



University
of Stavanger

Faculty of Arts and Education

MASTERS THESIS

Study programme: Master of Literacy Studies	Spring term, 2018 Open
Author: Annjolie Tho Bergtun (signature author)
Supervisor: Sonya Luise Lundblad	
Title of thesis: The Move onto the Big Screen: Discussion between Novel and Film and the Evangelical Potentials in Taiwan (R.O.C.)	
Keywords: Film Adaptation, Novel, Film, Christianity, Evangelism, Taiwan, Narnia, Love	No. of pages: 112 + appendices/other: 11 Stavanger, 11 May, 2018

UiS Literacy Master Programme 18'

The Move onto the Big Screen

Discussion between Novel and Film and the Evangelical Potentials in
Taiwan (R.O.C)

Annjolie Tho Bergtun. (Stud. Nr.: 238541)

2017-2018

Abstract

The following thesis uses the 2005 film: *The Chronicles of Narnia: the Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* as main text in the Case Study section to analyse the process of adaptation with measurements mainly provided by scholar Brian McFarlane in the field of film adaptation. McFarlane emphasises on what he terms as ‘fidelity,’ determining if the film has been adapted faithfully to its source novel. The present thesis also contains a secondary focus on how the Narnia film has evangelical potentials, specifically in Taiwan. The first chapter offers an introduction and explains the claim in slightly more detail along with the research questions behind the purpose of the present thesis. Then, Chapter Two provides a number of different scholars’ theories in the field of film adaptation as it is the primary focus of the present thesis to help understand the transition of the story from paper to screen later on in the case study section. The last section of Chapter Two contains literature review on the secondary focus on the evangelical aspect.

Centring on McFarlane’s fidelity criterion, the claim of the present thesis is that fidelity is salient in the case of Narnia’s adapted film –given that the story is created with a Christian theme of love in terms of affection, friendship and charity –in order for the film to be used as an evangelical tool. To prove that the importance that fidelity (faithful to the spirit) must be kept (see pp. 10) and considering the Narnia story contains a central message of love in Christianity, 20 churches in Taiwan are surveyed to find out whether or not the Narnia film has been used as an evangelical tool in the non-Christian island of Taiwan (see pp. 109-112). The survey discovers whether or not the film has acted as an evangelical medium that leads to successful conversion. Relevant and various theories are presented in the last section of the second chapter. The third chapter provides a thorough analysis regarding the Narnia story in the novel and in the adapted film, first in a mechanical word-by-word comparison before moving to the thematic analysis regarding love. As the elements in each form are different, adjustments are applied when deemed necessary by the director. The result shows that in spite of the novel and film being two very different formats, the film does manage to maintain the theme of love.

For the reason that Taiwan has a strongly non-Christian-related background, a section with information regarding the main religion that forms the basis of many, if not all, (national) celebratory holidays, is provided. As contrast with Christian ‘unconditional love,’ as demonstrated in the Narnia story, the information provided in this section shows a mandate of conditional reciprocation with the gods starting from life and ending after death. In other

words, worship in exchange for blessings and protections. After the religious background is briefed, the data from the survey of 20 churches are presented, during which three points are presented: 1.) the Narnia film has been used as an evangelical tool in Taiwan, 2.) conversions happen because of the evangelical event and 3. the film proves to be faith-strengthening to the Christians.

After all the information is provided and analysed, a discussion is provided in Chapter Six, leading to the conclusion in Chapter Seven, confirming fidelity is important in the case of 2005 film *The Chronicles of Narnia: the Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* for the evangelical usage in the folk-religion-based island of Taiwan, Republic of China.

Acknowledgements

I would like to give thanks to God, first and foremost, for leading me here to Norway and to this study. Through a lot of struggles, protections and growth, I managed to reach where I am, but only by His grace was I able to get this far. I simply can not claim this glory myself.

Secondly, I would like to thank my supportive family, starting from my loving husband, who has always had unending encouragements in my every academic struggle. I admit I did not always have the grace to receive them well, but altogether my husband and his kind and loving words got me through this study. I thank God for giving me such a perfect spouse and I thank Steinar for loving me and encouraging me onwards even as I stumble around.

Thirdly, I would like to thank my three-year-old toddler: ‘Though you are too young to understand what I am writing about right now, maybe one day you will get to read your mother’s master thesis. Know that you are a big part of the motivation behind my accomplishing all this.’

Fourthly, I would like to thank my mother, who has told me time and again that one day I will accomplish something great. So far this is the greatest of my academic life and I give thanks to the inspirations my mother has given me ever since I was a little girl.

Fifthly, I would like to thank my mother-in-law, who has helped me by proof-reading for me every now and then during my study here in Norway. ‘Thank you for your help and love towards me. I really appreciate the fact that you are my mother-in-law!’

Last and definitely not least, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Sonya: ‘Our meeting was a very special experience. Finding out you, of all 155 universities and university-level schools, had been to my university; and of 35 to 40 Professors, you have met the one home-class Professor that I could still remember, was magical. Thank you for your supervision and encouraging guidance. I am very grateful to have been your student for the whole of this school year.’

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	4
Table of Contents	5
1. Introductory Section	7
2. Theoretical Background and Literature Review	10
2.1 Fidelity – McFarlane, Leitch and Stam	10
2.2 Modes of Adaptation – McFarlane, Wagner, Andrew, Bluestone, Hutcheon and Leitch.....	15
2.3 Narrative and Consciousness - McFarlane, Ray, Bluestone, Wagner, Fjeld and Hutcheon..	26
2.4 Authorship - Wollen, Astruc, Cobb, Boozer and Russell.....	31
2.5 Special Focus – Christian Love (Lewis)	39
2.6 Evangelical Potentials – Hooten, Falke, Dillon, Davidson, Larsen, Tovey and Goh.....	44
3. Case-Study	52
3.1 The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe (2005).....	52
3.2 Narrative and Transfer—Structural Patterns: The Novel	53
3.3 Narrative and Transfer—Structural Patterns: The Film	60
3.4 Character Functions.....	78
3.4.1 Cardinal-Functions Characters.....	78
3.4.2 Catalysers-Characters	85
3.5 Enunciation and Adaptation	89
3.5.1 Narrational Mode: The Novel – Third-Person Narration.....	89
3.5.2 Narrational Mode: The Film – Andrew Adamson and the Silent Narrator: the Camera.....	90
3.5.3 Adaptation Modes.....	91
3.6 Authorship.....	92
3.6.1 Author of the novel: C.S. Lewis	92
3.6.2 ‘Auteur’ of the film – Andrew Adamson.....	93
3.7 Special Focus.....	94
3.7.1 Theme – Love	94
3.7.2 Christian Imagery	97

3.8	Narnia-Novel v.s. Narnia-Film.....	98
4.	Field Information	102
4.1	Taiwan.....	102
4.2	Taiwan as a Mission Field - Dong and Qian	103
4.2.1	Folk-Religion: Birth.....	103
4.2.2	Folk-Religion: Adulthood.....	104
4.2.3	Folk-Religion: Marriage	104
4.2.4	Folk-Religion: Birthday.....	104
4.2.5	Folk-Religion: Death	105
4.2.6	Other Important Times (in Lunar Calendar, dd/mm).....	105
4.2.7	Folk-Religion Conclusion.....	108
5.	Survey and Results	109
6.	Discussion	112
7.	Conclusion	118
8.	Bibliography	119

1. Introductory Section

The present research is a study first and foremost of the differences between a novel and its adapted film, namely, film adaptation. How the film could be used as an evangelical method through which Christians in Taiwan spread the Gospel is of secondary focus. In light of the popularity of film as entertainment, the fact that films are often adapted from an existing written work, such as a novel, and that often a film is judged by the way it reflects the original work, this study embarks on an investigation to examine the connection between the source novel and its adapted film. However, there are different ways of looking at how works of fictions are transformed into films and what codes must be examined in order to determine whether or not a film has been ‘successfully’ adapted from the fiction. Secondly, when a novel is successfully adapted into film, Christians in Taiwan have used them for evangelical purposes because they have influence over viewers and their society (see pp. 19). The film selected for analysis is the 2005 film, *The Chronicles of Narnia: the Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, addressing questions such as:

- *What structural differences are there between this novel and its adapted film?
- *How does one define if a film has been ‘faithful’ to its source novel?
- *How would whether or not a film is truthful to its novel or not affect its potential evangelical perspective?
- *Are there proofs that the Narnia film has been used as an evangelical tool in Taiwan?

Claim

The present author posits that the novel and its adapted film give different experiences and the impact of the film is bigger than the impact of the novel to their receivers (readers/viewers). Given that the materials used to create a novel are different from those a film, novel and film are not comparable and should be seen as two individual works of art or literature (75), as Robert Stam points out. However, while McFarlane’s focus on fidelity might not be the absolute and only way to look at film adaptation, the present author suggests, in the case study on the chosen film, fidelity (to the spirit) is crucial in the act of adaptation because of the values it contains and its impact as a story transformed into film that engages its viewer. Based on the film’s ability to reach people individually, and in terms of scope, fidelity is, in the case of Christian films and specifically in the case of Lewis’ Narnia story, a salient

element to be preserved, in order for the film to be able to serve its evangelical potential, at least in Taiwan, if not all other countries as well.

Theoretical Perspectives

Using McFarlane's theory in his *Novel to Film* (1996) as a set of guidelines on which the viewpoints of the present thesis are based, insofar as he supports adaptation that is being faithful 'to the "spirit" or "essence" of the work (9)' for starter. The Theoretical Background section is divided into six sections: Fidelity, Modes of Adaptation, Narrative and Consciousness, Authorship, Special Focus and Evangelical Potentials. In each section, a collection of viewpoints from multiple scholars can be found, generally starting with McFarlane's own theory. The fidelity sub-section addresses on McFarlane's definition of fidelity as well as other scholar's concerns and arguments regarding it. Modes of adaptation section includes other scholars and their theories, such as Geoffrey Wagner, Dudley Andrew, George Bluestone, Linda Hutcheon and Thomas Leitch. In Chapter 2.3, McFarlane's chosen method to dissect the story is compared with Seymour Chatman, Robert B. Ray, Bluestone, Wagner and Hutcheon. Because McFarlane does not address the element of authors in film adaptation, an Authorship sub-section is added and presenting theories from Peter Wollen, Alexandre Astruc, Shelley Cobb, Jack Boozer and James Russell, discussing the relationship between the literary author, the screenwriter and the film auteur. Considering the evangelical nature, Chapter 2.5 under the term 'Special Focus' is provided to focus on the theme of love in Narnia that is considered Christian and perceived as a good value to readers of Narnia's author, C. S. Lewis. Specifically, it references Lewis' *The Four Loves*. Following that, Chapter 2.6 moves on to the other scholars regarding Christianity and evangelism and provides a literature review on these topics regarding how the theories might apply to Taiwan. With a special focus on the Christians in Taiwan, this section provides methods that are used in some of the local churches, collecting information from the published works from doctors such as Dong, Qian and Weng as a background information regarding how the Christians, which are minority, evangelise in their homeland. After the Case Study, a chapter termed Field Information which presents the religious background of Taiwan is provided. Following that, a survey regarding whether or not the 2005 Narnia film was ever used as an evangelising tool is presented. Moreover, a survey is conducted amongst 20 churches throughout Taiwan to collect proof of usage of film with evangelical intentions and facts regarding the challenges

Christians face in leading conversions to its religion. The collected data is used as supporting information in regards of putting theory into actions in the reality of Taiwan for the discussion section.

Methodology

Following McFarlane's term in his *Novel to Film* (1996), in particular, using his analysis on *Great Expectations* (1964) in the book as a prototype, a Case Study that analyses *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (2005) is provided. The Case Study generally follows the example of McFarlane's own analyses in his book to determine whether fidelity has been preserved. By examining the structure in novel and the structure in film, character functions, ways of adaptation applied in the film and the additional focuses such as authorship and Narnia's Christian theme, the way fidelity is kept in the film is explored. The Case Study mostly focuses on the transformation from one form to another (novel to film) but with a specific interest to see if the theme of love, in the way C. S. Lewis describes in his *The Four Loves*, is preserved in order to serve the story's evangelical potential.

Relevance

Brian McFarlane writes:

The film-makers themselves have been drawing on literary sources, and especially novels of varying degrees of cultural prestige, since film first established itself as pre-eminently a narrative medium (3).

As McFarlane points out, and as film industry sits at the heart of cinemas for many, if not all of those who search for entertainment there, the study of the differences between a film and its source novel is important in that it provides insights to how the two forms interact with their audience and what differences they make in those on the receiving end. When a film is used as a medium to make its viewers focus on a specific theme, how lasting is its impact compared with the effects of the source novel and how does this impact work its way to being recognised? Recognising the differences between a film and its source novel could potentially help further studies on how each medium could maximise their performance to make an impact in the film market, commercial market or even society.

2. Theoretical Background and Literature Review

In light of the fact that the present thesis posits fidelity to be a salient element in the film adaptation process and that the present thesis follows the structure designed in McFarlane's *Novel to Film* (1996), the theoretical background starts with presenting different theories on fidelity. In his *Novel to Film*, Brian McFarlane's theory for analysing criteria that define fidelity in films, can be divided into a few categories: Fidelity, Modes of Adaptation and Narrative and Consciousness. Authorship, Special Focus and Evangelical Potentials are added in the later part of the section to provide an overview that covers the focuses of the present thesis. Through out this section, other scholar's theories are compared to examine each aspect in the process of film adaptation, and, eventually, film's usage as an evangelical tool. Specifically, the Evangelical Potentials chapter is presented as the literature review part for the present thesis.

2.1 Fidelity – McFarlane, Leitch and Stam

In his *Novel to Film* (1996), Brian McFarlane presents the concept of being faithful between the original novel and the film adaptation. Given the conventional process of a story being invented in the form of a novel or in any other written form first, the discussion of adaptation has evolved around and been debated on the fidelity issue,

Fidelity criticism depends on a notion of the text as having and rendering up to the (intelligent) reader a single, correct 'meaning' which the film-maker has either adhered to or in some sense violated or tampered with. There will often be a distinction between being faithful to the 'letter', an approach which the more sophisticated writer may suggest is no way to ensure a 'successful' adaptation, and to the 'spirit' or 'essence' of the work. The latter is of course very much more difficult to determine since it involves not merely a parallelism between novel and film but between two or more readings of a novel, since any given film version is able only to aim at reproducing the film-maker's reading of the original and to hope that it will coincide with that of many other readers/viewers (8-9).

McFarlane notices fidelity is ultimately comparing one's own experiences or readings of the novel and the presented interpretation of story on film. He also points out, 'though some [writers] have claimed not to embrace [fidelity], they still regard it as a viable choice for the film-maker and a criterion for the critic (9).' The idea of fidelity is variable from individual to

individual and the range of variety is as vast as cultural, religious backgrounds and personality differences cover. Despite the complex nature of such criterion, adapting films in letter and in spirit to its written source, novel has been a discourse that occupies the field of film industry (10). Director of the Narnia film, as one example in the film adaptation process, Andrew Adamson tries to bring the story of Narnia as faithfully as possible in his working together with co-producer, Douglas Gresham, to produce the 2005 Narnia film (see pp. 93-94). Another example, *Romeo+Juliet* (1996) is arguably a film adaptation that contains both McFarlane's being faithful to the letter and being faithful to the spirit or essence. Being faithful to the letter is to follow every word of the work itself in presenting the world within the text on screen and *Romeo+Juliet* (1996) is faithful to the letter in terms of the dialogues, which has been preserved in its original style in the original text from Shakespeare. On the other hand, in the very same movie, the antagonism between the two families (Montagues and Capulets) has been modernised, in ways faithful to the spirit or essence, into that of two mafia families. Also, the weapons used in the film are updated from daggers and swords in fiction into guns.

However, while McFarlane states that fidelity is the single most important criterion that covers all aspects in film adaptation, he does not necessarily notice the major differences in creating a novel and creating a film and that those differences may lead to changes of essence within the works. Categorising any changes as a definitive 'infidelity' could be looked at as too simplistic and that the complexity of film-making should be reflected in the measures taken to consider if an adaptation is executed successfully. As introduced later on (see pp. 13-15), Robert Stam points out other aspects in the process of creation for a film and a novel contain very different elements, all of which make fidelity not ideal to be treated as an exclusive measuring criterion.

As the fidelity criterion is being insisted by many, if not all scholars, viewers and directors alike, McFarlane turns to focus on a 'suppression of potentially more rewarding approaches the phenomenon of adaptation,' intertextuality (10). Quoting American film critic Christopher Orr's remark,

[w]ithin this critical context [i.e. of intertextuality], the issue is not whether the adapted film is faithful to its source, but rather how the choice of a specific source and how the approach to that source serve the film's ideology (10),

McFarlane addresses the fact that what constitutes an ideology such as love and romance could influence the making of a film. The film presents to its spectators a collection of choices made, perhaps in background, in order to convey a concept within the story while following the cinematic code and therefore fulfilling the presentation of specific ideology. For example, as McFarlane provides, the MGM-filmed *Random Harvest*, which is based on the 1941 novel by James Hilton, appears to present its ideology of England in the Hollywood fashion, wherein glossy 'house style' are shown, in a melodramatic romance and in the idea that the novel may have been written in the mind of having a certain actor/star to perform in it (10). While McFarlane does not single out ideology as one independent criterion and in light of ideology in the context of intertextuality, the importance of addressing that ideology may have the role of a variant which could determine the outcome of the film. Using the example provided by McFarlane, the ideology of England is summed up and presented in *Random Harvest* in the form of Hollywood code. The American Hollywood's cultural perception of England's environment from household to landscape, and even people, may be very different from how the English look at and experience it themselves. The same theory may very well apply to the ideology of England during war, English ways of speech and English behaviours in the Narnia film.

On another note, addressing McFarlane's fidelity criterion in his article, 'Twelve Fallacies in Contemporary Adaptation Theory,' published in *Criticism* (vol. 45, no. 2), Thomas Leitch considers using this criterion to measure the level success of adaptation from novel to film to be, in fact, 'a hopelessly fallacious measure of a given adaptation's value because it is unattainable, undesirable and theoretically possible only in a trivial sense (114).' Comparing the work of translation between languages to film adaptation, Leitch posits that no matter how much effort is put into attempting to adapt the content of the text into film, the relationship of the two already entails the superiority of the original: in this case, fiction. In his own words, Leitch writes, '[t]he only remake that would have maintained perfect fidelity to the original text would have been a re-release of that text (114).' Ultimately, the best version of the text, the most faithful version of the novel, would have to be the text itself. In Leitch's opinion, the reasons for fidelity to remain such a widely acknowledged criterion in film adaptation are mostly because it is generally those who are in literary studies that take interests in such discussions about how the texts are considered the original and the superior, thus the adapted film must adhere to the texts' originality at all costs (114). Although Leitch's argument is convincing, fidelity remains the nature of human's ability of making connections,

or ‘matching’ the similar in the different, as another scholar, Dudley Andrew, phrases it, between mediums that are otherwise not connected (69) (see pp. 18). Therefore, the resistance to everything related to fidelity seems impossible, if not entirely un-natural. In the case of Narnia, Leitch’s point provides an explanation to the quantity of difference between novel and film. Andrew’s observation regarding the human nature to match the similar in the different, on the other hand, becomes the foundation of the Case Study.

There is another scholar that joins this discussion regarding fidelity. However, his stance is neither for nor against. In his ‘Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation,’ published in James Naremore’s *Film Adaptation* (2000), Robert Stam proposes to not take fidelity as an ‘exclusive methodological principle,’ but rather simply to widen the horizon of its methods used to compare fiction and film with a ‘medium-specificity’ approach, which admits different mediums have their own strong suits and shortcomings. Quoting film critic Pauline Kael on ‘the “natural” propensities of the film medium:

[m]ovies are good at action; they’re not good at reflective thought or conceptual thinking. They’re good at immediate stimulus, but they’re not a good means of involving people in the other arts or in learning about a subject. The film techniques themselves seem to stand in the way of the development of curiosity (78).

Stam argues that fidelity is an inadequate trope to use as key criterion in the field of film adaptation and that ‘translation, reading, dialogization, cannibalization, transfiguration, and signifying... each sheds light on a different dimension of adaptation (80).’ As Stam points out, a novel could produce many different adaptations, just as a text can produce many different readings (80). Taking it further, Stam posits that adaptation itself is not about trying to recreate the ‘original’ text, but more about joining in an ‘ongoing dialogical process’ and pitch the director’s own interpretation as a response to the author of the novel (81). On a practical level, fidelity, as Stam points out, produces a demand that ‘ignores the actual processes of making films—for example, the differences in cost and in modes of production. A novel is usually produced by a single individual; the film is almost always a collaborative project, mobilizing at minimum a crew of four or five people and a maximum a cast and crew and support staff of hundreds (76).’ Stam’s theory widens the angle for analysis of Narnia film and leads to adding a small section that focuses on the ‘authorship’ on C.S. Lewis and Andrew Adamson in Case Study.

Different from McFarlane's take on intertextuality regarding one culture's perception of another highly influences the process of film adaptation, Stam brings in intertextuality in terms of the director making a commented version of the story the author writes and lets all the changes the director wants to make in his adapted film in order to converse with the author take adaptation to override issues on fidelity. Extracting from and building on Mikhail M. Bakhtin's heteroglossia concept, Stam summarises Gérard Genette's suggestion in that other concepts may be useful in discussing film adaptation aside from *intertextuality*, which Genette describes as 'the effective co-presence of two texts in the form of quotation, plagiarism, and allusion.' Stam explains film adaptation, on an intertextual level, partakes literally and cinematically (81-82):

Paratextuality: Refers to the relationships within the text, such as that between the content and the title of the text, and so on, even the cover of the book. It includes anything written down in the form of words.

Metatextuality: Refers to the comparisons between different texts, be they cited or inferred.

Architextuality: 'Refers to the generic taxonomies suggested or refused by the titles or infratitles of a text.'

Hypertextuality: Refers to the connection between what Genette terms 'hypertext' to 'an anterior text,' or 'hypotext,' 'which the former transforms, modifies elaborates or extends.'

Before concluding, Stam addresses and dissects fiction into the crucial elements of plot and character, narrator and provides in details of how vast the potential of variety in outcome is in the process from fiction to film. Calling it 'transmutations' and 'transformation,' Stam points out that while plot, character and narrator may be presented in one way in fiction, they may not necessarily be maintained accordingly when recreated into films. The process of transformation from fiction to film has a grammar, one that has 'a complex series of operations: selection, amplification, concretization, actualization, critique, extrapolation, analogization, popularization, and reculturalization (83).' From fiction to film, the story in fiction has to be transferred into another medium designated for film. Certain alterations might be required during the process of adaptation in order for the gist of the fiction to be conveyed in the different medium of film. Therefore, the likelihood of 'transmutation of plot

and character' may appear to happen naturally just so everything in fiction fits in film (83-84). Stam's theory leads to the Study Case's focus on analysing the characters and how they are transformed into the film.

Lastly, Stam reiterates that one must apply an approach in criticism that is widened into welcoming the differences between the media. Rather than remaining narrowly fixated on the notion of fidelity, Stam proposes that the action of scrutinising and comparing the differences between fiction and film should not be put to a stop just because he rejects stopping at solely focusing on fidelity, but as he writes in the title, to the scholars and critics alike, one must go 'beyond fidelity' and take into appreciation with all the variants between fiction and film (87). Stam's theory on film adaptation appears to be inclusive on many wider-ranged and exterior influences, while he resists the fixation on fidelity. However, attempting to cover such scope to discuss film adaptation may appear ambitious and easily distract, deviate and create an irrelevant subject in the novel-film relationship and, as a result, demote the importance of both fiction and film along the inclusive path of thinking. Including Stam's theory widens the focus on fidelity during film adaptation process and helps explain thoroughly the complexity in this transition. In the case of Narnia, however, the distraction, deviation or the creation of an irrelevant subject that might take place in the attempt of covering the vast scope of film adaptation is avoided in this project. With voices from different scholars commenting on fidelity, one thing remains the same: even in the voice that disapproves the idea of fidelity for reasons comparing the resources used to produce a novel and that a film, there is little doubt about the existence of it (fidelity). As McFarlane suggests, though it may not be as exclusive and salient as he explains, fidelity is nonetheless one valid criterion to be measuring the film adaptation process with.

2.2 Modes of Adaptation – McFarlane, Wagner, Andrew, Bluestone, Hutcheon and Leitch

As there are scholars for and against McFarlane's fidelity theory, this section provides ways that other scholars produce to overlook McFarlane's theory that fidelity is the sole and salient criterion to measure success in film adaptation. It is helpful to know what categories scholars have provided in film adaptation field, different categories have different nuances in their definitions, as all proposed theories are applicable for analysis and discussion in film adaptation. In Case Study, analysis of where Narnia film adaptation fits in is provided in order

to detail the different emphases each mode of adaptation focuses on. McFarlane himself, in describing the strategies some theorists propose to devalue the function of fidelity in film adaptation, brings in scholar Geoffrey Wagner's three possible categories:

1. *Transposition*
2. *Commentary*
3. *Analogy*

In Wagner's words, *transposition* happens when 'a novel is directly given on the screen, with the minimum of apparent interference. As this is a straight-forward way of presenting the story of a fiction in the form of a film, this is the method most generally used by Hollywood throughout its history (222). As most stories narrate themselves in a chronological way, transposition is a fitting choice for adaptation. Secondly, more aligned with the auteur theory, which will be introduced later on in the current section, *commentary* is taken place when the role of the film-maker is more prominent and he or she wishes to alter some parts of the film either deliberately or inevitably (because it just has to be done). Wagner writes this could also be called 'a re-emphasis or re-structure (223).' Thirdly and lastly, much like the fidelity in the sense of 'to the spirit' and 'to the essence,' *analogy* is about the 'striking analogous attitudes and in finding analogous rhetorical techniques (226).'

Similarly, but with a slight different nuance and emphasis, in his *Concepts in Film Theory* (1985), Dudley Andrew writes an article titled 'Adaptation' to orient the field of film adaptation in two directions, one in the connections between films and society, and the other in the aim to generalize the connection between film and fiction (or literature) (65). Looking at film adaptation simply as one version of the standard, namely, the text, Andrew posits that adaptation is 'both a leap and a process' and concludes that, with a global context that understands meanings, a version of the text is adaptation in its narrow sense (66). On the other hand, film adaptation could be viewed in a broad sense that could be traced back to the beginning of the existence of cinema. The connection between the text and its adaptation is rather defined and restricted and foregrounding. It leads to analysis that could be reduced into three categories. Andrew's modes of adaptations are:

1. *borrowing*,
2. *intersection*, and
3. *fidelity and transformation*.

Firstly and similar to Geoffrey Wagner's *transposition*, Andrew's *borrowing* is the procedure that is most commonly applied and where a text is transformed into film. One additional focus of Andrew's *borrowing* is that the original text has a certain prestige that derives from its popularity and fame may be consequently 'borrowed' into the film when being adapted to the screen and the film 'naturally' inherits the respectability because of its connection to the revered original text (67). For example, a biblical story adapted into film like *The Passion of the Christ* (2004), wherein the power of the story, with its historical and biblical background, is 'borrowed' into the film and produced high anticipation long before its release date. This is significant and useful for evangelical purposes because the importance of the source text plays a crucial role on how the adapted film is expected and perceived. The same borrowing effect works in the case of Narnia, as C.S. Lewis' work had gained popularity long before the 2005 adapted film. Secondly, as an extension of *borrowing* and slightly similar to Wagner's *Commentary* in that the adaptation produces something more than just being faithful, *intersection* comes as a twist that exhibits the preservation of the uniqueness of the original text. Andrew, using Robert Bresson's *Diary of a Country Priest* (1951) as an example reinforced with André Bazin's analytical comment, argues that the adaptation, in the method of *intersection*, presents the wholeness of the original text in an entirely different form, the film (67).

