when we can read, in the credits, a line with the words "based upon the novel by…". Sometimes, however, we feel somewhat frustrated and puzzled because we could not find where that story really came from.

For instance, if someone watches Amy Heckerling's 1995 movie *Clueless*, and if he/she has already read Jane Austen's *Emma*, he/she will probably recognize very strong similarities between the movie and the novel. The relationship existing between them is not, however, explicit, thus making it harder for some to recognize it. If a movie is to be based upon a novel by Jane Austen, considering that her adapted novels are always a good financial investment, the public would expect some type of information on the subject, if not on its theatrical trailers, at least on its opening or closing credits, but such does not happen. What makes it even harder for the audience to recognize such a connection are the changes in the characters' names and its relocation process, once "the film shifts the story to a modern-day Beverly Hills high school and an environment furnished with liposuction, drug abuse, and Starbucks" (MARCUS, 2004, p. 443). Even without those similar elements between both works, the palimpsestic phenomenon takes place: the movie is not the first writing, and yet, the first writing, that of the book, is not completely erased. Through such a process, considering a structuralist approach, the movie-goer who has already read *Emma* will be able to recognize the non-erased engravings in the movie from within the novel in terms of its narrative structure. While in the novel we have Emma, who tries to help her friends get married, in the movie, "Alicia Silverstone is irresistible as the charismatic Cher, the rich, spoiled, and totally irresponsible matchmaking character based on Emma" (*idem*), reinforcing the idea that "the activation of our informed sense of similarity and difference between the texts being evoked , and the connected interplay of expectation and surprise […] lies at the heart of of the experience of adaptation and appropriation." (SANDERS, 2006, p. 25)

I have mentioned a few examples of similarities, but there are far more, not only in terms of narrative and characters, but also in terms of family relationships, social roles and status,

misguided intuition, among others. Seeing those elements in relation to each other, we can better visualize the structure that lays beneath them. Thus, even if one cannot find any explicit elements that would establish the connection between Amy Heckerling and Jane Austen's works, such a structure is common to both, making this recognition probable and possible, according to Graham Allen's statement on Genette's theory: "Palimpsests suggest layers of writing and Genette's use of the term is to indicate literature's existence in 'the second degree', its non-original rewriting of what has already been written." (ALLEN, 2000, p. 108)

Following Gennete's theory, we can affirm that the movie *Clueless* is "a text in the second degree […], i.e., a text derived from another text" (GENETTE, 1997, p. 5), classifying it as a hypertext, whereas the novel *Emma* as its respective hypotext. When mentioning the types of relationships existing between different texts, Genette creates a distinction between hypotext and hypertext by saying: "By hypertextuality I mean any relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the *hypertext*) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the *hypotext*)" (*idem*).

Many literary critics and even Jane Austen fans might criticize *Clueless* for its attempt to copy an already existing and canonical narrative merely for profit, but, as I have mentioned earlier, no one ever (or hardly ever) does the same with Shakespeare, Handel or Michelangelo for making extensive use of hypotexts in order to create their hypertexts. As a matter of fact, perhaps the most acclaimed modernist writer in the English language literature is James Joyce, who has also made recurrent and broad uses of hypotexts. Even Genette quotes Joyce's famous novel *Ulysses* which uses Homer's *Odyssey* as its hypotext. Perhaps the reason for *Ulysses'* universal acclaim is that it is no mere copy, since "Joyce tells the story of Ulysses in a manner other than Homer's [and] extracts from it a pattern of actions and relationships, which he treats altogether in a different style" (*idem*, p. 6). Both in Joyce's novel and in Heckerling's movie we have what Genetterefered to as "a pair of symmetrical and inverse transformations […] saying the same thing differently/saying another thing similarly" (*idem*), and their reception, among critics and fans was not doomed because it lacked originality, but well-received because it was able to reread old texts in a convincing manner.

When we hear that a movie is based upon a book, we will often hear words such as "based upon", "adapted from", "inspired by", "a modern version of", "retold", and so on. Most of the time, except perhaps when a more specific definition is used such as "a modern version", the difference between "based upon" and the other adaptation concepts is not really clear. What is more, at times when we hear that a movie has been "based upon a novel" and one that has been "inspired by a novel", we might expect that the first – maybe because of its more scientific lexical value – would be more accurate (in relation to their hypotext) than the latter – since the word

"inspiration" has a more abstract and emotional connotation. Nevertheless, such concepts are not well defined in movies or on TV, since each director and producer will decide to coin his/her product not in accordance to the product itself, but rather to a merchandising need based on public expectation. Hence, in order to avoid confusion between the existing terms in our day-to-day life, terms that are understood differently by each one, I would like to bring up the ideas proposed by Julie Sanders concerning adaptation and appropriation.

Since a few paragraphs ago I made use of the "remodeling/rebuilding" metaphors, I want to continue working with these concepts in order to better introduce the concepts within intertextuality (or, in Genette's words, hypertextuality) of adaptation and appropriation. Sanders opens her book *Adaptation and Appropriation* by mentioning both processes as something natural and recurrent in different arts and in literature itself. She says:

> "Any exploration of intertextuality, and its specific manifestation in the forms of adaptation and appropriation, is inevitably interested in how art creates art, or how literature is made by literature. […] The literary academic or student reads many texts throughout their learning career and the more texts they read the more echoes, parallels, and points of comparison they identify in the texts that they encounter. The notion that the tracing of intertextual reference and allusion is a self-confirming exercise is reasonable enough […] suggesting the manifold ways in which texts feed off and create other texts – but, as readers and critiques, we also need to recognize that adaptation and appropriation are fundamental to the practice, and, indeed, to the enjoyment, of literature." (SANDERS, 2006, p. 1)

Not only does she say that such processes are natural and recurrent, but also "fundamental to the practice [and] enjoyment of literature", a thought that I also corroborate. Were it not for many adaptations and appropriations, many books might have been doomed to forgetfulness, since the book would not have been revived and recreated. But, what does she mean by the terms adaptation and appropriation? Are they the same such as the concepts of "based upon" and "inspired by", of which everyone has an idea, but no official definitions are made?

To start with, Sanders has proposed a well divided and coherent difference between both terminologies. In her book section entitled *Defining terms*, she mentions that the two terms are quite similar but different when she says:

> "There are many ways in which both the practice and the effects of adaptation and appropriation intersect and interrelate, yet it is equally important to maintain some clear distinctions between them as creative activities" (*idem*, p. 26)

At this point, she wants to make her reader aware of the fact that the two phenomena are different in terms, at least when it comes to creative processes they go through, even though they

are able to work side by side. She then goes on to explain the general concept of the term adaptation in the following:

> "An adaptation signals a relationship with an informing sourcetext or original; a cinematic version of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, for example, although clearly reinterpreted by the collaborative efforts of director, scriptwriter, actors, and the generic demands of the movement from stage drama to film, remains ostensibly *Hamlet*, a specific version, albeit achieved in alternative temporal and generic modes, of that seminal cultural text." (*ibidem*)

In other words, the dialogue the reader (or viewer), of a certain work that has been adapted, will establish is not necessarily with the author of the adaptation, but with the author of the adapted work. Furthermore, she establishes another concept for the term appropriation and how it differs from the previous one:

> "On the other hand, appropriation frequently affects a more decisive journey away from the informing source into a wholly new cultural product and domain. This may or not involve a generic shift, and it may still require the intellectual juxtaposition of (at least) one text against another […]. But the appropriated text or texts are not always as clearly signaled or acknowledged as in the adaptive process. They may occur in a far less straightforward context than is evident in making a film version of a canonical play." (*ibidem*)

As for appropriation, there is still a dialogue between the receiver and the author of the original work, but the author of the appropriation might disguise and conceal the first work so well, that the receiver might not realize whom he is also dialoguing with.

After reading the statements above by Sanders, one can conclude that, although similar, adaptation and appropriation are different processes, aimed at different targets. Adaptation is, according to Sanders, a rereading of a certain work and its recreation in another work, but where the "original" work is considered the essential element within the intertextuality process. Once the "original" work, or the hypotext, is considered to be the most important, the same is true to its author; the author who is often praised is not the one who wrote the screenplay or directed the television or cinema version, but the one who wrote the book which is being adapted.

Exploring a bit further on the definition of adaptation, we could mention movies suchas the 1940 and 2005 versions of *Pride and Prejudice,* as well asthe 1995 BBC television production. Despite the fact that each of those productions was made by different studios, directors, screenwriters, and produced in different decades, the fact that what we have there in their core, despite all the differences brought by each different director, is indeed Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice,* is indisputable. The genius for these movies and television series' success is much more

associated with Austen's narratives (even if she lived many decades before cinema's debut) than with the work the cast, producers and directors had to go through when shooting and editing those works. And, this is neither by chance or for free. Movie producers want to be sure that, in this case, the name Jane Austen works a commercially appealing element, giving the audience the feeling that what they are about to watch is not a movie made by a moviemaker, but the novel written by Austen, with the difference that now it will be shown on screen or television rather than on paper.

As for the definition of "appropriation", the process that takes place is that of perhaps borrowing certain elements or maybe even the whole structure of a certain work for the creation of another one. The difference, however, from the "adaptation" process has to do with two main aspects: (1) the new work we have is not necessarily the original work reread, but perhaps a totally new work where the author of the hypertext is much more important, whereas the author of the hypotext might not even be recognized and (2) since the hypotext's author is not as central as in the "adaptation" process, there is no need for the interpretation of the hypotext in its entirety, but just one or another element might suffice the hypertext.

In that sense, a movie such as *Bridget Jones' Diary* could be seen as an "appropriation" of Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice*. First of all, it is a movie that works as an adaptation and appropriation in different levels. The 2001 movie, directed by Sharon Maguire, is an adaptation of the homonymous 1996 novel, written by Helen Fielding. Both novel and movie borrow important elements from Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* in order to construct a new storyline. Bridget, the protagonist in the narrative, is a modern-day version of Elizabeth Bennet. Although independent and with a good career, she struggles just as much as (or perhaps even more than) Elizabeth in her romantic life. Although being a single child, Bridget's family relationship is very similar to that of Elizabeth's, since her parents are just as ridicule in one work as in the other.

The other appropriation level one can establish between *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones'* Diary is related not to the plot itself or any other element within either literary aspect, but with an outward, perhaps commercial feature: the casting of British actor Colin Firth as Mark Darcy in the movie. While facing challenges in search of true love, Bridget, the novel character, watches the BBC version of *Pride and Prejudice*, specially the scene where Mr. Darcy (interpreted by Colin Firth) is wet, after a swim in the lake, which she watches a few times. So, while struggling to find a male partner, she finds an ideal one on Austen and on BBC's work. Since Austen's novel has no picture of Mr. Darcy (despite the different illustrations the book has received), BBC producers are the ones responsible for giving Mr. Darcy a body and a face, that of Colin Firth. Thus, when Bridget meets Mark Darcy in the movie, there is already an existing

dialogue between Austen's novel, BBC version of her novel, Fielding's novel and Maguire's movie through the hero Mr. Darcy, not only because of his emotional characteristics, but also of his embodiment by actor Colin Firth.

The definition and difference between adaptation and appropriation is not, however, always that clear. Perhaps that is because when a filmmaker wants to produce a movie based upon a certain book, he/she is not worried about the literary theory and its nomenclature, but these are applied by scholars after the movie is released. Thus, there are often doubts whether a movie should be considered an adaptation or an appropriation, and how much of it ought to be seen as homage or plagiarism to a hypotext.

The already mentioned movies *Bridget Jones' Diary* and *Clueless* could be seen either as adaptations, appropriations, homage or plagiarism to Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice* and *Emma*. If one considers the main characters' conflicts between novels and movies as the most essential elements, the movies might be considered adaptations. If another approach considers the social situation of single women in Austen's time as the most important aspect of her novels, the movies will probably be considered appropriations, since the social background has had a major change, but with some elements remaining the same, such as the romantic pursue for a partner. At the same time, many fans of Austen's work will be delighted to watch those movies, once they will be able to see characters they have always loved in much closer situations to theirs. But other fans might not recognize Austen's text, specially watching *Clueless*, since, despite its similarities to Austen's *Emma*, has no explicit connection to it, not even during the closing credits. However, according to Sanders,

> "(…) part of the pleasure of response for the reader consists in tracing relationships for themselves. Without wishing to reduce the act of reading to a game of 'spot the appropriation' it is sure important to acknowledge that to tie an adaptive and appropriative text to one sole intertext may in fact close down the opportunity to read it in relationship with others." (*ibidem*, p. 35)

Thus, if at first a work is considered more respectful than other for mentioning its hypotext, Sanders states that a hypertext with no explicit reference to its hypotext might be even more pleasing to its audience than one that does because the audience will have to make use of its intellect and previous knowledge in order to "[trace] relationships for themselves."

Another author who works with concepts of intertextuality, that I plan to work with, is Affonso Romano de Sant'Anna[11]. In his 2004 book *Paródia, Paráfrase& Cia*, Sant'Anna

[11]Sant'Anna approaches the subjects of paraphrase, stylization and parody as they occur between verbal texts, and he does not approach other media such as cinema or theatre. Nevertheless, I have decided to work with his theory

distinguishes the difference between the definitions of paraphrase, parody and stylization. He starts by stating that when one is able to understand the function and use of such phenomena, one can better understand literature, as he says that

> "parody, paraphrase, stylization and appropriation, redefined and conceptually strengthened, help us understand the enigma of what is "literary" and to understand the formation of ideology through language.[12]" (SANT'ANNA, 2004, p. 8, my translation)

From this broad statement, his position is clear: one of the elements that can help one better perceive the aspect of literality to a text has to do with the different intertextuality processes different texts go through. As a matter of fact, each different intertextuality process represents a different artistic and creative ability of an author to interpret and recreate the original source. That is where the difference between the literary and non-literary is situated, in not merely providing information (as a journalistic text would), but in creating different connections with elements that are external to the text.

Afterwards, he moves to an explanation on how such terms work in literary studies, quoting mainly Mikhail Bakhtin and Yuri Tynianov's theories on stylization and on parody, where stylization tends to be seen as a positive detour from the original text and parody as a negative one[13]. Sant'Anna quotes Tynianov's own words:

> "Stylization is close to parody. One and the other live a double life: beyond the work there a second plan either stylized or parodied. But, in parody, both plans must be necessarily discordant, dislocated (…). But, when there is stylization, there is no longer discordance between the two plans: the one of the stylizer and of the stylized, which appears through the latter. Finally, from stylization to parody there is no more than a step; when stylization has a comic motivation or is strongly stressed, it becomes parody."[14] (TYNIANOV, *apud* SANT'ANNA, 2004, pp. 13-14, my translation)

---

because I find it useful for the elaboration of my work, for, even if he does not deal with visual or performance arts, films and plays are texts on their own.

[12] "a *paródia*, a *paráfrase*, a *estilização* e a *apropriação*, redefinidos e dinamizadas conceitualmente, nos ajudam a entender o enigma do que é "literário" e a entender a formação da ideologia através da linguagem."

[13] By "positive" and "negative", the author does not give a judgement of value between "good" or "bad", but positive meaning closer, whereas negative means further. (SANT'ANNA, 2004, p. 36)

[14] "A estilização está próxima da paródia. Uma e outra vivem de uma vida dupla: além da obra há um segundo plano estilizado ou parodiado. Mas, na paródia, os dois planos devem ser necessariamente discordantes, deslocados (...). Mas, quando há a estilização, não há mais discordância dos dois planos: o do estilizando e o do estilizado, que aparece através deste.Finalmente, da estilização à paródia não há mais que um passo; quando a estilização tem uma motivação cômica ou é fortemente marcada, se converte em paródia."

Therefore, according to Tynianov, stylization is similar to parody, in the sense that in both the original source moves towards another direction, giving them new meaning.Sant'Anna continues by quoting Bakhtin, who develops more on the same subject:

> "With parody it is different. Here also, as well as in stylization, the author employs someone else's speech; but, in opposition to styilization, there is the introduction in the first speech an intention that directly opposes itself to the original. The second voice, after its placement in the other speech, faces an antagonism with the original voice that received it, forcing them to serve totally opposed ends. Speech becomes a battlefield for contrary interactions. Thus, the fusion of voices, which is possible in a stylization or in the narrator's report (…), is not possible in a parody; voices in a parody are not only distinct and emitted from one to the other, but are placed, in the same way, antagonistically. It is for this reason that the other's speech must be stressed with so much clearness and sharpness. For the same reason, the author's projects must be individualized and richer in content. It is possible to parody someone else's style in different directions, there introducing new accents, even though it is only possible to stylize it, as a matter of fact, in a single direction – the one which he (the author) had proposed himself."[15] (BAKHTIN, *idem*, p. 14, my translation)

Here, Bakhtin talks not only of the difference between stylization and parody in terms of a comic element, but in terms of difference. If it is possible to move the original text to any direction the hypertext author wishes, then it is possible to create different types of parody from the same source. On the other hand, when the first author had created a work, he/she conveyed meaning to it, so, when recreated, it needs to follow the first author's direction in order to be considered stylization, otherwise, it will be considered a parody.

Although of great contribution, Sant'anna claims that Tynianov and Bakhtin's theory on the difference between stylization and parody are limited due to three main causes. First, "falls under a dualism that could reveal a Manichean vice of thinking"[16] (SANT'ANNA, 2004, p. 35, my translation). Second, the theory "is used exclusively for studies within the novel field (…). Thus, they are not concerned with extra-literary and extra-linguistic phenomena, which are equally important"[17] (*idem*, my translation). And finally,

---

[15] "Com a paródia é diferente. Aqui também, como na estilização, o autor emprega a fala de um outro; mas, em oposição à estilização, se introduz naquela outra fala uma intenção que se opõe diretamente à original. A segunda voz, depois de se ter alojado na outra fala, entra em antagonismo com a voz original que a recebeu, forçando-os a servir a fins diretamente opostos. A fala transforma-se num campo de batalha para interações contrárias. Assim, a fusão de vozes, que é possível na estilização ou no relato do narrador (...), não é possível na paródia; as vozes na paródia não são apenas distintas e emitidas de uma para outra, mas se colocam, de igual modo, antagonisticamente. É por esse motivo que a fala do outro na paródia deve ser marcada com tanta clareza e agudeza. Pela mesma razão, os projetos do autor devem ser individualizados e mais ricos de conteúdo. É possível parodiar o estilo de um outro em direções diversas, aí introduzindo acentos novos, embora só se possa estilizá-lo, de fato, em uma única direção – a que ele próprio propusera."

[16] "Recai num dualismo que pode revelar um vício maniqueísta de pensamento."

[17] "é usada exclusivamente para estudos na área do romance (...). Desinteressam-se assim dos fenômenos extraliterários e extralinguísticos, que são igualmente importantes."

> "perhaps stylization is not just an opposed feature to parody, but something more complex, something [named] effect and that may occur both within parody and within paraphrase. In other words: the duality parody/stylization [seems] weak, of little pertinence, leaving some blanks."[18] (*idem*, my translation).

Sant'Anna's criticism concerning Tynianov and Bakhtin is that their theory works better with novels, but since literature comprises a much larger scope than novels only, Sant'Anna claims that such theory is somewhat incomplete, since it does not deal with all the possibilities literature has to offer. What is more, he claims that such theory projects the difference between parody and stylization in a dualistic manner that is not strong enough.That is because Sant'Anna argues that the relation between stylization and parody is not a mere relation of opposition, but a more complex connection, in which stylization could work either when parodying or paraphrasing the original text.

Therefore, after such reflection on Tynianov and Bakhtin, Sant'anna proposes two different models where stylization and parody will no longer be studied through a dualistic and manicheistic manner, but in a triadic relation, where paraphrase, stylization and parody work together. Although both models are of great worth, I shall develop on the second one, which shall be useful for my purposes.

In his second model, Sant'anna uses the Portuguese word "desvio", which means "deviation", to explain how the processes of paraphrase, stylization and parody take a detour from the original text. He argues that paraphrase works as a *minimal deviation*, or even as a *desirable deviation*, where the paradigm of the original text goes through an innovation process where the original text's meaning is neither inverted, subverted or lost (*idem*, pp. 38- 39). As far as stylization is concerned, he considers it a *tolerable deviation*, where, similarly to the paraphrase, the original text's meaning is kept, but with certain differences and novelties. He compares paraphrase to a ritual and stylization to a game. In a ritual, one has to follow the already established rules from beginning to end, paying respect to an existing hierarchy. In a game, however, there are established rules, but each player ought to make each game a different one, where flexibility opens the opportunity for unknown results. Thus, there is a deviation, but it is a tolerable one, because even if the final result is unexpected, it works within the boundaries of already established rules (*idem*, pp. 39-40). And finally, parody is a *complete deviation*, since its

[18] "Talvez a estilização não seja apenas um dado oposto à paródia, mas algo mais complexo, algo [chamado] de efeito e que pode ocorrer tanto dentro da paródia quanto dentro da paráfrase. Em outros termos: a dualidade paródia/estilização [parece] fraca, de pouca pertinência, deixando alguns vazios."

purpose is to invert, pervert and subvert the meaning of the original text. Therefore, parody *deforms*, paraphrase *conforms* and stylization *reforms*"[19] (*idem*, p. 41, my translation).

For better understanding of what he means, let us take a look at three products based upon *Pride and Prejudice*. The first is 1995 BBC's production *Pride and Prejudice*; the second is 2004 Gurindher Chadha's Bollywood Production *Bride and Prejudice*; and the third is 2008 ITV's production *Lost in Austen*.

The first is, as I had mentioned previously, according to Sanders, an adaptation of Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. But it is also, according to Sant'anna, a paraphrase on the same novel. This is so because in producing the TV series, BBC aimed at a new product that would have its own authorship, but at the same time, would recognize Jane Austen's work as the main source. The elements in the novel were transposed (or at least there was an attempt made) to TV in a way that would depict faithfully to the ones Austen had in mind when writing the plot. But, to use the word *faithfully* here gives room for controversy and error. If BBC's *Pride and Prejudice* were to be a *faithful* adaptation, in its most strict sense, such would have proved to be impossible, since none of the directors or producers knew how Austen had imagined, for instance, the faces of Elizabeth and Darcy. The authorship of this new work does not consist in merely copying the novel, but to innovate it in a way that the deviation occurred would be as minimal as possible. Hence, BBC does portray the same plot, same characters, same conflicts, but they have to fulfill certain "blanks" that a written text cannot fill, such as the visual and phonographic elements of a video.

In the second, *Bride and Prejudice*, the plot is very similar to that of *Pride and Prejudice*: an Indian girl, Lalita Bashkin, struggles to recognize her feelings towards a rich US American entrepreneur named William Darcy. At the same time, following Indian tradition, her mother is obsessed with the marriage of her daughters for social convenience, in the same way that Mrs. Bennet is in the novel. Difference between social classes remains an issue, where United States of America is on the top of the economical hierarchy, and India is at the bottom, just as Rosings Park and Pemberley were superior, as far as finances are concerned, than Longbourn. Thence, according to Sanders, this movie could be classified as an adaptation, because the references to the author, Jane Austen, are explicit (either during the development of the plot, the title or Austen's name during the closing credits). There is, nevertheless, a deviation, but a tolerable one, which would consist in a stylization process. It is the same work, but with a different approach, set in a different context, but where the main meaning (that marriage ought to be based on love and not on money) and moral values have not suffered any inversion or subversion.

[19] "A paródia *deforma*, a paraphrase *conforma* e a estilização *reforma*".

The third one is *Lost in Austen*, where we have a female character, Amanda Price, who is a big fan of *Pride and Prejudice*, and, after reading it many times, finds herself in 19th century in Longbourn through a magic door, where she changes places with Elizabeth Bennet. The difference now is that, with Amanda's presence among the Bennet's and Elizabeth's absence, things happen in a very different manner than they were supposed to happen in the novel. For instance, with Amanda at the Netherfield ball instead of Elizabeth, Bingley finds Amanda prettier than Jane, making it easier for Mr. Collins to propose to Jane, since she was single (when in the novel he had been told that she was already engaged to Bingley). Such change in events creates an unexpected and tragicomic situation. Not only that, but the most expected event in the novel, Darcy and Elizabeth's wedding, does not take place, once he ends up marrying Amanda. Such a change in the plot is what Sant'anna refers to as a complete deviation or a parody to the original text. If in the original the happy end occurs because Elizabeth and Darcy, after dealing with their emotions and pride, find true happiness through marriage, then any adaptation or appropriation that leads to a different end is inverting and subverting Austen's hypotext. Thus, *Lost in Austen* could easily be classified as a parody of *Pride and Prejudice*.

Nevertheless, the boundaries for each definition are not always that clear or easy to be perceived. At the same time that *Lost in Austen* could be categorized as a parody, because some of its main events suffer a total deviation since they do not occur or occur in totally different and opposed manner, it could also be seen as stylization. Despite the radical changes the novel has suffered in this TV show, one might argue that its main message and essence are kept. Even if Darcy does not marry Elizabeth, but marries Amanda, this could be taken in two ways. The first, it is a total deviation, a parody. The second, it is a tolerable deviation, a stylization.