Last but not least, *fidelity and transformation* is categorised by Andrew and most often discussed. It is the most wearisome topic in adaptation in regards to fidelity. While explaining the conventional two directions of viewing fidelity (to the 'letter' and to the 'spirit'), as McFarlane suggests, Andrew believes that the framework of the written text, ultimately, becomes the framework of the adapted film. Andrew further discusses the more difficult aspect of fidelity (being faithful to the 'spirit') and extrapolates that by aiming at being faithful to the spirit, the task at hand is really to produce the exact experience for the viewer of a film as that for the reader of the fiction (68). As Andrew points out, the signifying systems of the text and of the film are rather oppositional in that a film works from the exterior (the seen, like 'George looks happy') to the interior (the invisible, like the human mind such as 'George feels happy') and the text vice versa. This nearly perfect binary opposition between the exterior and the interior makes, as some argue, adapting film with fidelity in being faithful to the 'spirit' impossible. 'George Bluestone, Jean Mitry, and a host of others find this opposition to be most graphic in adaptations. Therefore they take pleasure in scrutinizing this practice even while ultimately condemning it to the realm of the impossible (68).' However,

Andrew posits that the majority of discussion around adaptation, if not every, surrounds the act of ‘matching.’ Andrew points out, ‘We can and do correctly match items from different systems all the time: a tuba sound is more like a rock than a piece of string; it is more like a bear than like a bird; more like a romanesque church than a baroque one (69).’ Like Nelson Goodman, Gombrich and Metz, Keith Cohen suggests that despite the very different systems of fiction and film, common ground still exists: the ability to insinuate. When it comes to imagination, the readers and viewers are able to abstract what the narrative is at liberty to reveal and produce a meaning of the unsaid to form a picture that is richer and more complete. Here, as singled out, narrative is one noticeable element that exists and leads the way in both fiction and film. This emphasis on the narrative is applied in the Case Study on Narnia in terms of analysing how the story’s events unfold both in the novel and in the film.

In the section where he titles ‘Sociology and Aesthetics,’ Andrew, linking film style and the era (or society) in which the film was produced, writes that in the immediate post-war era, there was a new kind of discipling in *mise-en-scène* that was developed and applied by, amongst others, Cocteau, Welles, Olivier and Wyler. French film director, François Truffaut took adaptation not as a practice that needs to be a voiced by as a guideline for the era or society of that time. In his advocacy of *cinéma d’ auteur* in regards to how film adaptation reflects its original literary source, Truffaut means to compare different methods of adaptation rather than comparing the director in *auteur* theory with the adaptation itself (70-71). Andrew’s observation could explain the style of filming and the general background settings Narnia director Adamson chooses to produce the film, as they reflect or guide the way societies think of the era and country the Narnia story is set in.

Andrew also explains that, depending on the preference of the literary fashion of the time, the sort of adaptation done in films may vary greatly from decade to decade. ‘Particular literary fashions have at times exercised enormous power over the cinema and, consequently, over the general direction of its stylistic evolution (71).’ Romantic fictions such as those of Hugo, Dickens, Dumas and others had helped define the general style of American and mainstream French films near the end of the silent era. Altogether at this point, the mainstream film style was that of a naturalist. One director amongst many that stood out in the 1930s in redirecting the style of world cinema was Jean Renoir, who took interests in French *cinéastes* (71). The naturalist approach of fiction and film helped ‘develop its interest in squalid subjects and a hard-hitting style (71),’ which consequently influenced American

novelists such as Cain and Hammett, before spreading back to Europe and resulted in the film style of Visconti, Carné, Clouzot and others.

In addition to the naturalistic literature of the time, politics could also play a crucial role in film adaptation as reinforcement. Being influential to society and culture, films, much like commercials, could help form a certain direction of how things are looked at, valued or preferred. In the case of politics, Andrew draws an example of Russia in 1935, when Renoir adapted the work of Gorki and produced *The Lower Depths* (1936, original title: *Les bas-fonds*). With a speculation that Renoir might have been influenced by the pressures and aspirations of that moment, Andrew writes that ‘the film negotiates the mixture of classes which the play only hints at (71).’ And here naturalism was blended with a political need, with Gorki’s play being only a few years prior to the great uprisings in Russia. Renoir’s influence did not stop in Russia, but contributed to leading European cinema onto a naturalist direction (71-72). Andrew’s theory points out there is a social factor at play in the film adaptation process. In the case of the Narnia film, Andrew’s theory helps speculating that the reasons for adapting the Narnia story into film is because there is a need for the focus of love that the story provides. (See more analysis in Case Study.)

Unlike McFarlane, Wagner and Andrew, who, regardless of their different opinions, do share the mutual agreement that fiction and film are in fact comparable, in his *Novels into Film* (1973), Bluestone publishes an article titled ‘The Limits of the Novel and the Limits of the Film,’ which is often cited and discussed amongst scholars in the field of film adaptation. In his article, Bluestone starts off by referencing D.W. Griffith and Joseph Conrad and comparing their wish of making their receivers see, be it in the form of written words or of a directed film (1). Referring to Griffith’s statement: ‘The task I’m trying to achieve is above all to make you see,’ and Conrad’s preface to *Nigger of the Narcissus*: ‘My task which I am trying to achieve is, by the power of the written word, to make you hear, to make you feel—it is, before all, to make you see,’ Bluestone points out the differences between Griffith’s seeing and Conrad’s, on multiple levels (1-6).

Bluestone analyses that the differences between Griffith’s statement and Conrad’s lie in the structures, the background knowledge and the addressed, namely, the receivers. In his words, Bluestone describes the relationship between novel and film to be one that is historically ‘overtly compatible, secretly hostile (2).’ On the other hand, applying the viewpoints of Sergei Eisenstein’s essay, ‘Dickens, Griffith, and the Film Today,’ Bluestone

points out how applicable to film-shooting written fiction can be by taking Griffith's finding such easy connections in the works of Dickens.

Such statements as : 'The film is true to the spirit of the book;' 'It's incredible how they butchered the novel;' 'Thank God they changed the ending'—these and similar statements are predicated on certain assumptions which blur the mutational process. These standard expletives and judgments assume, among other things, a separable content which may be detached and reproduced, as the snapshot reproduces the kitten; that incidents and characters in fiction are interchangeable with incidents and characters in the film; that the novel is a norm and the film deviates at its peril; that deviations are permissible for vaguely defined reasons—exigencies of length or of visualization, perhaps—but that the extent of the deviation will vary directly with the "respect" one has for the original; that taking liberties does not necessarily impair the quality of the film, whatever one may think of the novel, but that such liberties are somehow a trick which must be concealed from the public (5).

Bluestone addresses both the similarities and connections between fiction and film to be that film could be considered as the deviation of fiction (e.g. change of ending or other details) while being connected to its original written source (e.g. plot presented in film the same order as in fiction). However, Bluestone also points out that there is a lack of awareness over the changes that take place when one form is converted into another, rendering the two forms as incomparable as it is of architecture and dance.

In the sections where he title 'A Note on Origins' and 'Contrast in the Media,' Bluestone discusses the mutual elements shared between fiction and film as well as almost incomparable differences. Firstly, according to Erwin Panofsky, American film industry started off as a result of the passion to the wonder and beauty in moving images from the general public. What began as a gadget ended up as a billion-dollar investment. Secondly, the idea of film itself was invented as a product of folk-art, made by people who did not consider themselves to be artists, might very well be offended if taken as artists by other people and their work was appreciated by people who did not consider themselves art-lovers. And these folk-art of films were pictures that were taken by people who were not professionally trained as photographers, of people who were not occupational actors (6-7).

In the beginning of the creation of American film industry, the most commonly accepted and appreciated categories were, '(1) melodramatic incidents, preferably of the

sanguinary kind found in popular nineteenth-century historical paintings, or in plays, or in popular wax-works; (2) crudely comic incidents—the beginning of the pie-throwing genre; (3) scenes represented on mildly pornographic postcards.’ As Panofsky concludes and Bluestone conquers, these categories eventually grew into what Bluestone calls ‘genuine film-tragedy, genuine film-comedy, and genuine film-romance’ after the public understands and embraces the fact that these categories ‘could be transfigured “not by artificial injection of ‘literary values,’ but by exploiting the unique and specific possibilities of the new medium as such (7).”’ On the other hand, as Bluestone points out, ‘If the film is protean because it has assimilated photography, music, dialogue, the dance, the novel is protean because it has assimilated essays, letters, memoirs, histories, religious tracts, and manifestoes (7-8).’ Fiction in the form of novel has a longer history and more defined framework, all leading to that the novel entails a more complicated structure for analysis.

Ultimately, as Bluestone concludes, ‘the complex relations between novel and film...[like two intersecting lines,] meet at a point, then diverge. At the intersection, the book and shooting-script are almost indistinguishable. But where the lines diverge, they not only resist conversion; they also lost all resemblance to each other. At the farthest remove, novel and film, like all exemplary art, have, within the conventions that make them comprehensible to a given audience, made maximum use of their materials. At this remove, what is peculiarly filmic and what is peculiarly novelistic cannot be converted without destroying an integral part of each. That is why Proust and Joyce would seem as absurd on film as Chaplin would in print. And that is why the great innovators of the twentieth century, in film and novel both, have had so little to do with each other, have gone their ways alone, always keeping a firm but respectful distance... In short, the filmed novel, in spite of certain resemblances, will inevitably become a different artistic entity from the novel on which it is based (63-64).’

Adding in other aspects of film adaptation, looking at film adaptation with the additional focus of marketing and breaking adaptation into two categories in her *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006), Linda Hutcheon defines adaptation into ‘adaptation as product’ and ‘adaptation as process (15-22).’

Adaptation as Product

Taking a commonly used analogy, Hutcheon puts adaptation and translation on a parallel, pointing out there are no ‘literal’ versions of either adaptation or translation (16). But aside

from that fact, there are many things these two acts share in common. Both adaptation and translation are dominated by a focus on the ‘original’ source, whatever the form it may be. But, as Hutcheon paraphrases Robert Stam, ‘there will always be both gains and losses’ (Stam 62, referenced in Hutcheon 16) There is simply not a 100-percent conversion when one adapts from one form to another.

As an alternative, Hutcheon cites Bluestone’s idea of analogy between adaptation and paraphrase. In this alternative way of approach to parallel adaptation with, paraphrase allows room for ‘free rendering or amplification of a passage (17),’ according to *Oxford English Dictionary*, meaning, like adaptation, paraphrase leaves a place for an ‘adapter’ to make some changes where he or she sees fit, be it because of a need to leave a personal mark, or because of a different interpretation of the source text. Hutcheon applies what she terms as ‘ontological shift’ here in a cases where adaptations are based on true events. As Hutcheon points out,

it makes little sense to talk about adaptation as ‘historically accurate’ or ‘historically inaccurate’ in the usual sense. *Schindler’s List* is not *Shoah* (see Hansen 2001) in part because it is an adaptation of a novel by Thomas Keneally, which is itself based on survivor testimony. In other words, it is a paraphrase or translation of a particular other text, a particular interpretation of history. The seeming simplicity of the familiar label ‘based on a true story,’ is a ruse: in reality, such historical adaptations are as complex as historiography itself (18).

What Hutcheon means is rather simply that adaptations based on true events are really just adaptations of adaptations, in terms of the fact that it is actually based on testimonies of people, who themselves become filters, and producing their ‘adapted’ version of the story.

Adaptation as Process

Focusing on the process, Hutcheon presents E.H. Gombrich’s analogy of an artist and an adapter. Gombrich posits if an artist is holding a pencil or a paintbrush when he or she is about to produce a piece of artwork by reproducing from a source such as nature; then the artist will naturally be looking in the source for something the choice of tool, in this case, a pencil or a paintbrush, is best fitted to accomplish the job of (19). In adapting long novels into

films, subtraction or contraction is commonly applied; on the other hand, in adapting short story to the screen, expansion is often called to work its magic.

There are different reasons that influence the adapters' decision on what direction or genre the adapted work is going to take on, the reasons could vary from being a financial reason, an aesthetic reason, to being a political reason. All this complexity make fidelity criterion less than sufficient to apply in the attempt to analyse the process of adaptation. 'Whatever the motive, from the adapter's perspective, adaptation is an act of appropriating or salvaging, and this is always a double process of interpreting and then creating something new (20).' Hutcheon's theory produces the importance of the 'adapter,' which is in link with the auteur theory and its emphasis on the director. The Case Study on Narnia therefore include an extra section on the author and the auteur.

Adding onto this, Hutcheon makes mention of Aristotle's idea about how humans take pleasures in imitation. Quoting from West and Woodman (1979), Hutcheon writes,

[i]mitatio is neither plagiarism nor a flaw in the constitution of Latin literature. It is a dynamic law of its existence (ix).' Like classical imitation, adaptation also is not slavish copying, it is a process of making the adapted material one's own. In both, the novelty is in what one *does with* the other text. Indeed, for 'Longinus,' *imitatio* went together with *aemulatio*, linking imitation and creativity (10). Perhaps one way to think about unsuccessful adaptation is not in terms of infidelity to a prior text, but in terms of a lack of the creativity and skill to make the text one's own and thus autonomous (20).

And on the receiving end, depending on the ideology the viewer is familiar with, one version of the adaptation could either be approved with joy or be rejected in disagreement.

Similar to Stam's take on fidelity, Thomas Leitch attempts to define adaptation for what it is or does, as opposed to a question Hutcheon asks in her *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006) regarding what an adaptation is not, in his 'Adaptation and Intertextuality, or What isn't an Adaptation, and What Does it Matter?' article. Leitch chooses to look at text, as film adaptation scholar John Bryant proposes, that 'no text is a fixed thing: there are always a variety of manuscript versions, revisions, and print editions (87).' Leitch therefore posits that 'adaptation is a subset of intertextuality—all adaptations are obviously intertexts, but it is much less obvious that all intertexts are adaptations—and review nine different accounts of

the relation between adaptation and intertextuality (89).’ The nine points provided are as follows:

1. Adaptations are exclusively cinematic, involving only films that are based on novels or plays or stories.
2. Adaptations are exclusively intermedial, involving the transfer of narrative elements from one medium to another.
3. Adaptations are counter-ekphrases.
4. Adaptations are texts whose status depends on the audiences acceptance of a deliberate invitation to read them as adaptations.
5. Adaptations are examples of a distinctive mode of transtextuality.
6. Adaptations are translations.
7. Adaptations are performances.
8. Adaptations are quintessential examples of intertextual practice.
9. Adaptations are a distinctive instance, but not a central or quintessential instance, of intertextuality.

Leitch comments and provides in each point some problems or limitations observed:

Adaptations in point 1 is too exclusive, meaning it excludes all other media such as ‘operas, ballets, theatrical plays, web pages, YouTube videos based on earlier texts... (90).’

Adaptations in point 2 indicates a ‘complementary ...[and] widespread existence of adaptation that are intramedial rather than intermedial...The result is to parcel out adaptation among transmedial, intramedial and intermedial operations instead of considering it as a unified set of texts or textual operations or a unified disciplinary field (92).’ In point 3, Leitch points out the focus on text over image in adaptation studies and posits that a focus in ekphrasis is beneficial to enriching the content of adaptation studies (94). In point 4, Leitch concludes that the intentions and a focus on the reader behind the written work are purely finance-driven, which poses as a problem when becoming the definition of adaptations (96). Regarding adaptations transtextuality, Leitch uses the not-absolutely-defined nature of Gérard Genette’s five transtextuality characteristic of ‘literature in the second degree’ from his *Palimpsests* to demonstrate the difficulty to define this field by showing how ‘elusive’ Genette behaves when asked to provide an absolute definition to it (97). As a response to Linda Costanzo Cahir’s reversal of George Bluestone’s analogy of adaptation and translation, Leitch writes in agreement with Cahir in point 6 that adaptations is not translations, for reasons of the fundamental difference of each actions and what it entails, as Cahir points out: translations

would erase the need of the original (text) altogether, while adaptations are the result of the original (text) being retained after major transformation (97-98). In point 7, as a continuation on Cahir's statement on the difference between adaptation and translation, Leitch reverses the equation that adaptations are translations and argues that adaptations are, instead, performances. Leitch argues that adaptations in terms of screenplay are, in fact, performances (100), which means adaptations are basically the blueprints for everything that should happen in the action of performing the text out. Point 8 and 9 are two connected yet conflicting models regarding adaptations and intertextuality, in which, after having discussed the two different angles of attempting to define adaptations: one, providing an absolute definition before going further ('inside out,' 103) and two, asking questions and search from the exterior to the centre ('outside in,' 103) Leitch concludes by writing ,

I propose a third alternative based on the fact that the field has been marked over the past ten years by a notable lack of consensus about the extent, the methodology, and the boundaries appropriate to its objects of study – except, of course, for the near-unanimous rejection of fidelity discourse, the bad object of adaptation studies – and an equally notable efflorescence of provocative scholarship. After reviewing the problems involved in organizing the discipline more rigorously, adaptation scholars may well decide to defer the question of what isn't an adaptation indefinitely. After all, no matter how they answer that question, they will be imposing new disciplinary constraints on a field that may well flourish more successfully when a thousand flowers bloom (103).

Thus, Leitch leave the question regarding adaptations as a multi-faceted object yet to be defined with unequivocal certainty.

Given the fact that the present thesis is focusing on film adaptation (as well as the film evangelical potential), a collection of different theories on adaptation modes provide an insight as to how to analyse any chosen films, including, but not limited to, the Narnia film. Though the importance of fidelity is emphasised throughout, as McFarlane acknowledges other scholars' theories of categorising different ways of adapting films, discussions on which mode is applied more for the 2005 Narnia film are provided in Chapter 3.5.3 in Case Study (see pp. 91-92).

2.3 Narrative and Consciousness - McFarlane, Ray, Bluestone, Wagner, Fjeld and Hutcheon

Stories are generally formed with narration, characters and plot, the key criterion fidelity may be preserved when at least a bit of each aspects of the story are taken into consideration in adaptation. This section provides McFarlane's take on the aspect of narrative in story. Later on, in Case Study, narrative is taken as a way to analyse how sequences of event unfold in the story. In stating, '...what novels and films most strikingly have in common is the potential and propensity for narrative (12),' McFarlane posits, in his *Novel to Film* (1996), narrative is of central importance to both fiction and film. However, McFarlane makes a distinction between narrative and narration. 'In the proliferating terminology of film theory, a further parallel frequently subsumes the categories referred to above of narrative and narration, story and discourse in discussion of *enunciated* and *enunciation* (20).' Like story and narrative, *enunciated* refers to the act, the product and the result of narrating. And like discourse and narration, *enunciation* refers to the process of a narrator narrating alongside the story.

There are a few other analogy of terms mentioned, but with preference, McFarlane uses the *enunciated-enunciation* relationship to define the differences between narrative and narration (20):

- (i) those elements of the original novel which are transferable because not tied to one or other semiotic system—that is, essentially, *narrative*[*enunciated*].
- (ii) those which involve intricate processes of adaptation because their effects are closely tied to the semiotic system in which they are manifested—that is, *enunciation*.

McFarlane's preference on 'enunciation' over 'narration' is one of scope. He feels *enunciation* is a better description to include the entire 'expressive apparatus the governs the presentation—and reception—of the narrative (20).' For simplicity's sake, the narrative analysis on Narnia follows McFarlane's own method when analysing his case studies and focuses on the sequence of events that unfold in the story. In order to identify how the act of *enunciation*, the Case Study on Narnia examines the product of the act, the *enunciated*.

Extracting from Roland Barthes' terms, McFarlane applies Barthes' *functions proper* and *indices*. *Functions proper* refers to incidents that happen in the story. In a chronological sense *functions proper* operates in the linearity that time in reality abides in. *Indices*, on the other hand, take place when certain relevant information is singled out to provide insights in depth. If *functions proper* could be visualised to be working in a horizontal fashion, *indices* is

considered to be working in a vertical one. Furthermore, Barthes divides functions (proper) into *cardinal functions* (or *nuclei*) and *catalysers*. Cardinal functions are considered to be the ‘cross-roads’ of narrative, a point worth noting in the story and can open up different directions or possibilities in the development and therefore play a significant role in narratives. Cardinal functions could be the equivalent of ‘*kernel*s (narrative moments that give rise to cruxes in the direction taken by events (14),’ a term from Seymour Chatman. Catalysers, or *satellites* in Chatman’s term, are the details given that help accumulate the story to the turning point of the ‘cross-road’ cardinal functions. Catalysers are there to make the events in the story richer (13-14). Neither cardinal functions or catalysers are restricted to the fiction medium, both can be conveyed verbally, visually and audio-visually. On the other hand, in the indices part, Barthes further divides it into *indices proper* and *informants* (14). The indices proper refer to concepts related to characters, surroundings and perhaps settings, and this leave more room that are open for different interpretation or adaptation than the word-by-word follow-up from fiction to film. Informants, however, refer to more specific information, such as the names, ages and occupations of characters that are already established and can be of immediately effective importance. Comparing Barthes and Chatman, McFarlane summarises, ‘[w]hat Barthes designates as cardinal functions and catalysers constitutes the formal content of narrative which may be considered independently of what Chatman calls ‘its manifesting substance’ (e.g. novel or film), and informants, in their objective name-ability, help to embed this formal content in a realized world, giving specificity to its abstraction (14-15).’ McFarlane uses Barthes’ cardinal functions and catalysers when analysing the events in the story, however, the importance of each terms may also apply to the significance each character contains in the story. In Chapter 3.4 on Character Functions of the Case Study, a thorough analysis is provided on most of the characters in the Narnia story in order to better present the process of adapting the story from novel to film while keeping fidelity. (See pp. 78-89).

In discussing narrative and their potentials in film, McFarlane singles out the first-person narration, which he calls a ‘precarious analogy between the attempts at first-person narration offered by films and the novel’s first-person narration, comprising the individual discourses of each character surrounded by a continuing (generally past-tense) discourse which is attributed to a known and named narrator who may or may not be an active participant in the events of the novel (15). Dividing the first-person narration, McFarlane categories of ‘the subjective cinema’ and ‘oral narration of voice-over.’ In ‘the subjective

cinema,' McFarlane refers to how the subjectivity of characters are presented in an objective point of view. He concludes that even though the techniques in film allow flexibility in physical shift of viewpoints in the characters, they are less applicable to do the same thing on a psychological level in the characters. Secondly, in 'oral narration or voice-over,' McFarlane posits such technique could serve as a significance in film in that the viewer is submerged in a relatively objective and omniscient sense of the film in the face of the combination of verbal words in the back and images. In the voice-over technique (in film), the film resists the novel's first-person narration and provides a broader view of the whole story rather than looking at the story through one character.

Discussing from an analytical perspective, as he writes in his 'The Field of "Literature and Film,"' published in James Naremore's edited *Film Adaptation* (2000), Robert B. Ray posits one needs to be studying the differences between film and literature (fiction/novel) from 'general' to the most specific and 'immediate,' as he categorises: '1. The nature of narrative, 2. The norm of cinema, 3. The methods of academic literary and film study and 4. The exigencies of the academic profession (39).' Ray addresses the strong link between film and storytelling when discussing the nature of narrative for both forms. Quoting Barthes, Ray makes a point that 'cultural codes,' meaning 'conventions, connotations, topoi and tropes' are transferrable between different forms (39). Main-stream industry that makes its film production paramount by producing a lot of popular films like Hollywood, as Ray observes, recognises the transferability between film, literature and its ability to make or dictate meaning. Concluding that, the same as ideology, Ray posits that narrative is not medium specific (40).

Under a disagreeing light, Bluestone, who posits that fiction and film are two incomparable media, uses his 'Modes of Consciousness' to demonstrate how the novel surrounds itself with what goes on internally rather than what happens in actions. Using E. M. Foster's words, '[t]he hidden life is, by definition, hidden.' Bluestone points out 'it is the function of the novelist to reveal the hidden life at its source (46).' On the other hand, Bluestone writes, '[w]here the novel discourses, the film must picture (47),' pointing out that films hugely focus on the external, the actions. Bluestone argues that the viewer may not get to know the thoughts or consciousness of a character like a reader does when reading a novel, the thoughts and consciousness can only be 'inferred (48),' resonating what Foster posits regarding the hidden life, '[t]he hidden life that appears in external signs is hidden no longer, has entered the realm of action (46).' To conclude, Bluestone explains films 'are almost

always disappointing' when presenting the abstract concept such as the retrospective angle, consciousness or subconsciousness (48). In the Case Study on Narnia, since the analysis focuses on how the fidelity theme of love is adapted into the film, description on how the film presents the abstract concept of love is provided.

With a focus on the viewer instead of the product viewed, and in his 'Psychology of Cinema' chapter in *The Novel and the Cinema* (1975), Wagner points out the difference between fiction and film when it comes to the internal process, consciousness, '[p]sychologically, it could be said that in a novel you control the medium, but film controls you (142-143).' Focusing mainly on the presentational methods in films, Wagner describes there is a power in the 'visual affect in principally ideological subject-matter (143).' Comparing fiction and film, Wagner explains that the novel requires the reader to participate ('engage' is the word used) actively and produce a mental image as s-/he reads to process the story, whereas the film provides its viewers a passive position to receive those images as they are presented nearly in the same fashion as the reality, in most cases (147). However passive a viewer may be in comparison to a reader, the form of a film allows the viewers to be actively engaging himself or herself in the story through the angle of a voyeur (155) and with a mixture of empathy, namely, 'self-recognition (152)' or 'pseudo-"identification"' (155).'

Similarly focused on the viewer, in her M.A. thesis, 'Letters or Image, or Both? A Study of How and Why People engage in Novel- and Film version of Popular Narratives,' Trude Fjeld cites, compares the novel and the film and points out that the film consists of some additional elements that allow the viewer to engage in the film to as deep an extend as the psychological experience the novel provides: sounds, music, effect and different plotline (23-24). Sounds can '[enhance] realism by reproducing sounds one would normally associate with the actions and events depicted visually,' according to 'Turner (1990) (23).' Music, being conventionally and widely used in films, performs the same enhancement with an additional emotional element that helps the viewers engage. Effects in terms of the light, colouring in the presentation of the film also are influencing factors to the viewers' engagement. Lastly, a rearrangement of the plotline may also help enhancing the engagement and identification from the viewer to the film's presented story (24).

Breaking from the main-streamed focus on the film and the less focused viewer; introducing the driving force of an element in film industry: marketing; and in her *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006), Linda Hutcheon uses the same word as Wagner, 'engage,' and categorises

there be different modes of engagement: telling, showing and performance; all three of them interactive between the story and its readers/viewers (22-27). The interaction between the story and the reader/viewer is largely influence by the media used, every difference on the method used to transport the story from its source to its receiving end indicates a butterfly effect cast on the engagement part of the process (22). The telling mode of engagement evolves around the form of the written being read: a novel. This mode, with its designed and chosen words, ‘begins in the realm of imagination (23).’ The mode of showing, on the other hand, presents the story with moving image, which includes small details as well as the big picture, everything in a speed controlled by the showing side of this interaction (23). Lastly, the performance mode includes other elements used in showing the story to its viewer, such as music, which may have an emotional denotation and therefore elicit (sometimes enhanced) reactions in the viewers, creating interaction. Hutcheon, on the other hand, also points out that the showing and telling modes each has their own specialty area that the other can not supersede (23). Each mode has their strong suits and shortcomings: the telling can not demonstrate the actual image but can provide very specific verbal or mental details that though the showing can provide every information in one image of, there is no guarantee that the receiving end would understand what is emphasised (23); the showing can present to its viewer the actual piece of melody in the story, which the telling can not achieve, but as mentioned, the showing does not manage to be as verbally specific as the telling manages (25). As the showing generally evolves in images and sounds, and requires no active initiation from the viewers in the process of delivering the content, in the case of Narnia, the story within the images and sounds; whereas the telling requires the readers to initiate and actively participate in order to ‘acquire’ what the text has to say; it is fair to assume that showing serves the purpose of evangelising better, especially when the viewers are not necessarily actively looking to know more about the value of Christian love.

Later on in her book, Hutcheon revisits the modes of engagement and bring the concept of modes of engagement further by adding one more determining agent: the adapters and those who market adaptations (128), making mentions that the director in the film, being aware of the power of the camera and his power of directing where the camera points to, becomes one deciding role in the interaction between the story and the viewers (128-129). Looking at engagement in a different way, Hutcheon quotes Bruce Morrisette, ‘[h]as the novel ever evoked, even in its most intense action sequence, the physical empathy affecting the muscles, the glands, the pulse, and breathing rate that chase, suspense, and other

extremely dynamic sequences in film bring about in most, if not all, viewers? (1985: 26) (130-131).’ Dividing engagement in terms of space and time, Hutcheon compares the power that the viewer holds when viewing a film and watching a live play. In terms of space: Using Peter Brook’s statement regarding films’ usage of image in its ‘immediacy,’ “‘When the image is there in all its power, at the precise moment when it is being received, one can neither think, nor feel, nor imagine anything else” (1987: 190) (131),’ Hutcheon comments on how, in contrast, the audience of a play still has the autonomy to decide where to look on the stage, what to think about regarding what is in focus, and so forth. In terms of time: Hutcheon discusses the ‘present-ness’ in how easily disturbance may surface when the viewer is receiving the story when the viewer watches a film (and television and plays) and when the reader reads a novel. Hutcheon points out, ‘[m]ost obviously, readers are always in control of the process of solitary reading. But novels take time and often lots of it to consume; films must be shorter, in part because of the audience’s inability to halt the process, except by leaving the theater (133).’ Considering a film is about presenting its story, the art of narrative becomes a central ground in analysis. Following McFarlane’s example, the Case Study on Narnia will also be taking a closer look on the chosen film’s narrative. However, the study on the viewer is nearly impossible to hypothesise, as the human variant creates infinite reception of the story in film. Therefore the Case Study structure will remain following McFarlane’s emphasis on film’s narrative.

2.4 Authorship - Wollen, Astruc, Cobb, Boozer and Russell

McFarlane does not address the element of authors in film adaptation, but roughly mentions the fact that there is an author for the written work in the general information section in the beginning of his case studies. However, considering the author of the novel is of decisive position on how the story develops and the director of equally the same position (auteur theory) on how the film is presented, a section of Authorship is added when analysing and considering film adaptation, introducing various scholars and their theories on this subject.

Regarding the film auteur and in his ‘The Auteur Theory,’ Peter Wollen introduces the role of an auteur not as one person (the director) but two styles of presenting the story in the adaptation: one is the kind that ‘insisted on revealing a core of meanings,’ and the other ‘stressed style and *mise en scène* (186).’ This division is similar to McFarlane’s being faithful ‘to the words’ and being faithful ‘to the spirit’ as mentioned earlier. Wollen admits that in the

production of the auteur, a film direction may not always be able to control every single detail him-/herself, explaining that this is ‘why the auteur theory involves a kind of decipherment, decryptment... a great many features of films analysed have to be dismissed as indecipherable because of “noise” from the producers, the cameraman, or even the actors... (193).’ However, because of the fact that a film production consists of many people, including but not limited to the director, Wollen clarifies that the auteur theory is explained to be the structure of a number of films adapted by the same director and ‘everything irrelevant to [the structure], everything non-pertinent, is considered logically secondary, contingent, to be discarded (193).’ Much like the importance of an author to his/-er text, the director, namely, the auteur weighs the same to his/-er film. Wollen’s theory helps understanding the Narnia film in terms of how director Andrew Adamson, the auteur, could edit parts of the story when transforming it into film. In general, Wollen considers the auteur theory to be more than a personal expression on the part of the film director but more similar to a report of the story by the director through ‘on empirical grounds’ and ‘through the force of [the director’s] preoccupations that an unconscious, unintended meaning can be decoded in the film, usually to the surprise of the individual involved (195).’ Because of the empirical factor in the production of the film, the auteur theory suggests a superiority of the source text as Wollen asserts that ‘the spectator has to work at reading the text (196).’

Lastly, Wollen brings in the critics as he discusses the decoding process of viewing an adaptation. After pointing out issues of different interpretations in the spectator and how there is not one version of interpretation that would define the film, Wollen concludes and suggests that ‘we...concentrate on the productivity of the work’ and evaluate an adaptation by whether or not the film has demonstrated itself to generate a continuous strand of conversing opinions in addition to new interpretations of the story (197). Focusing exclusively on film adaptation, Wollen takes the adapted film to be a part of a conversation between auteur and author. Ultimately, by his theory, the viewers become listeners of a conversation between two artists. Wollen’s theory applies to the Narnia film in terms of what the director of the film could bring to the adaptation and form details that are otherwise not described in the original source novel. Therefore, a brief information section on director Andrew Adamson is included in the Case Study on Narnia.

With an agreeing tone of voice (towards Wollen) and treating the role of a director as an equivalent of writer and in his ‘The Birth of a New Avant-Garde La Caméra-Stylo’ article, Alexandra Astruc describes the cinema has become a place for outlet of expression, opinions

or simply an opportunity to make a mark (182). Just like all other forms of art, within cinema there is an artist that uses his/her pen to produce his/her work. Astruc proposes to look at the camera (for shooting a film) as a *caméra-stylo* (camera-pen), used by the auteur, namely, the director (or the artist). Astruc further posits that ‘cinema is now moving towards a form which is making it such a precise language that it will soon be possible to write ideas directly on film without even having to resort to those heavy associations of images that were the delight of the silent cinema. In other words, in order to suggest the passing of time, there is no need to show falling leaves and then apple trees in blossom; and in order to suggest that a hero wants to make love there are surely other ways of going about it than showing a saucepan of milk boiling over on the stove, as Clouzot does in *Quai des Orfevres* (182-183).’ Insisting on treating the cinema as the equivalent of literature, Astruc posits there are no limits as to what could be conveyed through films. Using the camera as a pen, Astruc considers the cinema ‘the vehicle of thought (183).’ Calling it a ‘tendency,’ Astruc predicts that the day when the cinema is able to write like ‘the film-maker/author writes with his camera as a writer writes with his pen (183)’ in a future that will soon arrive as observations are made that the film production in general has a tendency to focus on the future and develops at speed as structures take form. Astruc’s theory elevates the role of director in the production of a film adaptation. If the Case Study were to include such emphasis on the director of the film, the result would be with a different focus entirely. As it is the Narnia story that is of main focus, the Case Study remains mostly following McFarlane’s method in focusing more on the story’s events, narrative and characters.

However, in a disagreeing tone, Shelley Cobb, in her ‘Film Authorship and Adaptation,’ addresses the differences between a writer (author of an adaptation, for example) and a scriptwriter, pointing out that the culture nowadays complicates the context in which adaptation lies. Being driven on the equation that originality means ownership and authority, Cobb writes, ‘[a]daptation never considers the director’s role as an author of the film adaptation... (106),’ before Cobb posits that the culture at hand is one that does not tolerate more than one author at the same time. At the same time, Cobb describes the relationship between a film auteur and a book’s author to be discursive by nature like a ‘battle that is often metaphorically haunted by the specter of death (108).’ Moreover, Cobb’s angle regarding the rise of the auteur is through gender, stating that the mass culture or society favours the male over the female and is overall patriarchal. Specifically, Cobb takes Astruc’s article as an example from the main-stream and masculine perspective (107).

Bringing back the focus on fidelity and addressing on the film auteur in regards to fidelity, Cobb summarises that it has ‘plagued adaptation criticism’ and turned the adaptation into an ‘artistic reproduction’ instead of a ‘production (108),’ taking away the creativity from the artist and denying him/her the right to ownership and authority. Taking François Truffaut’s interview with Alfred Hitchcock regarding adapting novels into films as an example, Cobb reveals that Hitchcock’s attitude of valuing his position as an auteur keeps himself from taking on the task of adapting any written fiction considered a masterpiece or a classic because ‘by definition..., masterpieces are unadaptable; the inevitable circular reasoning implicit ... is that anything that is adaptable or that is an adaptation is not a masterpiece.’ and as Truffaut agrees in his interview with Hitchcock, ‘... a masterpiece is something that has already found its perfect form, its definitive form (110).’ This then explains Hitchcock’s habit of reading novel ‘just once... and forget all about the book and start to create cinema,’ for as long as he ‘likes the basic idea’ of the story (109).

Using Timothy Corrigan’s words as foundation: ‘fidelity has become a fully archaic aesthetic measure, except as one [the auteur] can be faithful to one’s own self, desire, tastes, imagination, and inclinations (111),’ Cobb establishes the paradox that the so-called fidelity to the fiction in a film adaptation must be at the cost of infidelity to the auteur’s self as s-/he identifies herself/himself with the author of the source text instead of staying faithful to her/his own interpretation of the text (112). In addition to the paradox within the role of an auteur, Cobb moves on to a feminine take on adaptation using the examples of Jane Campion’s adaptations of *The Piano* and *The Portrait of a Lady*; making a point that ‘what it means to be a canonical author or a cinema auteur is not the same for everyone who acquires that status (115),’ and by this Cobb means gender. Pointing out the difficulty for a female to reach the same achievement as an auteur and maintain her status while it comes with relative ease for a male auteur to do just that (116).

Lastly, in her ‘Trademark or Signature?’ section, Cobb discusses the source a film auteur draws his/her power from: ‘marketing and reception (118),’ revealing the competitive nature of the game in adaptation. In this competition, a film auteur must try to gain the authority of his/her adaptation and compete with the power of the story’s author. Cobb concludes in regards of ‘the inevitable spectres of loss and authorial death that haunt the study of adaptation...It seems the only way to exorcise these ghosts is to pay close attention to those “individual bodies” in which texts are based, and to remember that not all bodies, and therefore, not all authors, are equal (119).’

Resonating to Cobb's division of the writer and the scriptwriter, Jack Boozer presents a point of view in which the screenwriter possesses a significance that may be of equal ground as the director (202). Indeed, in some cases, the screenwriter and the director may well be the same individual. The screenwriter's position is of the text in terms of dialogues, the director's, on the other hand, concerns more of the camera filming and how the images will be presented on the screen. Boozer recognises the issue of 'authorial intent' and makes it linked to the fidelity criterion. By looking to the author for the original purpose behind the story and looking to the director and to the film auteur for what is done in the adapting process, Boozer provides three terminologies for the styles of adaptation with film examples (204):

1. A literal or close reading: Ishmael Merchant-James Ivory adaptation of *Howards End* with Ruth Praver Jhabvala as writer.
2. A general correspondence: Anthony Minghella's 'reading' of Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient*.
3. A distant referencing: Coen brothers' tacit borrowing from Homer's *The Odyssey* for *O Brother, Where Art Thou?*

Taking Hollywood as an example, Boozer demonstrates how, as a big industry with consumer demands, many studios have their own routine of how the screenwriters are to produce works productively. Having a designated story department, the studios produce screenplays as if everything is assembled and made ready on a production line.

However, in what Boozer terms as New Wave auteurism, Boozer points out a turn as an influence of creativity is given to the position of the director, making the director an interpreter of the story (208). Despite of the focus on the director, Boozer still argues that screenwriters' role is perhaps equally important, if not more, considering what the screenwriter produces lay largely in the narrative of the film, and narrative 'has immediate, significant cultural relevancy (209).' In the end of the section on New Wave, Boozer concludes that only through good collaborations of screenwriter, director and producer can the adaptation stand a chance to claim 'artistic as well as cultural power (211).'

Lastly, as the auteur theory takes more and more focus in adaptation into semiotics, Boozer notes the source text author are added into the network of relationship. Being the one that writes the original story, the authority given to the author of the source text is undeniable. Like Foucault's 'author-function (212),' 'many case studies look to issues of authorship for understanding (213).' The image (and sound) and words are closely connected in an

intertextual context through film adaptation, as Boozer points out, ‘there appears to be a longing for the audio-visual image in the descriptive suggestion of the word, and a longing for the word to describe the full immediacy of the film image (214).’ Boozer’s in the end proposes viewers and critics alike to have an adaptive focus on the ‘sensitivity to adaptive film authorship,’ by looking at all three aspects (‘texts’)—‘Literary, Script intertext and Film’ (214) and look from small details like a character’s thought for clues to identify the working of adaptation methods.

Like Hutcheon and her note on the influence of the marketing factor, in his ‘Authorship, Commerce, and Harry Potter,’ James Russell addresses what Cobb mentions, the financial/business-related aspect of the relationship within adaptation: marketing. Using Harry Potter, specifically *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince* (2009) as an example, Russell demonstrates how, as simple as the theory sometimes makes it sound, the moment from the story is conceived in the author’s mind to the moment the story makes appearance on a cinema screen in a film is a long and complicated journey. In the case of Harry Potter, the most crucial and consistent people involve the author (J. K. Rowling), studio owner (David Heyman, owner of Hayday Films) and financial source (Warner Bros., who is also the distributor). When referring to the auteur theory, Russell writes, ‘even though many within the field refute the auteur theory, the value of the director as a brand and the status of the director as a central creative contributor, remains relatively unchallenged (393).’ Russell then focuses on the ‘creative authority’ aspect of film adaptation. Agreeing with Hutcheon’s reasoning,

[f]ilms are like operas in that there are many and varied artists involved in the complex process of their adaptation. Nevertheless it is evident from both studio press releases and critical response that the director is ultimately held responsible for the overall vision and therefore for the adaptation. Yet someone else usually writes the screenplay that begins the process... For this reason, in a film, the director and screenwriter share the primary task of adaptation. (2006: 85) (393).

Russell argues ‘identifying the director and the screenwriter alongside the original author as important creative contributors fits well within the bounds of literary and film scholarship. There are more authors here, but they still have creative authority (393).’ In his telling the developments of how Harry Potter comes to global attention, Russell shows how Rowling’s method of promotion as the author of her Harry Potter story is to ‘actively and currently

doing' something on the social media keeps the relationship of herself, her readers and her story progress in a lively, active and evolving nature. When the story calls the attention of David Hayman, the owner of Hayday Film, the beginning of a sequence of actions is set off. Hayman sends words of his notice and possible interest to Warner Bros., and eventually becomes the supervising producer on all Harry Potter movies.

Aside from Rowling and Hayman, according to Russell, Harry Potter movies 'have had four directors, six cinematographer and four composers.' Because the story's seven parts are spread out to eight films, all of them are over-two-hour-long in length, consistency must be maintained to keep the story's position in the market and, more importantly, to keep Harry Potter's fans rooting for the central character of the story, Harry Potter. The Harry Potter story, soon after its popularity in the form of novel and film, is developed into a franchise, which leads to a pursuit that seeks after the profit this story could bring out. Even though the story's 8-part films have had 'Chris Columbus, the American direct of of the first two films,' who 'was replaced by the Mexican art-house director Alfonso Cuarón for the third' before '[being] succeeded by Mike Newell, and then directing duties passed to David Yates for the final three films'; 'each director has brought a distinctive look to their entries in the franchise... These director have worked within a tightly managed system—they have overseen a large and established creative team, and worked under the control of a driven and directed producer (399).' In terms of directors, as Russell describes, if possess proof of success in the past, may gain a considerate amount of freedom, 'even for relatively experimental approaches, as long as they make money (397).'

With such a money-driven background thriving, the business of franchise at times becomes interfering with the story. Some details in the films must serve multi-purposes of being a part of the story as they are supposed to appear and of being potential replica products for commercial uses to increase revenue. Russell also points to Warner Bros., who 'used its status as the major financial contributor to directly influence all manner of creative decisions, from who to hire, through to the actual look of the film (397).' In addition to that, the tone of camera (image) shots may vary slightly from film to film under scrutinising eyes, but the theme of the story, once built from the first Harry Potter film, remained consistent throughout. The same applies to the music.

Lastly, to continue the on the consistency discussed, Steve Kloves is the screenwriter in seven of the eight Harry Potter films. Kloves, in Russell's opinion, has approached his

scripts with a shift ‘from almost total faithfulness to a more nuanced, distinctive adaptation. In particular, Kloves has removed much of the back-story from the films, emphasizing Harry’s journey over and over incidental events (398).’ Even as Kloves changes the focus on certain parts of the story here and there in the film, as he remains the screenwriter for nearly all the Harry Potter films, the consistency remains. The Harry Potter films have had a few directors throughout, but one decisive position in the production of Harry Potter films remains to be one of David Heyman. ‘Everyone working on the franchise, from casting agents and costume designers through to directors and starts, reports to Heyman, who has logistical and creative oversights through his control of the production budget.’ Heyman’s preference over the ‘melancholic moments, the nice quiet moments’ in the story is likely to be the pushing hand behind what sets the general tone of all eight Harry Potter films, as Russell posits, ‘although Heyman has claimed that he has allowed the various directors total creative latitude, his decisions regarding which directors to employ have shaped the overall texture of the movies, as has his close working relationship with Steve Kloves and others (398) .’

Russell’s point of view on authorship may not be purely focused on the author and the screenwriter as some other theorists, but his point on the financial influence in the adaptation production applies to other films adapted from a source text (especially the popular ones), while giving examples on how the author, the auteur and the screenwriter use their influence and significance to interact in the case of adaptation. This discovery is important in the case of Narnia film because of the fact that Adamson works with co-producer Douglas Gresham, who is one of the two stepsons of C. S. Lewis, author of the Narnia series (see pp. 93-94) and that Adamson himself also took on parts of the screen-writer role in addition to his director role. Doubtless to say, the forming of the Narnia film is influenced by not just one person. The role of the author/auteur in novel/film is undeniably important. Though there might be other deciding parts in a film production that could change the outcome of the film, such as the producer, screen-writer, or even the actor him-/herself; ultimately, it is still the auteur/director that bears the weight of the film in terms of decision-making. This then justifies the decision to include Authorship as a part of consideration regarding film adaptation. This way, one knows even better of the intention behind the way the film presents the story.

2.5 Special Focus – Christian Love (Lewis)

Taking love as a primary focus on which Christianity is based, the sole important message countless of missionaries and preachers based their evangelising messages on and considering Lewis' Narnia story to be a way to show the theme of love, this section focuses on Lewis' *The Four Loves* (1960). *The Four Loves* is of central material in the examination in Case Study section.

In his *The Four Loves*, Lewis provides four categories of love. Starting with a basic division, Lewis differentiates what he terms as 'gift-love' from 'need-love (1).' Calling gift-love the divine love, Lewis refers to the relationship between God and His Son. In the book of John, 3:16, 'For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life (NIV).' God gives His Son to the world and the world in the end redeems the world by sacrificing Himself and His blood. This relationship defines the divine love, which is given unconditionally and without the expectations or demands of reciprocal gestures. On the other hand, need-love carries an underlining basis which can be either biological, mental and spiritual - in a nutshell - natural. Lewis describes, 'Need-love, the greatest of all, either coincides with or at least makes a main ingredient in man's highest, healthiest, and most realistic spiritual condition. A very strange corollary follows. Man approaches God most nearly when he is in one sense least like God (3).' Having explained the paradox that need-love can both be a need wanting to be fulfilled and a need to fulfil the need, Lewis then explains the difference between what he calls 'nearness-by-likeness,' and 'nearness-of-approach' which has a focus on the mindset. Where nearness-by-likeness might be a factual closeness, the nearness-of-approach focuses more on the attitude that becomes the foundation and the driving force (5). Applying this to the Christian relationship to God, nearness-by-likeness is achieved by being created in His image, whereas nearness-by-approach is only accomplished when the act of seeking sets his/her mind on God Himself all the time. Lewis then introduces the four categories: Affection, Friendship, Eros and Charity.

Affection is considered to be 'the humblest and most widely diffused of loves (31),' Lewis points out affection is what humans shares mutually with animals. In his own words, Lewis' defines affection to be mostly directed towards parents and descendants. Affection also extends to siblings and is in general 'the least discriminating of loves (32).' Having described affection to be basically as 'liking a lot,' Lewis points out that 'affection would not be affection if it was loudly and frequently expressed; to produce it in public is like getting

your household furniture out for a move. It did very well in its place, but it looks shabby or tawdry or grotesque in the sunshine. Affection almost slinks or seeps through out lives. It lives with humble un-dress, private things; soft slippers, old clothes, old jokes, the thump of a sleepy dog's tail on the kitchen floor, the sound of a sewing-machine, a gollywog left on the lawn (33-34).' Lewis clarifies that he does not try to separate these categories of love from one another, but that one may well be mixed and layered with another (34). Affection appears to be very much rooted in the concept of appreciation, not the kind driven on appearance, or personal tastes, but the kind that take the recipient just as s-/he is (36). Within affection exist both the need-love and gift-love and may be considered 'Love Himself (37).' However, as affection is well mixed with some other categories of love, such as eros and charity, whose one common trait is choice, Lewis introduces the next category.

Friendship is one of the four loves that is based on choices. Lewis describes friendship to be the 'least natural of loves, the least instinctive, organic, biological, gregarious and necessary (57).' Much like the people in history, Lewis agrees that friendship is the purest love there is because it is a choice one makes, not a necessity. One can live one's life without ever having a friend. Being exclusive by nature and diverse in reality, friendship 'is a relation between men at their highest level of individuality. It withdraws them by two's and three's. Some forms of democratic sentiment are naturally hostile to it because it is selective and an affair of the few. To say, "Theses are my friends" implies "Those are not." (59).'

Differentiating Friendship from the erotic kind of love, Lewis points out, '[l]overs are always talking to one another about their love; Friends hardly ever about their Friendship. Lovers are normally face to face, absorbed in each other; Friends, side by side, absorbed in some common interest (61).'

Lewis therefore makes a distinction between Friendship and Eros, before introducing what he defines to be the 'matrix' of Friendship: Companionship (64). Being the environment of Friendship, Companionship becomes the basis on which Friendship rises and is often mistaken for Friendship. However, there is a difference between Friendship and Companionship. Being the environment of Friendship, Companionship emphasises on the togetherness while Friendship on the fact that there is a commonly shared goal or interests being focused on in the relationship. In Friendship there is, as Lewis portrays, a chance for it to go from 'admiration' to 'Appreciative love' and this transition is 'firmly based that each member of the circle feels, in his secret heart, humbled before all the rest (71).'

Friendship, being the kind of love that exists because of a conscious choice is what made it 'almost above humanity' for our forefathers (77). Applying Christianity and Friendship, Lewis analyses that

the Scripture does not include this love in describing the relationship between God and Man; instead, it focuses on what is ‘natural and instinctive...Affection is taken as the image when God is represented as our Father; Eros, when Christ is represented as the Bridegroom of the Church (78).’ Where the people of the past considered Friendship to be the highest of all loves, Scripture seldom upholds it to the same height. Lewis explains that the reason for this is for the likelihood that the relationship between God and Man be misunderstood if Friendship is taken as a symbol (87). In regards to Friendship in the Christian sense, Lewis writes,

[i]n reality, a few years’ difference in the dates of our births, a few more miles between certain houses, the choice of one university instead of another posting to different regiments, the accident of a topic being raised or not raised at a first meeting—any of these chances might have kept us apart. But for a Christian, there are, strictly speaking, no chances. A secret Master of the Ceremonies has been at work. Christ, who said to the disciples ‘Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you,’ can truly say to every group of Christian friends ‘You have not chosen one another but I have chosen you for one another.’ The Friendship is not a reward for our discrimination and good taste in finding one another out. It is the instrument by which God reveals to each the beauties of all the others. They are no greater than the beauties of a thousand other men; by Friendship God opens our eyes to them. They are, like all beauties, derived from Him, and then, in a good Friendship, increased by Him through the Friendship itself, so that it is His instrument for creating as well as for revealing. At this feast it is He who has spread the board and it is He who has chosen the guests. It is He, we may dare to hope, who sometimes does, and always should, preside (89-90).

Here Lewis concludes that although Friendship is not often used as a symbol in the Scripture to portrays God’s relationship with Man, it is, nonetheless, the working mechanism between God and Man, existing at the same time as there is a certain anarchy between the Creator (God) and the created (Man).

Thirdly, Lewis presents Eros as one of the four loves, referring to ‘being in love (91).’ Lewis extracts Eros from love as a complicated and exclusively human variation, setting it apart from sexual activity. Lewis calls the sexual factor within Eros Venus (91). While Venus is about the sexual intercourse, Eros is about the emotional and psychological level of the

love. Eros generates in the person in love a need for the beloved, which in itself produces pleasure. This need of the beloved is a desire to know that beloved in an Appreciative way. Outside Eros is mostly of a selfish intention, but within Eros is ‘rather about the Beloved (95).’ Lewis, in his extraction, explains, ‘[e]ros is “noblest” or “purest” when Venus is reduced to the minimum (96).’ Taking a theological angle, Lewis describes Eros and Venus with the relationship between the bride and the groom in marriage in a biblical way: husband is the head of the wife, Ephesians 5:25; and that the Church is in one such relationship with Christ, meaning that Christ is the head of the Church (105-106). Lewis explains Venus to be within Eros and that the love Eros produces in a marriage is like that between Christ and his Church: a love that will not give in to faults and flaws, even when those faults and flaws are inevitable. For Eros, ‘all...calculations are irrelevant—just as the coolly brutal judgment of Lucretius is irrelevant to Venus. Even when it becomes clear beyond all evasion that marriage with the Beloved cannot possibly lead to happiness—when it cannot even profess to offer any other life than that of tending an incurable invalid, of hopeless poverty, of exile, or of disgrace—Eros never hesitates to say, “Better this than parting. Better to be miserable with her than happy without her. Let our hearts break provided they break together.” (106-107).’ Eros is a love that inspires what is very close to God’s gift-love. However, Eros on its own is not enough and if ‘honoured without reservation and obeyed unconditionally, becomes a demon (110).’ Eros, the ‘being in love’; without a higher power, namely God, to rule over it; is just ‘driven to promise what Eros of himself cannot perform (114).’ Eros can easily be idolised, but by God’s Grace, Eros can produce a lasting and very appreciative love.

Lastly, Lewis introduces Charity as the fourth love. Of all four loves, Charity is one that involves God the most. Similar to Friendship, Charity is not considered a natural love. However, Charity has an element of gift-love and an element of submission in it. In order to admit there is an authority, God, Lewis points out, ‘...this pretence that we have anything of our own or could for one hour retain by our own strength any goodness that God may pour into us, has kept us from being happy... (131),’ indicating that only in surrender or submission to God’s complete authority over each individual does everyone find true happiness. The submission comes as a decision out of the free will humans are capable of, showing that the two elements are intertwined. Moreover, in discussing love for God and comparing that with love for something/-one else, Lewis detects a rivalry that puts the proportions of love and devotion into question. Positing that ‘all natural loves can be inordinate,’ Lewis confirms that it is the proportions of such love and devotion that the rivalry may surface, but the most

important thing here is the decision that must be made regarding which one in the rivalry one prioritises (122). Finally, in Charity, God transforms the natural loves (gift-love) into something divine: Divine Gift-love, as He is Himself, love (126), and so instead of loving what is naturally considered lovable; with Divine Gift-love, one is able to love what is ‘not naturally lovable; lepers, criminals, enemies, morons, the sulky, the superior and the sneering (128).’ In Charity’s Divine love, God gives His creation Charity, which is Gift-love by Grace. In addition, God ‘bestows two other gifts; a supernatural Need-love of Himself and a supernatural Need-love of one another (129).’ There is yet another gift that His created people may receive from Him by Grace: ‘[h]e can awake in man, towards Himself, a supernatural Appreciative love. This is of all gifts the most desired. Here, not in our natural loves, nor even in ethics, lies the true centre of all human and angelic life. With this all things are possible (140).’ Charity is the love that explains God’s relationship with Man and Man’s relationship with each other by God’s grace.

The understanding of different kinds of love and how they work in and for Man and how that reflects on God’s ultimate love is what helps explain God’s nature and His creation. As Lewis ends his book with,

[p]erhaps, for many of us, all experience merely defines, so to speak, the shape of that gap where our love of God ought to be. It is not enough. It is something. If we cannot “practise the presence of God,” it is something to practise the absence of God, to become increasingly aware of our unawareness till we feel like men who should stand beside a great cataract and hear no noise, or like a man in a story who looks in a mirror and finds no face there, or a man in a dream who stretches out his hand to visible objects and gets no sensation of touch. To know that one is dreaming is to be no longer perfectly asleep. But for news of the fully waking world you must go to my betters (140-141).

Lewis therefore concludes that by knowing more of love as is created and intended, the Man is made conscious of what has not been acknowledged before. The theme on love is analysed in the Case Study on Narnia. The loves that Lewis presents speak powerfully to whoever that has ever felt looked down at, judged, abandoned or just hurt in any way. The love that encourages tolerance and aims to inspire even more love for others in Christianity is key to evangelism for Christianity. It is therefore important to use Lewis’ theory about love to

analyse the Narnia film to see if the fidelity has been kept and the message of love may be discovered for evangelical purposes.