The idea of stylization is plausible if we give more importance not to happenings in the plot, but to the message Austen's work tried to pass along. From a line of *Northanger Abbey*, Austen claims that "if adventures will not befall a young lady in her own village, she must seek them abroad" (AUSTEN, 2005a, p. 11). This line, although from a book that was meant to be a satire on gothic novels of Austen's time, reflects the core of Austen's heroines' feelings: that one might need to leave his or her environment, or break with the system in order to find adventure, or one's own happy ending. Even if life was comfortable for characters such as Emma Woodhouse, Elizabeth Bennet and Catherine Morland, they needed either to leave their family or to break with the restrictions their families would impose on them, if they wanted to find true love. Hence, if we consider that this aspect of breaking with a certain traditional element in order to find true love is the core of Jane Austen's work, then it would be possible to classify *Lost in Austen* not as a parody, but rather as a stylization, given that Elizabeth Bennet (in this production) finds happiness

not through marriage, but by escaping her time and place to become an independent 21st century woman, and that Amanda Price escapes her mother, her job and her not very romantic boyfriend, to become Mr. Fitzwilliam Darcy's spouse. Whereas Elizabeth finds happiness by migrating to a modern and liberal setting, Amanda finds happiness by going the opposite direction, towards an ancient and extremely conservative surrounding place.

In short, despite the official definitions the different movies, TV shows, novels and other works that have as their hypotext the novels of Jane Austen have received, they can all be seen through three main aspects. Linda Hutcheon, in her book *A Theory on Adaptation*, says that adaptations can be described as "(1) an acknowledged transposition of a recognizable other work or works, (2) a creative *and* an interpretive act of appropriation/salvaging and (3) an extended intertextual engagement with the adapted work" (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 8). Although she refers to "adaptation" when mentioning these three different processes, they can be used to better explain and characterize all the definitions I have listed earlier, such as intertextuality, adaptation, appropriation, paraphrase, stylization and parody. The movies and TV shows I have previously mentioned are, as Hutcheon mentions, acknowledged transpositions, creative and interpretative acts as well as extended forms of intertextuality. Therefore, even if I am about to use certain definitions in order to better qualify the movie I shall work with in relation to the novel, it is of ultimate relevance to highlight that one work does not deserve a better or worse judgment of value just because it is a paraphrase or a parody, but, actually, each phenomenon has its own value, since, according to Hutcheon, each adaptation is its own work.

There is one last aspect pertaining intertextuality that I would like to approach. Quoting Sanders again, in her analysis of adaptation and appropriation, she claims that "many adaptations (…) contain further layers of transposition, relocating their source text not just generically, but in cultural, geographical and temporal terms." (SANDERS, 2006, p. 20). Such phenomenon is very common on cinema and television.

If we take, for instance, Charles Dickens' classic tale *A Christmas Carol*¸ it has received different versions, whether as adaptations, appropriations, stylization, paraphrase or parody. It is also a fact that the same work has received, in the word used by Sanders, relocations. For instance, the 1999 teenager TV show *Popular* has, in its episode entitled *Fall on Your Knees*, an intertextual relationship with at least two Christmas texts. The first is with the French Christmas carol *Oh Holy Night*, where the sentence "fall on your knees", taken from the carol's lyrics, serves as title for the episode, which also conveys its main theme, where the main character (for this particular episode), Nicole, has to "fall on her knees", in order to "hear the angels' voices" and humble herself. Such an idea is connected with the episode's plot, which is similar to that of Dickens' *A Christmas*

Carol. On Christmas Eve, Nicole has a vision of a deceased friend, who warns her that if Nicole does not change her behavior towards other people, she would have to face dreadful consequences. Subsequently, she has three following visions, where she is visited by the Ghost of Christmas Past, the Ghost of Christmas Present and the Ghost of Christmas Future. After learning the past reasons that made her become cruel to others, the way that other people feel towards her in the present and what future has in store for her, she realizes she needs to make changes in her life while she could. In the same manner, Ebenezer Scrooge, the protagonist from Dickens' work, has the same visions and receives the same message. The difference now, in *Popular*, is that, although some elements such as plot, character development and message have been kept the same, some have been relocated in another setting. While Mr. Scrooge was a businessman in Victorian England, Nicole is a late 20th century US American high school student. The difference between both works is not merely a change of country and century, but it also involves a strong cultural shift. Since women (especially teenagers) had little or no economical, political or influential power at all in Victorian England, having a woman playing the role of Mr. Scrooge might have been a very challenging task for Dickens to create and for his reading public to be convinced (but of course, not impossible, since there are female characters that behave similarly and are in a very close situation to that of Scrooge, such as Lady Catherine de Bourgh, even if not as bitter as him). As we are now dealing with a TV show aimed at a teenager public, set at a high school, to have characters having their conflict because of economical issues based on a character's employee would probably push a young public away from the series. The issue of Nicole is, therefore, transferred from labor exploration (that Scrooge inflicted on his clerk, Bob Cratchit, and on his family) to the coveted opportunities to be a part of the cheerleading group in school. If before Scrooge had the power to give or take Bob Cratchit's family's income, now Nicole has the power to give or take other girls the opportunity to become socially accepted by allowing them inside the cheerleading team (she has the power, within the school, to select new cheerleaders). In the same way that Bob is powerless in the novel to go against Scrooge's decisions, so is Carmen, an overweight girl who dreams of becoming a cheerleader, but is bullied and humiliated by Nicole.

By taking such an example, we can see how the idea of relocation works: changes between hypotext and hypertext do not occur only by switching names of places and dates, but they might require an entire reflection on the social, economical, cultural, among many other elements existing in each. A character like Mr. Scrooge, as a mean businessman, might have worked very well in the 20th century, in the United States, perhaps as a man involved with the stock market in Wall Street, but probably not in a school. By the same token, a girl denying a cheerleading position to another one would not have worked at all in Wall Street's financial world. This

phenomenon of relocation takes place very often, especially within classical works, especially with movies and TV shows based on Jane Austen's novels, such as *Clueless*, *Bridget Jones' Diary*, *Bride and Prejudice*, and, most importantly, the movie which is my subject of study, *Pride and Prejudice: A Latter-Day Comedy*.

So far I have made the use of the word *relocation* in order to better define this process within the intertextuality field, since Sanders uses the verb *to relocate* in her claim. However, in his theory, Genette talks about a *movement of proximization*. He starts by making an allusion to Daniel Defoe's novel *Robinson Crusoe*, and he subsequently mentions a couple of novels that were relocated (or proximal) versions of Defoe's work, such as 1779 Joachim Heinrich von Campe's*The German Robinson* and 1813 Johann Wyss's *Swiss Family Robinson* (GENETTE, 1997, p. 303). Genette explains why he makes use of the term *movement of proximization,* instead of using another term such as *relocation* or *modern adaptation* in the following:

> "As has just been indicated with reference to nationality, the habitual movement of diegetic transposition is a movement of proximization: the hypertext transposes the diegesis of its hypotext to bring it up to date and closer to its own audience (in temporal, geographic, or social terms). I know of no exception to this all-pervasive characteristic. True, one might conceivably entertain fantasies as to what would become of Emma Bovary if she were transferred to the Athens of Pericles or King Arthur's court, but such a distancing effect would be manifestly contrary to the 'natural' bent of diegetic transposition, which always consists in moving from the remote to the proximate." (*idem*, p. 304)

Hence, the reason for his use of the term *movement of proximization* does not have so much to do with the mere act of shifting the temporal and spatial cores of a narrative, but in making the narrative closer to its public. In the examples recently mentioned of the episode *Fall on Your Knees* from the TV show *Popular*, or in *Clueless*, or even in *Pride and Prejudice: A Latter-day Comedy*, the choice for change in setting within their respective hypotexts was not a random choice, but the studios and producers' aim was to establish a connection between the literary classic and the modern cinema and TV audience. When a 21st century girl reads a novel like *Pride and Prejudice*, as much as she might enjoy it, at a first and naïve reading, it might be hard for her to see how her life experiences could be in any manner similar to those of Elizabeth Bennet, since the social and economical restraints in Austen's time were very different from the ones in the 21st century. But, as she watches a movie like *Bridget Jones' Diary*, she can better relate to Elizabeth Bennet's struggles, as the reader realizes that, despite the social improvements that women have benefited from throughout history, the feelings and longings towards a love match are still just as

pertaining, as well as challenging, since many vices and frailties ought to be overcome by the heroines in either context.

This aspect of proximization, of bringing a text close to its audience is of extreme importance for my purposes. In the following chapters, where I shall develop more on the movie, I will establish a connection between the theoretical terms I have indexed in this first chapter, that have already been conveyed by Gérard Genette, Julie Sanders, Linda Hutcheon and Affonso Romano de Sant'anna, and Jane Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice* and Andrew Black's movie *Pride and Prejudice: A Latte-Day Comedy*. And, since this movie was produced within a specific context that is ruled by its own cultural and religious systems, appealing to its same public, I shall introduce in the next chapter the setting in which the movie takes place, through a macrocosmic-microcosmic movement, going from the early 21st century United States of America, to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, to its, the church's, largest and most famous education institution, Brigham Young University, in Provo, Utah, in order to prepare for the movie analysis in the third and final chapter of my work.

2. Jane Austen and Religion: a possible match (?)

"They should be instructed young
How to watch and guard the tongue,
And their tempers train and evil passions bind;
They should always be polite, and treat everybody right,
And in every place be affable and kind"

(Eliza R. Snow)

As I wrote in the outline for this chapter, in the introduction of my work, I had proposed three questions concerning religion. The questions I had outlined are the following: (1) What role does religion play nowadays? (2) Does it play any significant role at all? (3) What is there in Austen's novels that appeals to a large religious western reading public?

To answer the first question and the second, which is attached to the first, I would like to start by quoting the headline sentence from a magazine that publishes texts on science and technology, which was published in an article in a magazine issue of January 2001:

> "Does God exist? By the end of the [19th] century, Science believed to have all the keys of knowledge: to decipher the ultimate mysteries of nature was just a matter of time. Now, in the beginning of a new millennium, the clearest certainties agonize and scientists wonder…"[20] (LEMOS, 2001, my translation)

According to the statement above, there used to be a very strong conviction among scientists that the concept of God was just a made up idea and that Science knew, or, at least, would be able to know everything within a few decades, after a lot of study and research. Nevertheless, the beginning of the 21st century, a time considered by many as a promising era for great scientific discoveries and inventions, has probably made more people wonder the possibilities about the existence of a supreme being then actually erasing their certainties about its existence.

Whereas once there were certainties in the dichotomy science versus religion, now there seems to be questionings. The more science is able to develop and advance, the more it is

[20] "Deus existe? No final do século [XIX], a ciência acreditava ter todas as chaves do conhecimento: decifrar os últimos mistérios da natureza era só uma questão de tempo. Agora, na entrada de um novo milênio, as certezas mais claras agonizam e os cientistas se perguntam..."(my translation)

marveled and surprised at the vastness of the universe. When science has been able to finally solve a mystery and verbalize a phenomenon, new mysteries emerge in a speed that is infinitely faster than the process of their study and systematization. Such a paradox creates room for questionings on the full capability of Science as the one and only institution with the proper authority to answer some of life's most intriguing mysteries.

Science is not, however, the only field that may have had a competition with religion. The less concrete field of morality is one that has had, throughout history, a somewhat peculiar relationship with religion. It is a fact that several moral principles which rule a certain social group are originated in religion. Modern Jewish people, for instance, whether they practice the religion or not, own a lot of their practices and habits to the teachings found in the Old Testament. Many humanitarian aid campaigns are sponsored by institutions that base their missions on the Christian teachings of sharing with those in need. Thus, one could affirm, morals and religion always walk side by side. Unfortunately, this has not always been true.

Studying history, in any era or place, one easily learns that in several situations, people have used religion to destroy important moral values. Christianity's doctrine, for instance, teach us that tolerance to those who are different from us is an essential Christlike attribute. Nevertheless, there have been thousands of moments in history where innumerous people, when in want of power and wealth, would produce a discourse that would allow the practice of intolerance (often in a violent manner) in the name of Christianity. Therefore, there is a major paradox: religion, the institution where moral values are born, is the same institution that neglects those values in order to achieve unsound purposes.

Such paradox was perhaps one of the main reasons (along with many scientific advances that I have previously mentioned) for the radical change in the relation between religion and society, at least in the western world. Over the centuries, religion has lost much of its privileged central position in society to become a peripheral institution. Despite the many institutions that have a religious background in their basis (including several educational institutions), religion has lost much of its driving force in central and common issues for a social group.

Nevertheless, according to French sociologist DanièleHervieu-Léger, religion has not necessarily lost its power, but has actually gone through some major changes, including its deinstitutionalization. Whereas once political decisions would be based on common social religious attributes, those new important decisions are no longer based on religion, since due to its deinstitutionalization, there are no longer many common religious features within the same society. In other words, if in the past a social system would base its rules (legal or conventional) on one religious denomination that was common to that population majority's system, now those

rules have to be based on something else, because there needs to be room for different religions as well as for those who do not have a declared religion to express themselves.

In this same new scenario, where religion was no longer in the center but the periphery, people would look back to religiousness[21] in order to find a more personal connection with themselves and with something that would provide another type of meaning to them, differently from previous scenarios where religion was often social rather than personal experience. According to Hervieu-Léger, the return to religiousness is not only a consequence of the feeling of disappointment people face before the impossibility for science and reason to account for everything, but mainly because religiousness is able to give people an individual experience, which reason does not offer. She says:

> "At the same time in which religion is no longer thought through the exclusively view of rational disenchantment, there starts to be a bigger interest for the process of decomposition and recomposition of the beliefs that are not related to the ambience of verification and of experimentation, but find their reason of being in the fact that they give sense to the subjective experience of individuals[22]." (HERVIEU-LÉGER, 2008, p. 22, my translation)

Also, she continues by explaining the contradictory phenomenon of the modern society, which is that "Modernity continues to undermine the credibility of all religious systems and the movement which, at the same time, makes room for new beliefs to emerge"[23](*idem*, p. 41, my translation). It is a paradox that seems without a plausible explanation, since the same society that has in its core reason and science as the intellectual authoritative institutions, and that will often criticize any form of religion as another possible authoritative voice, is the same society that has, in the 21st century, not a decrease of beliefs and religious institutions, but rather its varied and ongoing increase. The reason for such paradox is an already existing paradox within modern society, where

> "Secularized modernity offers, provider as it is, at the same time, of utopia and opacity, the most favorable conditions to the expansion of belief. The more uncertain the future is, more pressure for change is intensified and more the beliefs propagate, becoming diversified and disseminated endlessly. (…) Secularization is not, above everything

[21] In my work, when I use the term *religiousness*, I am referring to the personal experience a person has with religion; when I use the term *religiosity*, I am referring to religion as a social activity, including a specific church's set of dogmas and its institutionalization.

[22] "Ao mesmo tempo em que se deixa de pensar a religião pelo prisma exclusivamente do desencantamento racional, passa-se a ter um interesse maior pelo processo de decomposição e de recomposição das crenças que não se relacionam com o âmbito da verificação e da experimentação, mas encontram sua razão de ser no fato de darem um sentido à experiência subjetiva dos indivíduos." (my translation)

[23] "A Modernidade continua a minar a credibilidade de todos os sistemas religiosos e o movimento pelo qual, ao mesmo tempo, ela faz surgirem novas formas de crença."

> else, the loss of religion in the modern world. It is the set of reconfiguration processes of the beliefs that are produced in a society where the driving force is the lack of satisfaction of the expectations it evokes, and where the everyday condition is the uncertainty connected to the unending search for means to satisfy them."[24] (*ibidem*, my translation)

Nevertheless, even if religion has received an important position over the past few decades in its relation to other institutions within society, it is important to highlight that, at least within the boundaries of Western society and Western thought, religion will (most likely) never have the same authoritative position it used to have centuries ago. The role of religiosity is still important and very expressive, yet different and set within established boundaries. Therefore, if Hervieu-Léger argues that religion is important in providing a close and personal experience with the world, she also claims that such personalizing process is also responsible for a new power relation order between society and religion. Since the experience with the world through reason is collective, with its objective results as mere data that has to be accepted by everyone no matter what one's personal convictions may be, the experience with the world through religiousness is quite the opposite: despite the data that science has been able to find on the different phenomena of nature, each person is free to interpret it in a very personal and intimate manner, whether such phenomena are believed to be a proof of God's love or punishment, nature energies and forces that are responsible for success and failure in life or even the interference in one's personality and behavior as result from the movements of certain celestial bodies. If religion does not play any longer a social role, where everyone needs to share the same beliefs and convictions, the social configuration has gone through a major change. Quoting Hervieu-Lèger once more, she mentions this new religious individuality by saying that "such religious concept of a personal faith is a key to the universe of representations from where it emerged, progressively, the modern image of the individual, autonomous subject who rules his/her own life"[25] (*ibidem*, p. 37, my translation).

In other words, religion has developed increasingly over the past years and has been important part of many people's lives. But, differently from the times when all the inhabitants of the same society would share similar beliefs and rites, modernity allows for each person to believe and practice rites according to one's own desires and convictions. And, at the same time that an

[24] "A modernidade secularizada oferece, geradora que é, a um tempo, de utopia e opacidade, as condições mais favoráveis à expansão da crença. Mais a incerteza do porvir é grande, mais a pressão da mudança se intensifica e mais as crenças proliferam, diversificando-se e disseminando-se ao infinito. (...) a secularização não é, acima de tudo, a perda da religião no mundo moderno. É o conjunto dos processos de reconfiguração das crenças que se produzem em uma sociedade onde o motor é a não satisfação das expectativas que ela suscita, e onde a condição cotidiana é a incerteza ligada à busca interminável de meios de satisfazê-las."

[25] "Esta concepção religiosa de uma fé pessoal é uma peça-mestra do universo de representações de onde emergiu, progressivamente, a figura moderna do indivíduo, sujeito autônomo que governa sua própria vida."

individual's personal convictions (whether they be religious or not) are important for his/her decisions within his/her personal life, modernity (in a western capitalist society) has also made very clear that those convictions are to be lived by within an individual's personal affairs, and not to be a decisive neither influential aspect of one's professional, academic or social life[26].

A good example of how religion has been present in our contemporary society, yet with a certain distance is the Brazilian mass cultural production, namely television soap-operas, produced with ambitious goals to achieve high levels of audience. By reaching those high levels of audience, television productions do reflect, in one way or another, the things that a large part of the population likes to watch and is also capable of understanding.

The example I want to use is that of 2001, of giant corporation RedeGlobo, which has, for many decades, been the leading communication conglomerate in Brazil, either in terms of audience or production. RedeGlobo's primetime schedule consists mainly of daily soap-operas. They are the shows that receive most investment from both the TV channel in terms of production, as well as the investment made by giant companies, which will take advantage of the soaps' success for advertising their products, whether concealed during the stories that are being told or during the commercial break.

In 2001, a year, as I had previously mentioned, when religion seemed to have lost much of its power and influence on people, it was somewhat surprise that, during the same year, two main TV shows (the soaps) produced by Globo had in their core a religious motivation. The first one, presented at the 6pm slot, was entitled *A Padroeira*. It takes place in colonial Brazil, during the early 1700's, and its plot consists of a mingling between historical data and religious beliefs. The story is set around a village, where an image of Our Lady of Aparecida (Brazilian Catholic Patroness) was found on a river by the local peasants in 1717, event which is received as a divine miracle. Near the old village, a famous church was built in honor of Holy Mary, as a way to respond properly to such a divine miracle. This church is, nowadays, the Basilica of the National Shrine of Our Lady Aparecida, the second largest catholic temple in the world, where millions of catholics go ever year, hoping to, such as the peasants in the 1700's did, receive some type of divine aid and miracle in their lives. Throughout the soap-opera, the idea of religious miracles performed by Our Lady of Aparecida is strongly present. Among the miracles portrayed in the novel are the unexplainable release of slave Zacarias, whose chains were suddenly loose, and also the conversion and repentance of the soap's antagonist and villain, Don Fernão de Avelar. The final scene of the production takes the public from the old 18th century small church to the

[26] Whereas the term "social life" is usually used as a reference to the friendships one has, I use the term here in the sense of life in society, meaning the civil duties and rights any citizen has within a society.

spacious and modern basilica, where many believers are worshiping their patroness, as a way to elicit that the same miracles that took place centuries ago are still possible within a certain religious system.

The other production, which aired at the 9pm slot (the television primetime in Brazil), is based upon two novels by Brazilian writer Jorge Amado, and has the Afro-Brazilian religion of Candomblé as one of its main themes. Despite its closeness to Amado's works, the plot has strong similarities with Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. In *Macbeth*, the presence of supernatural forces, such as the witches and Lady's Macbeth's visions of the people she murders, are responsible for important twists in the play. The same is true of the soap-opera. The difference now is that the supernatural forces are those of orixaYemanja, an Afro-Brazilian deity worshiped in Brazil as the goddess of the sea, and not from witches. And, differently from many other countries, where the beliefs originated in Africa are seen as ancient popular fictitious legends, the Candomblé religion is, still today, one of the most expressive and practiced religions in Brazil, with its organized rites and spiritual leaders.

Even if I am not dealing with television products in my work, it is important to stress that, at the same year, in the beginning of the 21st century, two major productions aimed at the different social, economical, cultural and geographical Brazilian population, were concerned with religion themselves, evincing Brazil's general public receptivity (and perhaps even a need) towards religiousness. Nevertheless, it is also important to emphasize that, as Hervieu-Léger had pointed out, these productions, although written on top of religious practices and beliefs, featured characters (with a few exceptions) that were free and autonomous to live surrounded by religion, to accept it, but also to reject it as they pleased. Even though the main plot of each soap-opera had religion in their core, many of the existing subplots and secondary characters were affected by religion in a very small scale or nor affected by religion at all. This configuration shows, to a smaller or larger degree, the modern aspect of society, where different religions play very important roles and are experienced by a large part of the population, but where each religion is experienced differently by everyone, and set within already established social and cultural boundaries. Although the example here takes place in Brazil, the pattern is somewhat similar in the Western world, including the United States, where the movie in my *corpus* takes place, where religion still plays an expressive role but within certain boundaries.

Such a society, which is open for the most different and diverse behaviors, convictions and creeds that coexist, is only possible within the modern western capitalist system that rules, for instance, Brazil in the early 21st century. This coexistence of different religious convictions, however, is not a fact from the late 20th century or early 21st century, but has already existed

throughout history. Despite the many examples I could show that have existed from ancient through contemporary history, and also despite the fact that the situations for a peaceful coexistence in the present are not any similar to the situations from the past, I would like to focus on a specific historical period that shall be meaningful for my purposes.

The historical period I intend to mention is one that was contemporary to Jane Austen: the American Revolution. This historical event had great consequences for both England, the country where the novel *Pride and Prejudice* was written, as well as for the United States of America, where the movie *Pride and Prejudice: A Latter-Day Comedy* was produced.

First of all, I would like to make it clear that by American Revolution I do not intend to limit this title to the war between Great Britain and the American Colonies for their independence, but also to consider other important historical events, both prior and after the Independence of the United States that have played either causative or consequential roles on it.

Among some of the causative events that have led to the American Revolution are the happenings of religious nature. One of them is known as The Great Awakening, which can be said to have changed drastically the relationship between religion and society. Whereas in most European countries religion and state were strictly connected, and each state's official religion's beliefs and practices imposed upon the population, the Great Awakening in the United States was intended to break many of the orthodox religious practices and to create new possibilities for worshiping, thinking and teaching religion. If in the past the King of England was the Church mentor and God's only authority on earth, now each inhabitant is free to accept any religious minister as an authority from God. If before, the state had the power to say what was to be practiced or believed, now each person is granted with the possibility of having a personal relation with God, with no need for an intercessor (such as the saints in the Catholic Church or the regulations by the state). This new social and religious order turned the United States of America to a land of religious freedom. This freedom was guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States, where in the first amendment we read that "[the] Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech […] or the right of the people peaceably to assemble".

This new formed nation would allow its inhabitants to read the Bible in their own manner, interpret it as they wished and even disagree with their preachers and ministers, and perhaps start a new church, where new doctrines and beliefs were possible to be introduced, with no need for political, royal or the Pope's approval. It is, therefore, in this heterodox society that The Church of

Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints[27], the religion institution that runs Brigham Young University, where the movie *Pride and Prejudice: a Latter-day Comedy* takes place, could have its start.

In the year of 1830, when the United States was a young, but well-established nation in terms of its own political and cultural ideologies and independence, in the State of New York, that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saint was officially organized by its first president (accepted by the Church members as a prophet, frequently referred to as such) Joseph Smith. The Church had six official members on the day of its organization and it had reached more than 14 million members by the end of 2010, in hundreds of countries in every continent[28]. Such a growth is of concern to the Church leaders either in the 21st century as well as on the 19th century. These concerns are not only with the membership's spirituality but also with their physical and intellectual welfare.