2.6 Evangelical Potentials – Hooten, Falke, Dillon, Davidson, Larsen, Tovey and Goh

This part of the theory examines how Christianity works inside a story and its story-telling. Gathering different scholars' theories on reading (Hooten and Falke), telling/listening (Dillon) and watching (Davidson, Larsen, Tovey and Goh), the potential of discovering Christianity in receiving the story is maximised, and therefore reaching the evangelical goal.

Starting from the perspective of reading, in her article 'After Theory, After Modernity: Reading Humbly (Edited by Cassandra Falke, in her *Intersections in Christianity and Critical Theory*),' Jessica Hooten addresses, from a Christian perspective, the difference of reading as a critic and reading as a reader. The difference between the critic and the reader is that one – the critic – is to 'judge and master the text' and the other – the reader – 'servant to the text (23).' The two different roles of a critic and a reader present two different relationships, one hostile and egocentric, while the other tolerant and accepting. While the critic tends to 'dethrone' the author and elevate the critic's own importance, pursue 'power and authority (24)' onto him-/herself and ironically, in the process produces 'doubt' onto him-/herself (23); the reader roots him-/herself in 'all three aspects of reading—author, text, and reader (24)' and puts on hold the pursuit of power and authority, fully aware of the fact that the work being read at hand is the product of an other writer (25). While the critic becomes more assertive of the self by being critical; the reader, as Hooten quotes C. S. Lewis, '[i]n reading great literature, I become a thousand men and yet remain myself. Like the night sky in the Greek poem, I see with myriad eyes, but it is still I who see. Here, as in worship, in love, in moral action, and in knowing, I transcend myself, and am never more myself than when I do. (1961, p.141);' becomes someone who looks at or examines oneself through the lens of the text. The critic elevates him-/herself to nearly an equal of the author, 'treats the book like a friend.' At the same time, the reader 'tests the text in so far as the text tests her (25).'

Hooten stresses on an 'active acceptance' of the text through reading 'selflessly,' terming the act 'charitable,' a way to reading without any presupposed agenda. The 'passive' acceptance in reading leads to the reading being dominated, while the active one being 'humbly' engaged. Lewis, and Jacobs extract their definition of charitable reading from the 'selfless love of Christ,' and with that comes a 'revering' of a text – 'bowing humbly before

its[the text's] wisdom and authority (26).' Hooten proposes a Christian attitude of reading and agrees with Flannery O'Connor that '[a] reader experiences the meaning, inseparable from the text, and any moral changes occur as an effect in that reader (28).' Taking it further, Hooten concurs with Augustine's suggestion of a 'more humble, selfless approach,' instead of looking for what the reader can get from the text, the reader contemplates on how the text applies to the reader. By the contemplation, the reader allows the text to read him (26). With one of the most important value in Christianity, love, as Lewis suggests, the reader's job is 'to understand rather than to dominate (30).' Much like Lewis' conclusion in *The Four Loves* regarding one being made aware of oneself, Hooten summarises '[i]f we read texts with love, with the appreciation of the other, then we will first lose ourselves and find ourselves in the reading, thereby coming to greater self-awareness.' In reading Narnia, Hooten's theory helps making room for accepting the patriarchy in the story instead of letting that hinder the reader from getting the bigger picture of the value within the story.

Similar to Hooten's theory and in her article 'Good Reading: The Ethics of Christian Literary Theory,' Cassandra Falke proposes to take the biblical way of seeing a communal relationship between the reader, the text and the author like 'bodies' and 'souls,' and that these bodies have 'political' and 'materially hierarchical' relevance to each other (47). Considering knowledge to be an action, Falke posits that this action is not enough to fulfil 'our call to charity (47).' In considering oneself to be one (body) with Christ, one must show one's 'membership in the body of Christ (John 13:34-5).' With this membership displayed with the action one performs, the 'charity' can become the foundation of all actions (48).

Falke points out, as Bonhoeffer explains, the first thing the reader with Christian ethics in mind is to do is to 'invalidate the knowledge of good and evil.' The acknowledgement of the notion of evil leads the reader to be reading as a 'fallen' man, for the in the beginning when God created man, man knew no evil. Acknowledging good and evil can easily convert to the action of judging. 'In judging, we focus on our own knowledge of good and evil rather than acting out of the communal knowledge of the body of Christ preserved in Scripture and the Church (48).' Distinguishing the difference between judgement - which is derived from one's own decision or will - and God's will, Falke suggests that an action done out of judgement is an action done without God. With God, to read well would mean to read without judging. Furthermore, Falke distinguishes judgement and discernment. Judgement is similar to Hooten's critic and where the reader exalt himself to the level of the author, the creator; whereas discernment is like Hooten's reader and where the reader submits

to an authority of the creator of the text as the reader reads. Falke therefore reasons, ‘[t]he act of discernment is always therefore an act of faith, performed from within the discourse community of the Church, in relation to Scripture, and from the unique material-historical position of our bodily existence (49).’ The theories on how a reader could read in a humble way to receive the message while submitting to an authority may apply to how a reader could read the novel of Narnia. Instead of rejecting the hierarchy within the kingdom of Narnia, as some readers might react to such structure, Hooten’s and Falke’s theories encourage the readers to give space to let the text do its work first before jumping to form one’s own (negative) opinions.

Next, from the perspective of telling/listening, in her *Telling the Gospel through Story* (2012), Christine Dillon writes that telling the Gospel through story is ‘as old as the Bible itself’ and ‘since the 1980s there has been a renewed emphasis on using Bible stories as a teaching tool with adults...[which was] started in cross cultural missions contexts with organizations such as New Tribes Mission and the Southern Baptists’ International Mission Board (18).’ Giving the examples of a physics teacher and an international company trying to teach and eventually succeeding in having their recipients learn through storytelling, Dillon suggests,

[s]tories can help change motivation and values. In addition, stories ensure that information is remembered readily and accurately. Bible stories help hearers to want to be more like Jesus in character, values and priorities, and they help listeners know the truth about him (20).

Dillon refers to storytelling as the talking-listening activity in general. But a story is still a story, disregarding the method it gets told through. It may be in spoken form, it may also be written or shown. Dillon explains the reason why stories work for evangelising is because ‘[a] story presents concepts in a way that hearers do not feel obliged to agree with them. As a result, the new ideas are more likely to be accepted (24).’ In addition,

[a]mong many features of postmodern thinking is the idea that all religions are the same and that truth is relative. People often react negatively to presentations of what they perceive as dogmatic truth. However stories seem to be acceptable style of presentation. Rick Richardson, evangelist and associate Professor at Wheaton college, writes, “Stories [are] the only containers big enough to carry truth, because stories convey not just the facts, but also the feelings and nuances of truth. Stories are a

bigger and better container for the whole of the truth than propositions, concepts and dogmas.... People today tend to distrust logic and truth when it is expressed propositionally and dogmatically. But when our truth is enfolded in stories, ... people are interested. ... We must recover our own stories, and God's Big Story, and connect them to the stories of people we love and are reaching out to (23-24).'

Dillon writes that '[o]ne of the most difficult parts of evangelism is starting a gospel conversation from scratch (25).' With stories as tool, the difficulty gets less challenging. As mentioned earlier, Dillon evangelises through telling stories in conversations. The same elements that works stories into conversations when evangelising should function the same way in written stories and in films. Dillon explains the fact that grownups can identify and 'relate to the characters' in the stories in themselves is one decisive factor that stories work in evangelism (26), so should the viewer of Narnia film be able to identify with some of the characters in it. In addition, stories also provides a 'participatory dimension,' as they allow the recipients to decide if they want to be a part of the action of sharing the story. 'Stories often linger long after we've ended a conversation with someone and gone our separate ways. A story will "continue [its] dialogue in mind and memory, expanding not only the truth of the Scriptures ... but also the capacity of our hearts to receive them,"' Dillon quotes a man in Taiwan comparing the stories he heard when being evangelised with peanuts, saying the more one gets them, 'the more they satisfy one's[your] heart (26).' Because of the 'lingering' nature of a story and combined with the powerful impact the moving images make on the films' viewers, the story is bound to stay with the recipients long enough to inspire thoughts regarding the message within the story at one point or another. Though Dillon's theory focuses on the telling and listening perspective, it is still applicable in the case of Narnia in terms of the receiving end. Furthermore, as the survey later on proves that the Narnia film has been used as an evangelical tool where events are build around it (see pp. 109-112), it is logical to assume that conversations take place to discuss the film after viewing, which then lead eventually to successful conversion of faith.

Lastly, from the perspective of watching, in his 'How Movies Express the Spiritual Longings of Their Makers (and Watchers)', Elijah Davidson agrees with Josh Larsen's opinion in his book titled, *Movies Are Prayers: How Films Voice Our Deepest Longings* (2017), that movies are expressions of prayers. These expressions derive from the way the 'anxiety haunts' the artist and that leads the artist to share such anxiety to the viewers, in order to help 'understand [oneself].' Additionally, the aforementioned expressions can be

divided into categories, all of which based on the element of ‘sincerity’ that Davidson paraphrases as ‘emotional honesty.’ Davidson praises Larsen’s ability to ‘help...see movies differently and, therefore, better (87).’

Through Davidson’s review on Larsen’s book, the theory of movies are expressions of one’s longing in the form of prayers is brought to light. In his *Movies Are Prayers: How Films Voice Our Deepest Longings* (2017), Josh Larsen proposes plainly that movies are, in fact, prayers. He explains that

they [movies]... can be prayers... You already know. You’ve prayed, even if you haven’t set foot in a church for years (or ever). You’ve longed, you’ve desired, you’ve marveled, you’ve groaned. You’ve looked around at the beauty of the world, as the Welsh miners do in *How Green Was My Valley*, and said, ‘Wow.’ You’ve seen great suffering, as Sgeruff Ed Tom Bell does in *No Country for Old Men* and asked, ‘Why?’ Who is it that you and the miners are praising? Why are you and the sheriff bothering to complain? Prayer is a human instinct, an urge that lies deep within us. Religion came along to nurture, codify, and enrich it (67).

Larsen then takes the Lord’s prayer (Matthew 6:9-13) as an example to show that it demonstrates ‘both the nature of God and our desire to be relationship with him (67).’ Using description of a nineteenth-century bishop in the Russian Orthodox Church, Larsen quotes Theophan the Recluse, who writes ‘Prayer is the raising of the mind and heart to God –for praise and thanksgiving and beseeching him for the good things necessary for soul and body (82).’ From this, Larsen extracts the idea that ‘[p]rayer can be expressed by anyone and can take place everywhere. Even in Movie theaters (100).’ The point Larsen attempts to make, after examples and examples of movies, is that the action of praying is possibly to be unconscious, as much as it appears to be one’s own words, it is actually under the guidance from the Holy Spirit as is written in Romans 8:26 (112).

Larsen explains that movies provides an emphasis on focus while the emphasis works in disguise and can form an unconscious act in community, just like prayers; making the common ground between a cinema and a church to be ‘set[ting] aside ... time and ... space to gather in community and join...concentration.’ More often than not, the agenda behind such gathering is to ‘escape the world,’ but it is also worth noting that people ‘gather to apply...intellectual, emotional, and artistic prowess toward considering the world and [their] purpose within it (131). Moreover, in regards to whether or not the movies may ‘offer the

same sort of communal and confessional prayer' as if it was made in churches, Larsen presents the viewpoint of the 'Dutch theologian and former prime minister Abraham Kuyper,' whose famous words are,

There is not a square inch in the whole domain of our human existence over which Christ, who is Sovereign over all, does not cry: 'Mine!' As such, reflections of God's grace and his revealing truth can be found in the most unexpected of places. [Larsen]'d also suggest that our attempts to seek that grace and grasp that truth can take unexpected forms (149).'

Larsen, in the hope to provide details to considerate 'the role of prayer in the Christian life, and a way of exploring film from a theological perspective (166),' offers nine categories for prayer in the scope of all films: Praise, Yearning, Lament, Anger, Confession, Reconciliation, Obedience, Meditation and Contemplation, Joy and Journey. Larsen's categories provide lenses through which the viewer bears in mind when viewing films. The Narnia film is, by definitions provided by Larsen, well-fitted in the prayers of yearning category, which contains elements of searching for the truth, an eagerness to believe and like Larsen's example of Wizard of Oz for this category, '[i]t wasn't ... accomplishments that mattered but... yearning. If only [one] had realized earlier that the God [one] sought was so near (524).' Narnia therefore could be looked at as a story of an escape from the war and a journey for truth.

Similarly, in his summary of Sue Sorensen's book titled *The Collar: Reading Christian Ministry in Fiction, Television, and Film* (2014), Derek Tovey presents Sorensen's way of categorising different types of minister in films, such as 'Heroism and Suffering; The Counsellor/Comforter; Fools for Christ; The Collared Detective; Passion, for Better and for Worse; Failure, for Worse of Better; Disaster; Frustration; Clergy Wives and Daughters: the Concealed Collar; The Canadian Collar,' and resolves to limit his focus on Sorensen's 'approach: interests and themes.' 'Fools for Christ' indicates the humorous effect of depicting the clergy; 'Passion' expands from purely 'sexual desires' to 'commitment;' 'Frustration' demonstrates what Sorensen feels regarding how the 'movies and TV shows "make use of" the clerical "type" to deliver "clerical clichés" and stereotypical portrayals (58).'

Then, in a reverse way, in his 'Film-as-Maturion: Faith, Healing and "the Body" in Evangelical Orientalism,' Robbie B. H. Goh focuses on Christian documentary films such as *1040* (2010) and *Finger of God* (2007), calling them 'Maturion' films. Maturion films act as

distance-shortener, pulling the ‘there,’ namely the Asian countries presented, to the ‘here,’ namely the viewing western society; and transforming the ‘local’ into ‘global’ by presenting the ‘miracles performed out there into the viewing here,’ using the ‘immediacy’ in the process to unify the ‘body of believers (469).’ By using the image, the viewer is commanded to have ‘a strongly “literalist” response... as the basis of powerfully emotive, empathetic and moral responses; “ultimately... the photograph insists on its referent” (Smith 2009: 108; Cassidy 2012: 108-10) (470).’ The presentation of the miraculous in the Maturion films inspires demands of such films in the Christian communities in the west and Asia, to the Western believer, becomes the place where ‘the Holy Spirit’s manifestation is ...more palpable and evident (481).’ Goh’s theory is proven from ‘there,’ Asia, where the miracles take place, to ‘here,’ the western world, where there are believers in need of a boost in faith and non-believers searching for answers; and it is natural to assume what works on way, it works the other way around as well: a story goes from ‘here,’ the western world, to bring a faith-strengthening/revealing experience to those spiritually in need over ‘there,’ only this time including but not limited to, Asia.

The idea of Goh’s regarding Maturion films does not only apply for Christian documentary films. Goh’s argument is that by showing the image in such an indexical sense, an immediacy is brought forth to the viewer, so the demonstrated performance of miracle evokes powerful emotions within the viewers, Christians and non-Christians alike. Consequently, existing Christian faith may get strengthened and non-existing Christian faith may be sowed and harvested. Like Larsen’s suggestion, the ‘prayer’ element in a film can easily be what makes a film a ‘Maturion’ film as well, in the sense that it strengthens the existing faith in Christians, very likely raises questions in the non-Christians and leads to conversion of faith. Although films in general do not always aim at conveying a Christian message, and the scenario in films are not always showing the viewers events of miracles taking place, Larsen shows that in every longing, desire, marvelling and groaning, there are prayers. In these prayers, there are chances for Christian viewers to turn to their faith and search for answers that would help grow their faith. Additionally, these prayers also provide chances for non-Christian viewers to contemplation about, as Davidson quotes Truffaut, ‘these artists...can hardly be expected to show us how to live, their mission is simply to share with us the anxieties that haunt them (86).’ By showing the viewer the ‘anxieties’ of the artist’s in films, the viewer is made aware of certain aspects, which may set him/her off to begin a search for answers and eventually find faith. Considering story-telling is at the core of

films, Dillon's theory that stories help when evangelising should confirm that films that are prayers, which may be considered as Maturion films, may in fact be used as an evangelical tool. In terms of film adaptation, the importance of stories that may evangelise and strengthen the existing Christian faith in its readers should be kept truthfully when adapted to the screen. From reading, telling/listening to watching, theories (with successful and documented case prove the possibilities to evangelise through written, spoken and shown (image) stories.

3. Case-Study

The present study follows the general structure provided by Brian McFarlane, in his *Novel to Film* (1996) in the hope to find out whether or not the film has been adapted faithfully from the source fiction and whether or not the story's (Christian) evangelical potentials are kept, if not enhanced. In order to see how fidelity works in the adaptation process in the 2005 Narnia film, this section discusses aspects of the adaptation's transition of the plot in the novel to the plot in film, character functions in the story (/novel) and presentation in the film, adaptation modes, authorship and themes and values of the story. The analysis is to determine whether or not the fidelity has been kept from novel to film. Fiction(/novel/text) comes to be before the film and this Case Study places a larger portion of focus on the film because of the large quantity of differences found between the two when treating the novel as the plumb line for the film to follow. All the while the analysis simultaneously focuses on the theme of Love, which is considered the core and major value that contribute to the film's evangelical potential. Taking Lewis' *The Four Loves* as a structure to which the Narnia story may adhere, the present case study's goal is to find out how Lewis develops the idea and value of love in the story and how they are adapted into the films by Andrew Adamson and co-produced with Gresham. Moreover, in 'Special Focus' section of the case study, an analysis regarding the theme of love and the Christian imageries are provided. Finally, in 'Narnia-Novel v.s. Narnia-Film,' the 'essence' or 'spirit' of the work is discussed in regards to the process of being turned into a film.

3.1 The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe (2005)

Published in 1950 under the title *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*, this novel by C.S. Lewis eventually developed into a seven-book series, now known as *The Chronicles of Narnia*, a name given by Roger Lancelyn Green. Green had been involved in discussions and editing of certain details in the Narnia stories with Lewis. In their biography on Lewis, Green and Hooper speculate Lewis started writing *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* in 1939 (7241). Around a depressing time when Lewis was troubled by events surrounding his brother and his own domestic life at The Kilns, as Green and Hooper assume, Lewis began to dream about lions. 'At first, I had very little idea how the story would go. But then suddenly Aslan came bounding into it. I think I had been having a good many dreams of lions about that time. Apart from that, I don't know where the Lion came from or why He came. But once He was there He pulled the whole story together, and soon He pulled the six other Narnian

stories in after Him (7276-7283).’ Although the first published story of the seven and therefore one would assume it the most natural to start on reading *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* as the beginning his or her journey of *The Chronicles of Narnia*, ‘Lewis had Hooper take out his notebook and he dictated the order in which the stories should be read. The order he gave was: 1. *The Magician’s Nephew*, 2. *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, 3. *The House and His Boy*, 4. *Prince Caspian*, 5. *The Voyage of the ‘Dawn Treader,’* 6. *The Silver Chair* and lastly, 7. *The Last Battle* (7520-7526). Despite the fact that this is the order Lewis wished and instructed his readers to follow; when *The Chronicles of Narnia* was transformed into film, like the Narnian invention/creation order, *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* was first that made it to the move in 2005, being directed by Andrew Adamson. One of the most noticeable interaction between Lewis and his readers in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (fiction) is through the narrative of the story.

3.2 Narrative and Transfer—Structural Patterns: The Novel

Unlike those broadcast talks of Lewis, which was introduced to the public (through radio) section by section, much like chapters in a book, *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* was published as one book in its entirety. The world, or maybe in this case, worlds in this fiction, are that of the London showered in the air-raids under the war (which will from now on be referred to as Human-world) and that of Narnia; the majority of the story happens in the latter. The transition from London to Narnia is initiated by Lucy. After that initiation the story can be divided into three parts: *Before Narnia*, *Narnia and War* and *Post-Narnian-War*. Instead of presenting the magical story from the side that is fully aware of the magic itself as most conventional or invented magical stories often are, if not always, this story is presented from the side that was unaware of the magic and then stumbling into the magic realm. The story itself is presented in a chronological way. However, the fact that Narnia is found in its perpetual winter and that it was not always this way suggest Narnia had begun existing before the story began. That in itself is a break of the linearity of the chronology in the story, in a subtle and suggestive way. The narrator in this story appears to be an omnipotent one that is not involved within the happenings in the story and can directly address the readers at the same time of his presentation to them. In addition, the narrator appears to be the author himself. The central character in the story may be said to be Lucy, the youngest of the four children (Peter the oldest, Susan the second oldest and Edmund the second youngest). She is the one that discovers the pathway to Narnia from Human-world and strikes up a friendly

acquaintance with a faun in Narnia which motivates her eager involvement in the situation in Narnia. She also keeps believing (in Aslan the Great) when all others give up. The love element in the character Lucy is demonstrated through her *affection* for her siblings; *appreciation love* (as an extension of affection) that allows her to forgive quickly; *friendship* that she chooses to have with Mr. Tumnus disregarding their differences, (one of which being the fact that they are from two very different worlds) and *Charity: Supernatural Need-love* in her connection to Aslan. He is of messianic role in the story, in times of despair and complete loss. He signals hope. Though the story is not centred solely on Lucy, her position of threading different events and opening up different aspects puts her to that significant category for the story's purposes, to which readers identify.

Before Narnia

In a few lines, the story was summed up to the point that explains it is 'about what happened to the Pevensies when they were sent away' to an old Professor's house from their home in war-time London, bombarded by air-raids (2405). The names of all the characters in Human-world (as opposed to the Narnian world) are given at this introductory stage as other relevant details – such as geographical locations and necessities in life (like transportation and post office). Here one gets a description of appearances of the characters – are being revealed (2401-2411). The meeting of the children and the old Professor is described to be a successfully friendly one, although provoking fear and unsureness in Lucy (2405). Little has been focused or given about Lucy at this point. Other than her being the youngest, Lucy is portrayed as a rather insecure and timid little girl, but friendly and warm-hearted once she warms up to someone, much like anyone's neighbour's youngest daughter next door. This creates an ease for the reader to treat her with kind but nonetheless observing eyes. Being the youngest, who most likely needs her parents the most in comparison to the others, Lucy's position in this group of her siblings is one who follows, one who obeys and one who needs to be taken care of. Her natural need-love towards her parents at the time of war is mostly the same as her other three siblings, who share the same need. However, curiosity is like one of the two sides of a coin with being a child. In contrast to the direct and head-on disobedience so pronounced in Edmund, Lucy shows a meek and tender nature, although the two do not have much direct interaction in the pre-Narnia part of the story.

Lewis' *affection* love is portrayed between the siblings in the dialogues between them. Even when Edmund retorts to the authoritative figure in the group, namely Peter and Susan (mostly Susan), the flow of the dialogues does not seem to be disturbed, which then shows the tolerating nature of affection between siblings. Lucy's importance of the story begins to unravel when her curiosity to a mysterious wardrobe in a spare room makes her trail behind her siblings' self-appointed exploration in the house, which eventually leads to her discovery of Narnia.

As an example of the *appreciative love* within affection, the story shows the readers that the siblings may disagree, but ultimately they stand by each other. When it comes to Lucy, having discovered Narnia and shared that enthusiastically with the others, Peter, Susan and Edmund responds to such far-fetched story differently. Peter and Susan, being the oldest two; on one hand dismiss Lucy's story as a pure fantasy or nonsense that comes out of nowhere, on the other hand they feel worried that their youngest sister may have gone 'out of her mind (2282).' Edmund is different. Having actually entered Narnia but chooses to deny the fact to make Lucy miserable, Edmund conceals the truth from the oldest two at the expense of making Lucy look crazy. Edmund's action is not only ill-received from Lucy, but also from Peter, who, though disapproves of Lucy's nonsense story about Narnia, disapproves Edmund's 'spiteful' behaviour towards her as well (2814). Then lastly, Lucy's position before all four children all enter Narnia is made in utter misery because she, having been considered a 'truthful' and 'reliable' person, is made into a liar by Edmund, which then results in appearing to be 'madness' to Peter and Susan (2844). Despite all the differences within the four children, the Pevensies stay together instead of breaking off to their separate ways.

Narnia and War

Lewis' *Affection love* between siblings (kinship), *Friendship love* and *Charity love* are the three major themes on love in the Narnia part of the story. Having gone through all the mental tortures in the Human-world just to be eventually proven to her siblings she was telling the truth when she told them about this magical kingdom, here Lucy's development is from being innocent to a point of gullible and unsure of herself to a confident and wise advisor on what the four children should do. Being very quick to forgive the two oldest for not believing her, Lucy displays charity in the form of forgiveness (as a Divine Gift-love that allows one to love the unlovable, such as those who transgresses) with her affection to her brothers and sister.

Having been in Narnia more times than the rest of her siblings and having established a trusting friendship with Mr. Tumnus –which allows her to have much more information about Narnia than the rest Pevensie children –Lucy has knowledge enough to be a guide for her siblings in Narnia. Edmund’s development is a rather different one from Lucy’s, if not entirely opposite. Having acquainted himself with Jadis the White Witch and become enchanted by her magic food (Turkish Delight) which makes one crave it constantly, Edmund willingly leaves his siblings and sides himself with Jadis, only to find out she is not as nice as she first posed herself, but full of harsh tortures awaiting him for he fails to keep his end of the bargain that promises to lead all the rest three children to her.

Then there comes a time for *Charity love* in the form of supernatural need-love to Himself when Aslan, as a messianic symbol of Jesus, makes appearance to the children, all hopes seem lost, this marks a monument in Peter, Susan and Lucy’s development in their sudden revelation to such a character that, like God in reality, seems so familiar and like a long-lost friend, even when first acquainted. The need-love in the three children is obvious in that the emotions stirred up in them upon hearing the name of Aslan are all positively encouraging and uplifting, contrasting Edmund’s first response, which could be categorised as Lewis’ explanation of ‘hate’ in terms of rejection. Up until this point, for as long as Edmund is around, Peter has been disapproving of him verbally. It is not until this point does Peter soften his attitude towards Edmund and show his caring side towards Edmund, showing a brotherly affection love where Peter admits his own faults.

Charity love in the form of the Divine Gift-love is shown in what happens after all four Pevensies are together again. After Edmund is rescued and reunited with the rest three, an agreement is made between Aslan and Jadis, for Aslan is determined to get Edmund out of his predicament permanently. The deal between Aslan and Jadis is fulfilled and executed when Aslan is killed by Jadis, a life for a life. The arrangement between Aslan and Jadis shows a Divine Gift-love of Charity much like God’s that sacrifices himself without even wanting the recipient to know (‘Our right hand must not know what our left is doing (135)’). For Aslan to be willing to take Edmund’s place to be killed instead, a deeper sense of love is revealed. For Edmund to not appear to even be informed of this event ever taking place for his sake in the story, a divine Grace that is as from a most powerful is established. Like Lucy says, ‘All the same I think he ought to know (4166).’ Lucy thinks Edmund should get to know what Aslan did for him, despite the fact that, as Susan reasons, ‘it would be too awful for him (4166).’ Much like the Gospels in the Bible, what Aslan does in place of Edmund is the

demonstration of a love that is almost incomprehensible, and this is news about how ‘good’ Aslan is that may be passed on to others who are still yet to know (believe in) him. Lucy’s opinion regarding Edmund’s being made known to the event regardless of the pain that the knowing may cause him (Edmund) is similar to Christian missionaries going to remote places just to tell people the story of Jesus and God’s love. Such desire to tell Edmund the truth (though it may hurt Edmund), is from a gift-love that may be said to be for the good of Edmund than for the selfishness of Lucy.

After the ultimate and Divine Gift-love is manifested in the action of dying in someone else’s place, Aslan shows that he chooses to lose his own valuable life to set the blood of Edmund, who is considered a traitor, free and that he does not falter on this decision. Both Susan and Lucy bear witness to the act and see the dead body of Aslan afterwards. However, the Dark Magic resurrects Aslan and the well-and-alive Aslan shows himself in all his might and glory to Susan and Lucy. After a rescue mission that ransacks the castle of Jadis and now with ‘re-enforcements,’ Aslan leads everyone back to the campsite and joins the on-going battle between his army and that of Jadis . Aslan’s side claims the triumph by killing Jadis.

Post-Narnian-War

The Charity love in forms of forgiveness and redemption; both of which share the source of a Divine Gift-love that allows one to love the unlovable, such as those who transgresses; is most noticeable in the later part of the war and the story. In a reminiscent light (because the war is already won) and told by a third person (Peter), the reader is revealed the sacrifice Edmund made during the war: he goes after Jadis when she is fiercely attacking everyone. Edmund has a plan, he goes for Jadis’ most powerful weapon, the wand, instead of Jadis herself. By putting himself in grave danger and being willing to possibly lose his own life to win the battle that has already injured many, and for the greater good of Narnia in terms of winning the battle, Edmund successfully rids Jadis of her most lethal weapon and in the meantime gets severely injured by her. Through this single act alone, Edmund’s betrayal to his siblings is erase by the redemption that comes after having almost lost his own life to save Narnia and others that he cares for. With redemption comes forgiveness. Edmund’s action in war shows a gift-love that puts his own welfare behind those that he loves and cares for. As Edmund is being given a knighthood by Aslan after Lucy’s cordial heals Edmund, Lucy

discusses with Susan regarding whether or not Edmund is aware of the content of the agreement between Aslan and Jadis. Edmund appears to be unaware. Susan logically suggests to Lucy it would be too awful for Edmund to find out about Aslan's taking his place in death. However, Lucy disagrees and thinks Edmund should know the truth, even if it hurts (4166). This conversation here may be considered to be a need-love. As mentioned before, Aslan symbolises Jesus and in a pure need as Man needs Jesus, so Lucy feels the need-love towards Aslan like a child need-loves his/-er mother. In addition, because of the sacrifice done on Aslan's side, a Grace emerges, one that creates the third gift God bestows Man: 'a supernatural Appreciative love,' with which 'all things are possible (140).' With this love to Aslan, the truth must come to Edmund, or so Lucy thinks, to create the Grace that will lead to the Appreciative love in addition to the supernatural Need-love of God (in this case, Aslan). After the wounded are healed, there are celebrations for the restoration of things and a coronation of the kings and queens. Then the reign of the kings and queens starts with eliminating the remnants of the followers of Jadis, laws being established and executed, things being put to their rightful place, etc.. Narnia is again flourishing and, while they reign on their thrones, the four kings and queens grow up being wiser and more glorious. Then in the end the four children, in pursuit of a White Stag, the kings and queens comes to the lamp post and recalls it as if it were from a dream, before stumbling their way back to the Human-world, appearing to be back to the same age when they entered Narnia long ago, as if they never left the human world of England as they know it. The book of this story ends with the Professor response to the Pevensies' explanation regarding the four missing coats from the closet. What the Professor says suggests he has knowledge regarding how things work between the England world and Narnia, ending the whole book in a mysterious tone.

Parallels and Contrasts

Although Lucy is considered the central character, the parallels between her and her siblings, in terms of behaviours, are still easily drawn.

In reality, the Human-world:

- (a) Peter: Taking the semi-parenting role in the absence of the parents, often verbally expressing his disapproval to Edmund with little to no concerns over how Edmund might feel internally in relation Peter's words.

- (b) Susan: Taking a role in the group similar to Peter's, often addressing the younger two siblings in a motherly tone, be it imperative or simply talk to the youngest two siblings as equals, sometimes giving (unwarranted) advice (between Peter and Edmund) in the face of conflict and appearing to be of the nature of reason.
- (c) Edmund: Appearing to be of bullying nature when sensing someone might be in a vulnerable position, is stereo-typically rebellious towards Peter in a competing sense and having a tendency to lie.
- (d) Lucy: Inclined to be insecure and slightly scared when dealing with adult-strangers, generally obedient nature, considered truthful by her two oldest siblings and is altogether rather quiet, even when feeling sad and suffering from confusions, self-doubt and very hurt.

In Narnia:

- (a) Peter: Still remaining the semi-parental role, but more loving and is willing to admit his faults privately as well as openly. His willingness to admit his faults and learn to appreciate the very different, if not opposite, Edmund, shows that he goes through a process of appreciative love in affection with his siblings.
- (b) Susan: Still remaining the similar role like Peter's, becoming more supportive of Lucy's opinions instead of immediately disapproving or neglecting them. Her role as the second oldest brings her to the position of peace-keeper in the group. The care-taking personality and her logical mind allows her to reason and show affection at appropriate timing and in ways that the recipient understands.
- (c) Edmund: At first appearing selfish but eventually turning remorseful for what he has done. Bravery is shown on battlefield against Jadis. Throughout the story, Edmund progresses from selfish to selfless. His selfishness is like Lewis' description regarding the rivalry between the love for God and the love for something else, in this case: himself. Edmund's self-centredness in the beginning of the story creates for himself a demon, which blinds him from the affection he has towards his siblings and convinces him that he should be having his guard against Peter, Susan and Lucy instead of the real enemy, Jadis. Edmund's path to redemption of his own self is a difficult one, which puts him almost on the equal importance with Lucy in the story. Around the end

of the story, Edmund finally finds true forgiveness, not just words, by learning to love as love intends: to help the needy (gift-love) to the point of complete loss of self.

- (d) Lucy: Becoming bolder and more confident of herself, judging by her name in Narnia towards the end of the book, 'Lucy the Valiant.' Perhaps like Edmund, bravery is also developed. Lucy's development in the story is the most versatile. The most significant development for Lucy inside Narnia is her friendship with Mr. Tumnus. Her choice of appreciating Tumnus as he is and insisting to help Tumnus where she can demonstrate the Friendship love that brings two unrelated persons to a near kinship sort of love.

3.3 Narrative and Transfer—Structural Patterns: The Film

The film version of the story is rather noticeably different when being compared with the novel minute by minute and event by event. 'A picture is worth a thousand words,' the slang goes; the novel itself is only about 200 pages long, whereas the movie is 2 hours and 12 minutes, longer than the average length of movies. However rich the story is in the novel, there must be more details to fill in each frame of picture in the film to make it more fitting to exist as a world of its own inside the film. Some details that are changed in the film are changed so that they appear more natural than they would have been if having acted out as the novel word by word. While other details that are changed would affect a certain degree of the build-up (*catalysers*) to the more crucial events (*carinal function*). Using the novel as a general plumb line to which the movie is supposedly adhered to, this section analyses the differences in the movie to demonstrate what those changes are and might affect on a cause-and-effect level and a integral level to the story as a whole. One significant difference between the film and the fiction is the narrator. In the novel, the narrator directly addresses the reader as the author C.S. Lewis himself, provides the reader information that he or she might be interested in knowing but is not particularly relevant to the story itself and summons or directs certain feelings or memory that, presumably, anyone with common sense would be able to produce. Throughout the film, this influential character (the narrator) is completely omitted. Traditionally a narrator could be presented in the film through a voice-over, but that is not found in the present film. Aside from the absence of the narrator, and however different it is between the novel and the film, the general plot of this story may still be divided according to the same way as that in the novel.

Before Narnia

The four children: Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy are depicted much as average war-time children who have to tolerate the bombarding air-raids and survive on the hope that one day peace will be restored and that they will be reunited with their parents and live as one whole family again. Instead of simply introducing the children with their names and practically jumping to the travel that the four children take to go to Professor Kirke, the film provides a glimpse of the life the children live in before they are sent off to Professor Kirke.

In the beginning of the film, there is a basic need-love from the children to their parents being presented by adding the existence of the parents to the story, which keeps coming back into focus every now and then throughout the story. The father of the children is never mentioned in the novel, but is shown in the film to be a soldier who is fighting in the war. As war-time children, the oldest of the four is shown as the responsible one, the man in the house and the one that takes a rather tender care on the youngest of his siblings, who is a girl name Lucy. Peter, in the introductory part of the movie, before their journey to Professor Kirke that is, appears to be rather harsh on Edmund, the second youngest of the four, in regards to Edmund's disobedience in dangerous moments, such as while they escape to the shelter during the air-raid. The film gives the viewer a complex tension or, perhaps, misunderstanding between Peter and Edmund right from the start. This tension has three levels of depth: brotherly rivalry, war-time survival and pure teenage hormones.

The affection love between siblings is not as prominent in the beginning of the film, instead, what is more focused on is the tensions and disagreements. The misunderstanding tension between Peter and Edmund is much more noticeable. Susan's more disagreeing voice towards Peter also leaves an impression on the viewer that the two oldest children do not always manage to be on the same page of everything. As for Lucy and Edmund, the little interaction between the two on screen only shows a bit later on Edmund's betraying Lucy and turning her into either a liar or a very disturbed little girl.

Same as the novel, the four children, although specifically war-time children, fit in a typical stereotype of children with their sibling: the oldest take care of the youngest especially in the absence of parents, and sometimes the one or ones in the middle there might rebel to the authoritative figure of the group. Some of the catalysers in the story are neglected, which change the direction of the story a bit. Although the important instances such as 'Lucy gets into Narnia first, then Edmund, before all four children get into Narnia' remain the same,

some elements that drive the child or children into the wardrobe appear to be changed based on omission of details provided in the novel. For instance, the novel provides information regarding Professor Kirke's house and says the house is one very historical site and it attracts many sight-seers every year, therefore one of Macready's jobs in the house, besides being the housekeeper in general, is to give tours for the sightseers. This information might be considered so important to be a catalyser because it contributes to the cause of getting all four children into Narnia. In the film, instead of simply trying to avoid an unaware Macready and her tourists and consequently 'escape' into Narnia, the children are actually the target of Macready's search, having broken a window and knocked down a suit of armour in the house, regardless of whether or not Macready is aware of the identities of the perpetrators. The change here emphasises an element of guilt, the kind that motivates the children to seek for a place to escape to, a hideout, and consequently find themselves in Narnia as a result.

Another note worth mentioning is regarding Lucy. The emphasis of her timid nature as a young girl is rather enhanced in the film. Where in the novel she is 'a little afraid of him[Kirke]' when Professor Kirke is introduced to the group of children upon their arrival at his house, the film makes no mention of such meeting and portrays Lucy to jump away when seeing a shadow of who she suspects to be Professor Kirke's, after Macready's very stern briefing that contains information regarding how the children must behave in the house upon arrival.

After entering Narnia on her own, Lucy strikes up an acquaintance with Mr. Tumnus the Faun. Her trusting nature leads her to willingly walk in the trap of this big-nosed, friendly and harmless-appearing Faun. Lucy's genuine nature leads to Tumnus' realisation that he is doing something bad as he follows Jadis' order and detains Lucy in his place. It is Lucy's good nature that brings out the gem of her friendship with Tumnus and this leads to even more visits from Lucy to Tumnus and a persuasive reason for the Pevensies to choose to stay in Narnia to help rescue Tumnus later. Though one might argue that Lucy has no choice but to befriend Tumnus when they first meet, but Lucy does have many opportunities to not want to go through the plan of staying in Narnia and become the prophesied queen, yet she chooses to stay and tries earnestly to convince Peter and Susan (and in the beginning, Edmund as well) that staying to help out is the right choice.

Lastly, the role of Professor Kirke, the film appears to be placing Professor Kirke in a less important light than he is put under in the novel. Where Peter and Susan decide to initiate

a talk with Professor Kirke about their predicament with Lucy and the wardrobe in the novel, in the film Professor Kirke is rather a passive initiator for the same exact talk. Also, Professor Kirke appears to be more or less aware of the existence of Narnia and how it works there in the novel; in the film he, however, sheds more of the light of an unaware yet logical and curious person towards this kingdom of Narnia in the wardrobe.

Narnia and War

One thing that stands out in the children's getting into Narnia through the wardrobe is the distance between the human-world part of the wardrobe to reaching Narnia. In the novel, it appears as if it is quite a few minutes' walk for a person to go from human-world to Narnia, as when all four children are about to enter Narnia, it is presented as the following,

“I wish the Macready would hurry up and take all these people away,” said Susan Presently, “I’m getting horribly cramped.” “And what a filthy smell of camphor!” said Edmund. “I expect the pockets of these coats are full of it,” said Susan, “to keep away moths.” “There’s something sticking into my back,” said Peter. “And isn’t it cold?” said Susan. “Now that you mention it, it is cold,” said Peter, “and hang it all, it’s wet too. What’s the matter with this place? I’m sitting on something wet. It’s getting wetter every minute.” He struggled to his feet. “Let’s get out,” said Edmund, “they’ve gone.” “O-o-oh” said Susan suddenly, and everyone asked her what was the matter. “I’m sitting against a tree,” said Susan, “and look! It’s getting light—over there.” “By jove, you’re right,” said Peter, “and look there—and there. It’s trees all round. And this wet stuff is snow. Why I do believe we’ve got into Lucy’s wood after all (2901).”

It is true that one is not to know if the characters are moving when they talk or as they talk, not does the reader know the speed the characters move in, but one gets a sense that this may have gone a bit slower than what a normal reader's pace would to go through these lines, therefore coming to the assumption that this path from human-world to Narnia is should be longer than the 18 seconds presented in film. The difference here in the film can be interpreted as that Narnia is closer to the human-world in the film for its viewers than in the novel for its readers.

After all four children having gone into Narnia, the first up-coming difference is the reaction of Peter and Susan and how they go about their apologies to Lucy. The novel has a

strong sense of civilisation (handshake), almost un-natural to the norm of children nowadays on a global level. In the film Lucy responded by a mischievous initiation of a snowball fight as a gesture of acceptance to the apologies from the others. This difference between film and novel help the viewers to identify with the four children as they exhibit what is considered more ‘normal’ children behaviours, given the circumstance that is.

As far as affection love between siblings at this arrival in Narnia goes, Lucy is immediately reinstated to the truthful and sane little sister as soon as the Pevensies find themselves in Narnia, whereas Edmund revealed as the big liar. This then adds onto the existing tension between Peter and Edmund. Even though the affection between the two eldest Pevensies and Lucy is restored, the affection between Peter and Edmund has only worsened at this point. Up until this point, the relationship between Peter and Susan’s, and perhaps throughout most of the film, is that Peter tends to be uncertain of Susan’s suggestive statements on what to do next. This, however, appears to be a reversal to the relationship of in the novel. This reversal in the film can be seen as a change made in order to build up the contrast in Peter as he develops into a leader and a king later on.

Perhaps to emphasise the secrecy in the film regarding Aslan, after meeting Mr. Beaver, the name Aslan first comes up in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Beaver, whereas in the novel, Mr. Beaver whispers it while him and the children are still standing in the open. As the children learn even more information from Mr. Beaver, the old prophecy gets introduced. The supernatural need-love that the children feel at the sound of Aslan’s name is not shown in the film as it is described in the novel. Aslan’s name appears to be just another piece of information to be absorbed before everyone moves on to the next thing to tell/know. The film version of the story produces yet another human-nature element that is not found in the novel: denial. In the film, the children’s reaction towards the prophecy is,

‘Mom sent us away so we wouldn’t get caught up in a war,’ – Susan to Peter

‘I think you’ve made a mistake, we’re not heroes!’ – Peter to Mr.&Mrs. Beaver

‘We’re from Finchley!’ – Susan to Mr.&Mrs. Beaver

One possible interpretation over this added element is that this is a catalyst designed for an additional cardinal function, one that happens during breakfast after the reunion with Edmund. Susan’s disagreeing tendency towards Peter shows her lack of the appreciative affection towards him, and her resistance towards being the prophesied queen shows her choice of rejecting a friendship sort of love towards Narnia. Lucy, by contrast, chooses to love

Narnia as soon as she is in it. Susan, however, appears to be suspicious in embracing Narnia entirely.

A film contains certain types of scenes that are popular and they are usually the reasons why the general public would go watch it in the cinema instead of be at home watching the same thing on their televisions. In the case of this film, it is arguably the battlefield and some thrills in the chase that draw the crowd to the cinema. Because of that, it is natural to assume that the reason for the film to change the cardinal function of Captain Maugrim's arrest at the Beaver's is for the thrill. In the novel, it appears the three children and the Beavers have quite a good head start before the police come to the home of the Beavers, while in the film, the police nearly catch the entire group.

Around the time of this arrest by Maugrim, Edmund is put in a cell in the castle of Jadis, next to his cell is the cell of Tumnus the Faun. This, too, is a change in the film that is nowhere to be found in the novel. Tumnus is implied to have already been turned into a statue by the time Edmund arrives at the castle of the Witch. This change in the film may come as a surprise, but the question 'Why?' is shortly satisfied as Jadis the Witch makes it known to Tumnus in the face of Edmund that Edmund is responsible to Tumnus' arrest, just before Tumnus is taken out of sight to be killed, namely, turned into a statue, as shown later in the film when Edmund is on his way out of the castle. The change here provides Edmund a chance to get to know his own victim before the bitter truth is brutally revealed. Having known little about Tumnus because it is only through Lucy's sharing, it is clear that Edmund has struck a friendship of some sort, a connection, when he meets Tumnus in the next cell. This influence from Tumnus to Edmund and also Edmund's guilt for being called in the face of his victim as a traitor can be taken as additional catalysers and amounts to Edmund's attempt to stop Jadis from doing harm with her wand to Mr. Fox later. It is also safe to say that these catalysers invoke the remorse Edmund demonstrates later on during the breakfast after his reunion with the rest of his siblings.

The importance of Lucy, and perhaps Susan as well, is reinforced in a harmonious way of affection between siblings when Father Christmas shows up and distributes his gifts to the three children. Unlike the novel, the film shows that Father Christmas gives his Christmas gift to Lucy first, then Susan and lastly, Peter. (In the novel it is the opposite order.) Because Lucy comes first, or rather, the cordial comes first, one can assume that the cordial plays an importance for what is to come. One might also argue that the reason why Lucy is given the

Christmas gift first is to indicate or because of the fact that she is the first to come to Narnia, the first to believe in Narnia and the first to defend Narnia (to her siblings that it is real).

Unlike the norm of thinking the oldest goes first, here the reversal of order shows the harmony the affection love could bring when the youngest is served first. It also fits with the Bible in Matthew, '[s]o the last will be first, and the first will be last (NIV, Matthew 20:16).'

The arrival of Father Christmas in Narnia is itself a confirmation of the weakening of Jadis' power, this remains the same in both novel and movie. However, Father Christmas' acknowledgement to this fact in the movie is portrayed as a catalyser, which opens up to one of the cardinal functions built around Peter. In the film, there is yet another additional scene that does not exist in the novel but adds onto Peter's development in the story. The scene referred to here is the one in which the three children and the Beavers rush to the melting river, one they are all to cross. Having heard from Father Christmas regarding the fact that spring is near, Peter recalls the Beavers mentioning a river that they must cross in order to reach the stone table to meet with Aslan. The group then rush forward to the river and see that it already is dangerous to cross. Here is where Maugrim catches up to the group. The fact that he does manages to track the children and Beavers up is not in the novel, yet this marks one of the major cardinal functions of Peter's development. This particular confrontation is one where he chooses to not surrender, even as Susan pleads, but to insist on keeping to their goal: to meet Aslan, regardless the huge white fangs of Maugrim and his subordinate. This shows progress on Peter's development. However, here he does not attack the wolves. This point is not just a major cardinal function to Peter alone, but also Susan. As they saw the river has already become dangerous to cross, Susan starts to hesitate. Being logical and sensible as she is, her hesitation is responded by Peter's negative and rather confronting comment, which marks a start of Peter's 'coming out of his insecure shell' and into his decisiveness later-on. When finally getting to meet Aslan, the movie shows a different introduction for Aslan than that in the novel. In the movie, Aslan gets to come out of his own tent in everyone else's silence and anticipation. In the novel, the children arrive at an on-going gathering of some sort and find Aslan in the mist of other animals. One interesting difference between the novel and the film regarding Aslan is that, the illustrations in the novel shows that Aslan is sometimes standing on his hind legs, upright like a human; whereas in the film he remains like a normal lion, standing and walking on all four. The change of Aslan's introduction or entrance into the story indicates and reinforces his importance in both the story and the kingdom of Narnia. This change also puts the children from the position similar to an intruder

(in the novel), into the position where they are expected, welcomed before they join the rest of the company. Peter's development does not stop at the river, but continue onwards to after they arrive and meet up with Aslan. The lack of affection love between siblings, noticeably between Peter and Edmund is now present. Upon Aslan's question regarding where Edmund is, Peter, after his often stern treatments towards Edmund, takes his responsibility and admits his wrongful treatment to his brother. The climax of Peter's brotherly love to Edmund is still yet to come, but here shows, though at the absence of Edmund, a turn for the better for the first time in the film.

Around the same time as the three children are meeting Aslan, Edmund is with Jadis the Witch. What Jadis does to Edmund at this time in the film is different from that in the novel. In the novel Jadis, having faced the sure signs of spring's already happening in Narnia, simply threatens to kill whoever dares to mention the name of Aslan; in the movie, however, this is when Mr. Fox comes back onto the screen, after he was captured by the wolves. This scene, like that of the river, is an additional one that is not found in the novel; but is added and can be interpreted as one of the major cardinal functions, not of Peter's but of Edmund's; since it shows Edmund's desire to not do any more harm than what is already done. Edmund's encounter of Mr. Fox is much similar to his encounter of Tumnus in that there is an unsaid connection between them, even in the presence of Jadis. This time, having already missed to help a friend (Tumnus) once, Edmund chooses to take action to stop yet another tragedy from happening by the hand of Jadis. This then leads to the beginning a sequence of ill-treatments on Edmund by Jadis. Edmund's action reveals his desire to forgiveness and perhaps redemption from a divine source. In this case, Aslan, who is said to be the true emperor of Narnia, is the only possible divine authority to give the forgiveness Edmund longs for. Edmund's longing to be forgiven is a divine Need-love for God (Aslan in this case) in the form of Charity love.

A bit later one sees yet another different depiction in the relations between Jadis and her dwarf servant, throughout the film this relations has been maintained as a hierarchy between master and slave. However, in the novel there are times when Jadis and the dwarf are discussing in a rather levelled position, as if they were equal or as if the dwarf is more of a councillor to Jadis, when in the same details they are presented in the absolute hierarchy shown in film. This change can be presumed to be made in order to keep that harsh image of Jadis' and keep it consistent throughout the whole film.

Charity love in terms of forgiveness and Affection love are shown the most prominently between the Pevensies. Shortly before the war actually starts, one major cardinal function is the reunion of Edmund and his siblings. In the novel, in a very adult and civilised way, 'Edmund took hands with each of the others and said to each of them in turn, "I'm sorry," and everyone said, "That's all right"' and basically everything goes on like nothing significant just took place (3756). But in the movie, there is no handshake at this point; instead, hugs are offered and some rather casual greetings happen to ease up the tensions that could have happened from reminders of things of the past. Here the ideology of the female role and the male role is also displayed rather clearly: Edmund says '[h]ello' (note: not 'I'm sorry. '), Lucy goes and gives Edmund a heartfelt hug, Susan gives a tap on the shoulder and asks if Edmund is alright (note: not 'I forgive you. '), whereas Peter finally gently asks Edmund to try to not wander off as a sign of peace-making, having almost let Edmund pass without saying anything at all. The care from Susan and Lucy here is presented to be greater than (possible) grudge and hurt that might be harnessed in their previous dealings with each other, and the equally indirectness between Peter and Edmund when showing their feelings but too shy or proud to say their feelings out loud to each other, are all rather fitting to the traditional views on women and men.

Following the reunion, the film, having rearranged the order of the reunion and breakfast in the novel, goes on to present the breakfast. This is where cardinal function takes place for multiple characters in one event. For Peter, his commitment which entails a willingness to sacrifice himself in Narnia is revealed to his siblings, when up until this point he has been rather undecided on matters regarding being one of the prophesied 'four kings and queens that will restore peace to Narnia.' For Edmund, though there were already signs of his 'turning good' before now, this is when he actually admits to his siblings, whom he betrayed, that his decision of siding with Jadis was a mistake and that she is a cruel person (as Lucy warned before, so by doing this he is actually saying he is sorry and that Lucy is right). Edmund then agrees with Lucy of the fact that Narnia needs all four of them and they should stay and help what they can. For Susan, the logical side of hers has been keeping her in the disagreeable spirit towards staying in Narnia and getting further involved. She has voiced on multiple occasions that they should all go home, meaning to Human-world or that they never should have entered here in the first place. But here, Susan appears to feel convicted into agreeing with her siblings (in sympathy and care) and compelled to stay and face (in bravery) the brutal war that will happen by leaving the breakfast table and setting off to practice on

how to use her Christmas gift (a set of bow and arrows). As for Lucy, her cardinal function here is not obvious, as it is rather a continuation of what she had already shown in the reunion scene with Edmund, that she has forgiven him, supports him and cares for him.

From Peter's first kill to Jadis' arrival at Aslan's camp, the only change of order is the reunion and breakfast between the film and novel. In the film, because of the relaxing pace and the additional focus on the breakfast, whose order is different from the novel, there seems to be a longer time span to build more details between Peter's first kill and words of Jadis' arrival (1:25:40-1:31:41). Where the story takes roughly 13 lines from the reunion to words from the dwarf, taking the reader (in this case, the present author) roughly 30 seconds to read, it takes the film almost 4 minutes for the viewer to watch. The details such as the discussion during breakfast for all four of the children, the battlefield-related practice after breakfast are designed to be the additional catalysers that do not exist in the novel to the cardinal function scene of Jadis. At the campsite, after Jadis arrives, the description surrounding the conversation taken in public between her and Aslan suggest Susan is on one side of Aslan and Edmund on the other. Where Peter and Lucy stand is not provided, making sense why in the novel it is a '[b]ull with the man's head (3792)' that confronts Jadis with threats to use physical force to defend Edmund. In the film, however, it is Peter that does the defending of his brother, having all four of them stand next to each other and him right next to Edmund. This difference in the film makes it more obvious of Peter's brotherly and protective love for his brother Edmund and how he has truly forgiven Edmund for the betrayal, and is another catalyser that foreshadows the cardinal function dialogue (between Peter and Edmund) later. The film also chooses to make no mention of 'the Emperor-beyond-the-Sea,' who appears in the novel and is said to be the one that sets the Magic into Narnia at its beginning.

After Jadis departs the campsite, the film shows that everyone remains at the same location, instead of moving the camp to the Fords of Beruna as it is in the novel. This omission leads to another rather significant change in the story in the film. In the novel, during the move from where they previously camped in to the Fords of Beruna, Aslan prepares Peter for the battle and tells Peter what he plans for Peter to do, giving Peter a sense that Aslan may not be around at the time of battle and their conversation shows Aslan knows for sure that Jadis is not going to attack that night, alluding something to happen that very evening. Susan and Lucy are described in the novel during the last part of the move to be with Aslan mostly and see that Aslan is deeply trouble, which raises concerns in Susan and Lucy. Because the film omitted the move, it also removes the catalysers regarding the conversation

between Aslan and Peter in addition to Susan and Lucy's concern for Aslan, which are mentioned in the novel. Instead, the film shows Aslan's defeated look after Jadis leaves and Lucy is the only one that sees this emotion from Aslan, before it proceeds directly to night time, when Lucy, who appears to be turning in bed and struggling to sleep. Lucy then notices Aslan's shadow through the tent that he is walking out of the campsite and wakes Susan up and immediately gets off her bed and walks out of the tent to follow Aslan; Susan in the meanwhile, wakes up and follows. After their following Aslan for a while, Susan and Lucy are discovered by Aslan and are permitted to walk alongside him for a while until where they must part ways. When Aslan does part with the girls, the girls are not in tears at this departure as the novel describes. In the film, Aslan does not give any instruction as to how the girls should not let themselves be seen, as he does so in the novel, therefore the film shows both Susan and Lucy have a sense of danger if they are seen by others, regardless of the fact that they are not informed of anything, for they conceal themselves well as their eyes follow Aslan and see what happens next.

Taking Aslan as a symbol for Christ, the love Lucy (in particular) and her siblings have towards Aslan may be explained to be a supernatural and divine Need-love of Himself, as explained as Charity by Lewis. The novel states that the girls did not see the actual killing done to Aslan because they have their eyes covered, but the film shows the girls witnessing the very act before beginning to cry. The presence of tears indicates emotions that support the love Lucy and Susan have for Aslan and how they feel when seeing him killed. In contrast to the film's tendency to make things more exciting and consequently change details in the novel, in the departure of Jadis and her follower from around the stone table, on which the dead body of Aslan lays, the novel describes the danger of the girls being close to the party's exit they feel the wind from the group's running past them and the shaking of the ground as Jadis' group rush to attack everyone still at the campsite. As the stone table is now settled in the quietness again, the film adds another detail where the novel does not provide, Lucy wants to use the cordial she got from Father Christmas earlier to save Aslan and Susan says it is now too late for that. Where the novel focuses on the girls' noticing the night's disappearing and that they are incredibly cold, the film shows Susan's sense of logic at this time of sadness by stating that they must warn the others. Instead of walking around the woods to keep warm as the novel reads, the film shows Susan and Lucy sending news (through help of the trees) back to the campsite to the still-asleep Peter and Edmund regarding the enemy's approach and Aslan's death. This comes as a surprise in the film as a result of the omission of the move of

the camp site to Fords of Beruna in the film. So the action of the girls' sending news is one that only exists in the film, not the novel. From there, the film focuses on the side of Peter and Edmund while the novel stays with Susan and Lucy. This report to Peter and Edmund comes as a surprise and in the film Peter is much less prepared than he is in the novel. A cardinal function scene takes place when Edmund points out Peter must take the lead in the absence of Aslan and gives encouragements by placing his faith in Peter for the job. The cardinal function here brings out the bonding and true reconciliation between the two brothers.