First of all, I would like to give some emphasis, briefly, on the LDS Church's doctrine[29], in order to provide a better understanding, latter, for the cultural and religious environment existing at Brigham Young University, where the movie I am working with takes place. Being thus a Christian church, we are to assume that its doctrines are built upon the teachings of Jesus Christ, as recorded in the Bible. And, if I were to abridge the core of Christ's teachings in a few words, I would say that the pursuit for perfection is Christianity's main objective.[30]

According to its dictionary definition, "perfect" means: (1) lacking nothing essential, (2) being without defect or blemish, (3) completely suited for a particular purpose (or ideal), and (4) accurate or exact. Definitions number three and four seem to be more related to scientific areas, so I shall not focus on those. Definitions number one and two are, nevertheless, of great value for my purposes.

---

[27] In this work's introduction, I had stated that the Church of Jesus of Latter-day Saints is also known as "The Mormon Church". From now on, I shall only refer to the Church (or its faith, rites and doctrines) by its official name. Since the name is long, I shall use abbreviations such as "LDS" or simply "The Church" when necessary. The reason for my choice is based upon an official speech delivered by M. Russel Ballard, a member of the Church's Quorum of Twelve Apostles, the Church's second hierarchical authority. My objective is to avoid confusion, since there are different religious groups popularly referred to as Mormons, but not all of them with the same beliefs. This speech was delivered at a Church General Conference, an event that takes place twice a year (April and October), broadcast online and by satellite to the different congregations of the Church in several countries, where many Church ministers deliver speeches concerning the Church's welfare and doctrines. The full speech is the first text in the annexes section.

[28] According to official data published by the Church in April 2011, 272,814 converts were baptized (thus receiving their Church membership status), with a total membership of 14,131,467 worldwide. (HALES, 2011)

[29] For a better understanding of the Church's doctrine, I have added an annex entitled *The Wentworth Letter*, a letter written by the Church's first leader, in 1842, which was published on a newspaper, explaining about the Church's history and doctrine.

[30] In the New Testament we read, in the Book of Matthew, chapter 5, verse 48, the following words pronounced by Jesus Christ: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

Definition number two is perhaps the one that is more frequently associated with the idea of perfection in Christianity: that, in order to be perfect, all the imperfections (or sins) need to be washed away not "with corruptible things, as silver and gold […] but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot"[31]. In this sense, religion seeks to warn and prevent people from committing sins that would lead them astray, keeping them from achieving perfection. This concept of sin and perfection is important for my purposes, but I shall discuss it later, when discussing Austen's work in more detail.

For now, I would like to focus on the first definition of the word "perfect", which means "lacking nothing essential". Earlier, I had stated that the LDS Church is concerned not only with its members spirituality (the idea of avoiding sin in order to achieve perfection) but also with their physical and intellectual welfare. This concern with temporal matters by the Church is aimed at perfecting the members in the sense that they should not lack anything essential. If spirituality is essential for ultimate perfection, then other things that will lead to such spirituality also need to be considered as essential. For instance: a family that attends church regularly will hardly ever cherish spiritual delight if the family householder does not have job in order to feed his/her children, because the simple acts of working and eating are essential for anyone's survival and development. Also, the householder might not find a good job, or never improve his/her skills and knowledge if he/she does not take proper instruction and education. Hence, lack of formal education is a type of imperfection, once something essential for one's growth is lacking.

Thus, I argue that for most Christian churches (or at least for the one I am referring to) perfection is not only and end, in a distant heavenly future, but also an earthly lifelong process, where daily essential things are to be sought, whether it is a professional career, academic performance or the fulfillment of basic needs, such as finding the means to provide for oneself and one's family. Such is true of each social and religious environment in both the novel and the movie. Religiosity itself is an important element (whether implicitly or not) both at Longbourn and at Brigham Young University, but balance is necessary for the welfare of the characters. The Bennet's do not spend all of their time in church, expecting that their physical needs will be fulfilled by divine miracles, but they do actually work for their own support. In the same way, Elizabeth Bennet (the movie character) does not sit and wait expecting a book publisher to simply publish her book with no effort on her part, but she actually goes after her desires through her personal actions. In that sense, I argue that morality has an important role in both productions,and religion an even more important role in the movie, which is in harmony with the morals in the

[31] I Peter, chapter 1, verse 19.

novel. Yet, the characters that succeed throughout the plot only do so when finding a balance between the social and religious culture in which they are inserted and other practical matters of everyday life.

In order to better illustrate what I mean, I would like to refer to two characters: Mr. Collins and Wickham (that are present in both the novel and movie, and have, if not the same, extremely similar roles in either the original and the adapted work). First of all, it is important to make it clear that Austen has a moral agenda in the pages of *Pride and Prejudice*. Harmony and peace can only be found among Longbourn residents if they all respect the already established moral values and codes. Those values are found in the Christian faith, and later developed and adapted to the Anglican faith, but are meant to be observed by everyone of that community, despite their level of personal faith and devotion, so that order could be maintained in that social group. Moreover, the life style we find in the pages of *Pride and Prejudice* pages has the morals based on religious principal as an important aspect to its characters, but religion routine is not necessarily central to them (or at least not mentioned).

Therefore, considering that those values are important to the novel characters, Mr. Collins and Wickham are two characters that go against those values, each in an opposite direction. Collins, the clergyman, is supposed to be the character that best represents what Christians ought to stand for. And for many chapters, Wickham is believed to be, by everyone (except for Darcy), a character who best mingles high standards of morality with well fulfilled ordinary tasks through an appropriate demeanor. Such expectations from the reader (and even from many characters) are, however, destroyed. As soon as Collins enters the plot, it is very visible that his excess of religiosity and morality is not what make him a good Christian, but rather the opposite, turning him into a ridiculous and caricatural character, for trying to live according to Christian principles in a senseless and even fundamentalist manner. A good example of how Collins is a character who, albeit supposed to be Christian, goes against such moral is the letter he sends to Mr. Bennet near the end of the novel, when he talks about Lydia and Wickham's elopement, by saying:

> "I am truly rejoiced that my cousin Lydia's sad business has been so well hushed up, and am only concerned that their living together before the marriage took place should be so generally known. I must not, however, neglect the duties of my station, or refrain from declaring my amazement, at hearing that you received the young couple into your house as soon as they were married. It was an encouragement of vice; and had I been the rector of Longbourn, I should very strenuously have opposed it. You ought certainly to forgive them as a Christian, but never to admit them in your sight, or allow their names to be mentioned in your hearing." (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 351)

To that letter, Mr. Bennet reacts with disgust (feeling which I believe most readers share with Mr. Bennet), and replies to his daughter Lizzy: "*That* is his notion of Christian forgiveness!" (*idem*).

The other character whom I have previously mentioned is Wickham. As stated in the excerpt above, he elopes with Lydia, after presenting himself to the Longbourn community with "such an expression of goodness in his countenance! such an openness and gentleness in his manner." (*idem*, p. 220). Nevertheless, as we as readers of the novel, and Elizabeth, who believes to be a good reader of character, move towards the middle of the novel, we learn that, despite Wickham's first self presentation, he goes against morality in issues that are considered extremely dangerous within the community. As he goes against the moral codes, he is banished from that society (even if virtually). When Lydia decides to elope with him, the same happens to her. Although described in a subtle manner, we learn that Wickham and Lydia end up living far away from the Bennet's, without much contact, because Wickham and Lydia are responsible for the Bennet's shame in facing their friends and acquaintances in Longbourn.

Thus, one can conclude that Austen's work's sense of morality was not merely based on how religion and moral acted on the characters, but rather on how the characters acted before the religious and moral codes that were placed before them. The criticism she does on these two characters is that they did not look for a balanced answer between their situations, their purposes and the common moral values. Collins tries so hard to please his matron, Lady Catherine de Bourgh, and to fulfill his duty as a clergyman that he overlooks the real essence of what the morals really meant. And, in the opposite direction, Wickham, aware of what that society expected of him, conceals his true motivations because he looks at marriage not as an end for a well established relationship and family life, but rather as a mean for his own financial stability.[32] With such purposes in mind, he does not care if he will hurt the feelings of others or if they will be

[32] "Mrs. Gardiner then rallied her niece on Wickham's desertion, and complimented her on bearing it so well. 'But, my dear Elizabeth,' she added, 'what sort of girl is Miss King? I should be sorry to think our friend a mercenary.'
'Pray, my dear aunt, what is the difference in matrimonial affairs, between the mercenary and the prudent motive? Where does discretion end, and avarice begin? Last Christmas you were afraid of his marrying me, because it would be imprudent; and now, because he is trying to get a girl with only ten thousand pounds, you want to find out that he is mercenary.'
(…)
'But he paid her not the smallest attention till her grandfather's death made her mistress of this fortune? (…) [It] seems indelicacy in directing his attentions towards her so soon after this event.'
'A man in distressed circumstances has not time for all those elegant decorums which other people may observe. If *she* does not object to it, why should *we*?
'*Her* not objecting does not justify *him*. It only shows her being deficient in something herself – sense or feeling.'
'Well', cried Elizabeth, 'have it as you choose. *He* shall be mercenary, and *she* shall be foolish.'" (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 153)

harmed somehow, nor if his actions will corrupt that moral system. Therefore, both characters go against morality, one by trying to live it to its extreme, and the other by willingly trying to take advantage of others' naivïté and vulnerability.

Despite such criticism towards those characters' doings, the novel does not necessarily criticize the purposes and motives for going against certain previously established social conventions, but the criticism lies on how one acts in order to achieve one's purpose. As harsh as it may seem, we could compare Charlotte Lucas with George Wickham. Such parallel might seem risky and wrong, because Charlotte is usually received by the reading public as a victim, whereas Wickham is seen as the main villain in the novel. Whether one is a victim and the other a villain, the fact is that their circumstances are not that different. Both are deprived of personal wealth, and are concerned with their future. Wickham serves in the militia, but does not have the real inclination for that. Yet, he serves because he is in need of an income. For this reason, he sees in marriage an opportunity for something that will provide him with what he needs and perhaps somewhat better than the militia life. As for Charlotte, she does not have the inclination either for matrimony, especially with Mr. Collins, but sees in this relationship the only (or the best) opportunity for her financial stability[33]. The difference between Wickham and Charlotte lies on the means employed by them. Wickham was more active (as man usually were in Austen's society in proposing), and was willing to achieve his purposes no matter what strategies he would make use of. Charlotte, on the other hand, did not deceive or jeopardize anyone around her. She knows her situation is far from ideal (and neither is Collins an ideal husband), but she never tries to manipulate or take advantage of anyone for personal benefit. The reason that best describes why Charlotte is regarded by many as both a victim (of that legal and social system) and a person with good moral standards is well presented in the following excerpt by Professor Ian Littlewood:

> "It is not, after all, the desire for worldly advantage that motivates Charlotte but the stark need for what Austen mordantly refers to as a 'preservative from want'. And in a society that left unmarried women at the mercy of their relations' charity, this was a powerful consideration. (…) With the death of [a family's] father, the female members of the family found themselves reliant on annual hand-outs from [other people]. (…) In any case, the outcome of Charlotte Lucas's marriage cannot really be said to prove her choice mistaken; she has made a bargain and lives with it in reasonable contentment.

[33] "(…) the boys were relieved from their apprehension of Charlotte's dying and old maid. (…) Mr. Collins, to be sure, was neither sensible nor agreeable: his society was irksome, and his attachment to her must be imaginary. But still he would be her husband. Without thinking highly either of men or of matrimony, marriage had always been her objective: it was the only honourable provision for well-educated young women of small fortune, and, however uncertain of giving happiness, must be their pleasantest preservative from want. This preservative she had now obtained; and at the age of twenty-seven, without having ever been handsome, she felt all the good luck of it." (AUSTEN, 2003, PP. 122-123)

> However much the romantic heroine may deplore it, this is the kind of compromise out of which the texture of ordinary social life is woven." (LITTLEWOOD, 1999, p. VIII)

In this statement, it is clear that Charlotte makes use of good judgment and of common sense to find a balance between her needs and the moral behavior she is expected to have. Perhaps she does not enjoy the same romantic relationship Elizabeth and Darcy do, but her choice is a wise one that is neither harmful nor embarrassing to either her family or friends, differently from Wickham and Lydia, who bring shame to the Bennet family, jeopardizing the real possibility of marriage for the other four Bennet girls. Even though Lydia is raised with the same moral teachings that Jane and Elizabeth are, she allows herself to be wrongly influenced by Wickham, which leads her to tragic consequences. Of course, the teachings might not be enough, because Kitty had received the same manner of teachings, and she has a very similar behavior to that of Lydia. Fortunately, she is kept from travelling with Lydia by Mr. Bennet. Otherwise, she might have had the same misfortune fate Lydia had. Lydia, being influenced by bad companies, and Kitty, not being able to interact with companies that might not have been wholesome, end up having the different fates, despite their common natural disposition.[34]

Therefore, I argue that Austen's work *Pride and Prejudice* aims at showing that, no matter what challenges one has to face or the situation one lives in, these already existing circumstances should not be the elements that would control one's life choices (thus serving as a justification for one's wrongdoings). Rather, people should be sensitive and wise enough to do their life choices based on moral standards that will not be harmful neither to the person nor to anyone else, and those choices should be made with a concern for a common sense between what an individual pursues and on how that social group will react to it. Otherwise, an individual is in risk of being either too dishonest, like George Wickham (for using his circumstances as an excuse for his obscure behavior, even if not utterly expressed) or too ridiculous, like Mr. Collins (for being so desperate to fulfill his religious responsibilities that, in doing so, he becomes so blind to realize that his personal behavior is not always in harmony with the ideals he claims to stand for).

Nevertheless, Mr. Collins and Wickham are not the novel's protagonists, so to say that the concept of morality is in the core of the narrative, but only acting on some not so central characters, might not be reason enough to claim such concept as a central attribute of the novel. For such, we would have to take a closer look at the novel's hero and heroine, Elizabeth Bennet and Mr. Darcy. As already mentioned earlier, Elizabeth and Darcy, in order to find their true

[34]Such a situation is in accordance with the Christian moral (present in both communities of Longbourn and Provo), as recorded in the New Testament book of I Corinthians, chapter 15, verse 33, where we read: "Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners."

happy ending, need both to overcome some challenges, including the ideas existing in the novel's title, pride and prejudice. The word "prejudice" often carries to our ears a sense of negativity, of something terribly wrong, especially in the early 21st century, when people have realized that so many centuries of different types of prejudice have been responsible for a vast majority of social injustices and struggles. On the other hand, the word "pride" is a word whose meaning is not totally clear. Actually, the meaning of the word is clear, but whether it conveys a positive or a negative message is a concept that might change from society to society, and from person to person. Not only that, but depending on the situation, one's pride might be a totally invisible attribute to oneself and to everyone else around him/her.

According to The American Heritage dictionary, pride could mean (1) a sense of one's proper dignity or value or (2) arrogance. Both usages of the word pride are found within the pages of *Pride and Prejudice*, since

> "almost every character exhibits too much or too little pride, pride of a bad sort or silly sort or pride of a good sort, sham pride or genuine pride and so forth. Elizabeth Bennet combines a dangerous cocksureness in her assessments of people with a proper sense of her own worth. Jane is quite uncocksure. She is too diffident. (…) There is no proper pride, and so no fight in her. Their mother is so stupid and vulgar that she has no sense of dignity at all, only silly vanities about her dishes and her daughter's conquests. Mr. Bennet has genuine pride. He does despise the despicable. But it is inert, unexecutive pride. He voices his just contempt in witty words, but he does nothing to prevent or repair what he contemns. (…) Bingley has no special pride, and so, though a nice man, spinelessly lets himself be managed by others where he should not. His sisters are proud in the sense of being vain and snobbish.
> Darcy is (…) haughty and snobbish, a true nephew of Lady Catherine de Bourgh. His early love for Elizabeth is vitiated by condescension. He reforms into a man with pride of the right sort. He is proud to be able to help Elizabeth and her socially embarrassing family. He knows what is due from him as well as what is due to him. Mr. Collins is the incarnation of vacuous complacency. He glories in what are mere reflections from the rank of his titled patroness and from his own status as a clergyman. He is soap-bubble with nothing at all inside him and only bulging refractions from other things on his rotund surface." (RILEY, 1968, p. 109)

If "every character exhibits too much or too little pride", it means that an average amount of pride is possible and good. None of the characters above mentioned is considered a sinner for having some sort of pride (or lack of it, like Mrs. Bennet, who is so shallow that cannot have the least amount of pride, whether of a good or of a bad sort). Nevertheless, not conferring upon them the status of sinners does not necessarily give them the status of saints or of perfect beings.[35] The

[35]On this matter, Gilbert Riley further develops the relation between Jane Austen's moral ideas and some different concepts of morality. He compares characters such as Mr. Collins (from *Pride and Prejudice*) with Emma Woodhouse (from *Emma*), and proposes the following questions: Are they good? Are they evil? Such questions could be posed to all of Austen's characters, and would probably be "equally unanswerable and equally uninteresting". (RILEY, 1968, p. 115)

novel opens with characters that are, in one way or another, in want of something, some change or even someone, to make them better. Charlotte is in want of matrimony. Elizabeth and Jane are in want of true love. Not only that, but Elizabeth was also in want of personal and emotional growth, something she could not realize until Darcy showed it to her. Her pride and his pride are not necessarily the same, but they are not that different either. First of all, both Elizabeth and Darcy are humans, vulnerable to all the errors any person is. However, perhaps due to the way they were raised during their childhood, they were both sure they knew everything about everyone. Darcy has a more traumatic experience in his childhood with Wickham, and because of this and other experiences, he develops an excluding type of pride, where he attempts to exclude from his life and from his social environment everyone who presents some type of threat.[36]Elizabeth, in her turn,

> "trusted her judgment way too much (…). She was so much cleverer than everyone she knew except her father – who was always telling her how clever she was – that she imagined that everything she believed must be true, just because she believed it. She didn't think she needed to give other people a fair hearing. (…) Elizabeth was not prejudiced in the modern sense of the word. She didn't judge people before she met them, because of the group they belonged to. She judged them the moment she met them, because she thought she could already tell everything about them." (DERESIEWICZ, 2011, p. 49)

Thus, Elizabeth's pride was perhaps even more dangerous than Darcy's. Had she acted according to her first instincts, she might have had a not very happy marriage with Wickham, and the beloved romance we so love would not have happened. And, as arrogant as Darcy might have seemed at first, his pride is the element in the novel that is responsible for important happenings in the plot, such as the restoration of a respectable reputation to Lydia, and his actual marriage with Elizabeth. In that sense, pride could be seen as either a vice or a virtue, because it can either protect us or deceive us.

But how is it that Elizabeth is able to overcome her personal pride and realize Darcy's genuine good deeds? According to William Deresiewicz, she overcomes her flaws by making mistakes. As paradoxical and "non-Austenlike", (or even non-religious, since religion, supposedly, is aimed at avoiding or erasing one's mistakes) as the last sentence may seem, Deresiewicz claims that it is through her mistakes that Elizabeth learns and grows.[37] In his book *A Jane Austen*

[36] Darcy excludes Wickham from his life, because he represents danger to his sister Giorgiana. He also tries to exclude Jane from his friend Charles Bingley's life, because the Bennet family (and their alleged desperation for marriage) represent danger for Bingley, once he was in the jeopardy of having a miserable marriage.

[37] This is also in accordance with the Christian principle of forgiveness. In Luke 15:7 we read: "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety nine just persons who

Education, Deresiewicz talks about his personal experience with Austen's novels. The subtitle to the book is: *How six novels taught me about love, friendship, and the things that really matter*. With this explanatory subtitle, there is not much need for further explanation. But what is important to know is that the author dedicates each chapter to each of Austen's novels, and develops on one moral value that, according to him is what Austen was trying to teach not only to her reading audience but also to herself.[38]

In the book's second chapter, devoted to *Pride and Prejudice*, the focus is on the subject of "growing up". The narrator highlights the fact that Elizabeth believes to be knowledgeable enough to read other people well enough. The narrator convinces us, as readers, that Elizabeth is really as knowledgeable as she believes she is. And since she has noble intentions, we do not blame her for behaving the way she does. Nevertheless, no matter how good her intentions are, she does need to grow up and understand that her instincts might not always reveal what the truth about things really is. After all, she was only in her early twenties, going from youth to adulthood. In her youth she had learned to recognize, as most teenagers do, her feelings and perceptions about the world around her. And according to her perception, Wickham could be her Prince Charming and Darcy was probably a terrible person. But, if Elizabeth wanted to become an adult, she would need to start doubting herself. That is why it was so shocking for her to read Darcy's letter. She realized that she needed to think and to reason above her personal feelings. She learned that it does not mean that just because she felt good or bad about something, that such was necessarily either a good or a bad thing. Such a recognition comes by learning from one's own mistakes. According to the author,

> "by making mistakes and recognizing her mistakes, and testing her impulses against the claims of logic, the heroine of *Pride and Prejudice* learned the most important lesson of all. She learned that she wasn't the center of the universe. Growing up (…) means coming to see yourself from the outside, as one very limited person." (*idem*, p. 72)

Earlier I had said that it might sound somewhat paradoxical to say that through one's mistakes one can become a better person. After all, I have stressed the importance of morality and of religion to this work, concepts that aim at keeping people from making mistakes. The author,

---

need no repentance." Even if Elizabeth is not an evil character committing serious sins, she does make mistakes. What makes her a heroine is the fact that she is able to recognize her weaknesses, learn with them and improve.

[38] On *Emma*, the focus is on paying attention to the everyday things, because that is what life is really about; on *Northanger Abbey*, the focus is on learning to learn by opening yourself to new experiences; on *Mansfield Park* the focus is on the difference between amusement and true happiness; on *Persuasion*, the focus is on how true friendship really works; and, on *Sense and Sensibility*, the focus is on falling in love with people who are different from you, and who challenge you.

however, explains that those mistakes take place when one is maturing. Before the novel begins, Elizabeth had "achieved the relative autonomy of adolescence – learning to trust [herself]" (*idem*, p. 68). But the only way for her to become an adult was by "testing her impulses against the claims of logic" (*idem*, p. 72), the logic of her own feelings. Had she not made any mistake, she would have grown up an old lady with the same pride and prejudice she had as an adolescent. But of course, she does not look for opportunities to make errors. A mistake is often a consequence of a misunderstanding or misconception, and not necessarily the willing disobedience to a moral code. In that sense, Elizabeth's mistakes are merely then result of her misunderstandings about herself and about other people. Her misunderstandings lead her to make mistakes, but it is only when she recognizes those mistakes that she is able to grow. Perhaps that is why she has to read Mr. Darcy's letter twice, so that in her second reading she can acknowledge and say to herself that she was indeed a victim of her own pride.

Thus, making mistakes will help one's growth, but only if the person is willing to recognize them and start acting differently. Lydia, perhaps the most faulty of the Bennet sisters, makes mistakes out of impulse and also of misunderstanding. She is not necessarily evil, and she does not seek to embarrass her family by eloping with Wickham. In her understanding, if she marries (no matter whom, no matter how), she will fulfill her social role, therefore enjoying a better position than her sisters, or than other single girls in her neighborhood. When Lydia returns home, after her wedding, she shows no regret whatsoever:

> "Nothing of the past was recollected with pain. (…) But she [Lydia], who never heard nor saw anything of which she chose to be insensible, gaily continued, 'oh, mamma, do the people hereabouts know I am married to-day? I was afraid they might not; and we overtook William Goulding in his curricle, so I was determined he should know it, and so I let downside glass next to him, and took off my glove and let my hand just rest upon the window frame, so that he might see the ring, and then I bowed and smiled like anything." (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 306)

The problem with Lydia is that she does not recognize, neither to a smaller or greater degree, the full impact of her disastrous choice. And, by the manner her mother reacts when Lydia returns a married woman, it is clear that Mrs. Bennet herself is a woman who has never really learned from her mistakes, and that Lydia, in a very similar manner, will never learn either. Having said this, I would like to establish a connection between the ideas by Deresiewicz(who claims that Austen's work defends certain moral values), and on the idea exposed in the poem by Eliza R. Snow, which I have used for this chapter's epigraph (which represents the ideas of religiosity that I am trying to defend).