Next the film moves on to the battlefield, taking time to present the tension build-up between Aslan's army and Jadis' and their head-on contact with each other, before moving back to Susan, Lucy and Aslan's dead body. In the film, Susan and Lucy do not walk about to keep warm as is described with a fair amount of details (roughly fifty lines or more) in the novel, but sit by the dead body of Aslan and mourn. It is when they finally realise they are very cold and decide to head back to Peter and Edmund that something suddenly happens and Aslan is resurrected back to life. Where there is a scene of playful chase between Susan, Lucy and Aslan in the novel, the film shows that the very first thing after Aslan's appearing alive again is that Susan and Lucy need to accompany Aslan to Jadis' castle to turn the sculptures back to life and to aid Peter and the army in their fight against the White Witch Jadis. While the novel spends a great amount of focus on describing how it is to ride on Aslan for Susan and Lucy, how light and fast Aslan is in his running on the way to Jadis' castle and what happens after Aslan and the girls arrive at the castle (the focus on the castle is shown by dedicating one whole chapter under the title, 'Chapter Sixteen: What Happened about the Statues'), the film focuses rather on filling the screen with shots after shots of the battlefield and a significantly less amount of them on what goes on with Aslan's rescue mission in the castle.

In the novel, there is an element of comedy in the scenes inside the castle of Jadis' when Aslan arrives and starts turning the statutes back to life. A giant named Rumblebuffin has a funny interaction with Lucy when he finds himself in need of a handkerchief and Lucy offers hers, the combination of Rumblebuffin's big face and Lucy's small handkerchief creates a comic effect. Later, a very excited lion that is brought back to life by Aslan creates another comic atmosphere in this ransacking mission by running around proudly broadcasting, 'Did you hear what he said? Us Lions. That means him and me. Us Lions. That's what I like about Aslan ... (4113).' It is the same aforementioned lion that gets brought back to life first and marks the beginning of the comic element in the castle scenes in

the novel, whereas in the movie it is Tumnus the Faun that is shown to be brought back to life and not much more is presented. In the film, the tension of the battle and of the rescuing of turning the statues back to life at Jadis' castle seem to be racing against time which produces the dominant tone in the sequence of shots. The Friendship between Lucy and Tumnus is again the centre of attention for the viewers. In addition, the serious and war atmosphere in the story is strengthened in the film by omitting the comic part in the novel regarding this rescue mission in the castle.

The affection through kinship is presented in an overwhelming and emotional aspect in the film, as Peter presents a thought of keeping all his siblings safe by sending them back to the Human-world while he himself stays and fights, quite possibly, till his death. This idea of 'going home (to the Human-world)' before the Narnian war takes place is not in the novel. This additional information in the film acts as a catalyser that builds up to a cardinal function of Edmund. On the battlefield, Peter shouts to Edmund to leave and take the girls 'home' because there are too many of the enemy. And Edmund chooses to disobey that order half way in his escape away from the battlefield as he sees Jadis slowly and triumphantly makes her move towards Peter with the intention to kill in her eyes. Edmund sees Jadis' wand and decides to get back to the field, determined to destroy her wand instead of just focusing on attacking her. Succeeding at his goal, Edmund breaks Jadis' wand and takes away her magical power that has created such an edge for her on the battlefield, but he also gets wounded terribly by Jadis as she stabs him with her broken-off glass-like wand. This dramatic cardinal functions is presented in the film as an ongoing event, proceeded in a chronological way together with the storyline, but in the novel the same account is given in a reminiscent way after the war is over and Jadis is defeated.

After Edmund is attacked by Jadis, Peter becomes the focus on the battlefield in the film as everything else is sped up and blurred out. This suggest Peter's internal shock and indifference to all else but his brother Edmund. Because of his love for Edmund and fear for Edmund to die, Peter is shown to suddenly have a fearless surge of combat to whoever enemy that comes his way to fight. Because of the change on the order in how the war is presented, the film does not focus on how Aslan manages to bring everyone he has turned back to life from being the statues to the battlefield. The viewer sees that in the combat between Peter and Jadis, Peter gets injured just before Aslan comes for the kill (of the White Witch). On the other hand, the novel simply describes it as 'The battle was all over a few minutes after their

[Aslan and those he rescues from the castle] arrival' in the beginning of the very last chapter of the book.

Post-Narnian-War

After the White Witch is killed by Aslan, the film shows that Susan immediately asks for Edmund, seeing he is not around; whereas the novel provides an immediate praise and explanation from Peter when he is with Aslan again. In the novel, Edmund is found under the care of Mrs. Beaver, but in the film Edmund is not tended to by anyone. In addition, the film shows the dwarf slave of Jadis is on his way to finish Edmund off when Susan (and others) arrives and (Susan) promptly puts an arrow in the dwarf. It is also worth noting that in the novel, Lucy appears to be in a passive position in making use of her cordial to save Edmund, but in the film appears to be taking her own initiative without the need of Aslan instructing her. In addition, the novel describes that Lucy is reluctant to leave Edmund's side when she is waiting to see Edmund's improvement after taking the cordial. The film, on the other hand, shows having seen Edmund is brought back to a good physical state, all four children reunited in a group hug and Peter expresses his care and love (in a brotherly indirect way) to Edmund, Lucy takes the cordial and goes off to serve others still in need of help on her own initiative. The film does not show very distinctly that Edmund does more than recovering from his wound, he seems to have appeared 'better than [Lucy] had seen him look—oh, for ages... (4159).' In this particular incident, the words in the novel gives a more specific message to the reader than the image in the film does its viewer. The film here omits the part where Edmund is made a knight as he does in the novel, as well as the parts where description about how the day ends with food Aslan provides for everyone, a night's rest, before spending two days to reach the castle of Cair Paravel. The film does not mention what the children do before the coronation, but jumps right to when Aslan walks together with them to their thrones, where they are crowned kings and queens of Narnia. The order of the crowning in this ceremony in the film is not from Peter to Lucy according to age as suggested in the novel, but from Lucy to Peter according to age in a backward manner. Noticeably, the title such as 'Queen Lucy the Valiant,' 'King Edmund the Just,' 'Queen Susan the Gentle' and 'King Peter the Magnificent' are provided in the film at the coronation, signifying the significance of a beginning as kings and queens marked with these qualities, whereas these titles are provided

in the novel to describe what the children eventually grow into as they stay and reign in the kingdom of Narnia.

The film shows a swift but subtle change of scene from the coronation to what appears to be right in the middle of the hunt of the White Stag from the four now-all-grown-up kings and queens, leaving out the part in the novel where a little bit of information is provided on the children's growing up in Narnia. Some trivial differences are shown in this part of the story: 1. The speech between Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy as grownups should be quite very different from the conversational English they speak in the beginning of the story, according to the novel, but the film shows no difference in the way they converse with each other as grownup kings and queens. 2. Susan's hair is described to be almost reaching her feet in the novel and the film only shows her hair to be slightly shorter length than Lucy's, which is at chest level. 3. Lucy's hair is described to be golden as an adult, which combined with her usual joyful demeanours result in her gaining the title 'Queen Lucy the Valiant' in the novel. However, the film shows a auburn-haired version of the grow-up Lucy. Because of this change, the Lucy in film appears more solemn than the Lucy with cheery disposition described in words in the novel.

The notice of the lamp-post is made by Susan in the novel, whereas in the film the viewer's attention is brought to it because of Edmund's glancing at it just before Susan makes a remark. When it comes to the matter of whether or not they should keep looking into this familiar object of a lamp-post, the novel produces a collective decision whereas the film shows an initiation of Lucy in bringing all of them back to the Human-world. After stumbling back to the Human-world, having not aged any more than perhaps a few minutes, if not seconds, the children are not caught by Mrs. Macready. In the novel, the story quickly ends with the Professor suggesting how the children how they ought to behave regarding Narnia now that they are back to the Human-world, indicating the Professor's possibly awareness or his knowledge of Narnia. The film ends with the Professor promptly entering the spare room and finding the children appearing to have fallen out of the wardrobe just moments before, having the ball that broke the window and knocked down a suit of armour in one hand. As the Professor asks what the children are doing in the wardrobe and Peter speaks up for all his siblings by saying that the Professor would not believe what they have to tell him. Being very intrigued (and confident to the point of suggesting that he may have personal knowledge or experience of Narnia) to what the children have to say about their reasons for coming out from the wardrobe, the film (technically) ends with the Professor answering and daring the

children, '[t]ry me.' After the first part of credit rolling is finished, however, the viewer is shown that Lucy comes to the spare room intending to go through the wardrobe to enter Narnia again when the Professor appears to have been in the room for a while before Lucy comes. Here the viewer is revealed the knowledge that the Professor may have previous knowledge or experience of getting into Narnia before the children and knows how it might work for a person to enter Narnia. Instead of giving instructions to the children as it does in the novel, the film ends (finally) with the Professor answering Lucy that the access to Narnia will probably become available when one does not look for it (but '[a]ll the same, best to keep your eyes open,' says the Professor to Lucy) when she asks if they would ever get back there in Narnia. Then the viewer sees, after the two leave the room, that the wardrobe opens by a little gap and lights shines in the dark room. The viewer hears lion's roars, before the second part of the credit rolling is resumed and finally the film is officially finished.

Parallels and Contrasts

The film shows a slightly different emphasis within the Pevensies. While still paying a bit more attention to Lucy in general, it seems that Peter's development is portrayed more. Nonetheless, because the film follows the novel in terms of events, Lucy's role remains a crucial one.

In reality, the Human-world:

- (a) Peter: In the beginning of film, Peter demonstrates harsh comments towards Edward, obviously meaning to straighten Edward's misbehaviour up with little or no regard to the fact that his words may hurt Edward and his opinions may be in fact misled or misunderstood.
- (b) Susan: Susan is less focused on in the beginning of the film. She appears to be taking care of the younger ones when it is needed. Sometimes she is disrespected by Edmund verbally.
- (c) Edmund: From the beginning of the film, with the air-raid, he appears to be a boy who cares for and misses his father but is misunderstood by Peter. Slowly, Edmund shows that he tends to treat someone more vulnerable than himself badly, just to save his own face.

- (d) Lucy: Being the youngest, Lucy is often the one being taken care of by someone older. She appears to be a bit insecure in the beginning. Once Lucy discovers Narnia, she is all excitement and wants to share it with her siblings. But when she is called a liar, she becomes hurt and is resolved to stand her ground in believing what she experienced to be true.

In Narnia:

- (a) Peter: Peter's development inside Narnia seems to be the most focused on, next to the presentation of what Edmund goes through that is. His treatment towards Edmund after they arrive in Narnia is, though with good reason, harsh. He shows little care towards Edmund. But right in the beginning in Narnia, he shows that he is willing to admit he has been wrong to disbelieve Lucy and apologises. With the discovery of betrayal that Edmund left for Jadis, Peter soon realises that he must do whatever he can to try rescue Edmund back. He also realises that his relationship with Edmund needs to be mended. Later on, as he has had struggles with the idea of being the prophesied king ever since he gets to know the prophecies, Peter finally makes a brave decision of embracing the role of a king. His wish to have his brother back, attempt and success to amend his relationship with Edmund all help his decision of taking up the responsibility of being the oldest amongst the Pevensies to protect everyone and to be in good relationship with his siblings; and becoming the prophesied king, even if that means going into war during Aslan's absence. As he fights on the battlefield by the side of Edmund, Peter's concerns and worries of losing Edmund is shown the most. His general growth in Narnia film is through his admitting his faults and accepting the responsibility of a king.
- (b) Susan: Susan's development is less noticed in the film, it is there nonetheless. As Father Christmas says, Susan is not afraid to make herself heard. Once inside, she keeps insisting that it is better to go back. Her reluctance to stay in Narnia any more than necessary is finally replaced with acceptance, much like Peter's, when she finally agrees with her siblings that they must fight for Narnia and protect everyone in it. Though Susan appears to warm up to Narnia later than most of her siblings, she warms up to Lucy's friend, Mr. Tumnus, almost instantly, when they finally meet in person

towards the end of the film. Her change evolves largely on her love towards Narnia as a whole and towards others in general.

- (c) Edmund: Edmund appears to be a misunderstood boy who thinks he only has himself to look after and can only count on himself. Unfortunately, he befriends the enemy, Jadis, and has to learn about how Lucy has been right all along the hard way. His selfishness starts changing and he starts thinking about others when he realises he has really brought lethal damage in the lives of people he does not even know, one of which is Mr. Tumnus. Eventually, Edmund grows firmer in his decision doing the right thing and becoming good again, even at the cost of nearly getting himself killed. His relationship with the rest of the siblings is truly restored starting from when he shares how he thinks the Pevensies have to stay and fight. Since then Edmund shows what appears to be his true nature. Edmund's selfishness turning selflessness is what is the most noticeable in the film.
- (d) Lucy: Throughout her time in Narnia, Lucy remains to be a loving and faithful friend to those she has acquainted herself with and friendly towards strangers who she knows to follow Aslan. She also shows that she can be the bigger person that forgives the wrong done on her with her siblings and that her love for them is great. In comparison with her siblings, Lucy is possibly much less focused on, next to Edmund and Peter, ever since all four children enter Narnia. But her role of being the key to all these experiences and guiding the group to the right path of following Aslan makes her significant.

3.4 Character Functions

Aside from the plot of the story, which makes structure, characters are important in that they are the ones presented to the readers/viewers and are the ones that fill in the gaps in the events that take place in the plot. Borrowing terms from the analysis on events that take place in the story, this section examines each character in Narnia and their significance in the story. The main characters in this story are Peter, Susan, Edmund, Lucy, Aslan and Jadis, whom the story surrounds and who can make the kind of difference a cardinal function makes in a story. After the main characters come those whose functions in the story act more like the catalysers to the cardinal functions. In this case, these catalysers-characters are Mr. Tumnus, the Professor, Father Christmas and the Beavers. In addition, the film version contains characters such as Oreius and Mr. Fox as catalyser-characters, although they are not found in the novel.

3.4.1 Cardinal-Functions Characters

Peter

As the eldest of the four children and in the absence of their parents, Peter's role is one of the authoritative figure in the group. Being one of the two males in the group, Peter seems to be in certain tension in his relationship to Edmund, the other male of the four children. In his interaction with Susan, Peter seems to be more or less taking Susan as a councillor in matters regarding decision-making. Lastly, in his treatment to Lucy, Peter appears to be a loving big brother who is caring to her and only display mild reproach when he thinks it is necessary. In the novel, Peter is generally into exploring, be it the Professor's house or Narnia. There is not so much self-doubt in the novel when prophecies are revealed to him and more knowledge of Narnia is established within him. Only as he gets more involved with the Narnian war that is bound to happen does he begin with a bit of self-doubt. The more noticeable change happens through Lucy's thought described to the reader that Peter looks 'so pale and stern (4147)' and he appears much older because of that. Throughout the adventure regarding Narnia, Peter's change is not very clearly presented to the reader, but he maintains a brave (even when he does not feel like it) and adventurous character of the four children. In the film, Peter demonstrates much more personal emotions towards others in his verbal expression (specifically to Edmund) and conversations with others. A huge focus is laid on Peter and his progress from being a boy to becoming a man, a knight and a king. This focus on Peter nearly effaces the importance of Lucy (and Edmund) in the novel. Because the film provides the

visual as well as the audio of the characters, Peter's facial expression, tone of voice and so on combined together demonstrate a more out-spoken personality in him. In addition, the pretext part of the film (with the air raids in London and the children's mother having to send them to the Professor) provides a stronger sense of tension between him and Edmund until Edmund is returned back to the rest of the children. The beginning of the film shows Peter's outburst of anger under the pressure and fear of war and that contrasts with around the end of the film when Peter yells at Edmund on the battlefield to save himself (Edmund) and the rest of their siblings while he (Peter) fights against his enemies. The moment Edmund is injured by Jadis creates such shock to Peter that all fears within him appears to have evaporated and what is left is pure determination to end Jadis. Peter displays doubts about himself being one of the prophesied kings, which produces fears in him for being involved in a war and denial of his importance/responsibility in Narnia. However, that doubt is later replaced with a love and bravery for Narnia as he progresses further into confidences and acceptance of his new identity, that of a king in Narnia. The focus on Peter regarding his growth from being a child to being a grownup king is placed in a central spot in the film rather than in the Lucy-Edmund parallel in the novel, elevating his significance amongst the four children, almost parallel to Lucy's importance to the story in film.

Susan

Being the second oldest of the four, Susan often is presented as the motherly figure while Peter the fatherly one. While Peter may be authoritative and commanding, Susan is caring and peace-making. She is described to be one with logical thinking and her advice is of good counselling effect to Peter. In the novel, Susan is presented to have logical ideas and suggestion to solve practical issues, such as taking the coats to wear in the snowy Narnia when they first enter it. Susan also appears to be caring when noticing someone disturbed emotionally (such as when Aslan is troubled) and she can be so affected that she does not manage to sleep (in the same evening). Susan is portrayed to have a gentle nature as she as a grownup is called Queen Susan the Gentle. Throughout the story, though also a main-character, Susan might be the least focused on amongst her other three siblings. In the film, Susan appears to voice more in a protesting light, especially in the beginning after the children arrive in Narnia. Susan insists on her opinion regarding going home to be the correct thing to do whereas staying in Narnia is unwise, but her opinion was not followed by her

siblings. In contrast to Lucy's total acceptance of talking animals and Peter's quick reconciliation to Mr. Beaver, who is able to talk, after an embarrassing first encounter experience, Susan depends on her logical mind and the Human-world common sense to resist the idea of Narnia, which is full of magic and does not follow the rules that generally apply to Human-world. Susan's reasoning for resisting to be involved more in Narnian affairs in the beginning appears to be based on her recalling '[m]om sent us away so we wouldn't be caught up in a war,' to which Peter agrees as he struggles to accept his identity in Narnia. Later on, Susan finally reconciles herself with the idea of staying in Narnia to help out by the breakfast table when she hears the other three siblings' thoughts on the matter. Another example of Susan behaving based on how she sees her sibling feel is when she meets Tumnus for the first time in Jadis' castle, after his being brought back to life by Aslan. Seeing Lucy's comfort to witness Tumnus being brought back to life and knowing Lucy's fondness towards this dear acquaintance, Susan gives a hearty hug to Tumnus as if they are good friends for a long time (like Lucy and him) when they in fact just met. Susan is described by Father Christmas that she does not 'seem to have a problem of making herself heard.' Because Susan is able to make herself heard every now and then, she does not appear to be completely neglected throughout the film but just that she is comparatively less focused on amongst her other three siblings in the story.

Edmund

Being the younger brother of the four children, second youngest (note: not the youngest), and in the absence parents, Edmund has a rebellious temper towards authoritative figures. With the little information provided through dialogues in the beginning, the reader gets to know that Edmund starts misbehaving at a school. Being sandwiched between Peter, Susan and Lucy in terms of age, and with a rebellious tendency, Edmund tends to not be obedient of Peter's decision, tends to retort Susan's caring instructions and tends to treat Lucy with unkindness when chances opportune. In the novel, Edmund appears to be a bit moody sometimes. The proportion given on describing Edmund in the novel appears to be taking up nearly equal amount with that on Lucy. At first Edmund is described to utter lies at times, just to get the result he wants, and does not like being in the wrong. His change comes after having sided himself with Jadis, only to discover her cruelty after suffering a series of miseries while imprisoned by her. Admitting his fault, Edmund reconciles with his siblings as

they reunite after Edmund is rescued back to Aslan's camp. Throughout the novel, Edmund is the second most focused character amongst his siblings. His experience in the story is similar to the Prodigal Son story in the Bible, in terms of his choosing to be away from the right path first before returning and being accepted back to the good side. In the film, Edmund is first introduced in the pretext (the bombarded London that is not in the novel) to be a slightly misunderstood brother to Peter. The tension between him and Peter is not only rooted from Peter's side, but Edmund's own missing his father as well, as Edmund fights back in pointing out to Peter, '[y]ou think you're Dad, but you're not!' Edmund's teasing and jeering of Lucy in the novel is transposed to the film in a significantly less portion. In Edmund's misery while being prisoned by Jadis, he experiences the humiliation of being pointed a finger at as a snitch for the price of sweets in front of Tumnus whom he betrayed, combined with many other ill-treatments, Edmund realises what he has heard from Lucy and the Beavers concerning Jadis are all correct, and that he is, in fact, wrong to choose to side with Jadis. As Edmund slowly recovers his conscience, he finally reveals his care for those Jadis considers enemies when he attempts to stop Jadis from gaining yet another victim, Mr. Fox. It is not until Edmund is reunited with his other three siblings that he gets to speak about his support for staying in Narnia and be of a help to this kingdom. After he redeems himself through a near-death experience on the battlefield, Edmund seats alongside his siblings on the thrones at the coronation ceremony after their victory on the battlefield. In the film version of the story, Edmund may be the second most focused character amongst the four children.

Lucy

Lucy is the youngest of all four children, yet the most focused one, as she is the first discoverer of Narnia of the four children. Lucy is portrayed to be of trusting nature and very caring. Lucy's development is the most versatile in terms of the aspect of love. In the beginning of the story, Lucy demonstrates the affection love towards her siblings in the novel despite their differences (Peter and Susan's disbelief of her experience of Narnia, and Edmund's unlovable and harsh mockery regarding Narnia), friendship to Mr. Tumnus and finally, a gift-love to forgive and to heal (quite literally, to the wounded with the precious cordial) in the sense of Charity. In the novel, being curious, Lucy seems to be rather brave as a little girl in her exploring Narnia. Lucy's first acquaintance (Tumnus the Faun) leads her to eventually be rooting for Aslan's side in the conflict within Narnia. It is fairly clear that Lucy

is placed in the central position of all human characters. Throughout the story, Lucy's position is firstly, in the pre-Narnian-War, the discoverer; then, during the Narnian War, she is one of the believing supporters, and after the Narnia War, as one of the reigning queen, she is referred to as Lucy the Valiant for her happy and joyous nature. Lucy's care for Aslan and practically everyone she meets in Narnia who mean no harm is also worth noting as a quality in this character. Of all four children in the main characters that have the cardinal-functions effect, Lucy is unquestionably the one that is in a decisive position; in fact, had Lucy been timid and not ventured onwards when she enters the wardrobe and consequently enters Narnia, there might not be a book called *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* to start with. In the film, Lucy is portrayed to be a little girl who might be frightened by the Human-world reality with the war going on, but transforms into a brave little girl when she is in Narnia (also with a war going on). Although appearing to be in need of care amongst her siblings for being the youngest, Lucy becomes a leader (because of her knowledge gained from Tumnus) once all four children are inside Narnia. Much like Susan, Lucy is not scared to make herself heard when the occasion calls for it, e.g. when she is taken as a liar for making Narnia up by her siblings and when she is in Narnia voicing a strong desire to stay and help out. Lucy also appears to be very caring and quick to forgiving. For example, she cares for Tumnus even when she learns from him that he has bad intention; she notices and cares for Aslan in his troubled emotions so much that she can not sleep at night; she cares for Edmund and is the first to run to him to give him a hug when they reunite and the list goes on. This caring nature corresponds with the Christmas gift she is given by Father Christmas (the precious cordial) as she attempts to give it to Aslan's dead body and is able to provide much needed help for the wounded (the ones she cares for in Narnia), including her own brother Edmund. At the end of the children's stay in Narnia, as grownup kings and queens of Narnia, Lucy is still of very important position as she is the person that leads her brothers and sister back to Human-world, again because of her curiosity. Throughout the film, though the viewer's attention is distributed rather equally amongst each character, particularly amongst the four children, and even slightly more directed to the growth of Peter from being a boy to being a king. Because of the significance of Lucy's character, she is considered the most focused one in comparison with her siblings, despite the obvious focus on Peter's throughout the film and a fairly large amount of attention sometimes more on Edmund in the novel.

Aslan

Taken as a Christly figure of the story, Aslan is categorised as one of the cardinal-functions characters because of his significance, given that the Narnian war is basically a war between good and evil, with him being the symbol of good and Jadis evil. Though Aslan is not presented right from the beginning of the story, it is indicated that he at least has been around since the very beginning of the creation of Narnia. Aslan's possessing authority is symbolised in his being good and powerful and in his being a lion, which is considered the 'king' in the animal realm(,which, Narnia basically is), and - interestingly enough- in human opinions. In the novel, Aslan is portrayed and illustrated to be a lion that at times stands upright like a human and at times stand on all four like a normal lion does. The name Aslan is first introduced in the story by Mr. Beaver. At the mention of the name, strong feelings are evoked within the listening children, such effect shows Aslan's importance is beyond his presence's reach. For a lion, Aslan seems to have a great deal of knowledge of the children (names, number of them and so on) than they do him. Throughout the story, Aslan's identity is one of the real king in Narnia, one that was there when the emperor-beyond-the-sea put magic and set laws in Narnia and one that is good, but what he really is (besides being a lion) remains a mystery. Even the comings and goings of Aslan is not as predictable as one may wish them to be. In addition, Aslan appears to have great care for the children, even before they are crowned as kings and queens, as he goes as far a length as taking Edmund's place as a traitor to die for him and later becomes resurrected because of the dark magic. In the film, Aslan remains the image of a normal lion and stands on all four the whole time. Perhaps because of this, Aslan appears to give even more intimidating atmosphere when he shows himself to the children as he walks out of his tent. The film version of Aslan gives an assertiveness that is not as prominent in the novel and sends an allusion that Aslan may, in fact, know what is going to happen in the future, in an omniscient sense. Though not always physically present in every scene, Aslan appears to maintain an omnipresence either by physically present or by being mentioned by the characters as if he is so near to bring hope to end their misery in Narnia. Aslan in the film, with the visual effect, is presented with more radiance than what is described with words in the novel, producing more hopefulness and glory in his presence. In his opposition with Jadis, Aslan's authority over Jadis seems to be shown in a less obvious way than it does in the novel, but his triumph over the battle with Jadis is definite overpowering.

Jadis the White Witch

As the antagonist of the story, Jadis is the source of all sufferings in Narnia. Her power of bringing the persisting winter in Narnia and keeping Father Christmas out of Narnia is the most crucial of her securing the authority of hers in the kingdom. Being surrounded by statues of her victims in the castle, it appears Jadis' power, though effective in the absence of Aslan, functions only in solitude. She also possesses magic that helps her lure her victims or preys into her trap, should she sees it fit to approach them in such a way, as she does to Edmund. Her position as the villain puts her in opposition with Aslan. In truth, she does not stand a chance to claim victory over Aslan, so she sees to it that Aslan dies and she gets to continue being queen. Eventually Jadis fails this attempt as she does not understand the dark magic well enough to know its logic and true meaning. This lack of knowledge result in her own failure to keep the throne to herself and her fall to death. While Aslan provides hope and summons bravery in the listeners at the mention of his name, Jadis is presented to be very well-feared (and despised) and brings a chill down to the bones in the audience at the sound of her name. Jadis is the example of Lewis' 'irredeemable' heart that was changed by being locked up in the 'casket or coffin' of her 'selfishness (121).' In the novel, Jadis is revealed to the children by Mr. Beaver to be a descendant of Adam and his first wife, Lilith (meaning, she is not a daughter of Eve), who is of the Jinn on one side and the giants on the other; meaning Jadis is not of pure human breed (3197). Like Aslan, Jadis appears to have a history in Narnia long before the four children arrive there. As to who came first, Aslan or Jadis, or at the same time, remains a question mark. Also like Aslan, Jadis has power (magic) that she uses to keep Narnia under her command. Her temper is rather hard to predict for Edmund, her personality is selfish and she appears to be in fear of Aslan when in his presence. Her fear of Aslan is not as vividly described in the film version of the story than it is in the novel. Throughout the story, Jadis represents a force (dark and cold as snow) that is doomed to fade away by the sun, hope and life that Aslan and the prophecy-fulfilling kings and queens of Narnia bring. Her attempt to keep the throne that is not even rightfully hers to begin with proves to be short-lived. In the film, Jadis' background information (regarding who her parents are and that she is not a pure human) is completely omitted, she just appear in all white (snow-white to be exact) and rather tall. One very distinctive feature of hers is her manipulation (sometimes with the help of her magic): her getting Edmund to believe she is a very nice and friendly person and getting him to agree to bring his siblings, her negotiating with Aslan and make it so that he would die in Edmund's stead; both of which she fails her own goals. Edmund does not

manage to bring his siblings to her and Aslan resurrects, joins the battle with reinforcement and together with his army triumphs over Jadis and her followers.