Deresiewicz, when talking of his academic experience, mentions an often existing duel between the fans of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* and Charlotte Brönte's *Jane Eyre*. The duel consists, on the fact that the fans of each novel were different not only in their preference for one literary work or the other, but mainly on the way each group sees life and understands how certain values work. According to him,

> "In *Pride and Prejudice*, reason triumphs over feeling and will. In *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Brönte's own typically Romantic coming-of-age story, emotion and ego overcome all obstacles. Those of us who choose *Pride and Prejudice* couldn't imagine how you could stand to read anything as immature and overwrought. Those who chose *Jane Eyre* couldn't believe that you would subject your students to something as stuffy and insipid as *Pride and Prejudice*. Our choices, of course, reflected our personalities." (DERESIEWICZ, 2011, p 70)

As he cites the opposition between the two novels (or rather, between the reception from their readers), he says that many of those who do not like *Pride and Prejudice* do it so because they believe that Jane Austen did not know anything about passion or feelings. But his point is that "Austen valued the feelings and passions; she just didn't think we should worship them." (*idem*, p.71). After all, "Lydia was nothing *but* the passions" (*idem*), and we know that it lead her to tragic consequences. Elizabeth also had passions and feelings, but she had to learn to control them. Just as in the poem by Eliza R. Snow, people should "their tempers train and evil passions bind" (SNOW, 1985). The poem does not say one should avoid or expunge one's own temper and passions, but to learn how to train and control them. If Lydia acts wrongly for not controlling her passions and tempers, Mary acts, not necessarily wrongly, but perhaps just as ridiculously as Mr. Collins does, because she seems to deny any type of passion in her life. When Lydia talks to her about an amusing event she engaged in, Mary answers:

> "Far it be from me, my dear sister, to depreciate such pleasures. They would doubtless be congenial with the generality of female minds. But I confess they would have no charms for *me*. I should infinitely prefer a book." (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 217)

Reading books was good. Darcy and Elizabeth both loved to read, and that is a characteristic that surely adds a great amount of importance and nobility to their heroic characters. But, differently from Mary, they learn how to recognize their feelings and to control them. Mary acted as if, by having or acknowledging certain feelings of pleasure, such would not be beneficial. But it is only by paying attention to one's personal feelings that one can find true love, such as Darcy who, although seemingly cold at first, feels the urge to reveal his true feelings to Elizabeth. And the reason why the novel labels Lydia as wild, Mary as plain and Elizabeth as a heroine has to

do with how well they are able to manage their reason with their feelings, learning how to cope with both.

Therefore, after all the considerations I have made on Jane Austen's novel, on morality and on religion, I would like to establish a parallel between them, in order to show how my two objects of study, the novel and the 2003 movie, are able to dialogue with each other, not only in matters of plot or of adaptation, but in a deeper level of meaning. If I were to say what *Pride and Prejudice*'s message is, I would probably refer to William Deseriewicz's claim: people are not born perfect, and in order to become better, they need to find a balance between reason and passion, even if by making mistakes. In that sense, we do find a common ground between the morals defended by the novel and the movie, morals that are in perfect harmony with the teachings of Christianity, the religion existent in both works. Of course, as present as the Anglican Church or the Latter-day Saints Church are, respectively, in the novel and in the movie, neither work can be said to be a religious work. Not even the movie, which portrays young adults who have a religious routine, focuses on religion directly. By the end of the movie, we learn that its overall message is that, in order to find true happiness, one must live according to certain moral standards. When living according to those standards, an individual can have a better judgment of things. It is this correct judgment that leads to a happy ending. Elizabeth, in both works, already lived by those moral standards, but she also had to learn that in her judgment she might be deceived, especially when she learns that "[Darcy] has got all the goodness, and [Wickham] all the appearance of it" (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 220). Nevertheless, despite her ill early judgment, because of the standards she lived by, it was easier for her to recognize that she had failed, and to understand that a major change in her life was necessary.

Then, going from that to religion, I had said in the previous paragraph that neither the novel nor the movie focuses on religiosity directly, even if religion was an important part of each work's social group. In the movie, for instance, it is clear that Elizabeth and her roommates are church goers, but the issue of faith is never addressed. There are no evidences, for instance, if Mr. Darcy is a churchgoer at all. Of course, this detail is implied, not so much for the general public, but to the viewer who, before watching the movie, is already aware of some particularities of the LDS and BYU campus life style. The message the movie does try to convey, however, is that one can be happy by making good choices and finding one's right companion, and not necessarily by being part of a religious group.

For better understanding of how this movie, that has a well-defined religious scenario, does not necessarily focus on religiosity or faith issues, but instead, focuses on morality, I would like to talk briefly on the existing opposition between the characters of Darcy and Wickham. Since it is not clear, in the movie,

if Darcy is an LDS church member, and he is portrayed as the hero of the movie, in the same way he is in the novel, it cannot be said that the movie attempts to proselytize a religious message. As for Wickham, who is portrayed as the villain in both the novel and in the movie, it is clear, from a dialogue he has with Collins, that he does go to church (even if he has not been assiduous) in the movie. The reason for Darcy's role as the hero in opposition to Wickham's role as the villain is not, therefore based on the fact that by being a churchgoer one is better than another, but rather on how each of them decides to act towards their fellow human beings, neither sporadically nor feigningly, but habitually and genuinely.

Hence, if religiosity is not necessarily the focus of the movie, despite its location and LDS characters, why have I proposed such a relationship between Austen's novel, Black's movie and the referred institution? My point is that, despite all the historical changes that have occurred between Austen's time and the movie's, there is a strong and pertinent dialogue between those two works. Such dialogue does not merely exist because the main plot and characters have been adapted or appropriated from the novel to the movie, but mainly because both works agree on some fundamental aspects pertinent to both the scope of ethics and moral values as well as to the scope of religiosity, especially when it comes to Christianity. According to Canon Harold Anson,

> "Austen's novels are religious not because they contain religious controversy or 'a strong ecclesiastical motif', (…) but because they show 'the underlying principles upon which men live their lives and by which they judge the characters of others'." (ANSON, *apud* KELLY, 1998, p. 155)

That is, therefore, the existing dialogue between Jane Austen's literary production, Andrew Black's cinematographic production and religion. That, by living according to certain principles, people (whether they be religious or not) ought to find a better balance in their life and, consequently, happiness. And, since religion's aim is to provide people with conducts that will lead them towards happiness, the relation between the original work and the adapted work, with basis on the moral both of them expect to bring, is not only suitable, but also pertinent.

My point in establishing a connection between these works of fiction and religion is best described by T. S. Eliot's own words:

> "The common ground between religion and fiction is behavior. Our religion imposes our ethics, our judgment and criticism of ourselves, and our behavior toward our fellow men. The fiction that we read affects our behavior towards our fellow men, affects our patterns to ourselves. When we read of human beings behaving in certain ways, with the approval of the author, who gives his benediction to this behavior by his attitude towards the result of the behavior arranged by himself, we can be influenced towards behaving in the same way." (ELIOT, 1975, pp. 100-101)

According to T. S. Elliot, when reading a work of literature, readers do not do it "with a separate compartment of their minds" (*idem*), one used for merely reading and another for making moral judgments. He claims that this "separation is not, and never can be, complete" (*ibidem*), because the "moral judgments of literature are made only according to the moral code accepted by each generation, whether it lives according to that code or not" (*ibidem*, p. 97). In other words, an individual, who is a member of certain social group, within a certain period of history, lives according to certain moral standards that are most likely common to everyone who belongs to that group, and especially, to the same generation. Those standards are very important in the group's reception and judgment of the artistic works with which they will come in contact. And, quoting Eliot again, "our religion imposes our ethics, our judgment and criticism of ourselves, and our behavior toward our fellow men" (*ibidem*, p. 100). In that sense, one's religiosity, when properly observed by the individual, is the driving force of his/her most personal convictions. With those convictions in mind, it is possible to establish the parallel that I intend to make here between the works and the concepts of moral and religious values. The reason why the novel dialogues with the movie is due to their strong similarities in terms of moral convictions, grounded on the religion institutions that were part of each work, namely the Anglican Church and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, respectively.

Finally, religion receives Jane Austen's literary works with open arms because she incorporates in her novels the same teachings that several Christian principles do, such as compassion, forgiveness, honesty, etc. And in a time an era when the world has an innumerous variety of options for personal guidance, life styles, ideologies and convictions, humanity does seem to be not necessarily lost, but more puzzled before so many paths whose guarantee of an expected promising end is not always certain. But one possible path that does seem o lead towards a promising end, and that seems to have achieved its purpose for nearly two hundred years, is the one we find when reading Austen's novels, where she teaches us, in a witty and pleasant manner, that we can also enjoy our happy ending. However, it is up to us to reflect upon many things, including upon ourselves, and make the right choices, that will lead us to our fulfillment.

Moreover, in the following and final chapter of my work, I intend to work more closely with the movie itself. With that in mind, I expect to explore the decisions that were made by the director Andrew Black, as well as by the movie production crew, during the adaptation process. By doing so, I hope to better illustrate how the adaptation process works in the 2003 movie, and its relevance to my writing.

3. Relocating Jane Austen: from Longbourn to Provo

> *"The narrative is no longer purely personal. The personality of the artist passes into the narration itself, flowing round and round the persons and the action like a vital sea. (…) The dramatic form is reached when the vitality which has flowed and eddied round each person fills every person with such vital force that he or she assumes a proper and intangible esthetic life. The personality of the artist, at first a cry or a cadence or a mood and then a fluid and lambent narrative, finally refines itself out of existence, impersonalizes itself, so to speak. The esthetic image in the dramatic form is life purified in and reprojected from the human imagination. The mystery of esthetic, like that of material creation, is accomplished. The artist, like the God of creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, paring his fingernails."*
>
> (James Joyce, in *The Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*)

During a religious service held in August 1st, 1831, in the early days of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, an official statement was given by the Church leader at the time, Joseph Smith, concerning many policies and doctrines of the recently organized church. Considering that the church had been legally and officially established just a year before, many of its members were probably wondering what type of changes in their lifestyle would be required of them in order to live according to the faith they had recently become part of. Among the different counsels and procedures that were delivered at the occasion, one is very particular because it concerns not religiosity only, but also the congregation's temporal affairs. The members of the congregation were in doubt as to what type of activities they could or should engage in, since they had a new formed religion, and were thus expecting, as an answer, a detailed list of things that they ought to do and not to do. With that concern in mind, they received as a response the following counseling words:

> "(…) it is not meet that I should command in all things; for he that is compelled in all things, the same is a slothful servant and not a wise servant; wherefore he receiveth no reward. Verily I say, men should be anxiously engaged in a good cause, and do many things of their own free will, and bring to pass much righteousness." (SMITH, 1981, p. 105)

Despite the fact that the LDS Church, just like the majority of Christian churches, already has a set list of "do's and don'ts", the purpose of the quotation above is to tell the church members that they should not expect ecclesiastical advice in everything they are supposed to do. Rather, they should use "their own free will" in order to do things that will be wholesome for them. And,

if the "do's and don'ts" list concerns mostly religious matters and ecclesiastical duties, then their free time should be guided by themselves, as long as they are "engaged in a good cause". If, within church membership, there is to be a division between duty and leisure, the same could also be said to be true with people in general, not only churchgoers. Anyone who has duties with study, work, or any other commitment, will look for a balance between a proper and effective accomplishment of his/her professional or academic responsibilities and proper rest and enjoyment as a result of entertaining activities.

It is in that context of fulfilling one's duties and consequently enjoying some spare time with amusing activities that the LDS film industry has emerged. There have been official church productions being made since the 1960's, but the movement known as the LDS film industry is a somewhat different concept. The official church movies are not commercialized, nor released in commercial movie theaters. They are usually released straight on video or in special movie theaters run by the church, located in LDS Visitor's Centers, open to any visitor, and free of charge. Also, these movies have a very clear agenda of proselytizing and delivering a message of religious substance. Now, for the movies of the LDS film industry, the agenda is quite different. Despite the producers' good intentions in bringing the LDS moral values to the screen, one of their main purposes is that same of any other movie that is commercially distributed: to be viewed by as many viewers as possible, consequently making the biggest gross gain as possible as well.

Another main difference between these two types of production has to do with their content. As I said earlier, the LDS official productions are made by the church, under the approval and direction of church ecclesiastical leaders, with a proselytizing purpose. As for the "Mollywood" productions[39], the idea, at least within the first group of films made, was to create a plot and characters that would entertain and touch, mainly, the LDS audience, by focusing on an LDS environment, characters and situations. Some of the first set of movies, made in the early 2000 decade, were comedies that would depict, often in a caricatured manner (yet respectful, since the moviemakers are, in one way or another, laughing at themselves) some of the most common stereotypes concerning the LDS people, their habits and culture. The problem (or not) with those movies is that they were so centered on the jokes involving the LDS lifestyle that the movies could not be said to have "jokes", but actually "inside jokes", which would only be understood by those that were familiar not only with the LDS culture, but mainly with the Utah LDS culture.

[39] In an article published on The Deseret News by Jesse Hyde, in 2003, he coined the term "Mollywood", meaning "the Mormon Hollywood". In another article published on The Seatle Times, in 2005, journalist Debbie Hummel talks more deeply about the LDS film industry, what she also refers to as "Mollywood". Both full texts are present in the appendix section of this work.

Considering that many of those movies would portray a culture (the LDS Utah population) within another culture (the LDS Church), the movies, whether they had clever screenplays or not, might have had a hard time finding a large public, and even perhaps empathy and understanding from its already restrict public. For instance: LDS church members, who live outside the United States and who do not speak English as their first language, are very likely to find it difficult to understand some of the inside jokes, because they do not always depict common aspects of the LDS faith, but rather very specific aspects of one specific culture within a specific geographic place. At the same time, even if the jokes tend to be respectful because they are elaborated by moviemakers who attend church regularly, they might not be received in that manner by everyone. Whereas a moviemaker finds room in a certain doctrine or ceremony to create a joke on that, another member, even if sharing the same religious values, might find such comicalness offensive and disrespectful.

On the other hand, however, a group of moviemakers from the LDS film industry seems to have gone towards the opposite direction in the last years. Instead of creating movies whose themes and motifs were purely centered on the Utah LDS culture (therefore restricted to the same audience), these moviemakers have decided to make movies that would be able to be well-received (thus well-understood as well) by both the LDS population and the mainstream cinema public. Some of those movies would present a narrative set in an LDS environment, but with a plot that would be easily understood by those who are not acquainted with some particularities of the institution, whereas others would have no clear connection at all with the LDS culture, but would still, through their stories and messages, corroborate the religious values, even if not in an explicit manner.[40]

It is within this film production context that the 2003 Andrew Black movie *Pride and Prejudice: a latter-day comedy* emerges. It is a modern retelling of Jane Austen's classic novel *Pride and Prejudice*, set in the early 21st century at one of LDS official universities, Brigham Young University. Since it takes place at the university which is run by the Church, it cannot be denied that several conducts of morality and behavior stressed in the university's policies are

[40] Two examples of movies related to the LDS culture that were distributed to the mainstream audience, and are easily understood by those who do not have belong to the LDS faith are 2001 *The Other Side of Heaven* and 2003 *Saints and Soldiers*. The first, which has Anne Hathaway in the cast and was distributed by ©Disney, portrays the true story of John Groberg, an undergraduate student at Brigham Young University who is sent to serve as an LDS missionary in Tonga, for nearly three years, in the 1950's. The second takes place during World War II, and portrays an LDS war soldier amidst the war conflicts and struggles. Both movies, although depicting LDS characters in the leading roles, and also presenting some important aspects of the LDS theology, can be appreciated and easily understood by the general public, despite their convictions or religious background, because the focus of those movies is not on the theology itself, but on the characters and their development throughout the plots.

based upon the Church's beliefs and practices.[41] Nevertheless, what makes this movie suitable for the mainstream public is the fact that it does not dwell on church related issues (even if they are present and pertinent), but focuses mainly on the retelling of Jane Austen's witty and romantic novel. As I had mentioned in the previous chapter, the movie does reinforce many religious values, but it does it in the same way that Jane Austen does in her novels, by "[showing] 'the underlying principles upon which men live their lives and by which they judge the characters of others'" (ANSON, *apud* KELLY, 1998, p. 155). Therefore, whereas it is stated in the movie dialogues hat Wickham is a church member and there are no explicit remarks on Darcy's church membership, the first is still portrayed as the villain and the second as the hero, not because of their involvement and activity in the Church, but due to their behavior and actions, which are consequences of their moral values. Thus, even if the movie portrays LDS characters and some of the LDS core convictions and conducts, it is still a welcoming and easily understood work of art for everybody, despite the cultural or religious background one comes from.

As proposed in this chapter's title, *Relocating Jane Austen: from Longbourn to Provo*, my aim here is to discuss some of the relocation procedures that have taken place during the adaptation and appropriation process of Austen's novel into Black's movie. Considering that cinematographic art and language are quite complex, and that the movie could be explored in its hundreds of elements, whether present in the scene or behind the scenes, it shall not be possible for me to develop on every possibility which each cinematographic detail provides. The elements which I intend to work with are, however, concerned mainly with the scenario and the characters in the movie. And since, as I had mentioned earlier, I am working with the concepts of relocation, adaptation and appropriation, my aim in working with those two elements is to establish a comparison between the scenario and characters created by Jane Austen in the original work and their respective recreations in Andrew Black's modern-day movie version.

3.1 Scenario

To start with, I would like to compare the novel's scenario with the movie's scenario. But before starting to develop this, I would like to make it clear that, since the word scenario, according to each context and motivations, has different meanings, the meaning I plan to work with here is that of the novel's (and movie's) social, cultural and geographical setting. With that meaning in mind, it is not difficult to state that the geographical setting of the novel is that of Great

[41] According to the University's Honor Code Statement, students, whether they are Church members or not, are expected to "be honest, live a chaste and virtuos life, obey the law and all the campus policies, use clean language, respect others, abstain from alcoholic beverages, tobacco […] and substance abuse [and] observe the dress and grooming standards" (from *BYU's Honor Code Statement*)

Britain in late 18th and early 19th century. But, if we wish to be more specific, we could say that the novel portrays different settings within the major British setting, such as the rural community where Longbourn is situated, the exquisite landscape and wealth of Pemberley or the elopement destination of Gretna Green, in Scotland. Each of these geographical settings in the novel has, consequently and respectively, its own social and cultural setting, and since there is no culture without a society, they cannot be set apart from each other. Each of them has an important role within the novel, because it is due to their social situation that most of the events in the novel take place. For instance, if the reality of women living in the rural areas (and in urban centers as well) of England did not require them to marry, because of financial reasons or for moral and emotional support or various other reasons. After the family male members were gone, we might not have had Mrs. Bennet's desperation for her daughters' matrimony, nor Charlotte Lucas' marriage with Mr. Collins. And, if Gretna Green did not offer the possibility for eloping couples to get married quickly and easily, the fate of Lydia and Wickham might have been another one.

With those considerations in mind, it is clear that the situational internal elements of a narrative (meaning here the temporal-historical aspects where the novel takes place) can be, and are, oftentimes, crucial to the development of the narrative itself. We might not have had James Joyce's *Dubliners* in its specific context, if British colonization and Catholicism were not relevant social and political circumstances in Joyce's Ireland. In the same manner, if World War II had not reached England and France, Ian McEwan's *Atonement* would have been a somewhat different novel.

That is not to say, however, that the fictional narratives are enslaved to History. As a matter of fact, "narratives are indeed structures independent of any medium." (CHATMAN, 1978, p. 20) That is to say that narratives can exist in literature, music, on the stage, cinema, historical accounts, paintings, sculpture and in many other media. Also,

> "there are narratives not only in literature but also in other cultural utterances that surround us. (…) our conversations with other people contain narrative sequences. (…) Our thoughts often assume a narrative form, and even our dreams are like incomplete and confusing stories. Human beings have a deep-seated need to establish narrative patterns, something that is again connected with the tendency we have to see life as a story – a temporally limited line of development from beginning to end, from birth to death, in which we like to find each stage meaningful and to justify the choices we make." (LOTHE, 2000, p. 3)

Thus, narrative is a phenomenon that exists within human language, despite the situation one belongs to, or the medium one has chosen to record it in. And, if narratives exist independently of any medium or social circumstance, it can also be said that the same narrative (or

a very similar one) could exist despite its internal cultural location. By saying that, I argue that it would be possible for Joyce to have written *Dubliners* and for McEwan to have written *Atonement*, even if the political situation of Ireland were totally different, and even if World War II had never reached neither England nor France, or had never taken place at all. Joyce's Dubliner characters could still face the same existential crisis they do, even if Ireland were not marked by strong British and Catholic influence. At the same time, Briony Tallis' lie could have been as destructive to other and to herself, even in a very peaceful setting. Nevertheless, choices ought to be made by each work's author in order to achieve his/her purposes. The author has to decide either to take advantage of a historical situation in order to magnify the characters' suffering or enjoyment, or to create other narrative elements that will allow the different possibilities in characters' behaviors and reactions before varied life opportunities and struggles.

My objective in pointing that out is to talk about the choices that were made by Andrew Black in the movie version of *Pride and Prejudice*. When other moviemakers produced other versions of the novel as adaptations, such as Joe Wright's 2005 *Pride and Prejudice*, or 1995 BBC's homonymous television production there were not many changes to be made in terms of relocation and transposition. Of course, there were important choices in terms of adaptation that had to be made, and that were well made, giving these two productions the deserved acclaim and respect they still cherish today. But when it comes to the themes and social surroundings involving the characters, the producers showed on screen possible representations and interpretations of events verbalized by Jane Austen. As for Andrew Black, and the other producers involved in the 2003 movie, they had to elaborate different strategies, so that Austen's story would be suitable for the new setting they planned to use.[42]

When attempting to use a relocation, or a proximization process, as the ones proposed by Julie Sanders and Gerard Gennete, which were exposed in the first chapter, special attention needs to be given to several details in the new work, so that the adapted work is not rejected by its public due to contradictions and anachronisms it might present. We can see that in other productions based upon Austen's works that have been mentioned here already, such as *Bridget Jones' Diary* and *Clueless*. Both depict similar situations to those we find in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Emma*, even if the social and economical surroundings have changed drastically within two centuries.

[42] I do not intend, by this comment of mine, to make a judgment of value between those two productions, which are often considered to be "faithful" to Austen's narrative, and between the modern-day movie version by Black, as if I were attempting to say to a group of producers were better or worked harder than another group. I do believe that each production had its own challenges, whether in trying to recreate Austen's society or to recreate her story within another society. Each work deserves to be praised equally, despite the means employed, for achieving, in one way or another, the same spirit or message that Jane Austen intended to share.

Thus, each production crew has to find manners to recreate Austen's stories, by eliminating certain elements of the novel that would not be suitable for the setting they planned to illustrate, or to add other elements that would be necessary for an understanding of the same story within a totally different setting.

3.1.1 Longbourn

In Black's situation, he decided to use Brigham Young University campus as the new setting for his movie[43]. Hence, the Bennet family has moved out of the Longbourn estate, and moved into Longbourn Avenue, in Provo, Utah. But not all of them have moved in. Mr. and Mrs. Bennet have remained in their old residence, and just the girls moved in to Provo. And, since in the early 21st century families rarely ever have many children, the Bennet girls have moved in as five roommates, and not as sisters (except for Kitty and Lydia, who remain siblings in the movie). The new context is not merely any university, but BYU, which has its own values and culture. As previously mentioned, since BYU is run by the LDS Church, and is a private university in the United States, it is in charge of, and allowed to establish its own policies and moral codes. Among the many values defended by the Church, and strongly reinforced at BYU campus, is the value pertaining to the idea of marriage. If in the 19th century rural England families were apprehensive for their children's (especially daughters') marriage, the same can be said to be true within the LDS community, especially among single university students who attend BYU[44]. Thus, Black found a good and reliable setting for his production, where the issue of marriage was just as strongly addressed.

Nevertheless, one of the main differences concerns the motivations for marriage in each work. Of course, one of the main reasons for the novel's appeal to any audience, from any time or place, has to do with an inherent human need for true friendship and true love, but it is a fact that in both works we come across several characters that choose marriage for different reasons. In terms of personal motivation, each character from the movie presents similar motivations to those

[43] During the movie, at least in the DVD version, there is explicit reference to the fact that the characters attend BYU. However, during an early scene, Elizabeth receives a letter, and the address on it says "Longbourn Ave., Provo, UT". Considering that Provo is a city with 112,000 inhabitants, and that BYU houses at least 34,000 of the population, it is not difficult to conclude that the university they go to is actually BYU, apart from the fact that BYU is the only university in Provo and the characters have a very similar routine and culture to the one found at BYU.

[44] Across the United States, especially around colleges and universities, the Church has created some congregations that are referred to as "Singles Wards". A regular or family ward is a regular congregation where church members worship regularly. The singles wards are intended mainly for university age students (from 18 to 30), who are still single. The purpose is to provide those young single students an environment where they can spend time with their peers, and consequently, date people who share similar convictions and lifestyles.

in the book[45]. But in terms of social and collective motivation, the reason is quite different. Women in Austen's time who did not have an income of their own (who were but a few, including Jane Austen herself, with her writing), would have to depend financially either upon their husbands or upon male family members, making marriage one of the only (if not the only) options for financial support. As for BYU students today (considering that more than 90% of them are LDS), there is no need for marriage for financial purposes, but that does not mean that the idea of marriage is not in the mind of the vast majority of BYU students[46]. With that pursue in mind, the transposition of *Pride and Prejudice*'s original scenario into the BYU campus serves the movie's purposes well, since the movie has been able to reproduce a setting where the culture of dating and of marriage is just as present as in Austen's society.

If we were to compare the different settings of the novel with the different settings in the movie, there would not be much controversy in affirming that the house where Elizabeth, Jane, Lydia, Kitty and Mary live, situated on Longbourn Avenue, represents Longbourn estate, the house of the Bennet family in the novel. Consequently, BYU campus could be compared with the entire rural community surrounding Longbourn, in Hertfordshire. In the same way that the community houses the different residences of the novel's many characters (such as Lucas Lodge, residence of the Lucas family, and Netherfield Park, residence of Charles Bingley), the university campus equally shelters many of the movie's many characters. Considering that in the post-modern world, in cities with skyscrapers, where individualism is predominant and individuals tend to be detached from external society, the idea of a neighborhood environment in the 21st century similar to the one we find between the Bennet's, the Lucases and the Gardiners, for example, might sound somewhat difficult to take place, as it would in the early 19th century. However, placing the movie inside a university campus, allows the interaction between characters to be a friendly one, similar to that we find in the novel, among the residents of the same region. Whereas in most US American universities there are fraternities and sororities that are an important part of students' social life, BYU has none of these. Nevertheless, the lack of these social groups does not impede BYU students to have social interaction. Rather, their social interaction with other university students is likely to be even greater, since students from the same fraternity or sorority are likely to interact mostly among members from the same group, while BYU students have no other option but to interact with any student on campus, because in this context family is replaced by the Church and the University. Such a configuration, along with the LDS church routine among

[45] I shall develop more on the personal motivations of each character further, when discussing the characters themselves.

[46] According to an article by XiaoheXu, entitled *The Time of First Marriage: Are There Religious Variations?*, when compared to young single adults from other religions, LDS are the ones who wed the earliest.

students, is what allows the interaction between the movie characters. It is just because such interaction exists that Charles and Caroline Bingley are able to invite other students, whom they did not know very well, to the party in the house, present in the movie's early scenes. This party, which resembles the Netherfield ball, is where many major events take place, at least in the movie. It is at this party that the public has its very first contact with some important characters, such as Collins, Charles Bingley and Jack Wickham. Darcy is reintroduced in this scene, in a manner that corroborates the very first impression Elizabeth has of him, from the scene in the bookstore. At the same time, Wickham presents himself as an adorable and eligible bachelor. It is at this party that Elizabeth makes her judgments as to who is supposed to be the good guy, and who is supposed to be the bad guy[47], and such a judgment is what will lead to many other actions in the movie, and mainly, to the movie's main theme and message.

3.1.2 Pemberley

Now, if the BYU campus symbolizes the rural neighborhood where the Bennet's live, then what resembles Darcy's mansion, Pemberley? Apparently, Darcy's character in the movie is always travelling on business, and is originally from London, so that we never see his actual residence. Nevertheless, there are three locations in the movie that are indeed connected to the novel's fictitious mansion of Pemberley.

. In the novel, when Elizabethvisits Pemberley, in the company of her uncle and aunt, Mr. and Mrs. Gardiner, she is astonished by the estate's exuberant beauty. Not only that, but while visiting Pemberley and paying close attention to the furniture and decoration, she has a better perception and understanding of Darcy's personality. When Elizabeth first enters the mansion, we read:

> "Elizabeth, after slightly surveying it, went to a window to enjoy its prospect. The hill, crowned with wood, from which they had descended, receiving increased abruptness from the distance, was a beautiful object. Every disposition of the ground was good; and she looked on the whole scene, the river, the trees scattered on its banks, and the winding of the valley, as far as she could trace it, with delight. As they passed into other rooms, these objects were taking different positions; but from every window there were beauties to be seen. The rooms were lofty and handsome, and their furniture suitable to the fortune of their proprietor; but Elizabeth saw, with admiration of his

[47] In the same way that Elizabeth misjudges Darcy and Wickham, I believe the public might misjudge them as well, as long as they are not acquainted with the story yet. The very first time I saw the movie, I had not yet read the book, nor seen any other movie version of the novel. Thus, when I saw the party scene, I was sure that, in a similar way to other "chick-flicks", Darcy would be the bad guy, and that he would be punished, and that Wickham was the good guy, and that he would be rewarded in the end. I believe this was the reason that made me become interested in Jane Austen, the element of surprise and the realization that I, just like Elizabeth, had been deceived by unfair judgments.

> taste, that it was neither gaudy nor uselessly fine, – with less of splendor, and more real elegance, than the furniture of Rosings. “And of this place,” thought she, “I might have been mistress! With these rooms I might now have been familiarly acquainted! Instead of viewing them as a stranger, I might have rejoiced in them as my own (…).” (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 240)

In this part of the novel, Lizzy had already received Darcy’s letter and learned some truths about Wickham’s relation to Darcy’s family, so that “[Darcy’s] mind or manners [were not] in a state of improvement; but that from knowing him better, his disposition was better understood” (*idem*, p. 229). She is not yet totally convinced or fully aware of Darcy’s good disposition, but when she enters his residence, she starts to realize, subtly, that his taste was good. Considering Elizabeth’s strong personality and judgment values, to say that the furniture, landscape or decoration of the estate would be enough to change her concept of Darcy would be somewhat contradictory. Yet, after reading his letter and realizing that she had misjudged him, to observe his simplicity despite his wealth was definitely something that would open her eyes, even if to a small degree, about the possibility of his personality matching hers.

In the movie, the fist place presented that could be identified as a transposition of Pemberley estate is Rosing’s Restaurant. From the early scenes of the movies, we learn that Elizabeth is writing a novel of her own, while attending Literature and Creative Writing classes at BYU. After many negative replies from publishers, she receives a positive answer from an editor, with an invitation for a meal at Rosing’s Restaurant. As she arrives there, she is surprised, and at the same time intimidated, when she learns that the editor, or what is more, one of the publishing company owners, is Darcy, who is about to talk to her about the possibility of her book being published. The difference here from Pemberley has to do with a chronological order, because in the novel, Lizzy had already read Darcy’s letter about Wickham when first entering Pemberley, but not in the movie. In the movie, their dinner at Rosing’s Restaurant is what causes Darcy to write her an e-mail with an explanation about Wickham. Still, this restaurant is where she has her very first insight concerning the real character of Darcy. Even if, at this point, in the movie, she is not able to learn everything about him, she learns that he, by being a publishing house owner, is perhaps more interested in arts, and much closer to her than she had first imagined.

The second place that could be viewed as another transposition of Pemberley is a cabin in the woods owned by Darcy, a type of holiday residence of his. In the middle of the movie, while writing her novel in an open landscape, Elizabeth falls asleep and wakes up after sunset, under rainy weather. Since she is not very familiar with the region, she is lost and looks for shelter in the nearest house she finds, which happens to be Darcy’s property. Surprisingly enough, not only Darcy is at the house, but also his sister Anna (originally Georgiana in the novel). At this point,

Elizabeth learns (in both the movie and the novel) more about Darcy's nature by seeing the way he treats his sister. After hearing from different people that he was indeed good natured, but believing to have strong reasons to doubt it, she is in a situation where she has no other option but to accept the fact that his disposition is good, because now she cannot rely on anyone's words, but is facing his example for herself. In the movie, the cabin has a very important role, because not only does she meet Anna, and is able to interact with the siblings in a friendly manner, but it is also the place where their love and attraction becomes mutual. It is at this point, in the movie, that Elizabeth starts to feel attracted to Darcy, and to treat him in a manner that would show that. And, since we never see his actual residence in London, this is the nearest we get to see of his taste for decoration and furniture (as in the novel when we read about Pemberley). Not only that, but perhaps what surprises Elizabeth the most is that Darcy (in both the novel and movie) shows simplicity despite his possessions.

The third place that could be considered a transposition as well is a virtual one, since it is a location that is just mentioned in the movie, and Elizabeth only goes there when her happy ending with Darcy takes place. The place is London, the English capital. While attending Literature at BYU, she is offered an interchange program by her professor in London. At this point, she sees London as an opportunity for an academic upgrade, nothing more than that. She is excited to go, but not so much for the city itself, but due to her academic purposes. Thus, in the scene mentioned in the paragraph before, when Elizabeth goes to Darcy's cabin, and during a moment in which Anna leaves them alone, Darcy starts to describe London in a very personal and emotional manner. He, whom at first seems so concerned about his own business, surprises Elizabeth when he describes to her the feeling he has when seeing and enjoying the sight of London during the early hours of the day. As simplistic as it may sound, it is during this conversation that her feelings towards him change. Before, while talking to him and his sister, she had felt he was a good person, with a noble disposition, but it is only when they are by themselves, talking about London, that something happens. From this point on, London did not represent to Elizabeth just an opportunity for academic enlightenment, but the opportunity of being a citizen of that place, in the same way that the novel's character feels when she realizes she could be the mistress of Pemberley, and that this is the place where she might find true happiness. Not only that, but London, in the movie, also represents to Elizabeth an important part of her cultural heritage. I shall not go too deep in detail on the subject, but I find it important to highlight that

> "ancestors and heritage have an essential place in the Mormon faith, as they do in Austen's novel. Admittedly, in Austen's novel, ancestral ties are used to determine social positioning in a way that they are not in the Mormon Church. Regardless, when

> Elizabeth mentions that her ancestors are from England, it is both a reference to Austen and her text, and to Mormon culture as a whole." (BARCSAY, 2008, p. 111)

It is a historical fact that a large number of Utah's population nowadays are descendent of LDS pioneers, many of them who came from England to the United States East Coast, and from there, migrated into the West, to the regions where today we have the modern states of Utah, Idaho, Nevada, and others. This explains why the LDS population in these states is considerably larger than the population of other religious groups[48]. What is more, the state of Utah, especially the Church, celebrates on a regular basis, their origin and their pioneer history. Thus, when Elizabeth hears Darcy's heartfelt description of London, the same land of her ancestors, she has another reason to find in London something very meaningful, a possible connection between her family roots and the new roots she is about to sow with her new companion Darcy. This also works as a way to approximate the average US American teenager to the English context. The movie does not mention Austen's specific territory, but it emphasizes London, which to the average US American teenager is what first comes to mind when mentioning Jane Austen's geographical context.

In short, these three places in the movie (being the third a virtual one), can be interpreted as possible "modern Pemberleys", because in each of them, Elizabeth (the movie character) has similar insights about Darcy to the ones the novel character has, while visiting Pemberley, insights which will lead to the solution of the conflict between the protagonists in the end of the narrative.

3.1.3 Gretna Green

And, if BYU campus is to resemble the surroundings of Longbourn estate, and there are at least three different places in the movie that could symbolize Pemberley, then what is the match for the Scottish destination of Gretna Green? The answer is quite obvious: Las Vegas, in Nevada.

Even if in the novel Wickham and Lydia never make it to Gretna Green, a famous destination for young eloping couples, the place has an important role within the novel. After all, it is only because of the possibility for a quick marriage, without the need for legal or judicial parental approval in Gretna Green, that Wickham and Lydia elope. So, even if the marriage does not take place in Gretna Green, it is of great importance. It is due to Lydia and Wickham's disposition that a great scandal is about to destroy the Bennet family's reputation. The jeopardy of such a scandal is what causes Darcy to be sensitive towards Elizabeth's family's bad social reputation, allowing him to act in a heroic manner, in order to save the family. And, after all the

[48] According to data from the U. S. Religious Landscape Survey, from 2008, the LDS population in the states of Utah, Idaho and Nevada are, respectively 58%, 23% and 11%, versus the nationwide rate of 1,6%.

insights Elizabeth has about his good nature, this is the act that makes her finally realize that he is indeed the man she had intended to marry from the beginning of the story, when she stated that she would only marry someone she could really love.

In the movie, the situation is not that different. Wickham tries to elope with Lydia, not to Scotland, but Las Vegas, which is just a few hours by road from Provo. Considering that Las Vegas is internationally famous as a place for easy and fast marriage ceremonies, there is no need to develop much on the city. It is sufficient, however, to emphasize that, in the 21st century, Las Vegas serves as an elopment destination in the United States, in the same way that Gretna Green served Great Britain in Austen's time. And, in a similar manner to that of the book, it is due to the elopement that Darcy has the chance to save Lydia from a bad marriage, thus being seen by Elizabeth with other eyes, allowing her to finally understand and accept her true feelings towards him.

3.2 Characters

One of the most important elements in fiction ought to be the character. After all, it is the character who, through his/her actions and development, will be greatly responsible for the changes in the fiction's story; he/she lives in a delimited space; and the character has his/her story told within a certain period of time. If we consider any other 19th century work, such as Charlotte Brontë's fictional work *Jane Eyre*, we can see how most of the other fictional elements work around the novel's homonymous protagonist. It is due to her actions and behavior that other events in the story take place, whether it is of or against her own free will. It is because of her behavior as a child that she is sent to a boarding school; it is because of her strong personality that she is punished when at the boarding school; it is because of her moral values that she refuses to marry to Mr. Rochester upon her discovery concerning Bertha. Also, the time aspect of the novel is focused on Jane's growth. We are acquainted with her during childhood, see her adolescence and her adulthood. In terms of space, it is she who leads the reader to the different settings of the novel, such as Lowood and Thornfield.

This is not different in Austen's novel. Here, more than in many other novels published in her time, Austen would place most of the novel's issues inside characters, not outside them. According to Deresiewicz,

> "(…) Austen also altered the traditional pattern in an enormously profound way. In the classic comic plot, a pair of young lovers are kept apart by some external obstacle, some 'blocking figure' that represents the eternal antagonism of age and youth: a possessive father, a jealous old husband, the laws and customs of an antiquated,

> repressive society. Austen changed everything by putting that obstacle on the inside[49]. Now we ourselves are the blocking figures who are causing us so much trouble. *We* are the ones standing in the way of our happiness." (DERESIEWICZ, 2011, p. 73)

This is evidently very different from fairy tales or gothic romances, where evil creatures, selfish stepmothers and witches' spells are the things that young lovers have to fight against, in order to have their happy ending. In Austen, nevertheless, the focus is on obstacles that are, at the same time, of much harder perception, and also of greater impact. Moreover, as already explained in the previous chapter, what keeps Elizabeth from finding true happiness are not external elements, but her own inner feelings and motivations, which she needs to change if she wants to find true love. Therefore, the narrative element of character is of extreme importance for the novel's development. In the same manner, the movie is also built around the characters that are as important as the ones in the novel.

The characters now live in new and modern setting, in a different country and different century, so some changes had to take place in order to make the movie a coherent work of its own (whether it is an adaptation or an original work, coherence is an aspect looked for in any artistic work). In the movie, some characters have been changed slightly, some have changed drastically and some have even been erased. In the following paragraphs I shall discuss a little more about them.

3.2.1 The missing characters

Considering that now the five Bennet girls are no longer sisters, but roommates, the characters of Mr. and Mrs. Bennet have, consequently, disappeared in the movie version. The reason has to do mainly with a social-historical adaptation. While in Austen's novel the parents play a major role in their daughters' love relationships and other actions, in the movie the parents have no voice at all[50]. There are some brief references to Elizabeth's parents and to Lydia and Kitty's parents, and they do have some influence on their decisions (Elizabeth mentions she was encouraged by her father to become a writer and Kitty has a rich father who owns the house where the five girls live), but it is perfectly clear throughout the movie that the girls act on their own, and never because of what their parents wish. In the novel, the parents participate in their daughters' lives and are acquainted with their suitors, giving their opinions on who should marry whom. And

[49] Deresiewicz may have exaggerated in his opinion because, although Austen was important in highlighting how a person needs to learn and overcome his/her shortcomings in order to succeed in life, previous authors have done that, such as Shakespeare, whose protagonists reach a tragic end as a consequence of their shortcomings, such as Hamlet.

[50] Even if the Church and BYU replace the parents as the authority, the movie characters have much more freedom than the characters in the novel do.

of course, they did not do anything different from what most (if not all) parents and guardians in 19th century England would do concerning their children. In 2003, in the United States, however, those five girls have left home to study at University (some from overseas, as Jane, who is an Argentinian student in the movie) and are totally independent. They still have a family, but they are living their own lives, making their own decisions and pursuing their own goals.

Therefore, now that we live at a time when girls are perfectly capable of moving on with their own lives and making their own choices, to transpose certain characters that had certain roles in Austen's novel to the movie would create a feeling of falseness due to its unlikelihood in the movie's setting. And since some characters can no longer have the role they once had, they have disappeared in the movie version. Of course, many characters have not been transposed to the movie because of limited movie length that would not allow a plot with so many characters and subplots as the novel does, but now I would like to focus on those characters that have been purposely excluded from the movie so that it would have a more plausible structure.

3.2.1.1 Mr. and Mrs. Bennet

In the opening page of *Pride and Prejudice* we learn that many families in 19th century England would look to "single [men] in possession of a good fortune (…) as the rightful property of someone or other of their daughters" (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 5). In the same page we are introduced to Mr. and Mrs. Bennet, and soon we discover that Mrs. Bennet's main aim is to find a rich husband for her daughters. On the other hand, Mr. Bennet is not concerned about his daughters' marriage, and he actually comes to the point of mocking his wife in her search for sons-in-law.

One of the main reasons for their absence has to do with LDS values concerning matrimony. In the novel, Mr. Bennet expresses his frustration with his marriage, as a consequence of idle choices in his youth. His marriage was not miserable, but it was not ideal either. And in an environment where family plays a very important role, and where parents are expected to do and be the best for their children, the presence of flawed parents would go against its message on the importance of family.

Also, even though Mr. Bennet is seen to be the opposite of Mrs. Bennet in behavior and thoughts, he is another unnecessary character in the movie. The simple fact that these girls have moved to a university campus shows that, despite any emotional attachment they might still have with their family, there is no need for their parents' approval in their love life. In the novel it is very clear that, despite Mrs. Bennet's wish to find a husband to her daughters, Mr. Bennet plays the male patriarchal authority over the Bennet family. Thus, he is responsible for approving the

love encounters between the girls and their suitors as well as visiting them, so they will know they are "allowed" to pursue the idea of marriage with the Bennet girls. That is well expressed in the lines uttered by Mrs. Bennet to her husband when trying to convince him to visit Charles Bingley: "… consider you daughters. Only think what an establishment it would be for one of them. (…) Indeed you must go, for it will be impossible for *us* to visit him if you do not" (*idem*, p. 6).

The difference in behavior of people in general, especially girls, towards their parents has gone under major changes. While in the 19th century parents would play a major role in choosing the future spouses for their children (sometimes playing an even more important role than the children themselves), in the 21st century a greater number of teenagers and young adults are conducting their romantic lives without their parents' knowledge, without the need for their consent and approval. That does not mean that they are hiding their lives from their family, but that they are free to go out with different people and to start a romantic relationship before they mention anything to their parents, a totally different cultural scenario from that of Austen's time.Also, the authority of the parents is transferred, in the movie's context, to the Church and to the Univeristy.

Thus, in order to create a coherent structure in the new setting of *Pride and Prejudice*, changes would need to occur. This happens with the absence of the Bennet's parents, because there is no more room in the movie's cultural and social context for characters that would play the same role the Bennet parents play in the novel.

3.2.1.2 Lady Catherine de Bourgh

To mention the role of Lady Catherine de Bourgh as no longer necessary in the western society of the 21st century is quite a risk. The truth is that, despite all the changes that have occurred concerning inheritance, class hierarchy and arranged marriage over the past centuries, there are still examples that attest to the fact that many things still work in the same way they did long ago. If we turn on the TV and watch a soap-opera or a "chick-flick", or read some "chick-lit", we might come across characters and situations that are very similar to the ones in *Pride and Prejudice*, especially the relation between Lady Catherine de Bourgh, Mr. Darcy and Elizabeth Bennet. And not only instories that take place in the past, but many stories that take place nowadays will have something similar, presenting such circumstances and characters in a convincing manner.

So, to say that the absence Lady Catherine de Bourgh is merely a question of cultural relocation in time and space might not be good enough. Evidently there has been a great change concerning class and family hierarchy over the past two centuries. It is more and more difficult to

find parents or guardians like Lady Catherine, who will expect their protégés to be part of an arranged marriage because of money and social status. Though that might be part of the reason for her absence in the movie, there must be another reason that would allow us to be convinced that Lady Catherine has no role to be played.

For such we need to stop looking at the cultural context of the movie, and turn to the movie itself. As we become acquainted with Will Darcy (the movie character) we learn that he is a successful, rich, English businessman, and who often travels to the United States on business and leisure. We are not provided with the details that led him to his current economic situation[51], but there is no evidence of a tutor, or that he has obtained the money he has out of family inheritance. In the scene where Elizabeth goes to Darcy's cabin, Darcy and Anna do talk briefly about their parents, but there is no explicit information on their social or economical situation, or even if they are alive or deceased, as in the novel. In the book, although Mr. Darcy has a fortune of his own, it is clear that he has to account for his actions to his aunt, Lady Catherine. In the movie, he is a totally independent man, who seems to have made his fortune on his own, with no explicit need to account for his doings to anyone in his family. At the same time, the idea of an arranged marriage is not present in Darcy's life (in the movie). The only girl who wishes to marry him is Caroline Bingley (as in the novel) but there are no references at all that indicate she wishes to marry him because of her parents' initial motivation (like Lady Catherine's daughter in the novel).

In conclusion, to make those three characters (Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Bennet and Lady Catherine de Bourgh) inexistent in the movie was a good alternative in order to show that during the adapting process some social roles have either changed or become inexistent. There are many others, such as the Gardiner's, the Philips' and Colonel Fitzwilliam, that have also disappeared, making room for a deeper development of the main characters.

3.2 The present characters

In the previous section I have discussed a bit about the characters that were present in the novel, but that are not present in the 2003 movie version, and why their disappearance was necessary in order to convey a new historical and social context, and perhaps to suit some technical needs. But since the movie director "has a political or ethical commitment […] to reinterpret [the] source text" (SANDERS, 2006, p. 2), some of the main characters would have to be present in the movie, even if with some slight changes. In the following paragraphs I would like

[51] We know that he owns part of a publishing house, but it is not clear if he has other economic activities, or if that is the company that made him rich.

to mention some characters that are important in both the novel and the movie, along with the similarities and differences between the same characters in each work.

3.2.1. Jane and Charles Bingley

If there is something the 2003 movie producers deserve to be praised for is their ability to select an excellent cast. By "excellent cast" I do not mean that the cast is formed by Oscar winners or nominees, nor by famous Hollywood stars, neither by actor and actress with an outstanding or superb performance. As a matter of fact, the members of the cast are not really famous, but good actors. Not only that, but they were also well chosen, in terms of their physical aspect, to play each character. Kam Heskin (Elizabeht) is good-looking, and has a similar physical aspect to that of Renée Zellweger (who plays Bridget Jones in the cinema, a possible contemporary version of Elizabeth Bennet), and often wears glasses, saying that she is beautiful but she is also clever; Lucila Solá (Jane) is even prettier, as described in the novel; Kelly Stables (Lydia) has a similar body type to that of Alicia Sylverstone (Cher, from *Clueless*, a possible 20th century Beverly Hills version of Emma) and with her red hair, shows her humor[52]. As for the male cast, Orlando Seale (Darcy) is handsome just like Ben Gourley (Bingley), but the first has, from the start of the movie, a serious, almost aggressive countenance, whereas the last seems to be pleasant all the time.[53]

The social and financial aspects from the novel are also present in the movie. Charles is rich (his is the mansion where the party is taking place) and has a business that sells CD's made for dogs (which is portrayed in a pretty humorous manner) that proves to be a successful enterprise. As for Jane, there is no evidence of her being poor, but we know she is a foreign student from Argentina. Foreign students are outsiders. Thus, for Jane to be able to marry Charles is an opportunity for her to achieve a higher social status becoming an insider. Of course, in the movie that is approached in a much lighter manner, and might not even been perceived by a naïve audience, but it is still an important part of the essence of the characters as it was in the novel.

[52] "'Lizzy is not a bit better than the other; and I am sure she is not half so handsome as Jane, nor half so good-humoured as Lydia.'" (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 8)

[53] "Mr. Bingley was good-looking and gentleman-like: he had a pleasant countenance, and easy, unaffected manners. (…) his friend, Mr. Darcy, soon drew attention of the room by his fine, tall person, handsome features, noble mien. (…) he was looked with great admiration for about half the evening, till his manners gave a disgust which turned the tide of his popularity; for he was discovered to be proud, to be above his company, and above being pleased; and not all his large estate in Derbyshire could then save him from having a most forbidding, disagreeable countenance, and being unworthy to be compared with his friend." (*idem*, p. 12)

3.2.2. Jack Wickham and Lydia

As mentioned before, when I first saw the movie that is the object of this study, I had not yet read Austen´s novel. Therefore, my expectation in relation to the possible romantic matches followed those of any other chick flick: Wickham was the hero who would marry Elizabeth, while Darcy was some sort of villain. To my surprise, the "twist" in the movie was well developed and, as I later found out, reflected the one in the novel.