3.4.2 Catalysers-Characters

Tumnus the Faun

In both the novel and film, Tumnus' choice of keeping Lucy is itself of cardinal-functions importance, but the character himself, being rather in the margin of the story, provides more of a catalyser's building-up function. Although absent most time of the story, being the first animal of Narnia that Lucy meets and befriends, Tumnus is a character that begins the thread of motivation or persuasion for the children to remain and be more actively involved in Narnia throughout the story. Tumnus is an important catalysers-character that receives Charity in the form of redemption through acquiring Friendship. Being a subject to Jadis' ruling, Tumnus chooses to follow her order when he first finds out that Lucy is in fact a daughter of Eve. His choice turns out to be a mistake as he realises the damages he is doing by kidnapping Lucy. But Lucy's reassurance and quick forgiveness allows Tumnus to take strength and be brave enough to attempt to right the wrong he has committed. In the end, Tumnus gains himself a trustworthy friend, Lucy, who will bring forth the prophesied kings and queens, fulfil the prophecies and (help) rescue Tumnus' life. Perhaps because of the effect of moving image, the friendship between Lucy and Tumnus appears to be portrayed to be in a stronger degree in the film than in the novel. Where there are rather melodramatic descriptions over Tumnus' remorse for kidnapping Lucy, the film demonstrates Tumnus' cooping up nearly in a ball in a far corner of the room when Lucy wakes up and his teary eyes (note: not actually 'sobbing' as the reader reads in the novel) as he explains what he has done and who makes him do it in a more realistic way. The fact that Tumnus behaves melodramatically in the novel when he expresses his being sorry makes his emotions appear ever so slightly untruthful. The novel does not make mention of Tumnus very often, but the film puts Tumnus to in a position much closer to the main four children, for instance, not only Lucy gets to be friends with Tumnus, in the film Edmund also gets to meet Tumnus in his cell in Jadis' castle (this bit of story only exists in the film, not the novel) and have an entirely different relations with Tumnus (cell-neighbour and then the-betrayed-and-the-snitch). In the novel, as Aslan take Susan and Lucy to Jadis' castle, Tumnus is eventually discovered and turned back to life; however, the film shows the Tumnus is brought back to life by Aslan's

breath first thing (for the viewer) after Aslan arrives to ransack Jadis' castle. Though the film does show that Tumnus is not the first one that is turned back to life, it only shows the viewer the part where Tumnus is rescued from being a statue indefinitely to sum up the whole rescue mission Aslan conducts in ransacking Jadis' castle. Tumnus is the source of Lucy's knowledge on Narnia and Lucy's knowledge of Narnia is the basis of decision-making amongst the four children. In this respect, Tumnus can be looked at almost as important as one cardinal-function character, for his knowledge and friendship make Lucy's importance in the story possible, and this marks him as one salient catalysers character to be mentioned first here.

Professor Kirke

In the novel, the Professor appears to be a person not easily dismissing what the children have to say when Peter and Susan went to him for advice regarding Lucy. His reaction to Peter and Susan's initiated talk is of cardinal-function importance, which leads to Peter and Susan's thinking that perhaps Lucy is telling the truth. The thought and logic the Professor presents lead to Peter and Susan's taking care of Lucy as usual after their talk, when they could have easily respond to the matter in a seriously different direction and try to remove themselves (all four children) from the Professor's house by contacting their mother. When all four children return to the Human-world from Narnia, they speak with the Professor again. In this incident the Professor appears to remain as trusting to what he is hearing from the children as before and again presenting a logic that indicates he himself may have had some knowledge of Narnia. In the film, the cardinal-functions effect but catalysers position of the Professor in the story is elevated in the few scenes he actually shows up in the story. The Professor is portrayed in the film to be the one initiating the talk instead of Peter and Susan taking the initiative. When Peter appears reluctant to ask for help, Susan reveals their predicament and then the Professor is suddenly intrigued. After the children return from Narnia and tell the Professor of their time there, in the end the viewer gets to know that the Professor has tried to enter Narnia through the wardrobe himself when Lucy goes to the spare room, wanting to go back to Narnia. The desire of going to Narnia appears to be much more in the Professor in the film than in the novel. In general, the Professor's connection with the children in the story deems him to be of a guiding sort of character. One that can make a deciding influence on how the story may turn out. If the Professor had been dismissing the children's affair

regarding Narnia entirely and wanted the nonsense away, the story might not exist, just as what would have been if Lucy did not find Narnia through the wardrobe.

Father Christmas

Being the one that gives Peter the battle-fighting sword, Lucy the life-saving cordial and Susan the horn of help and the bow and arrows, Father Christmas is the source on which the cardinal-functions moments lie, since he provides tools that the receivers rely very much on in crucial moments during war, danger and even death. In the novel, Father Christmas appears to have given a family of squirrels and a fox reason to celebrate. This then is encountered by Jadis, leading to her turning the whole party into statues after Edmund's own cardinal-functions moment to show his disagreeing opinion. In the film and like in the novel, Father Christmas only actually appears when he meets the children and the Beavers. However, the part about the party does not take place in the film, making Father Christmas appear slightly less important as a catalyser character. It is worth noting that, in addition to the catalyser position of Father Christmas, who is the source of build-ups to several cardinal-functions moments, Father Christmas himself has a significant meaning in the story. As Father Christmas was kept out of Narnia for a hundred years, his being in Narnia itself is a sign of the weakening of Jadis' power of keeping Narnia in perpetual winter. Though appearing only once and mentioned a few times in the story, Father Christmas remains one important character that has catalysers effect to the story.

Mr. and Mrs. Beaver

As mentioned regarding Tumnus the Faun, who himself alone is the source of knowledge regarding Narnia for Lucy in the beginning (and making him one important catalyser character), Mr. and Mrs. Beaver take over that informative position during Tumnus' absence in the story. Mr. and Mrs Beaver provide the children information regarding the prophecies as well as some background information of Jadis and Aslan, the latter is omitted in the film, but the help the children receive in the guiding, protecting and even material-providing aspects from the Beavers (when they first arrive in Narnia and find out Tumnus is captured) is one major foundational catalyser to build up to the many cardinal-functions moments in the story. With the information provided by the Beavers, the children and the reader (and the viewer)

get to know that Narnia has a history that exists long before the children can imagine. The aspect of time, that Narnia's history comes long before the children enter it and will last long after they leave, is brought into light and entailed with the information given by the Beavers.

Oreius the Centaur and Mr. Fox

Being the differences between the novel and the film themselves, two noticeable characters are made stand out in the film and made into catalysers-characters. Both the centaur and the fox are mentioned in the novel, but without specific focus; yet in the film names are presented in a light less dependent on the other characters around them, demanding attention from the viewers. The novel does not actually provide any names of any of the centaurs that is addressed such as in the occasions of Aslan telling the centaurs (and eagles) to follow the wolf that gets away after Peter's first kill, when Aslan is telling Peter how he must lead the army in the battlefield before Aslan's own death by Jadis the Witch, and so on. However, in the film one centaur is given the name Oreius to the viewer, therefore made stand out amongst all the un-named centaurs in the story. Oreius is portrayed in the film as one who values loyalty and is readily willing to sacrifice himself on the battlefield for whom he serves with loyalty. Although not particular focused on in the film (since it is only in the film that this character is brought to the attention of the viewer), Oreius produces an image to the viewer that he, in his silent ways, is a creature of unshakeable loyalty and strong quality as such comes in especially handy in times of war. Though not specified in the film, Oreius could be taken as a character of catalyser influence to Peter particularly on the battlefield.

Mr. Fox is strictly speaking a character that only exists in the film version of the story, but not the only fox mentioned. One fox is mentioned in the novel version that appears when Jadis interrupts a cheerful squirrel party before damning them all into statues, but no name nor a way of addressing him is given. In the novel, after Edmund attempts and fails to stop Jadis from turning the whole party into statues, Edmund is said that 'for the first time in this story, felt sorry for someone besides himself (3550),' marking the significance of the incident where the fox is a part of but not the main focus of. In the film, Mr. Fox is significantly more central than the fox mentioned in the novel. When Jadis' wolf-police Maugrim nearly catches up with the Beavers and the children, it is Mr. Fox that provides a misdirection to the wolves which then saves the children and the Beavers. Another occasion of the Mr. Fox's catalyser position is when he is brought to Jadis and Edmund by the wolves. From the way Mr. Fox solemnly

addresses Edmund according to what is due to him in Narnia with kindness and good manner, Edmund, in his cardinal-functions moment, dares to attempt saving Mr. Fox from being harmed by Jadis. Jadis here is treated as if invisible by Mr. Fox, who insults her self-appointed importance. This incident in itself is one crucial escalator for the story development, hence a catalyser moment, one that builds up to the cardinal-functions moment where Edmund chooses to disagree with Jadis and whose treatments onwards from Jadis are reduced to prisoner level. The way Mr. Fox is able to trigger shifts in the significance of different characters and to put pressure on decision-making on Edmund's side (whether or not he should continue siding himself with Jadis), makes him an important catalyser-character, regardless of the fact that he does not exist in the novel.

3.5 Enunciation and Adaptation

3.5.1 Narrational Mode: The Novel – Third-Person Narration

The story itself is told by a third-person omniscient narrator, who appears to be the author Lewis himself. Instead of using words to describe and paint a picture for the reader, the narrator gets straight to the point and basically gives out the gist of the story: '[o]nce there were four children whose names were Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy. This story is about something that happened to them when they were sent away from London during the war because of the air-raids (2401-2405).' The narrator is both aware of the happenings inside the story -especially what goes on in the minds of the characters- as he presents the story and aware of the reader while addressing himself to the reader, sometimes directing the readers on what to feel, think and imagine. On multiple occasions, the narrator, instead of simply presenting the story, interferes the reader's mind and tells the reader what to think, what to feel and what connections to make while identifying with the characters in the story. Because the narrator is presented to be Lewis himself, not a by-stander character within the story, the narrator is therefore in the position of the creator of the story while he presents his work to the reader, making the story quite literally a meeting place for the reader to meet the author. This personal approach also makes the presentation of different characters' minds natural. Instead of a divine third-person party peeping into the minds of the characters and sharing that with the reader, the narrator, as Lewis, presents the reader with authority exactly what is on the characters' minds. The narrator addresses the reader in a casual way, while sometimes directing what the reader should do (know, feel or remember) as s-/he reads, for example, 'you remember he had seen...(3304),' 'I hope you know what I mean by a voice sounding

pale.(3421),’ ‘[s]oon, wherever you looked, instead of white shapes you saw the dark green of firs or the black prickly branches of bare oaks and beeches and elms (3580),’ etc. The narrator, Lewis, acts as a guide for the tour of the story and tells, in a performative sense, the reader how to be a reader to his story.

Although the most central character is considered to be Lucy, amongst all her siblings and other cardinal-functions characters such as Aslan and Jadis for her significance in the story, the focus (for instance, providing internal thoughts to the readers) given by narration is rather evenly distributed amongst characters, sometimes even a little bit less on Lucy than others such as Edmund. Thoughts and feelings of individual involved within the story are provided as the dialogues take place, therefore providing a richer context for the reader to know the motivational aspect of each character and the individual’s personality. The narrator appears to be rather omniscient regarding the internal feelings and thoughts on some characters, such as Lucy and Edmund, significantly less on Peter and Susan and practically none on Aslan and Jadis.

3.5.2 Narrational Mode: The Film – Andrew Adamson and the Silent Narrator: the Camera
In comparison with the novel, the film removes the narrator and instead presents the story in the same neutral way of what a third-person objective narration looks like in the form of a film. The film does not have a voice-over where the narrator comes in and provides the viewer the psychological development within each character or where the narrator may tell the viewer information such as names and relations of the characters or some other possibly important and relevant details. Everything regarding information the viewer needs to know is known by listening to the dialogues between the characters and every emotion in the characters is observed by the viewer. The camera in the film, unlike the narration in the novel, does not necessarily distribute its focus evenly on all four children but gives more focus on Lucy, in terms of the focused shot when one of or all other three children are together with her: when she is discovering Narnia, when the children are in Mr. Tumnus’ raided and deserted home, when Mr. Fox is risking his life for the children and the Beavers to escape, when the children meet Father Christmas, when Edmund reunites with the rest of the children, when Jadis arrives at Aslan's camp site to claim what is rightfully hers (Edmund’s blood as a traitor), when Aslan’s dead body disappears with a shake of the earth, when Lucy notices Aslan’s departure after the coronation ceremony and after the children are all grownup before

rediscovering the lamp-post after long forgetting the Human-world. In the film, because it is the camera that directs the attention of the viewer in navigating throughout the story instead of a narrator as in a person in the novel, the camera-narrator in the film appears to be unbiased. Because the camera as the narrator is not presenting itself to be the author Lewis, like the narrator in the novel does, what the viewer gets is: instead of getting to know the story second-handed through the narrator, who appears to be Lewis himself in the novel, the viewer gets to witness the story first-handed.

3.5.3 Adaptation Modes

When discussing categories in adapting films from novels, McFarlane mentions Wagner's categories, which are *transposition*, *commentary* and *analogy*. In the present analysis, the adaptation of Narnia fits between transposition and commentary. The story itself in the film is presented chronologically as the novel does so as well. However, when the novel is compared nearly in a word-by-word fashion next to the film, some oddities appear. What appears to be smooth in style of Lewis' writing, in comparison with what is shown in the film, becomes unnatural, almost abnormal, such as the handshakes that take place in the apology scenes (Peter and the others to Lucy and Edmund to his siblings). The changes made in the film in specific moments as such makes the interactions of the character more natural to their age in the modern viewer's eyes. Moreover, the style of the shooting of the film also shows the commentary effect on the present film. The changes made in the film both in events and in the method of shooting the film, which is heavily influenced by the director's shooting style, categorise the adaptation to lean towards commentary while still hugely belonging in transposition.

Similarly, Andrew has three modes of adaptation, and the present analysed work fits in all three modes of *borrowing*, *intersection* and *fidelity and transformation*. For borrowing, aside from the similar, if not the same part of the definition to Wagner's transposition; considering the original work is a classic children story and written by the famous Lewis; the film adaptation fits in the nuance sense of the category, being that the respectability the adaptation naturally is made connected to when the fact that the source text is by Lewis is made known. Narnia, in this sense, fits everything this borrowing mode entails. The second mode of Andrew's, intersection, is very similar to Wagner's commentary, but focused rather on filling the gap where the source text neglects to make a more wholesome story than to

blend in personal film-shooting style. Of course, that is not to say that there are no signature style of film-shooting from director Andrew Adamson in the Narnia film. The film version of the story provides a pretext to explain the tension between Peter and Edmund, why all four children are going to the Professor's house to stay for a while and why the children's father and basically mother as well are absent in the story. This action of filling-in-the-gap in the film qualifies the adaptation in Andrew's intersection mode. Lastly, Andrew's fidelity and transformation focuses on producing the same experience for the viewer as the novel does to its reader while following more or less the same framework of the story. This mode specifically focuses on the difference between 'fidelity to the words' and 'fidelity to the spirit.' While the film does not necessarily adapt Lewis' story 'to the words,' it does present the story's major qualities with enhancement, making the evil appear more vile, the loyal more glorious and the good more triumphant, giving the viewer at least the same experience and more emphasis on certain scenes because of the film-shooting style of Adamson.

3.6 Authorship

The authors (author and auteur) considered for this section of the case-study are C. S. Lewis and Andrew Adamson, as *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* was written by C. S. Lewis and published in 1950. Then in 2005, the story of Narnia was adapted and put onto screen in the cinema, directed by Andrew Adamson, who was known for producing Shrek movies.

3.6.1 Author of the novel: C.S. Lewis

C. S. Lewis is known for his many published works, amongst which are the ones he published after having gone from being an atheist to a theist in 1930, including but not limited to his *The Screwtape Letters* (1942), *The Allegory of love* (1936), *A Grief Observed* (1961), *The Pilgrim's Regress* (1933), *Surprised by Joy* (1955), *The Problem of Pain* (1940), *The Great Divorce* (1945), *Mere Christianity* (1952), last but not least, *The Chronicles of Narnia* (1950-1956) and still many more. Many of the books aforementioned are Christianity-related and full of discussions on how one is to exercise or maintain the walk of faith while living on earth. There are also a few fictions in the mentioned books that focus on presenting a theological point of view on faith, such as *The Screwtape Letters*, *The Pilgrim's Regress* and his famous series of children book, *The Chronicles of Narnia*. In many of his novels, Lewis

writes with his hallmarked technique: a *supposal* to invite his readers into the stories (4019). This technique, however, is not often used, if at all, in Lewis' *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. Lewis admits that he, as a ten-year-old, 'read fairy tales in secrets and would have been ashamed if found doing so.... At the age of fifty... read them openly (7225).' Having been well-read in mythologies, fairy-tales, fantasies and such alike, Lewis uses the Bible as the source-book for his Narnian stories and reasons that 'most readers, even of mature age, recognize little of it [Christian faith, the Bible] except in Aslan's death and resurrection... Lewis intended it to be recognized only subconsciously... (7579).' Lewis' friendly approaches to introduce the story to his readers is what makes his story stay well with the reader. This magical realm easily makes his young readers to daydream about joining the Pevensies when they are young and allows that daydreaming to turn into possible contemplation in adulthood later on.

3.6.2 'Auteur' of the film – Andrew Adamson

Although the film is a production not of only one person but a result of a crew of at least five persons, what the viewer sees is where the camera points to, and where the camera points to is decided by the director, hence in this section, the 'author' of the film focuses on the director.

Andrew Adamson was known for his *Shrek* movies before he directed *The Chronicles of Narnia: the Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* that was in the cinema in 2005. According to Internet Movie Database (IMDb), Adamson has the trademark of 'using handheld camera to shoot close-up shots on the protagonist during battle sequences' and 'his films often start with some sort of journey or escape'¹ It is easy to extract from this that Adamson tends to focus on the theme of war, fight and journey. This is what the film shows to be focusing on as well, given the fact that a large portion of time in the film is focused on the actions that take place on the battlefield. The film, with some rearrangements of the order and modifications of plot, also shows a stronger focus on the thrill of the chase and the combat fighting. Because it is a film, Adamson uses the specialty he has proved himself capable of in *Shrek* movies in *Narnia* by the simulation scenes of talking animals and mythological creatures. With keen

¹ IMDb. Andrew Adamson trademark. Accessed 5 January, 2018.
<http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0011470/bio?ref_=nm_ov_bio_sm>

eyes, one spots the computer effect in the battlefield scene as well, as one individual with such keen eyes, Jay Tolson comments in his ‘An Intimate Epic on a Big Screen,’

Adamson, by and large, has done an exceptional job of filling in visual details, both with completely digitalized computer graphic characters like Aslan or with digitally enhanced characters like the faun Tumnus. And whether depicting the climactic battle or more intimate scenes, he blends live action and computer graphics with an uncanny, even understated elegance that never allows the visual elements to overpower the deep simplicity of the story—or the very human conflicts at its center (52).

Adamson’s skill as a director for Narnia is clearly affected by what he is reputed for from previous works in terms of visual effect and his favour for battle scenes.

In addition, as Adamson works with one of Lewis’ step sons, Douglas Gresham as co-producer, Adamson expresses that the changes made in the film are given approved by Gresham (74), coming from a place of authorial relation, despite the fact that he became Lewis’ step son after *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* already published. Gresham’s reasons for approving those changes in the film as a co-producer are not made known to the public specifically. However, Jeff Gile of Newsweek reports that Gresham believes ‘that the “Narnia” story could speak for itself (74),’ presumably even when some events of the story are changed or edited away. Meanwhile, Adamson’s attitude remains, ‘I feel my responsibility to Lewis’s fans is just being true to the books and letting people take from [the film] what they will. What you take from it depends on your belief and how much interpretation you place upon it (72).’

3.7 Special Focus

3.7.1 Theme – Love

Of the four loves Lewis writes about in his *The Four Loves*, Narnia includes three: Affection, Friendship and Charity. One thing noticeable in the story is the love between siblings. The novel shows the love between the four children in a civilised and subtle way. There is the rather natural quarrel between brothers and sisters, but when it comes to serious matter like life and death (such as Edmund’s siding himself with the wicked Jadis), love compels Peter, Susan and Lucy to do everything within their power to improve the situation, if not entirely solve it. On the other hand, the film shows a significantly more of the disagreements and disapprovals within the Pevensie children until after their reunion inside Narnia again. After

the children reunite, there is no more disagreements between the children, but a wholeness (now that all four are back together) that makes the children cherish each other's company, an appreciative love. More strongly depicted than the novel, the film shows the children, having gone through an awkward apology-and-greeting moment, move on to their breakfast, where they finally reveal their care and love freely: Peter tells the others he wants to protect them by sending everyone else home and he himself stays in Narnia to help out. Susan, after hearing everyone's opinion about staying, begins to practise her bow and arrow as a logical preparation for the battle that is coming up now that she will most likely be involved in it. Edmund, expresses his regrets for having sided himself with Jadis, where he witnesses how horrible she treats her subjects and slaves after telling his brother and sisters his wish to right the wrong by staying in Narnia and fight. The additional scene of breakfast after the reunion becomes a moment of love that they first share to each other in harmony and without deflecting embarrassedly in the film.

Perhaps it is not easy to define which category this love between Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy fits in Lewis' four loves - because love is not always very strictly defined in one kind and entirely excluded from the other - but it is clear that what may start as the natural need-love between siblings: the need to be approved, the need for companionship and the need to take care of or be taken care of (in practical things like keeping the children warm by making sure they take the coats on themselves when first arriving in Narnia); eventually becomes the gift-love in that the selfishness fades away and the four children think of the benefit of the others as their goal instead of selfish gains. A very clear example in the novel is Edmund's initial thoughts towards being a king means himself having the power over his siblings, who are then consider his subjects; to in the end of the story, Edmund sits amongst his siblings as they claim kingships and queenships in harmony. In the film, Peter's need-love to be the big brother that has authority over Edmund and see that Edmund gives him obedience is turned into Peter's gift-love to be the big brother keeping his younger brother and sisters safe by sending them back to Human-world and he himself stay and fight.

There is another love that Lewis writes in his *The Four Loves* that prominently shows in the Narnia story: Friendship. It is safe to say that the relationship between Lucy and Tumnus the Faun is friendship. Tumnus chooses to disobey Jadis' order as queen of Narnia and lets Lucy go back to the Human-world after he repents from his crime on her, gets forgiven by her and then finally starts a Friendship with her. Lucy takes Tumnus' arrest as a reason to persuade the rest three children to stay and help rescue Tumnus. Throughout the

story, both in novel and in film, Lucy's friendship to Tumnus is the thread that connects different group of characters: human-children, Narnian animals, Aslan and Jadis into one synchronised and specific time and space.

Moreover, the story also provides examples of Charity love. By taking Aslan as a symbol of God, as he is 'the King,...the Lord of the whole wood (3153),' it is fair to regard any act to submit to the authority of Aslan in their (supernatural need-)love for Aslan is a form of Charity, just as Aslan has a Divine Gift-love for all his subjects and the Penvenies, so much that he is willing to die for one of them (sacrificial love). As Charity has to do with the one's love to the other by God's grace, and Charity has a quality of Divine Gift-love, which allows one to love what is conventionally regarded as unlovable; one posits that repentance and forgiveness are rooted in Charity. With repentance and forgiveness comes redemption. The first repentance-forgiveness-redemption process in the story is by Tumnus and with this process he gains himself a true friend, Lucy, as his redemption. Through Tumnus' Friendship with Lucy, Narnia regains its peaceful and beautiful time after hundreds of years of winter and has its prophecies fulfilled finally. Another noticeable repentance-forgiveness-redemption process is the one that Edmund goes through in the story. After his hardened heart awakened to repentance, Edmund receives the forgiveness he needs through the grace that Peter, Susan and Lucy's appreciative affection has for him. In the end, Edmund's new-found conscience prompts him to a self-sacrificing act, much like Aslan's Divine Gift-love, before leading him to his redemption as the novel describes Edmund has never looked better after he recovers from his wounds that are healed by Lucy's precious cordial (4164).

Last but not least, the gift-love of sacrificing oneself for another is the greatest and perhaps the most powerful in the Narnia story when Aslan dies in Edmund's stead. When Aslan does not have any blood connections or not necessarily even an acquainted connection to Edmund, he agrees with Jadis that he provides the blood that Jadis is rightfully entitled to have. Such action is shockingly hard to understand. Because it is very closely connected to the following section on Christian imagery, this will not be discussed in further detail at present time but be in more elaborated explanation in the coming section.

3.7.2 Christian Imagery

Though Lewis supposes that even mature readers would not recognise much of the biblical influence in his Narnia stories, here in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, are a few details that connect the story to Christianity:

1. Aslan's death and resurrection

Similar to Jesus' death and resurrection (referenced in Matthew chapter 27-28, in Mark chapter 15-16, in Luke chapter 23-24 and in John chapter 19-20), Aslan, though not crucified, is killed after being mocked about by Jadis' followers. Though there is no trial in public before the act of killing in Aslan's case, there is a meeting that is held between himself and Jadis. His death, like Jesus,' is witnessed and mourned by female persons/characters (in this case Susan and Lucy). His resurrection is, also like Jesus,' not witnessed by anyone and he shows himself, resurrected to the ones that mourn his death.

2. Edmund's betrayal

Much like the action of Judas when betraying Jesus, Edmund's choosing to side with Jadis, however misinformed and misled he is, places himself in the shoe of Judas.' Like Judas, Edmund feels regrets afterwards and repents, however, unlike Judas, Edmund's story does not end with death but redemption from his action on the battlefield against Jadis' army.

3. Edmund's redemption

Jesus' death and resurrection is often connected to redemption and salvation amongst Christians (referenced in Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45, amongst many other places), and Edmund, having betrayed his siblings (as well as Aslan), though already forgiven by his siblings, receives redemption in his near-death experience on the battlefield. Edmund's wound from the battlefield is almost fatal. As he struggles to stay alive, Lucy comes with the precious cordial, bringing him back to healthy state. Edmund's experience is as close as a death and resurrection as there is in this story. Through his action when fighting Jadis' army, he is finally taking into action what his heart has repented from when he tries to stop Jadis from turning more animals into statues and consequently gets himself treated as a lowly prisoner.

4. The battle between good and evil

The concept of good and evil has existed since the beginning of Christianity. God is good, whoever is against or intends to lead people away from Him is evil. Questions

regarding why God allows evil to exist amongst his creation had been asked often and rarely answered satisfactorily. Considering the parallel between Aslan and Jesus and how the story portrays all its characters, one is inclined to say that Aslan represents what is good and Jadis evil. The story presents to its reader that, though co-existing, the evil does not surpass the good, as Aslan is much more powerful than Jadis and claims his triumph over her easily, yet he does so only when the time is right and appropriate, namely on the battlefield.