An interesting cultural relocation made in the movie has to do with Wickham's elopements[54]. In Austen's novel, Lydia elopes with Wickham. As already pointed in the previous chapter, their first plan was to go to Gretna Green, in Scotland where, differently from England, a couple under the age of 21 did not need parental approval in order to be married. Thus, Lydia and Wickham could be married even if against her parent's will. The best solution for the screenplay was to look for a similar place near Provo, Utah, where elopements could take place. Luckily enough, within 380 miles from Provo is the famous city of Las Vegas, in the state of Nevada, known as a popular wedding destination, since the marriage license is cheaper than in the rest of the United States of America, and where options such as "drive-thru marriage" are available. Thus, Vegas was chosen as the perfect setting for Lydia and Wickham's elopement.

The main difference however in the movie concerning their elopement is that they do not get married. The similarity however has to do with Darcy's interference: in both the novel and in the movie, he "saves" Lydia from public embarrassment. In the novel, Darcy pays Wickham so that he will marry Lydia properly (since the idea of a girl living with a man with whom she was not married would be the social ruin for the other Bennetgirls, keeping them from attending social events and getting married); in the movie, as soon as Darcy finds out about Wickham's plan (and at this moment the audience already knows about Wickham's previous marriages), he travels to Vegas as fast as he can in order to prevent their marriage (which in the movie turns out to be a possibility of happy ending for Lydia).

Something that is quite different from Lydia, the novel character, and Lydia, the movie character, has to do with her character construction. In the novel, Lydia is a flat character, from the first to the very last page, because she does not change at all, and she does not recognize her mistakes. She always presents herself as a "huntress", doing whatever it takes for her to find a husband. And, even after she is married to Wickham, causing several problems to her family, she is still as "vain, ignorant, idle, and absolutely uncontrolled" (AUSTEN, 2003, p. 226) as she was in the beginning of the novel.

[54] I use this word in the plural because in the movie, differently from the novel, we hear that Wickham has married at least two girls.

In the movie, however, Lydia goes through a drastic change. Here, differently from the novel, she is prevented from marrying Wickham due to Elizabeth and Darcy's intervention. In the movie, Wickham's situation was even worse than the one in the novel because, whereas in the novel his act is considered immoral, in the movie it is both immoral and illegal. He ends up being arrested for polygamy, a practice not only condemnable by culture and society, but also by the law. Thus, perceiving Wickham's misconduct and illegal affairs, Lydia has a greater shock than the novel's character, which leads her to a change of behavior.

Throughout most of the movie, Lydia is a "huntress", who reads *The Pink Bible*[55], a fictitious self-help book aimed at helping single women, in the book's own terms, "to bring your man to his knees". She follows every piece of advice in the book, believing it to be helpful in her search. Yet, she is so worried about following the set rules of the book that she is portrayed as vain, once she does not pay attention to her feelings at all in her quest. Obviously, she is not anxious for a relationship in the same way that Jane is, or that Elizabeth later becomes. Lydia's concern has more to do with the fact that she wants to have a "trophy husband" so that she can be popular among her peers.

Considering Lydia's initial behavior, it would be expected for her to have a similar fate to that of Lydia, the novel character. But, when she is shocked before Wickham's concealed strategies, she decides to change. The girl who was once reading a book targeting, as the own book says, at "huntresses" in search of a "trophy husband", following every line of it with no hesitation, through Machiavellian methods[56], has now gone in a totally different direction. Lydia ends the movie as a writer and conference speaker, sharing the idea that women can be happy and lead a successful life without the need of a husband. Therefore, Lydia can be said to be a character (perhaps the only one) who, in the adaptation from novel to movie, has had a major transformation as a character, and actually surprising the audience.

3.2.3. Elizabeth Bennet and Fitzwilliam Darcy

Our hero and heroine are given the proper treatment in the movie version and remain just as heroic as they are in the novel. Just as in the novel, both movie characters are independent, strong about their opinions and values, and somewhat stubborn (or, in Austen's own terms, proud and prejudiced). Their very first encounter is quite disastrous at the bookshop where Elizabeth works, and the same awkwardness takes place again at Charles' party. Neither Darcy nor Elizabeth

[55] Some excerpts from the *Pink Bible* are in the annexes section.
[56] In an early scene, Lydia, in an attempt to seduce Bingley, causes Kitty to suffer an electric shock, and does not feel any type of guilt.

seems to have the least empathy towards each other, a very similar aspect with the novel. Since the movie is narrated by the came, from Elizabeth's point of view (with her voice narrating the movie), in the same way that the novel is (although not a 1st person narrator, all the other elements in the plot are portrayed through Elizabeth's perspective), so what the viewer, as the reader as well, perceives, is the same Elizabeth does. In that sense, the movie also introduces the two opposed characters, Darcy and Wickham, in the same way that Elizabeth perceives them at first. The viewer is led to believe, in the same way that she does, that Darcy is not a nice person, while Wickham is. Her premature judgment is responsible, in part, for her lack of empathy with Darcy, which takes a while to change. Also, she is portrayed, from the very first seconds of the movie, as the movie's protagonist, and we learn in her first lines that she dreams of being a great writer, that she has good intentions and that, consequently, she deserves a good romantic relationship. Thus, when Darcy first appears the way he does, the viewer might picture Darcy as the last man with whom Elizabeth ought to be involved.

First of all, he acts arrogantly with her in the bookstore, complaining to her boss about her behavior towards costumers, behaving not only unpleasantly and embarrassing her, but possibly also causing her to lose her job. Afterwards, in the party scene, his first dialogue with Bingley shows him as an antisocial type, who prefers to hide in the garage, sit on a car and read a book rather than interact with other people, because, according to him, most girls are not worth knowing, due to their lack of psychological and emotional depth. In the following minutes, when he meets Wickham (who is accompanied by Elizabeth), he tells him to leave the premises immediately. Later on, he goes to Elizabeth's work, and asks her out on a date, but does it in a strange manner. Instead of just saying that he would like to have dinner with her, he starts by saying that even if she is not as good as he expected, even if her friends are an embarrassment, he still feels "strangely attracted" to her. No matter how good his intentions were, after an invitation of this nature there could be no other answer than a refusal from Elizabeth. Thus, his actions, which are well intentioned, but poorly executed at first, give both Elizabeth and the public, the feeling that Darcy was nothing but a terrible person, not differently from what happens in the novel.

But, if Darcy has a hard time presenting himself in a proper manner, and if Elizabeth has a hard time in her judgment of people, their struggles are what lead them, in one way or another, to the happy conclusion of their inevitable romance. If Darcy is introduced, at first, as an antisocial type of person, itis because he is displeased with girls like Lydia, who are so desperate to find a male partner, that they become shallow, and not capable of having a strong and lasting relationship. Thus, it is when he meets Elizabeth that he meets a girl who is everything but

shallow. Despite her immaturity in judging people, she has a very good disposition, turning her into a selfless person, something that Darcy realizes at an early stage of the movie. He sees in her a woman of great depth, who is not necessarily opposed to the idea of marriage (while everyone else is only thinking about it, but merely for social convenience), but is not willing to marry just because of impulse or peer pressure. Elizabeth lives according to the moral values of her religion, but she does not do it blindly. She does question and evaluates the practices, specially the one concerning marriage, that are believed in within that social context. It is due to this difference between Darcy and Elizabeth and most of the other characters in the movie, that these two are able to find in each other not only a matching partner, but mainly one of the few people with whom they could learn to grow and truly love.

Conclusion

"Who did not know the whole story before the end of the day?"
(Jane Austen, in *Pride and Prejudice*)

As I conclude my work, I would like to resume a discussion I had proposed in the introduction and first chapter. During the first chapter, especially, I made use of different theories concerning the spectrum of intertextuality. After all, as I had stated in the introduction, my purpose was to work with Jane Austen's 1812 novel *Pride and Prejudice*, and with one of its adapted versions, Andrew Black's 2003 movie *Pride and Prejudice: a latter-day comedy*. My aim was to work mainly with the second work in terms of the intertextual relations it was able to establish with the first work. In other words, referring back to Genette's vocabulary, my aim was to work with the movie, which is a hypertext of the novel, being therefore its hypotext.

During the first chapter, I introduced some theories from different theoreticians on the subject of intertextuality, and my aim in doing so was to, by the end of my work, be able to classify the movie within the definitions provided by the different concepts I have made use of. Among these concepts, I had mentioned Genette's words of hypertext and hypotext, a very clear distinction between the novel and the movie, as well as his theory of movement of proximization, the phenomenon existent in the movie, once it brings the core of its hypotext closer to its audience, whether in temporal, cultural or geographical settings. This is what the movie, doubtlessly, does. It does bring Austen's original story from a rural setting in England during the early 19th century to a 21st century university in the United States.

Other authors I worked with are Linda Hutcheon and Julia Sanders. Hutcheon works more with the concept of adaptation, but Sanders goes a step further and proposes a distinction between *adaptation* and *appropriation*. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons for such a distinction has to do with the fact that a vast majority of people are somewhat confused in the use of terms such as "based upon", "adapted from", and so many other terms, when having contact with a hypertext. According to Sanders, then, the difference between adaptation and appropriation is the following: when a work is an adaptation, the relation between the hypertext and hypotext is very clear. In that sense, no matter what choices have been made during the adaptation process of the hypertext, its hypotext remains the most visible, or at least most visible, element of the adapted work. As for an appropriation, the difference consists in the fact that the hypertext is much more visible than its hypotext. In an appropriation, there might be a use of the hypotext in its entirety, or just a few ideas.

The hypotext is there, but it is not very clear or explicit, or if it is, the hypertext author is the one in charge of leading the hypotext towards any direction he/she wishes.

Thus, considering Sanders' definition, I argue that the movie can be classified as an adaptation and appropriation at the same time. First of all, there is no doubt that, during the entire movie, Jane Austen as an author is present in every scene. The name of the characters, plot similarities, borrowing from the novel's own dialogues, transposition of names of places, and some many other elements, are already enough to justify the references to the hypotext towards the hypertext. And, even for those who might not have read the novel, thus not being able to establish a connection between the novel and the movie, the movie, in every scene, makes use of title cards. These title cards use the novel's own lines in order to introduce the events or characters that will be present in that scene. Below the text, there is indication of the text's source, which always comes with the name of the novel (*Pride and Prejudice*) and the volume and chapter where it was taken from. Therefore, even if we only have the movie, in Black's production, it is clear that what the public is watching is not only his creation, but also his reading of Austen's text, and the public is reminded of that in every scene.

The movie also operates with the process of appropriation. Even if the text we have in the movie has a strong dialogue with Austen's text, Black had to be an author on his own in order to make the movement of proximization work in a convincing manner. As a matter of fact, the movie is clearly an adaptation of Austen's work, but Black had to interfere strongly in the hypotext. Considering that the movie takes place just nearly two centuries later than the novel does, and even more, that it does not take place at any university, but at a religious one, where religious moral values are overly emphasized, certain changes had to take place, so that the hypertext would be suitable and convincing within its new context. The changes that Black makes, such as eliminating some characters, relocating the scenarios and shaping the characters' situation, are an adaptation process. The hypertext is an Austen text, but it can only be conceived, in this new modern setting, if the hypertext is also a text authored by Black, according to its needs. Therefore, it works as both an adaptation and as an appropriation.

Moving ahead, the other author I mentioned was Affonso Romano de Sant'Anna. He quotes other authors, such as Tynianov and Bakhtin, and proposes the following denomination with the intertextuality phenomena: *Parody*, *paraphrase* and *stylization*. He does not make use of the terms hypotext and hypertext, but claims that these three processes work in a relation of deviation between the hypotext and the hypertext. In paraphrase, the process is of a minimal, or even a desirable deviation, in conformity with the hypotext. Stylization is the process of a tolerable

deviation, the remodeling of the hypotext. With this terminology in mind, it is possible to see how the movie works with those processes.

In terms of paraphrase, Sant'Anna claims that such is the process of a desirable or minimal deviation from the hypotext. In that sense, the movie can be perceived as a paraphrase of Austen's work. The simple fact that it is no longer a written text, but a cinematographic one is enough to make it undergo some deviation, even if to a smaller degree. There is a deviation, but it is minimal because it keeps some of the most relevant aspects and elements of Austen's narrative.

And, in terms of stylization, Sant'Anna compares this process to a game where there is a set of rules, but the results are always a surprise, because the players are free to interact as they wish, as long as they do not disrespect the rules. In that manner, the movie can also be seen as a stylization. There are rules that are known to Black and to the movie's audience, and he is able to play the game in his own way with no need to break any rule. He does respect what Austen had originally conceived, but he also brings new elements that give the hypertext, not necessarily a different meaning, but different possibilities on how to explore these already existing meanings.

Thus, considering that there is no room for the definition of parody in Black's production, but that the other two definitions by Sant'Anna, as the definitions by Sanders are suitable for this comparison, I would like to propose a combination of definitions. If a paraphrase is a minimal deviation from the hypotext and adaptation is the supremacy of the hypotext over its hypertext, then why not talk of them in equal terms? On the other hand, if stylization is a tolerable deviation from the hypotext, where, despite the already established rules, each participant is free to interact as he/she wishes and bring surprising results, and if appropriation signals a more distant relation between hypotext and hypertext, then why not work with them in similar terms as well? Even if there is some difference in terms of theory, context or motivation between Sanders and Sant'Anna's concepts, they do present, in one way or another, very similar ideas. And, these four ideas, or better, these two sets of ideas, are both present in the movie.

The movie mingles both the concept of adaptation and paraphrase, as well as the concept of appropriation and stylization (considering them as two sets of ideas, and not as four totally separate ideas), in a suitable manner. This happens both at the levels of structure and meaning of the movie, when in comparison with the novel. In terms of structure[57], the transposition made is not very hard to be verified. The Bennet girls, even if no longer blood relations, are still sharing the same roof, as university roommates. The idea of marriage is appealing to them, and the presence of two new

[57] When discussing the comparison between the structures of both the movie and the novel, it is important to highlight that the language of each work is responsible for the way the structure works. That is an issue that deserves to be studied deeply, but I shall not deal with it in my work.

handsome and rich bachelors within, or around, the campus is an event that really excites them, similar to the Bennet's excitement on the occasion of Bingley's arrival at NetherfieldPark, in the novel. Not only that, but there was a proper management within the transposition process of each character, as well as in the decision to eliminate certain novel characters that would have been either unnecessary or culturally not suitable in the movie's geographical and temporal context, considering that each scenario from the novel was transposed to another scenario in the United States. Also, this is the case in terms of how the main characters are introduced, and how little by little, not only Elizabeth, but also the public, learns about their real nature. This is an important aspect from the novel's structure that has been kept. Otherwise, had Elizabeth and the audience already learned the truth about each character from the beginning, she (and we as well) would not have had an opportunity to learn from her own mistakes. Thus, the movie finds a way to be an adaptation and paraphrase of the novel, because it is essentially Austen's work, and at the same time, to be an appropriation and stylization, because even if the hypotext is much more present than the hypertext, the final work is only possible because Black has decided to reform the original work, through his own reading and interpretation, adding, eliminating and adapting the several hypotextual elements in order to have a coherent hypertext.

In the spectrum of meaning, my purpose in this work was to establish a connection between the movie, the novel and religion. Nevertheless, to approach the subject of religion within Austen's narratives is quite debatable. After all, she does not include any explicit references to faith or religiosity, and the two most religious characters in *Pride and Prejudice*, Mr. Collins and Mary, are portrayed in a ridiculous manner. Yet, besides the similarities between the structures of each work, they also have something in common, in at least one social aspect. In both 19th century HertfordshireCounty, as well as in 21st century BrighamYoungUniversity, religion plays an important role in society. However, the fact is that both in the novel and in the movie, the subject of religion is not approached directly, but finds a harmonious possibility for dialogue due to the moral values Austen wants to defend. As William Deresiewicz points out, behind her apparently simple stories, there are great teachings and moral values that Austen tries to present to her readers, even if in a subtle manner. Thus, the dialogue existing between the two works is not necessarily on religion, but rather on morality. Considering the several changes in western society that have taken place over the last decades in terms of religiosity, it is coherent to state that Austen's works do find in religious communities a welcoming public. So it is that not only the movie I am working with, contextualized within a Christian LDS environment, intends to recreate Austen's themes in religious oriented communities, but other works such as Bollywood production *Bride and Prejudice* and Debra White Smith's novel *First Impressions* do as well. It is due to Austen's lasting values

concerning love, loyalty, friendship and so many other topics, that Black was able to reshape and recreate *Pride and Prejudice* in a very different setting from the original one, with its own culture and own peculiarities. The movie tries to combine these particularities in a way in which they will be suitable for the mainstream public, not restricted to those who belong to the LDS or BYU environment, with its particular culture and values.

In conclusion, I would like to express my appreciation for Jane Austen's work. It did not come at first, because I, just as Elizabeth Bennet, was blind due to my pride and prejudice towards her work. I used to imagine that her novels were restricted to a feminine reading public, interested in reading lame romantic stories that were just as shallow as their readers. And since I had good reading habits from my childhood, I imagined I knew well enough to be able to judge a work, even before reading it. It was not until I was in my early twenty's, that I had my very first contact with Jane Austen, when I had the opportunity of watching the movie I have worked with here. My experience was perhaps not as violent as the one Elizabeth had to face when she reads Darcy's letter, but it was still just as important for me, so that I could realize that maybe I was also prejudicial and proud, which had kept me, for many years, from having contact with an author I ended up learning to admire deeply.

What is more, and that is what I desire to really make understood as I conclude my work, is to show that, just as I realized that Austen could reach me, she can still reach any reading public. Even if I have mentioned a specific religious public (the Latter-Day Saints, specially the Brigham Young University students), throughout my text I have mentioned several other movies, television productions and books, aimed at the most varied publics, originated in the most diverse time and places, as a way to show that Jane Austen does not reach only a few people, but that she can reach anyone who is willing to overcome his/her pride towards any prejudicial statements one may have heard about literature from female writers, and learn that she can be as insightful and as valuable today as she was back in her days.

References

ALLEN, Graham. *Intertextuality*. The New Critic Idiom, New York, New York, 2000;

ANDREW, Dudley. *Concepts in Film Theory*. New York, Oxford University Press, Inc., 1984;

A PADROEIRA [TV Series]. Directed by Walter Avancini. Written by Walcyr Carrasco. With Deborah Secco and Luigi Baricelli. Rede Globo, 2002. 45 minutes (each episode), color;

ARISTOTLE. *Poetics*. Mineola, New York, Dover Publications, Inc., 1997;

AUERBACH, Nina. *Communities of Women: An Idea of Fiction*. Massachusetts and London, , Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1978;

AUSTEN, Jane. *Emma*. New York, Barnes & Noble Classics, 2004;

AUSTEN, Jane. *Northanger Abbey*. New York, Barnes & Noble Classics, 2005;

AUSTEN, Jane. *Persuasion*. New York, Barnes & Noble Classics, 2005;

AUSTEN, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. New York, Barnes & Noble Classics, 2003;

AUSTEN, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. Ware, Hertfordshire, Wordsworth Editions, 1999;

BALLARD, Melvin Russel. *The Importance of a Name*. In: *Ensign*. Salt Lake City, published by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, November, 2011, pp. 79-82;

BARCSAY, Katherine Eva. *Profit and Production: Jane Austen's* Pride and Prejudice *on Film*. 131 pages. Thesis for Master of Arts. Vancouver, University of British Columbia. August 2008;

BECOMING Jane [Movie]. Produced by Graham Broadbent, Robert Bernstein and Douglas Rae. Directed by Julian Jarrold. Written by Kevin Hood and Sarah Williams. With Anne Hathaway and James McAvoy. HanWay Films, 2007. DVD, 112 minutes, color;

BLOCK, Daniel. *Handel's* Messiah*: Biblical and Theological Perspectives*. In: *Didaskalia*. Volume 12, number 2, Spring 2001;

BRAIT, Beth. *A Personagem*. 2ª ed., Série Princípios. São Paulo, Editora Ática, 1985;

BRIDE and Prejudice [Movie]. Produced and directed by Gurinder Chadha. Written by Gurinder Chadha and Paul Mayeda Berges. With Aishwarya Rai Bachchan and Martin Henderson. Pathé Pictures International, 2004. DVD, 111 minutes, color;

BRIDGET Jones's Diary [Movie]. Produced by Tim Bevan, Eric Fellner and Jonathan Cavendish. Directed by Sharon Maguire. Written by Andrew Daviews and Richard Curtis. With Renée Zellweger, Collin Firth and Hugh Grant. Working Title Films, 2001. DVD, 97 minutes, color;

BRONTË, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. New York, Barnes and Noble Classics, 2005;

CARVALHAL, Tania Franco. *Literatura Comparada*. Série Princípios, Editora Ática, 4ª ed., São Paulo, 2006;

CHATMAN, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. New York, Cornell University Press, 1978;

CLUELESS [Movie]. Produced by Scott Rudin and Robert Lawrence, written and directed by Amy Heckerling. With Alicia Silverstone and Paul Rudd. Paramount Pictures, 1995. DVD, 97 minutes, color, Dolby digital sound;

Church History in the Fullness of Times. Student Manual. Salt Lake City, published by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, 2003;

COPELAND & McMASTER, Edward&Juliet [et al]. The *Cambridge Companion to Jane Austen*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997;

DERESIWEWICZ, William. *A Jane Austen Education: How Six Novel Taught me about Love, Friendship and the Things that really Matter*. New York, The Penguin Press, 2011;

DINIZ, Thaís Flores Nogueira. *Literatura e Cinema: Tradução, Hipertextualidade, Reciclagem*. Belo Horinzonte, Faculdade de Letras da UFMG, 2005;

DIREITO & Literatura: Orgulho e Preconceito [TV Show]. With Lênio Luiz Streck (host), Roberta Magalhães Gubert and Sandra Maggio (guests). TVE-RS, 2011. 30 minutes, color;

ELIOT, T. S. Religion *and Literature*. In: Eliot, T. S. *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*. New York, Edited by Frank Kermode. Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1975;

ELIOT, T. S. *Tradition and Individual Talent*. In: *Perspecta*, Vol. 19. (1982), pp. 36-42;

ELWIN, Malcolm. *Lord Byron's Wife*. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963;

EMMA [TV series]. Directed by Jim O'Hanlon, produced by George Ormond, written by Sandy Welch. With Romola Garai and Jonny Lee Miller. BBC, 2009. 230 minutes, color;

FOWLER, Karen Joy. *The Jane Austen Book Club*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 2004;

GARDEER, Jostein. *Sophie's World: A Novel about the History of Philosophy*. Translated by Paulette Miller. New York, Berkley Books, 1994;

GENETTE, Geràrd. *Palimpsests: Literature in second degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1997;

HALES, Brook P. *Statistical Report, 2010*. In: *Ensign*. Salt Lake City, published by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, May, 2011;

HAMLET [Movie]. Directed by Franco Zeffirelli. Written by Christopher De Vore and Franco Zeffirelli. With Mel Gibson, Glenn Close and Helena Bonham Carter. Icon Entertainment International, 1990. DVD, 130 minutes, color;

HERVIEU-LÉGER, Danièle. *O Peregrino e o Convertido: A Religião em Movimento*. Traduzido por João Batista Kreuch. Petrópolis, Editora Vozes, 2008;

HOHLFELDT, Antônio. *Cinema e Literatura: Liberdade Ambígua*. In: AVERBUCH, Lígia (org.). *Literatura em Tempo de Cultura de Massa*. São Paulo, Nobel, 1984, pp. 127-150;

HOWARD, Carol. In: AUSTEN, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. New York, Barnes & Noble Classics, 2003;

HUTCHEON, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York, Routledge, 2006;

JOYCE, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Dubliners*. New York, Barnes and Noble Classics, 2004;

KELLI, Gary. *Religion and Politics*. In: *The Cambridge Companion to Jane Austen*. Edited by Edward Copeland and Juliet McMaster. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998;

LEMOS, José Augusto. *Deus Existe?* In: *Super Interessante*. São Paulo, Editora Abril, ano 15, 1º de Janeiro de 2001, pp. 60-65;

LITTLEWOOD, Ian. Introduction to *Pride and Prejudice* In: AUSTEN, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. Ware, Hertfordshire Wordsworth Editions, 1999, Introduction, p. v-xv;

LISPECTOR, Clarice. *A Hora da Estrela*. Rio de Janeiro, Rocco, 1998;

LISPECTOR, Clarice. *Um Sopro de Vida (Pulsações)*. Rio de Janeiro, Rocco, 1999;

LOST in Austen [TV Series]. Produced by Kate McKerrell. Directed by Dan Zeff. Written by Guy Andrews. With Jemima Rooper and Elliot Cowan. ITV, 2008. 184 minutes, color;

LOTHE, Jakob. *Narrative in Fiction and Film: An Introduction*. New York, Oxford University Press, 2004;

MARCUS, Steven. In: AUSTEN, Jane. *Emma*. , New York, Barnes & Noble Classics, 2004;

MAST, Gerald. *Literature and Film*. In: BARRICELLI & GIBALDI, Jean-Pierre & Joseph. *Interrelations of Literature*. New York, The Modern Language Association of America, 1982;

McEWAN, Ian. *Atonement*. London, Vintage Books, 2007;

METZ, Christian. *Linguagem e Cinema.* Trad. Marilda Pereira. São Paulo, Editora Perspectiva, 1971;

NEWTON, Judith Lowder. *Women, Power & Subversion: Social Strategies in British Fiction, 1778-1860*. New York, Methuen, Inc., 1985;

PAECH, Joachim. *A Institucionalização e a Literarização do Filme*. Translated by Lara F. Kengeriski and Michael Korfmann. In: *Revista Contigentia*, vol. 5, n. 1. Porto Alegre, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, maio 2010, pp. 99-114;

POPULAR [TV Series]. Episode *Fall on Your Knees* (episode 10, season 1). Directed by Elodie Keene. Written by Ryan Murphy. With Leslie Bibb and Carly Pope. Touchstone Pictures, 1999. 43 minutes, color;

PORTO dos Milagres [TV Series]. Directed by Roberto Naar and Marcos Paulo. Written by Aguinaldo Silva and Ricardo Linhares. With Antônio Fagundes and Cássia Kiss. Rede Globo, 2001. 60 minutes (each episode), color;

PRIDE and Prejudice: A Latter-Day Comedy [Movie]. Directed by Andrew Black. Written by Anne Black, Jason Faller and Katherine Swigert. With Kam Heskin and Orlando Seale. Excel Entertainment Group, 2003. DVD, 104 minutes, color;

PRIDE and Prejudice [Movie]. Produced by Hunt Strumberg. Directed by Robert Z. Leonard. Written by Aldous Huxley and Jane Murfin. With Greer Garson and Laurence Olivier. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, 1940. 118 minutes, black and white;

PRIDE and Prejudice [Movie]. Produced by Tim Bevan, Eric Fellner and Paul Webster. Directed by Joe Wright. Written by Deborah Moggach. With Keira Knightley and Matthew MacFadyen. Working Title Productions, 2005. DVD, 127 minutes, color, Dolby digital sound;

PRIDE and Prejudice [TV series]. Directed by Simon Langton. Written by Andrew Davies. With Jennifer Ehle and Colin Firth. BBC, 1995. 320 minutes, color;

RILEY, Gilbert. *Jane Austen and the moralists*. In: *Critical Essays on Jane Austen*. Edited by B. C. Southam. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968;

SANDAGE, Allan. *A Scientist Reflects on Religious Belief*. In: *Truth Journal: An International, Inter-Disciplinary Journal of Christian Thought*. Leadership University, vol. 1, 1985;

SANDERS, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation.* The New Critic Idiom. New York, Routledge, 2006;

SANT'ANNA, Affonso Romano de. *Paródia, Paráfrase & Cia.* 7ª edição. Série Princípios. São Paulo, Editora Ática, 2004;

SCHOLES, Robert. [et al]. *Elements of Literature: Essay, Fiction, Poetry, Drama, Film*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1991;

SHERMER, Michael. *Sacred Salubriousness*. In: *Scientific American.* New York, vol. 305, number 6, December 2011;

SMITH, Debra White. *First Impressions*. Eugene, Harvest House Publishers, 2004;

SMITH, Joseph. *Doctrine and Covenants*. Salt Lake City, published by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1981;

SMITH, Joseph. *The Wentworth Letter*. In: *Teachings of Presidents of the Church*. Salt Lake City, published by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2007, pp. 435-447;

SNOW, Eliza R. *In Our Lovely Deseret*. In: *Hymns*. Salt Lake City, published by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985, hymn number 307;

The American Heritage Dictionary. Fourth Edition. New York, Bentham Dell, 2007;

The Holy Bible. King James Version. Salt Lake City, published by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1979;

THE PASSION of Christ [Movie]. Produced and directed by Mel Gibson. Written by Benedict Fitzgerald and Mel Gibson. With Jim Caviezel and Monica Bellucci. Icon Productions (USA), 2004. DVD, 127 minutes, color, Dolby digital sound;

TITANIC [Movie]. Produced, written and directed by James Cameron. With Leonardo DiCaprio and Kate Winslet. Twentieth Century Fox Film, 1997. DVD, 194 minutes, color, Dolby digital sound;

TWAIN, Mark. *The Wit and Wisdom of Mark Twain: A Book of Quotations*. Mineola, New York, Dover Publications, Inc., 1990;

TYNIANOV, Iuri. *Da Evolução Literária*. In: EIKHEMBAUM [et al]. *Teoria da Literatura: Formalistas Russos*.Porto Alegre, Editora Globo, 1971;

U. S. Religious Landscape Survey – Religious Affiliations: Diverse and Dynamics. Washington D. C., published by The Pew Forum of Religion and Public Life, 2008;

WELLER, Shane. In: SHAKESPEARE, William. *Four Great Tragedies: Hamlet, Macbeth, Othelo & Romeo and Juliet*. Mineola, New York, Dover Publications, Inc., 2005;

Note on the appendixes

The first appendix consists of an interview I was able to have with Andrew Black via e-mail on April, 2012. Since the interview took place when most of my work was concluded, I have not changed any part of my work due to the influence of Black's answers.

The second appendix is a chart with the quotes from the novel *Pride and Prejudice* exhibited in the movie in order to introduce a scene, establishing explicit connections between Black's movie and Austen's novel.

Appendix 1

INTERVIEW WITH ANDREW BLACK, DIRECTOR OF *PRIDE AND PREJUDICE: A LATTER-DAY COMEDY*

DUDLEI: First of all, why Jane Austen, and why *Pride and Prejudice*?

ANDREW: After the modest success of Halestorm's "The Singles Ward" in 2002, myself and the producers felt that raising financing for a low-budget LDS film was viable. Unlike the Halestorm productions, we wanted to make something that was aimed primarily at a younger female audience and something that was very "LDS-lite", that is something for which ignorance of LDS culture would not be a barrier for non-LDS audiences but still would have resonance for LDS viewers. Adapting an existing popular story seemed the best path as a novel like "Pride and Prejudice" has built-in worldwide appeal. We entertained a number of possible adaptations but Austen's comedy of manners seemed to be the perfect fit and seemed like the right choice as soon as we thought of it.

DUDLEI: Do you believe another novel by Austen could have been equally adapted within the BYU setting?

ANDREW: I think Sense and Sensibility could definitely work. I remember we discussed the novel but P&P seemed like a better fit, in terms of story and international appeal.

DUDLEI: Many novel characters no longer exist in the movie. Some of them, such as the Gardiner's, are not really necessary for the movie development. But others, such as Mr. and Mrs. Bennet, or Lady Catherine de Bourgh, are important characters in the novel. Why have they disappeared? Was it motivated by financial or technical reasons (such as movie length), or more cultural reasons?

ANDREW: A mixture. In the LDS version, Collins refers to President de Bourgh but I never seriously considered featuring the character more than that. The Bennets were always intended to be featured but financial considerations (script length and locations) saw their scenes removed from the script very at the last minute, something I've always regretted. Originally Elizabeth joined her parents for a vacation on Lake Powell (S Utah resort) where she unexpectedly encounters Darcy, Bingley and Caroline. When her jetski breaks down on the lake, Elizabeth swims to a houseboat for help only to come upon Darcy and Caroline (this action was transferred to the cabin). I loved the idea of a slightly "redneck" version of Elizabeth's parents (who are undoubtedly some of the best characters in Austen's novel) and they were probably my favourite part of the script. I mourn their loss! We used to, half-jokingly, discuss the idea of a "Meet the Parents"-style sequel which would centre on Darcy meeting Elizabeth's family.

DUDLEI: Talking about characters again, why the choice of marrying Collins with Mary?

ANDREW: It just seemed to make sense. We didn't have "room" for Charlotte Lucas as a heavily developed character and so Mary and Collins seemed like an obvious, and audience-pleasing, pairing.

DUDLEI: Reading and hearing different people's opinions on the movie, there does not seem to be unanimity on the relation between the movie and religion. Many mention the movie as a "Mormon movie", where religion plays an essential role. Others, and many of them who are not LDS, say that they have not identified the Mormon culture within the movie at all. When writing the movie, what was your aim? To discuss religion or to just create a romantic comedy? From your perspective as the movie director, how important is the religious aspect in the movie?

ANDREW: I always wanted to make the film "LDS-lite". I knew that something that was too dependent on an insider knowledge of LDS/Utah culture might have limited/local success but would not translate to wider audiences. I also think that significant portions of the LDS audience enjoyed seeing a film which featured LDS characters who seemed "mainstream". My focus was more to make a romantic comedy than discuss religion. In all honesty, the religious aspect was not that important but I never consciously shied away from it either.

DUDLEI: While researching about the movie, I learned that there are two movie versions, the theatrical and the DVD version. Since I have only had the opportunity of watching the DVD version, I would like to know what are some of the main differences between them? What was the motivation behind this choice?

ANDREW: If you have the US DVD you can access the LDS version as an Easter Egg - Go to the Second Page of the Scene Selections and then, from the words "Main Menu," hit down three times. This will highlight Lydia's CTR ring. Hit enter and it will play the uncut theatrical version of the film. I'm not sure about international editions of the DVD. To answer your questions, we basically removed a few more overt LDS references (Mission Presidents, Bishops, etc). I'm sorry to say I can't remember them all but they necessitated a few minor picture edits and a small amount of dialogue replacement. Overall, I'd say that the changes were very small. The motivation was commercial. We, and the distributor, felt that the film would be more successful if it was as accessible as possible and didn't feel overly parochial.

DUDLEI: I know that you have studied at BYU. In the movie, characters are varied in terms of personality, moral behavior and religious commitment, even if they are supposed to have share similar values. According to your experience, would you say that such a difference exists among BYU students, whether they are LDS or not? Or was it your intention to create different characters in order to recreate Austen's original novel?

ANDREW: Both your hypotheses are correct! In my experience, BYU students run the gamut of morality and religious commitment (though there are certainly more Collins' than Jacks!). The most important concern was replicating the personalities of the novel's characters and the BYU setting didn't create a barrier for this.

DUDLEI: In your experience as a BYU student, originally from Scotland, how was your adaptation process at BYU? Would you say that it is easy, because even if it is a very conservative and religious institution, it is not that different from any other university? Or would you say that it does have its own culture, and that an outsiders really needs to learn the difference and to adjust to it?

ANDREW: I found it very hard, to be honest, despite the fact that the Theatre and Film Department is probably the most un-conservative, relatively speaking, in the university. It definitely has its own culture and though it can be quite welcoming at the same time "outsiders" such as myself need to work to adjust to it. I'm not even sure that I ever successfully did that.

DUDLEI: In the past decade, there seems to be growth in the LDS film industry, or in "Mollywood". Do you believe this industry has a promising future, not only among the LDS public, but also with the mainstream public?

ANDREW: It definitely has a future. I think that in general the more successful films will tend to be the ones which look beyond exclusively LDS stories. P&P was one of the few "Mollywood" films which gave a good return to the investors – Saints and Soldiers was another – both aimed for markets in addition to Utah and LDS audiences. I believe exclusively and heavily LDS films could still be successful but they won't be the norm.

DUDLEI: To conclude, I would like to know if you have future plans for other movies. You have already adapted *Pride and Prejudice*. Would you consider adapting another literary classic? Which one? Would you do it within a LDS context again?

ANDREW: I don't think I'd adapt within an LDS context again, though I'd never say never! I have lots of future plans and there are many novels I would love to adapt - most of these tend to be Scottish! Scotland has a tremendous body of literature which has never been adapted for tv or film and tends to be little known outside of Scotland. Neil Gunn's "Young Art and Old Hector and Nancy Brysson Morrison's "The Gowk Storm" are particular passions of mine. The latter is probably closest to "Pride and Prejudice" as, although darker in tone, it concerns three sisters confined within a patriarchal and prejudiced society. I've also written a contemporary adaptation of John Webster's "The Duchess of Malfi" – again, it couldn't be further from my P&P film in tone, but does feature a strong female protagonist so maybe there's a connection.

Appendix 2

QUOTES FROM THE NOVEL *PRIDE AND PREJUDICE* PRESENT IN THE MOVIE

Quotes from *Pride and Prejudice* in the movie	**Localization in the book**	**Related movie scene**
"Lydia and Kitty were ignorant, idle, and vain."	Vol. II Ch. XIV	Lydia tells her roommates about Bingley and Darcy while "studying" from The Pink Bible.
"Charles Bingley, a single man of great fortune. What a fine thing for our girls."	Vol. I Ch. I	Elizabeth and the other girls go to Bingley's mansion where a party is taking place
"Mary worked hard for knowledge and accomplishments, and was always impatient for display."	Vol. I Ch. VI	During Bingley's party, music is interrupted due to Lydia's electricity interruption. Mary, after reading in an old magazine that women should not hide their talents, starts to sing aloud in front of all the guests at the party, embarrassing herself and her roommates.
"How ashamed I should be of not being married before three and twenty."	Vol. II Ch. XVI	Collins proposes to Elizabeth and is rejected by her.
"Those who do not complain are never pitied."	Vol. I Ch. XX	Elizabeth tells her boss that she does date, but all the wrong guys. Darcy goes to her work and asks her out, and is rejected.
"The dullest topic might be rendered interesting by the skill of the speaker."	Vol. I Ch. XVI	During a church meeting, Collins tells the entire congregation about Elizabeth's rejection, saying that if a woman rejects a respectful single man (which he believes to be), it probably means that she is not a very honorable woman.
"A fortnight later…"	Vol. II Ch. XIX	Jane receives and e-mail from Bingley, saying that he breaking up with her because was going on an expedition.
"Angry people are not always wise."	Vol. III Ch. III	At a dinner in Rosings Restaurant with Darcy, Elizabeth believes he is persecuting her and her friends, talks to him angrily and leaves the restaurant abruptly.
"One morning, about a week	Vol. III Ch. XIV	After receiving Darcy's e-mail, explaining all

after…"		the misunderstandings between him and Elizabeth, she and Jane feel strongly depressed.
"Health, good humour, and cheerfulness began to re-appear."	Vol. II Ch. XIX	Lydia, in her bossy but helpful manner, helps Elizabeth and Jane to overcome depression. Mary goes on a date with Collins. Elizabeth is told by her professor that she is eligible for a Literature course in London.
"What are men to rocks and mountains?"	Vol. II Ch. IV	Jane and Bingley reunite. Elizabeth is writing in the woods and gets lost. While looking for help, she accidently ends in Darcy's cabin, where she starts to have feelings for him.
"Nest to being married, a girl likes to be crossed in love a little now and then."	Vol. II Ch. I	Kitty tells Elizabeth and Jane that Wickham and Lydia have eloped to Las Vegas.
"Happiness in marriage is entirely a matter of chance."	Vol. I Ch. VI	Darcy impedes the marriage between Lydia and Wickham to take place. Lydia learns the true story about Wickham, who is arrested.
"Who did not know the whole story before the end of the day?"	Vol. III Ch. V	The movie reaches its happy ending.

Note on the annexes

I have made use of seven texts in the annexes section, with the expectation of better clarifying and exemplifying some aspects of my work.

The first two texts are official publications from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Considering that the name “mormon” is often misunderstood and misused by a large part of the population, including the media, I found it pertinent to include two official texts that better explain the real believes and practices of the church portrayed in the movie I work with.

Annexes 3 and 4 were published on newspapers, and give some insight on the LDS film industry, also referred to as Mollywood.

Annexes 5 and 6 are messages delivered on the radio and television program *Music and the Spoken Word*. It is show that has been on radio since 1929, where The Mormon Tabernacle Choir, the LDS official choir, sings religious, classical and popular music, and the host always delivers a message. Both messages pay homage to Jane Austen. The footnotes on annex 6 were published in the original texts.

The final annex contains excerpts from *The Pink Bible*, the fictitious self-help book that Lydia reads in the movie.

Annex 1

THE IMPORTANCE OF A NAME

By M. Russel Ballard

General Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

October 2011

Since last April's general conference, my mind has repeatedly focused on the subject of the importance of a name. In these past few months, several great-grandchildren have come into our family. Although they seem to come faster than I can keep up with, each child is a welcome addition to our family. Each has received a special name chosen by his or her parents, a name to be known by throughout his or her lifetime, distinguishing him or her from anyone else. This is true in every family, and it is also true among the religions of the world.

The Lord Jesus Christ knew how important it was to clearly name His Church in these latter days. In the 115th section of the Doctrine and Covenants, He Himself named the Church: "For thus shall my church be called in the last days, even The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (verse 4).

And King Benjamin taught his people in Book of Mormon times:

"I would that ye should take upon you the name of Christ, all you that have entered into the covenant with God that ye should be obedient unto the end of your lives. …

"And I would that ye should remember also, that this is the name that I said I should give unto you that never should be blotted out, except it be through transgression; therefore, take heed that ye do not transgress, that the name be not blotted out of your hearts" (Mosiah 5:8, 11).

We take the name of Christ upon us in the waters of baptism. We renew the effect of that baptism each week as we partake of the sacrament, signifying our willingness to take His name upon us and promising always to remember Him (see D&C 20:77, 79).

Do we realize how blessed we are to take upon us the name of God's Beloved and Only Begotten Son? Do we understand how significant that is? The Savior's name is the only name under heaven by which man can be saved (see 2 Nephi 31:21).

As you will remember, President Boyd K. Packer discussed the importance of the name of the Church in last April's general conference. He explained that "obedient to revelation, we call ourselves The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints rather than the Mormon Church" ("Guided by the Holy Spirit," *Liahona* and *Ensign,* May 2011, 30).

Because the full name of the Church is so important, I echo the revelations from the scriptures, the First Presidency's instructions in letters of 1982 and 2001, and the words of other Apostles who

have encouraged the members of the Church to uphold and teach the world that the Church is known by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is the name by which the Lord will call us at the last day. It is the name by which His Church will be distinguished from all others.

I have thought a lot about why the Savior gave the nine-word name to His restored Church. It may seem long, but if we think of it as a descriptive overview of what the Church is, it suddenly becomes wonderfully brief, candid, and straightforward. How could any description be more direct and clear and yet expressed in such few words?

Every word is clarifying and indispensable. The word *The* indicates the unique position of the restored Church among the religions of the world.

The words *Church of Jesus Christ* declare that it is His Church. In the Book of Mormon, Jesus taught: "And how be it my church save it be called in my name? For if a church be called in Moses' name then it be Moses' church; or if it be called in the name of a man [like Mormon] then it be the church of a man; but if it be called in my name then it is my church, if it so be that they are built upon my gospel" (3 Nephi 27:8).

Of Latter-day explains that it is the same Church as the Church that Jesus Christ established during His mortal ministry but restored in these latter days. We know there was a falling away, or an apostasy, necessitating the Restoration of His true and complete Church in our time.

Saints means that its members follow Him and strive to do His will, keep His commandments, and prepare once again to live with Him and our Heavenly Father in the future. *Saint* simply refers to those who seek to make their lives holy by covenanting to follow Christ.

The name the Savior has given to His Church tells us exactly who we are and what we believe. We believe that Jesus Christ is the Savior and the Redeemer of the world. He atoned for all who would repent of their sins, and He broke the bands of death and provided the resurrection from the dead. We follow Jesus Christ. And as King Benjamin said to his people, so I reaffirm to all of us today: "Ye should remember to retain [His] name written always in your hearts" (Mosiah 5:12).

We are asked to stand as a witness of Him "at all times and in all things, and in all places" (Mosiah 18:9). This means that we must be willing to let others know whom we follow and to whose Church we belong: the Church of Jesus Christ. We certainly want to do this in the spirit of love and testimony. We want to follow the Savior by simply and clearly, yet humbly, declaring that we are members of His Church. We follow Him by being Latter-day Saints—latter-day disciples.

People and organizations are often given nicknames by others. A nickname may be a shortened form of a name, or it may be derived from an event or some physical or other characteristic. While nicknames do not have the same status or significance as actual names, they can be properly used.

The Lord's Church in both ancient and modern times has had nicknames. The Saints in New Testament times were called *Christians* because they professed a belief in Jesus Christ. That name, first

used derogatorily by their detractors, is now a name of distinction; and we are honored to be called a Christian church.

Our members have been called *Mormons* because we believe in the Book of Mormon: Another Testament of Jesus Christ. Others may try to use the word *Mormon* more broadly to include and refer to those who have left the Church and formed various splinter groups. Such use only leads to confusion. We are grateful for the efforts of the media to refrain from using the word *Mormon* in a way that may cause the public to confuse the Church with polygamists or other fundamentalist groups. Let me state clearly that no polygamist group, including those calling themselves fundamentalist Mormons or other derivatives of our name, has any affiliation whatsoever with The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

While *Mormon* is not the full and correct name of the Church, and even though it was originally given by our detractors during our early years of persecution, it has become an acceptable nickname when applied to members rather than the institution. We do not need to stop using the name *Mormon* when appropriate, but we should continue to give emphasis to the full and correct name of the Church itself. In other words, we should avoid and discourage the term "Mormon Church."

Through the years as I have filled assignments around the world, I have been asked many times if I belong to the Mormon Church. My response has been, "I am a member of the Church of Jesus Christ. Because we believe in the Book of Mormon, which is named after an ancient American prophet-leader and is another testament of Jesus Christ, we are sometimes called Mormons." In every instance this response has been well received and in fact has opened up opportunities for me to explain the Restoration of the fulness of the gospel in these latter days.

Brothers and sisters, just think of what an impact we can have by simply responding by using the full name of the Church as the Lord has declared we should do. And if you cannot immediately use the full name, at least say, "I belong to the Church of Jesus Christ" and later explain "of Latter-day Saints."

Some may ask, what about the Internet sites such as Mormon.org as well as various Church-initiated media campaigns? As I said, referring collectively to members as *Mormons* is sometimes appropriate. As a practical matter, those outside of our faith come looking for us searching for that term. But once you open up Mormon.org, the proper name of the Church is explained on the home page, and it appears on each additional page on the site. It is impractical to expect people to type the full name of the Church when seeking to find us or when logging on to our website.

While these practicalities may continue, they should not keep members from using the full name of the Church whenever possible. Let us develop the habit within our families and our Church activities and our daily interactions of making it clear that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is the name by which the Lord Himself has directed that we be known.

A recent opinion poll indicated that far too many people still do not understand correctly that *Mormon* refers to members of our Church. And a majority of people are still not sure that Mormons are Christian. Even when they read of our Helping Hands work throughout the world in response to hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, and famines, they do not associate our humanitarian efforts with us as a Christian organization. Surely it would be easier for them to understand that we believe in and follow the Savior if we referred to ourselves as members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In this way those who hear the name *Mormon* will come to associate that word with our revealed name and with people who follow Jesus Christ.

As the First Presidency asked in their letter of February 23, 2001: “The use of the revealed name, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints … , is increasingly important in our responsibility to proclaim the name of the Savior throughout all the world. Accordingly, we ask that when we refer to the Church we use its full name wherever possible.”

Back in 1948 at the October general conference, President George Albert Smith said, “Brethren and sisters, when you go away from here, you may be associating with various denominations of the world, but remember that there is only one Church in all the world that by divine command bears the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord” (in Conference Report, Oct. 1948, 167).

Brothers and sisters, may we also remember this as we leave conference today. Let our testimonies of Him be heard and our love for Him always be in our hearts, I humbly pray in His name, the Lord Jesus Christ, amen.

Annex 2

THE WENTWORTH LETTER

By Joseph Smith

Published in the newspaper *Times and Seasons*, in May, 1842

"I was born in the town of Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, on the 23rd of December, A.D. 1805. When [I was] ten years old, my parents removed to Palmyra, New York, where we resided about four years, and from thence we removed to the town of Manchester. My father was a farmer and taught me the art of husbandry. When about fourteen years of age, I began to reflect upon the importance of being prepared for a future state, and upon inquiring [about] the plan of salvation, I found that there was a great clash in religious sentiment; if I went to one society they referred me to one plan, and another to another; each one pointing to his own particular creed as the *summumbonum* of perfection. Considering that all could not be right, and that God could not be the author of so much confusion, I determined to investigate the subject more fully, believing that if God had a Church it would not be split up into factions, and that if He taught one society to worship one way, and administer in one set of ordinances, He would not teach another, principles which were diametrically opposed.

"Believing the word of God, I had confidence in the declaration of James—'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.' [James 1:5.] I retired to a secret place in a grove, and began to call upon the Lord; while fervently engaged in supplication, my mind was taken away from the objects with which I was surrounded, and I was enwrapped in a heavenly vision, and saw two glorious personages, who exactly resembled each other in features and likeness, surrounded with a brilliant light which eclipsed the sun at noon day. They told me that all religious denominations were believing in incorrect doctrines, and that none of them was acknowledged of God as His Church and kingdom: and I was expressly commanded 'to go not after them,' at the same time receiving a promise that the fullness of the Gospel should at some future time be made known unto me.

"On the evening of the 21st of September, A.D. 1823, while I was praying unto God, and endeavoring to exercise faith in the precious promises of Scripture, on a sudden a light like that of day, only of a far purer and more glorious appearance and brightness, burst into the room; indeed the first sight was as though the house was filled with consuming fire; the appearance produced a

shock that affected the whole body; in a moment a personage stood before me surrounded with a glory yet greater than that with which I was already surrounded. This messenger proclaimed himself to be an angel of God, sent to bring the joyful tidings that the covenant which God made with ancient Israel was at hand to be fulfilled, that the preparatory work for the second coming of the Messiah was speedily to commence, that the time was at hand for the Gospel in all its fullness to be preached in power, unto all nations that a people might be prepared for the Millennial reign. I was informed that I was chosen to be an instrument in the hands of God to bring about some of His purposes in this glorious dispensation.

"I was also informed concerning the aboriginal inhabitants of this country and shown who they were, and from whence they came; a brief sketch of their origin, progress, civilization, laws, governments, of their righteousness and iniquity, and the blessings of God being finally withdrawn from them as a people, was made known unto me; I was also told where were deposited some plates on which were engraven an abridgment of the records of the ancient Prophets that had existed on this continent. The angel appeared to me three times the same night and unfolded the same things. After having received many visits from the angels of God unfolding the majesty and glory of the events that should transpire in the last days, on the morning of the 22nd of September, A.D.1827, the angel of the Lord delivered the records into my hands.

"These records were engraven on plates which had the appearance of gold; each plate was six inches wide and eight inches long, and not quite so thick as common tin. They were filled with engravings, in Egyptian characters, and bound together in a volume as the leaves of a book, with three rings running through the whole. The volume was something near six inches in thickness, a part of which was sealed. The characters on the unsealed part were small, and beautifully engraved. The whole book exhibited many marks of antiquity in its construction, and much skill in the art of engraving. With the records was found a curious instrument, which the ancients called 'Urim and Thummim,' which consisted of two transparent stones set in the rim of a bow fastened to a breast plate. Through the medium of the Urim and Thummim I translated the record by the gift and power of God.

"… This book … tells us that our Savior made His appearance upon this continent after His resurrection; that He planted the Gospel here in all its fulness, and richness, and power, and blessing; that they had Apostles, Prophets, Pastors, Teachers, and Evangelists, the same order, the same priesthood, the same ordinances, gifts, powers, and blessings, as were enjoyed on the eastern continent; that the people were cut off in consequence of their transgressions; that the last of their prophets who existed among them was commanded to write an abridgment of their prophecies, history, etc., and to hide it up in the earth, and that it should come forth and be united with

the Bible for the accomplishment of the purposes of God in the last days. For a more particular account I would refer to the Book of Mormon, which can be purchased at Nauvoo, or from any of our Traveling Elders.

"As soon as the news of this discovery was made known, false reports, misrepresentation and slander flew, as on the wings of the wind, in every direction; the house was frequently beset by mobs and evil designing persons. Several times I was shot at, and very narrowly escaped, and every device was made use of to get the plates away from me; but the power and blessing of God attended me, and several began to believe my testimony.

"On the 6th of April, 1830, the 'Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' was first organized in the town of Fayette, Seneca county, state of New York. Some few were called and ordained by the Spirit of revelation and prophecy, and began to preach as the Spirit gave them utterance, and though weak, yet were they strengthened by the power of God, and many were brought to repentance, were immersed in the water, and were filled with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. They saw visions and prophesied, devils were cast out, and the sick healed by the laying on of hands. From that time the work rolled forth with astonishing rapidity, and churches were soon formed in the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri; in the last named state a considerable settlement was formed in Jackson county: numbers joined the Church and we were increasing rapidly; we made large purchases of land, our farms teemed with plenty, and peace and happiness were enjoyed in our domestic circle, and throughout our neighborhood; but as we could not associate with our neighbors (who were, many of them, of the basest of men, and had fled from the face of civilized society, to the frontier country to escape the hand of justice,) in their midnight revels, their Sabbath breaking, horse racing and gambling; they commenced at first to ridicule, then to persecute, and finally an organized mob assembled and burned our houses, tarred and feathered and whipped many of our brethren, and finally, contrary to law, justice and humanity, drove them from their habitations; who, houseless and homeless, had to wander on the bleak prairies till the children left the tracks of their blood on the prairie. This took place in the month of November, and they had no other covering but the canopy of heaven, in this inclement season of the year; this proceeding was winked at by the government, and although we had warranty deeds for our land, and had violated no law, we could obtain no redress.

"There were many sick, who were thus inhumanly driven from their houses, and had to endure all this abuse and to seek homes where they could be found. The result was, that a great many of them being deprived of the comforts of life, and the necessary attendances, died; many children were left orphans, wives [were left] widows, and husbands, widowers; our farms were taken possession of by the mob, many thousands of cattle, sheep, horses and hogs were taken, and

our household goods, store goods, and printing press and type were broken, taken, or otherwise destroyed.

"Many of our brethren removed to Clay county, where they continued until 1836, three years; there was no violence offered, but there were threatenings of violence. But in the summer of 1836 these threatenings began to assume a more serious form, from threats, public meetings were called, resolutions were passed, vengeance and destruction were threatened, and affairs again assumed a fearful attitude; Jackson county was a sufficient precedent, and as the authorities in that county did not interfere, they [the Clay county authorities] boasted that they would not in this; which on application to the authorities we found to be too true, and after much privation and loss of property, we were again driven from our homes.

"We next settled in Caldwell and Daviess counties, where we made large and extensive settlements, thinking to free ourselves from the power of oppression, by settling in new counties, with very few inhabitants in them; but here we were not allowed to live in peace, but in 1838 we were again attacked by mobs, an exterminating order was issued by Governor Boggs, and under the sanction of law, an organized banditti ranged through the country, robbed us of our cattle, sheep, hogs, etc., many of our people were murdered in cold blood, the chastity of our women was violated, and we were forced to sign away our property at the point of the sword; and after enduring every indignity that could be heaped upon us by an inhuman, ungodly band of marauders, from twelve to fifteen thousand souls, men, women, and children, were driven from their own firesides, and from lands to which they had warranty deeds, houseless, friendless, and homeless (in the depths of winter) to wander as exiles on the earth, or to seek an asylum in a more genial clime, and among a less barbarous people. Many sickened and died in consequence of the cold and hardships they had to endure; many wives were left widows, and children [were left] orphans, and destitute. It would take more time than is allotted me here to describe the injustice, the wrongs, the murders, the bloodshed, the theft, misery and woe that have been caused by the barbarous, inhuman, and lawless proceedings of the state of Missouri.

"In the situation before alluded to, we arrived in the state of Illinois in 1839, where we found a hospitable people and a friendly home: a people who were willing to be governed by the principles of law and humanity. We have commenced to build a city called 'Nauvoo,' in Hancock county. We number from six to eight thousand here, besides vast numbers in the county around, and in almost every county of the state. We have a city charter granted us, and charter for a Legion, the troops of which now number 1,500. We have also a charter for a University, for an Agricultural and Manufacturing Society, have our own laws and administrators, and possess all the privileges that other free and enlightened citizens enjoy.

“Persecution has not stopped the progress of truth, but has only added fuel to the flame, it has spread with increasing rapidity. Proud of the cause which they have espoused, and conscious of our innocence, and of the truth of their system, amidst calumny and reproach, have the Elders of this Church gone forth, and planted the Gospel in almost every state in the Union; it has penetrated our cities, it has spread over our villages, and has caused thousands of our intelligent, noble, and patriotic citizens to obey its divine mandates, and be governed by its sacred truths. It has also spread into England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, where, in the year 1840, a few of our missionaries were sent, and over five thousand joined the Standard of Truth; there are numbers now joining in every land.

“Our missionaries are going forth to different nations, and in Germany, Palestine, New Holland [Australia], the East Indies, and other places, the Standard of Truth has been erected; no unhallowed hand can stop the work from progressing; persecutions may rage, mobs may combine, armies may assemble, calumny may defame, but the truth of God will go forth boldly, nobly, and independent, till it has penetrated every continent, visited every clime, swept every country, and sounded in every ear, till the purposes of God shall be accomplished, and the Great Jehovah shall say the work is done.

“We believe in God the eternal Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.

“We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam’s transgression.

“We believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.

“We believe that the first principle and ordinances of the Gospel are: (1) Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; (2) Repentance; (3) Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; (4) Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.

“We believe that a man must be called of God by prophecy and by the laying on of hands, by those who are in authority, to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof.

“We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive Church, viz.: apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc.

“We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.

“We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God.

“We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

"We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion will be built upon this [the American] continent; that Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory.

"We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may.

"We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law.

"We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to *all men;* indeed we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul, We believe all things, we hope all things, we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report, or praiseworthy, we seek after these things.

"Respectfully, etc.,

"JOSEPH SMITH."

Annex 3

MORMON FILMMAKERS HOPING UTAH CAN BE A WHOLESOME HOLLYWOOD

By Debbie Hummel

The Seattle Times, November 6, 2005

OREM, Utah — After almost five years of making movies for Mormons, the group of filmmakers who were part of the genre's most prolific production studio are branching out with projects that leave the church jokes behind with the hopes of engaging a broader audience.

And they want to do it in their own backyard. Could Utah become a "Mollywood" of sorts — a family focused, film-making Mecca that still caters to Molly Mormons, the nickname given to those who embrace the faith's clean-cut morality?

If filmmaker Richard Dutcher started it all with "God's Army," his 2000 film about missionaries for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Los Angeles, Dave Hunter and Kurt Hale perfected it. The two formed Halestorm Entertainment in 2001 and went on to release a string of movies over the last four years, mostly comedies, aimed exclusively at a Mormon audience.

Members of the LDS church are discouraged from watching R-rated films.

Halestorm's films are made with small budgets that are easily reclaimed by screening in states such as Utah, Arizona and Idaho, where a significant number of the population belongs to the Mormon church. DVD sales of the movies are where they make their money, they said.

While Hale says the niche possibilities are endless — "there are three or four great stories on my desk right now ... a Mormon horror comedy, a Mormon musical" — Hunter and Hale are ready to develop a broader, commercial base and maybe turn Utah into a wholesome Hollywood along the way.

Their company has captured the attention of motion-picture industry insiders by shooting films for $400,000 to $500,000 and making double or triple that back. But that seems to be the ceiling.

The company also has been an incubator for other filmmakers, including Jared Hess, who had a breakaway hit in "Napoleon Dynamite" last year.

"We're done engaging the Mormon audience," Hunter said. Added Hale: "There's just not enough Mormons."

Early next year, Halestorm plans to move into a $5 million production studio with 46,000 square feet of space that will house all of its offices, production and distribution, as well as two large sound stages.

"We'll be able to do a film from beginning to end in the studio," Hunter said.

They hope the studio, combined with Utah's unique geography, will draw one big outside production each year. Within an hour of the studio, a crew could be filming on desolate salt flats, sand dunes, mountains or dense forests, and just a three-hour drive away is Utah's red rock country.

While Halestorm will remain true to its family friendly ethic, it won't monitor what other film producers want to do.

"To have a censor board to read scripts and approve productions, that would not only be damaging to us, it would be damaging to the state of Utah," Hunter said.

Marketing to the Mormon niche has boomed recently, providing the devout with ample entertainment focused on their faith, including "The Work and the Glory" trilogy bankrolled in part by Utah Jazz owner Larry Miller. Its second installment had a nationwide release last weekend.

A sampling of plots from Halestorm movies include a romantic comedy set in a singles' congregation of the church, the trials and tribulations of a young man back from his two-year proselytizing mission and a spoof about a fictional Mormon boy band.

Halestorm begins its foray into the mainstream with the upcoming release "Church Ball," a farce about how viciously competitive Mormon church basketball leagues can be. It has a more recognizable cast, including Fred Willard and Gary Coleman, and the religious denomination of the church players is obscured.

Halestorm deserves a lot of credit for finding and developing a niche market, said Jason E. Squire, an instructor of cinema practice at the University of Southern California's School of Cinema-Television.

He said such films as "Napoleon Dynamite" and "My Big Fat Greek Wedding" are examples of how to break out of that niche while trying to maintain a certain ethic. "It doesn't matter what kind of movie it is. What matters is capturing the audience's imagination," he said.

Other filmmakers who have ties to Halestorm, and like Hale and Hunter were in the film program at church-owned Brigham Young University, have gone on to their own successes outside of strictly Mormon plot lines.

Ryan Little was a director of photography for many of the Halestorm movies and struck out on his own to direct "Saints and Soldiers" in 2003. The film about a band of World War II soldiers

during the Battle of the Bulge had some critical success, including awards at some small film festivals and a nomination for an Independent Spirit award.

Little is filming an adventure film called "The Outlaw Trail." The movie follows a young boy who has inherited a belt buckle that belonged to Butch Cassidy.

The director said his goals are to make movies families can enjoy together and help build the film community in the state.

While Utah has lured filmmakers to its scenic vistas since the days of the spaghetti western, it's never fully capitalized on its proximity to Los Angeles, less than two hours away by plane.

Utah lawmakers are considering increasing incentives to entice more production companies.

Mormon-genre films have made their mark on the Utah Film Commission's revenues, bringing in $500,000 in 2001 and more than $2 million last year, said commission director Aaron Syrett. But that's still a fraction of the more than $60 million the commission sees annually from filming in the state.

Mark DeCarlo, the host of the Travel Channel's "Taste of America" program and the star of Halestorm's current release "Mobsters and Mormons," said he enjoyed working in Utah and was charmed by the "good, honest people" he met on the set. But to lure more productions, local filmmakers need to have a more Hollywood-like professionalism, he said.

"They use a lot of friends and favors," DeCarlo said. "In order for it to really compete with Hollywood you need a professional class of person both in front of and behind the scenes."

Annex 4

LET'S HEAR IT FOR MOLLYWOOD: FILMMAKER SAYS LDS VERSION OF 'PRIDE AND PREJUDICE' HAS A MARKET

By Jesse Hyde

Deseret Morning News, June 21st 2003

PROVO — Hollywood. Bollywood. Mollywood.

The first needs no explanation, the second is the name of India's film industry, and the third . . . well, the third has just been born.

Mollywood is the term Jason Faller, a film producer who recently studied at Brigham Young University, uses to describe a new genre in LDS filmmaking — the Mormon chick flick.

"Charly" was probably the first of the kind, but Fuller thinks his updated version of the Jane Austen classic "Pride and Prejudice" will be an even bigger smash.

"It's not an inside Mormon joke. It has a market," Fuller said. " 'Pride and Prejudice' has a huge following. It's kind of like 'Star Wars' for women."

And that's why Fuller thinks his film will not only please "Molly Mormons" across the Wasatch Front but fans of the book everywhere.

In Fuller's version of the beloved classic, the setting is Utah's frenzied dating scene instead of the English countryside, and the girls are five BYU roommates rather than sisters. The story follows Elizabeth, whose resolve to remain single until she graduates is tested by two courtiers: Wickham, a smooth-talking playboy, and Darcy, a sensible businessman.

The film will feature cameo appearances by Carmen Rasmusen of "American Idol," the entire entourage of the Miss Utah pageant and the two LDS girls who appeared on ABC's "The Bachelor."

One night this week, Fuller's cast and crew gathered at the old Utah County correctional facility in south Provo to film a scene in which Wickham tricks a naive BYU co-ed named Lydia into eloping with him. The actors were dressed in retro wedding clothing, and the room had been painted in bright red and pink hues to give the film a stylized look similar to "Down With Love" or "Legally Blonde."

The lead actor, Orlando Seale, who has dark curly hair and speaks with an English accent, said he knew nothing of Mollywood before this film. In fact, he knew nothing of the LDS Church.

Seale says the LDS culture — which encourages marrying young and discourages premarital sex — lends itself well to the story. But he says the film is not overtly religious and should appeal to a broad audience.

Seale also found an ironic parallel between the book's account of Darcy's trip from London to a small isolated English village and his own experience coming to Provo from London.

"I came from a place very different than here. It was very Bohemian, very permissive, very artistic," Seale said. "When you arrive here you feel like you are coming into a whole new world, and as an outsider it's a very surreal experience. It really hits you."

Most of the actors in the film are not LDS, and Seale said making a film with LDS undertones has been an eye-opening experience.

"It would be a great thing if this film helped people see this is just a normal community, that there's nothing mysterious about it," he said. "Because there is that (mysterious) perception."

Annex 5

SIMPLE GIFTS OF THE HEART

Delivered by, Lloyd D. Newell

From radio and television broadcast of *Music and the Spoken Word*, program # 4021

On the bookshelf of many a reader and romantic sit the novels of Jane Austen, celebrated British author. She died in 1817 at age 41 after facing months of ill health with remarkable faith and optimism. Her grave lies beneath the worn stone floor of the massive medieval cathedral in Winchester, England. Carved in stone is a tribute to this accomplished writer who devoted her life to much more than writing. The words read:

"In Memory of Jane Austen. . . .
She departed this Life . . .after a long illness
supported with the patience and the hopes of a Christian.
The benevolence of her heart, the sweetness of her temper,
and the extraordinary endowments of her mind
obtained the regard of all who knew her,
and the warmest love of her intimate connections."

Jane Austen's gift for writing made her famous, but her family remembered her simpler gifts—her friendship, her personal strength, her goodness and kindness. Other graves lie nearby, with tributes telling of one person's accomplishment in battle and another's great contributions to society. But Jane Austen's uses words like *benevolence, sweetness,* and *warmest love* to memorialize a woman who nurtured those close to her, prized their contributions, and was a trusted and treasured friend.

What will be said of us? Will our legacy too be measured in the simple gifts of the heart? Will such qualities as charity, tenderness, and endurance be found in our hearts and someday carved in stone? We write our own memorials with our lives. Each new day is a new opportunity to choose what our legacy will be.

Annex 6

TO QUIETLY SERVE

Delivered by Lloyd D. Newell

From radio and television broadcast of *Music and the Spoken Word*, program # 4066

In her endearing novel *Pride and Prejudice,* beloved author Jane Austen writes of a fictional clergyman, "Mr. Collins is a conceited, pompous, narrow-minded, silly man," with "a very good opinion of himself." For all his pretensions to piety, Mr. Collins does nothing in the novel to bless or help others; rather, he takes every opportunity to belittle those of a lower social standing, and he advises the father of a wayward daughter to "throw off your unworthy child from your affection for ever, and leave her to reap the fruits of her own heinous offence." [1]

Such overblown self-righteousness reminds us that those who really are good and who do the most good for others do so quietly. They don't wear their goodness like a medal and call attention to their acts of charity or even bravery. In fact they usually prefer anonymity, content to let gratitude in the hearts of others be the only monument to their service.

Mother Teresa, who spent her life serving the poorest of the poor and doing good to all she met, felt no need to promote herself. When praised for her work, she said, "I'm just a little pencil in [God's] hand."[2] She believed that "there should be less talk" and more action. "Take a broom and clean someone's house," she taught. "That says enough."[3]

Those who leave a legacy of good deeds generally shun the limelight. They would rather modestly push a broom, or quietly bind up a wound, or lend a private shoulder to cry on than bask in adulation. The kindest actions and the best people are often unheralded by the clamorous and cynical public. Instead they receive the highest honors from those whose opinion really matters—from the people they serve and from God, who "seeth in secret."[4]

[1] (2003), 133, 69, 282.
[2] *No Greater Love* (1997), 53.
[3] In *The Joy in Loving: A Guide to Daily Living,* comp. Jaya Chaliha and Edward Le Joly (1996), 390.
[4] Matthew 6:4.

Annex 7

Excerpts from The pink bible, as found in the movie. The booklet was written for the movie by Brandon Mull, under the pseudonym Maren M. Jepson.

Introduction

Every woman pursues men in different ways, and no single strategy stands supreme. Each huntress has different specialties and strengths. The purpose of this manual is not to spoon-feed every conceivable technique relevant to securing an engagement ring - if those methods were listed in their entirety, all the libraries of the world could not contain the books that would be written. Instead, this handbook establishes the basic concepts you must master in order to become an active participant in the hunt. For some this will be a valuable review. For others it will serve as an essential introduction to the art of capturing male attention. Remember, all of the principles contained herein can only be perfected through "daily scripture study" and individual adaptation. Welcome to the hunt.

Man: a species apart

A huntress must understand her quarry. The first mistake made by inexperienced women on the hunt is to treat men as equals. Men are simple creatures. If you deal with them as equals, they will become frightened and confused.

The key to the hunt is convincing the man he is the aggressor. He will be yours only after he believes he has caught you. If your quarry realizes you are stalking him, all is lost.

Some of the differences between men and women are best appreciated by comparison

Men gawk. Women glance.
Men brood. Women discuss.
Men count. Women calculate.
Men forget. Women remember.
Men dance poorly. Women dance well.
Men scowl when angered. Women smile.
Men want to get bigger. Women want to get smaller.
Men get angry. Women get even.

(…)

Stalking your prey

Men can be found virtually anywhere. Accordingly, the clever huntress always looks her best. You never know when big game might cross your path. Do not limit your vision by only hunting men at clubs or social events. Sometimes the best place to ensnare a husband is a less predictable location, where you can move in while their guard is lowered. Classrooms, health clubs, gun shops, rodeos – the options are endless.

For example, single men do their own shopping. This makes the supermarket an ideal hunting ground. Men love to eat. If they associate you with food, it might help you get added to the menu. Do not forget the importance of first impression. Pay attention to what your cart says about you.

To arouse the male's romantic interest, fill your cart with the following items:

- Any fruit which may be easily fed to a partner, such as grapes or berries.
- Pineapples, kiwis, or coconuts. These will make you seem exotic.
- Vegetables. Men rarely buy vegetables, so they will make you seem mysterious.
- Flour, sugar, and baking powder. These create the illusion you can cook.
- Bottled water. It makes you seem athletic.
- Gum. It implies fresh breath. Avoid mouthwash, which implies you have a problem.
- Steaks. If men think you will provide them with steaks, your foot is already in the door.
- Never put feminine hygiene products in your cart. Get them through the internet.

(…)

Sorting the catch

The seasoned huntress can afford to be selective. There are many fish in the sea, but very few are keepers. In the end, the limit is one, so choose carefully. All tastes are different, but here are some guidelines.

Good looks are not the only qualification for a trophy husband. Do not forget popularity, money, clothes and car.

Nerdy men can be a pain, but they are easy to catch and will usually support you.

Avoid fixating on how much money a guy has. Devote equal attention to his earning potential and the economic status of his family.

Some guys try to seem cool. Do not be fooled. This is a pathetic attempt at misdirection. No guy has ever been cool, no guy will ever be cool. Beneath the façade, all guys are like your dad.

All husbands were once goofy single guys. Make sure you have properly examined, weighed and measured every specimen before throwing him back. Don't let a good one slip through he net.

(…)

The art of camouflage

For a hunter to get near enough to make a kill, he must become invisible. A huntress seeking a husband should attract loads of attention, while hiding their true nature.

Sell the dream, not the reality.

You wear makeup because the illusion of rosy cheeks and long lashes is more important than how you really look. This is the same idea.

Men don't marry realities. They marry fantasies. Romance and reality cannot coexist.

Only let him see you at your best. Keep your real personality hidden. Never complain, and he'll assume nothing bothers you. Never act sad, and he'll imagine you're always happy. Never mention your ambitions, and he'll figure you're a pushover. By the time he discovers it was all a mirage, it will be too late.

Bagging big game

Single men see life as a buffet. To appease their tiny attention spans they move from treat to treat. You must become the only item on the menu. Hold his attention with teasing. Offer samples of affection, but no meals. Kiss his face but not his lips. Keep him off-balance. Leave him wanting more, and he'll always be back.

Once you have a relationship with your quarry, never let him feel he has your total devotion until after your wedding day. As soon as he thinks he won your heart, he will begin to lose interest. Men want what they can't have. If you want him to be yours forever, keep him insecure. He must believe that the only way he can ever truly possess you is through marriage. Men need to feel they have married someone out of their league, so you must appear unattainable.

Never initiate a conversation about your relationship. Whoever starts that kind of discussion is stuck in the weak position. For maximum effect, pretend you never realize you had a relationship.

Trophy husband

At last the happy day arrives. Months of meticulous calculation finally culminate as your prey voluntarily enters into a contract to care for you always. Everyone comments that you look radiant. It is because you are reveling in your triumph.

The victorious huntress has not killed her prey. She has harnessed him. If she continues to employ subtlety and guile, she can steer him like an ox for the rest of her life. And on her wedding day, she smiles inwardly as the oblivious ox rejoices his conquest.

After the honeymoon a new chapter of duplicity and intrigue commences – a lifelong contest even more intricate than the hunt. But that, my prospective brides, is another story.