5. White Stag

Having an Irish background and being a well-read person, Lewis puts a white stag in the story. It is through the hunting of the white stag that Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy eventually stumble across the lamp by which all four came across when entering Narnia long ago. The white stag has both a Celtic connection as well as a Christian one. The Celtic myth interprets the white stag to be an indicator that the ‘otherworld’ is approaching.² The Christian connection to the white stag is through its symbolising to be Christ, in connection to St. Eustace’s conversion to Christianity when encountering a deer that has a cross between its antlers.³

3.8 Narnia-Novel v.s. Narnia-Film

As mentioned previously, the novel version and the film version are quite different from each other in terms of the way, tone or choice of words in presentation, the impact the story makes on its recipients and the changes in the series of events. Where the novel presents the story in a smooth flow and under a harmonious and magical light in a far-away-land, the film seems to be giving a more realistic touch with all the darkness the event of a war entails (see pp. 61-62). In some ways, the words in the novel is more precise in its ability to pinpoint, especially in certain concept (e.g. feelings) that might not always get through to the recipients through images considering one image contains many details and is therefore hard to focus on the one thing or concept intended. One example in the present case-study is when Edmund is healed from his battle wounds by Lucy’s precious cordial. After he has recovered from the wounds, the novel specifically provides that he was,

² Jones, Mary. Accessed 10 January 2018. <<http://www.maryjones.us/jce/whitestag.html>>

³ Jones, Mary. Accessed 10 January 2018. <<http://www.maryjones.us/jce/whitestag.html>>

...standing on his feet and not only healed of his wounds but looking better than [Lucy] had seen him look—oh, for ages; in fact ever since his first term at that horrid school which was where he had begun to go wrong. He had become his real old self again and could look you in the face (4166),

whereas the film shows only that Edmund goes from appearing to be severely injured (hardly catching his breath) to being able to smile and breathing evenly (2:04:20-2:04:35), there is not any colour difference on Edmund that is noticeably suggesting recovery, other than that now he seems well enough to be moved with bigger movements (Peter picking him up slightly, making him go from lying position to leaning/sitting position, to hug him).

Aside from the word's definite nature in expressing the meaning of the context, the film appears to be producing meanings that may leave a deeper impact on its viewer than the novel does its reader. When reading the novel, it is up to the reader's imagination to visualise the story in a understandable way to comprehend the gist of the story; when watching the film, it is the film that provides the viewer the image to attempt delivering the message shown the same as is written. When it comes to feelings in the characters in the story, as established in the last paragraph, words are more definite than what the viewer sees in the film. The words read summon feelings in the reader through empathy, and the image seen elicits feelings in the viewer through either a mirrored behaviour or a response to what the viewer speculates the actor on screen is trying to communicate. While the interpretations for what is seen by the viewer may be considered to be up for grabs, the generalised code in films makes it possible for there to be a fairly accurate decoded message in the viewer. As images may have stronger effect on its viewer in terms of how the events involved are memorised, the film manages to produce an impact on the viewer more than the words do to its reader. In the example of feelings, with the help of sounds in terms of spoken words and music, the image convey stronger emotions, one such example is the emotion Peter has at the sight of Edmund's being stabbed by Jadis (2:00:55) and what happens after that delivers a concept of how, for Peter, after witnessing Edmund's attack, nothing else matters. This then builds onto and contrasts itself with the emotion in the moment when Edmund heals.

The novel version of the story seems to do what the title entails: tell the story about Narnia, specifically about the lion, the witch and the wardrobe. In the novel version of the story, it is fair to say the story focuses on what it promises to do in the beginning: '[o]nce there were four children whose names were Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy. This story is

about something that happened to them when they were sent away from London during the war because of the air-raids. (2401-2405).’ The novel delivers its narration fairly equally on Lucy and Edmund. Edmund’s part tends to leave more of an impression than Lucy’s, if anything. Then there is a fairly equal amount between Peter’s part and Susan’s, both of which are less than those of Lucy’s and Edmund’s. The whole novel devotes most of its passages on the happenings in Narnia and is overall regarding Narnia, either inside it or outside it. In contrast, the film, making no promise of what is to come in the beginning of the film and in order to fill the multiple layers of element, details and information, provides all the images, sounds, music, special effects and more. The ‘more’ part in the film includes a change of the order of events in the story. The result of the ‘more’ part is an additional focus on emotions and psychological breakthroughs. In both versions, Lucy is central by her importance, not necessarily by proportion in presentation. In particular, the film seems to leave on the viewer an impression of the importance of Peter’s growth from being a boy to being a man, then being a king. It is through the focalisation on Peter in the film that the viewer identifies better with the story.

The novel distributes its descriptions on different events fairly evenly in terms of chapters, making sure that the reader does not get a one-sided story when the Pevensies are divided (Edmund on Jadis’ side and the others on Aslan’s). It does not appear there might be a ‘favourite’ part of the story in the novel, and this may appear to be so partially because of the style of narrative in the story in addition to the even distribution on the description. On the other hand, the film, having the ability to produce computerised visual effect on the screen, seem to ‘favour’ the battle scene and anything magical much more than when there are only human actors on the screen. As mentioned in Authorship section, this may be so because of the director involved (see pp. 93-94). Where the film is in its most extravagant display (at war), the novel simply breezes it through ‘[t]he battle was all over a few minutes after [Aslan and the reinforcement] arrival. ...’ in reminiscence (4141). In comparison to the 57 lines spent in the 200 something pages novel, the film spends more than one fifth of its total length to shoot battlefield scene.

The novel appeals to its reader a Christian theme that Lewis designs ‘to be recognized only subconsciously... (7579).’ The film, on the other hand, although managing to be faithful to the spirit of the story in the novel - hence providing the possibility to the subconscious recognition of Christianity - seems to possess an additional attraction through the usage of visual effect for the talking animals, other mythological creatures and action scenes where

they are involved. The reader of the story may have to rely on the narrator to identify with the story's character, the viewer on the other hand does not need a narrator for the job. With the help of sound, music visual effect and rearrangement of the plotline, the viewer can easily find him-/herself identifying with one of the characters; most likely in this case, Peter.

It is important to remember the message the story is intended to convey. The film, having rearranged the storyline and readjusted the focus, may have distorted the original plan of the novel. But because the majority of the details are still present, the sacrificial acts are maintained in the film, it is fair to suggest that the film has adapted faithfully from Lewis' story. With the help of discussion between the viewers after having watched the film, the message that seems to have been replaced by the visual effects and Peter's breakthrough could still easily be rediscovered.

4. Field Information

Given that the present thesis posits the 2005 film of Narnia can be served as evangelical means in Taiwan, relevant information about Taiwan should be provided as it is taken as a target field.

4.1 Taiwan

According to the *International Religious Freedom Report 2007 – Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor* (2007)⁴, Taiwan is an 13,800-square-mile large island with the population of 23 million (1). In 2006, in '[t]he Government Information Office Yearbook, the Religious Affairs Section of the Ministry of the Interior (MOI) states that 35 percent of the population consider themselves Buddhist and 33 percent Taoist.' Moreover, on top of people who practise 'organized religion,' there are many others who 'followed a collection of beliefs deeply ingrained in Chinese culture that can be termed "traditional Chinese folk religion.'" In the less-than-5-percent part of the traditional Chinese religions, there are I Kuan Tao, Tien Ti Chiao (Heaven Emperor), Tien Te Chiao (Heaven Virtue Religion), Li-ism, Hsuan Yuan Chiao (Yellow Emperor Religion), Tian Li Chiao (Tenrikyo), Universe Maitreya Emperor Religion, Hai Tze Tao, Confucianism, Zhonghua Sheng Chiao (Chinese Holy Religion), Da Yi Chiao (Great Changes Religion), Pre-cosmic Salvationism and Huan Chung Chiao (Yellow Middle Religion) (1).

In addition, '[t]here also may be an overlap between practitioners of Buddhism, Taoism and other traditional Chinese religions with those of Falun Gong, which is registered as a civic, rather than religious, organization. In Taiwan, Falun Gong is generally considered a spiritual movement and not a religion. There is yet a small percentage of the whole of Taiwan that are influenced by the western religions, such as Protestant, Roman Catholic, Sunni Muslim, The Church of Scientology, the Baha'i, the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Mahikari Religion, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormons), the Unification Church, Presbyterians, the True Jesus Church, Baptists, Lutherans, Seventh-day Adventists, Episcopalians and Judaism (1).

Because of missionaries from abroad, '[a]pproximately 70 percent of the indigenous population of 475,000 Aborigines is Christian (1). However, not all Aborigines are Christians

⁴ Accessed 23 February 2018. <<https://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/irf/2007/90134.htm>>

and not all Christians in Taiwan are aboriginal. Simply put, Christians are of the minority in general in Taiwan. In his *The Religions in Taiwan* (2008), Fang-Yuan Dong provides an overall information regarding the aboriginal religions, Taiwanese folk religions, Religious Confucianism, Religious Taoism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam. In Christianity, Dong provides a list of 102 groups of different denominations that got introduced and were established in Taiwan since 1950 (370-376). Though Christianity remains a minority in Taiwan, the diversity of denominations is still preserved.

4.2 Taiwan as a Mission Field - Dong and Qian

Having been raised as a Christian in Taipei, the present author understands the difficulties of Christians spreading the Gospel in Taiwan. There are potential conflicts for a person to become a Christian when his/her family is originally not Christian.

The Taiwanese Folk Religion has many important rituals on different things, ranging from birth, adulthood, marriage, birthdays and deaths, altogether summed up to the term ‘rites of passage (130).’ Through the experiences and observations from the ancestors, the forefathers of Taiwanese/Chinese people call each monument in life ‘critical periods’ or ‘changeful periods,’ for the sake of easy usage these are termed into ‘junctures (131).’

4.2.1 Folk-Religion: Birth

Because of the traditional Chinese cultural influence through Confucianism, the concept of family remains the core of culture. What children must do in the family is to respect and honour their parents. The basic duties of the children include: produce a male heir and take care of the elders (/parents) anyway they can. Starting from pregnancy in a family, rituals begin to be important thanks to the belief that these rituals would guarantee certain desirable outcomes. Many of the rules related to pregnancy (from the day of conception or the day of discovering the pregnancy to a hundred days after birth delivery) are limiting changes surrounding the pregnant woman, such as arrangement in the room, constructions (to build something new) or renovations (on the existing places), even meeting other pregnant women are prohibited. Crossing over a horizontally placed stick, watch a puppet show or touching a coffin casket, etc. are considered taboos for the pregnant woman (132). After the birth, on the third day, the newly-born baby must join the ancestral and ‘home-god’ sacrificial worship and

the mother must spend a whole month doing nothing but rest after delivery, this one-month rest is compulsory.

It calls for celebration and more ancestral and 'home-god' sacrificial worship when the baby reaches one week of age. Then a series of asking for suggestions of names from warlocks, following the naming rules existed inside the family, imparting good wishes and blessings unto the baby and fortune telling, the name of the baby is finally decided.

4.2.2 Folk-Religion: Adulthood

Before the point of reaching adulthood, the child is often found wearing a necklace with fortune money pendant on red thread as a protection to ward off evil attacks. This pendant is something the person acquiring the protection for the child gets after he/she goes to the temple of Guanyin or Mazu and worships the goddesses with sacrificial rituals (135). To mark the point of entering adulthood, simply take the protection necklace off in front of the god will do. In the occasionally-possible event that the child passes away before reaching adulthood, the child is then considered 'debt-chasing child,' and it is considered the parents owed some debt to someone else in the last life, so they now need to pay their debts by losing their child. In an occasion such as this, the dead body is not allowed to be in a coffin and can only be wrapped in a straw mat to be buried in. In addition, there must not be a tablet erected for this child's death's sake for the usual sacrificial worship.

4.2.3 Folk-Religion: Marriage

The most important juncture in life is marriage, seeing the union of male and female a combination of Ying and Yang. There used to be six stages in the process of getting married, nowadays only four remain being commonly practised: proposal, engagement, dowry and wedding. In each stage, fortune-telling and asking a warlock for guidance are very easily and commonly applied, even Feng Shui could be involved in these stages, just so that everything can be perfect (136-138).

4.2.4 Folk-Religion: Birthday

The most celebrated ages in the Taiwanese Folk Religion are one week old (the first birthday in life), sixteen years old (first birthday after entering adulthood), thirty years old (as a

celebratory congratulations to the birthday person's having survived the superstitiously dangerous twenty-ninth birthday) and rounded-number age after reaching fifty years of age (a big celebration should take place at the 50th, 60th, 70th, 80th, 90th and 100th birthdays) (139-142).

4.2.5 Folk-Religion: Death

Traditionally, it is believed that a person has three spirits. At death, one of the three spirits is sent to the king of hell to be tortured. Another one goes to the underworld and lives a normal life and every necessity in the life in the underworld is depended on being sent over from the family members who still live and care for the dead by ritual burning paper copies or smaller-scaled models of the things intended to be sent as substitute. The last one goes back to be with the tablet erected in the home for the ancestral worship ceremony by sacrificial ritual (143).

How the grave is to be positioned is done with careful calculations within Feng Shui, the method of burial, the shape of the tomb(-stone) and proper way of presenting information on the tombstone each have different rules that must be followed as each possesses its own special meaning (146-148).

4.2.6 Other Important Times (in Lunar Calendar, dd/mm)

- 1-16/1: First day of the Chinese New Year marks the beginning of a sixteen-day feast and the first four days are the absolute peak of the celebration during the Chinese New Year. Lots of fire-crackers are set off (by stores on 5/1 in particular) to welcome the new beginning of the year. 7/1 is what is called people day, 9/1 the birthday of the Jade emperor, 11th and 12th of the first month is when a married couple go back to the family of the wife's as guests, 15/1 a reunion feast where games and fire-crackers are present again. Lastly, 16/1 the birthday of the god that protects drama and music. In most of these days, there are fire-crackers being set off, if not all. Most important of all, these are the days that call for worshipping the gods (150-151).
- 3/3: Tomb-Sweeping Day is the day for the living to make an ancestral and sacrificial worship event at the site of the tomb of the elders in the family that already passed away. There are specific types of food present, 12 types of bowls for food, silver paper and five-colour paper as symbolic and substitute for blood sacrifice. A part of the common thing to be done on this day, aside from the worship, is to clean the site

where the tombs are. Dong writes, ‘this day is the equivalent of Easter for the Taiwanese people, for on this day the deceased gather with their living descendants in the hopeful spring and celebrate together in the nature (152).’

- 5/5: Dragon-Boat Festival has origin from the death of poet Qu Yuan. Nowadays, taking the same pronunciation of five and ‘mistake’ in Taiwanese, the doubling of five’s is considered ominous, hence it becomes a day of extra measures, such as different kinds of plant being put into a bundle and hung up on the doors, are done to ward off the bad and evil. In addition, chickens and ducks are slaughtered and made into food for the home-god and the ancestor during worshipping ritual, together with a particular kind of dumplings made for eating during this time. Additionally, there is usually a dragon-boat race happening that was originally designed to ward off the water ghost and is nowadays taken to be of entertaining purpose solely (153).
- 7/7: It is a day important for women, children (up to 16 years of age) and lovers, for this is the birthday of Seven Mother (a goddess) and she is the protector goddess for women and children. At the same time, the folklore goes that this is the one day when two stars: Niu Lang (Cowboy) and Zhi Nu (Weaver girl), two lovers who are separated, get to meet each other every year. Because of the protection Seven Mother is believed to do to protect the children under 16 years, there is usually a grateful feast to worship Seven Mother. There is also worship for the Bed-Mother, who is also considered a protector goddess for the children. Lastly, women usually burn incense to the star Zhi Nu to pray for being able to perform what is traditionally considered to be the duties of the women’s well (154-155).
- 1-30/7: The whole seventh month is considered the most unlucky month, commonly known as the ghost month. This is the month when people make a lot of good food and make a feast for the ghosts who are coming out to the human realm, in passing to their next stage of the reincarnation. It is believed that many of the ghosts are ‘hungry’ and would therefore be of ill intention if not appeased with food by the living. In addition to the food, there are many places where lanterns are lit in the hope of helping lighting the paths for the ghosts in their passing by. The door that opens from the ghost realm to the human realm is open from 1/7 to 30/7 (155-156).
- 15/8: Moon Festival is the Moon Mother’s birthday, therefore on this day it calls for worship and feast (sacrificial food includes moon-cakes and fruits). During the day, most households worship the home-god and Gong Ma (a goddess) with moon-cakes,

rice taro. The theme during Moon Festival is generally focused on reuniting with family, wishing each other good long years to live and all blessed with wealth (156-157).

- 9/9: Both the sun and moon have reached their limit on this day and the doubling of nine's is considered unlucky. Because of this, old people at home are advised to stay indoors on this day. Some people let the elders at home bring the family for a hiking trip, symbolising the wish to have the family transcend and surpass the average. Commonly, this day is associated with goddess Mazu as her 'ascension' day, which then calls for more worship of those who practise folk-religion rituals (157).
- 15/11: This is the winter solstice point, which indicate the undeniable presence of winter. Back in the days of the old, winter meant hardship, emperors led their subjects to gather in worship of the sun, moon and stars to pray for blessings for quality of life. In general, in the olden days, winter meant diseases and a lack of food and materials, all of which prompted people to put even more efforts in worshipping and praying to the home-god and ancestors for blessings and protection. Every household is reminded of family members and what it means to be united as one family on this day. Rice dumplings are particularly important on this day, as the name of the dumplings has a nuance of united-ness and after eating the dumplings everyone is considered to have gain one year of age, therefore the winter solstice point has both a family-uniting perspective and an age-prolonging one (157).
- 16/12: Wei Ya (Tail Teeth) is the last day when people must worship the Land god. The Land god's birthday is on 2/2, making the day also known as Tou Ya (Head Teeth). In the hope to live a prosperous and wealthy life, people worship the Land god every half a month in accordance to his birthday, so every month's second day and the sixteenth day are days when people should be burning the gold paper (symbolising money) to the Land god to wish for the land's produce to be of best quality and provide success to the worshippers. As this is the last day in the year of worshipping the Land god, people from all walks of life usually gather with their colleagues and make a celebratory feast out of it (158).
- 24/12: god ascension day is believed to be the day when every family envoy god, the stove god, gets to ascend up to the boss/ruling-god to report about what his assigned family household has been doing. In other words, each household is believed to be assigned one supervising family envoy god, who reports back to his superior. The

stove god is believed to be the god that taught mankind the usage of fire (Sui Ren's or the fire god). On this day there must be a proper sacrificial feast made to worship the fire god (and his horse as he rides his horse to ascend) and hope for good words in his report to the ruling god. This is also the day when most households begin their annual cleaning of their homes. The next day is believed to be the day of godly surveillance as the gods that work in the court of the ruling god are sent down to monitor mankind, therefore everyone should be on best behaviour on 25/12 (158-159).

- 29 or 30/12: the last day of the year is considered the most important day for families to reunite. Every home should be making sacrificial worship to their home god and their ancestors. There should be a feast of a dinner, which ends with the passing on of the red envelopes (with money inside as blessings) from the elders to the younger generation, sharing of experiences in life. It is believed that the better the children sleep on this night, the longer the parents will live. So after dinner and long talks, there are fire-crackers being lit, before finally, bedtime for everyone (159-160).

4.2.7 Folk-Religion Conclusion

Folk-Religion runs deep in the Taiwanese tradition and conventional way of thinking. The blend of the Folk Religion and other main religions like Buddhism and Taoism can be so well mixed that it is hard to tell if it is the Folk Religion influencing Buddhism and Taoism or vice versa in Taiwan. Most ideas and concepts, even some gods and goddesses are borrowed from either Buddhism, Taoism or simply Chinese ancient legends into Folk-Religion. Because of this mixture, the majority of people tend to simply follow what is done inside the family with no questions asked, as the culture runs too deep and rich to be extracted out of the Folk Religion altogether. It is clear that the Folk Religion lays the ground for the majority of important events in Taiwan for the most time of the year and for most non-Christian, if not all. The blindly following tendency in the majority of non-Christians make it difficult for Christians to evangelise and lead people to believing in Christianity.

Despite the difficulties taking Taiwan as a missionary field presents, in his *First-timer Evangelist Handbook* (2014), Yu-Shun Qian suggests with the proper and subtle usage of tools like 'The Four Spiritual Laws,' 'The Bridge of Salvation' and 'How to Become a Christian,' evangelising in Taiwan is not as difficult a task as one previously assumed (55-59). Moreover, Qian writes that not all evangelising events have to be as well facilitated and

on as big a scale as the crusade seminars held by famous or popular evangelists. With appropriate attitude of the matter of evangelising others and a good amount of preparation, location is not as big of an issue as it may first appear (32-37). In regards to those who express interest, Qian suggests organised planning and documenting information, to provide detailed and more thorough follow-ups later (48-49). Most importantly, Qian points out how beneficial it is to give space to the evangelised and wait in patience and prayer to see that people may become interested in God (74-75). Though Qian's strategies are not originally and specifically designed for evangelising through the usage of films, the core value of each points is applicable in nearly all occasions inside the art of evangelising, including, but not limited to, using films as a way of evangelising people in Taiwan. The fact that the method of using films as an evangelising event is not specifically focused on only suggests that it is not so widely used that Qian would write about it, but it does not mean films are never used as a way of evangelising in Taiwan. The following section focuses on finding out more about whether or not films have been used to create an evangelising event in Taiwan.

5. Survey and Results

According to Chinese Christian Tribune's reporter, Rong-Zhen Li, the number of churches in Taiwan grew from 3181 in 2005 to 4287 in 2015⁵, it is only natural to assume the number of churches now is even bigger than that back in 2015. In light of the fact that the present thesis expresses interests on the evangelical potential the 2005 film of Narnia has in Taiwan, a 10-question survey has been conducted amongst 20 churches, asking one person (mostly in the senior pastor position) per church, spreading out from the north to south of Taiwan. The method used for the survey is by setting up the survey online through SurveyMonkey.no and sent out to different churches to partake. The answers are reported back to the present author entirely anonymously.

The purpose of the survey is first and foremost to prove that the 2005 Narnia film has been used as a tool to evangelise in Taiwan, whatever the percentage. Secondly, where

⁵ Accessed 7 March 2018. < <https://www.ct.org.tw/1290803>>

there may not have been emphasised on evangelism and conversion, the survey attempts to find out if the Narnia film is faith-affirming for those who are already believers of God.

The questions were initially designed to be asked about the churches and their evangelical moves when *Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring* (2001) and *The Chronicles of Narnia: the Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (2005) were in the movie theater, for both films were going to be analysed in the present thesis. However, because of the scope of the thesis, *Lord of the Rings* was removed from the Case Study section. The survey still applies the claim of the present thesis as it discusses what evangelical potential a film regarded to be a Christian one, such as Narnia, could have for the churches in Taiwan to apply in their goal of leading the majority of population in Taiwan to the conversion of Christianity. Only a minority of survey-takers distinguishes Narnia film from *Lord of the Rings* and only in some questions. Because of the difficulty to separate the two, the present author provides the analysis for the entire survey follows,

The questions in the survey are as follows:

1. Does your church see *Lord of the Rings* and Narnia as an opportunity to evangelise and host an event accordingly to attract non-Christians?
2. What other films does your church use in evangelical events that it hosts?
3. Through these events, does your church manage to lead non-Christians to become believers?
4. What other evangelical means, methods and kind of event does your church do?
5. Do you know the general plot of Narnia and *Lord of the Rings*?
6. What are the biggest challenges your church faces when leading non-Christians to Christ?
7. If there are opposition from the family members regarding the person's faith conversion, what reasons are the usual ones?
8. Other than films, what media-related measure does your church use for the goal of spreading the Gospel?
9. As a Christian in Taiwan, do *The Lord of the Rings* and Narnia help your personal relationship with God?
10. Have you been in conversations about God or Christian faith with non-Christians regarding the content of *The Lord of the Rings* and Narnia?

Out of the 20 churches surveyed, 6 churches (31.58%) report to have made an evangelical event when Narnia was showed in the cinema, 4 of the 6 churches report to have gotten in touch with people who were interested in the Christian belief. The age group of the non-Christians becoming in contact with the churches varies from teenagers to university students. The number of the target non-Christians involved in films like Narnia's evangelical event ranges from five-to-ten persons to half the people that filled the audience seats. Amongst the struggles of leading non-Christians to conversions that the surveyed 20 churches (note: not every church responds to all 10 questions) face, two (10.53%) report opposition from family members, one (5.26%) reports the person does not want to follow the rules Christians obey and the rest of the reasons provided vary from indifference or a strong sense of autonomy away from God on the non-Christians' part, inability to reach deeply on the Christians' part, to it being a challenge to keep non-Christians in the church and the misunderstanding society casts on Christians. Though the evangelical usage of Narnia or films that are considered Christian ones like Narnia does not appear to be 100 percent in the 20 churches surveyed, the usage of such films being in the centre of an evangelical event from the church is nonetheless evident by nearly one third. It proves parts of the claim of the present thesis that some Christian films have been put into evangelical practice or usage in the church in Taiwan.

Secondly, 11 (60.11%) answer question numbered 9 regarding whether or not the film help one's personal relationship with God with yes. One of the answers further extrapolates that '[i]t was very helpful for me in my youth. I started wondering about the living God's plan for me and for this world. More importantly, I longed for the loving relationship that exists between the leading characters and was led to contemplate just how deep and how wide God's love is. Then through time and prayers I got to know God better, our relationship improved.' Still a couple of the answers point out specifically that 'the scene of death for the lion makes me think of Jesus' crucifixion.' Still a few other answers provide a brief, 'I was made aware and understood the sacrificial love,' 'I became grateful for Jesus' salvation and became alert to watch out for Satan's traps' and 'I got to get to know God through a different way.' The answers provided regarding question numbered 9 prove that in addition to the film being used as an evangelising opportunity, the experience of viewing the film for Christians is proved to be faith-affirming, if not faith-deepening.

To sum up, this survey shows both that this method of hosting an evangelism-based event for films like Narnia has led non-Christians to conversion into Christian faith in Taiwan, where the major religion is not Christian and can cause conflicts with Christian faith

during conversion; and that the 2005 Narnia film (as well as other Christian films alike) provides a faith-affirming relationship. However, this survey is unable to pinpoint exactly what elements and/in which scenes in the film may have sparked interests in the non-believers who are later converted into Christianity as this survey is designed to collect the information from churches through their senior pastors, not exclusively targeted on finding individuals that had become Christians through a church-hosted Christian film event. Such limitation of the survey, while compromising one exclusive desired proof, brings out the other side of the same coin and proves that the same kind of films may enrich one's faith.

6. Discussion

In Terms of Novel v.s Film

The differences between novel and film have been academically discussed by different scholars since the film became a popular form of entertainment. Rarely does one find a film that is created entirely without any pre-existing published novel in its source and never does one find a film without any written script (for the actors) to produce the film altogether. Where novel and film are linked is where film adaptation comes in. The term 'film adaptation' insinuates that the story is originally created elsewhere - most likely in the form of a novel – before it gets adapted into the form of a film. Within the scope of film adaptation, scholars have debated on how to categorise different ways of transforming the story from one medium to another or what to look at to measure if the adaptation is executed faithfully. Some scholars agree that one criterion, if not the most important, fidelity, should be taken as the one salient measure in determining whether the job of film adaptation has been done properly, while other scholars dismiss the notion of fidelity on the grounds that novel and film are in fact produced in significantly different ways. The result of the dismissal of fidelity often deems that novel and film are two incomparable forms and should be treated as two autonomous creations even when the story each form portrays is the same.

In terms of the story, because of the various functions each form is best at, the novel and film should be looked at and compared by the precision of presentation in each form. The novel's main tool of presentation is by written words. As mentioned in the case study, written words can be much more precise than image when it comes to ideas of abstract concept such

as feelings. Words have specific definitions and those are relatively black-and-white clear; on the other hand, an actor's facial expression leads to endless possibilities of interpretation, and from there to reaching the receiving end is one major changing factor: humans. While words (signifiers) and their meanings (the signified) have been said to be arbitrary for literature (in this case closely related to the novel form), the actual living human part of the story in film makes it much more intricate to be able to deliver the designated message. An actor has his/her own acting experiences and the background he/she grew up in. Though perhaps actors are supposed to be a blank canvas that can present anything, a person has to have a background to be building the ability to act out the lines on. This background that is referred to includes experiences, cultures and sometimes even personal beliefs, for all of these sum up what a person is defined by. The inevitable outcome of having human actors in the presentation of the story is that nearly nothing is objective. The human factor does not end with the actor, but the viewer as well. Like all the various details that have deciding influence on determining the outcome in an actor, the viewer also possesses the same overwhelming amount of combinations of background details, all the factors determining the outcome of whether or not the story may be received the same way through film as it does through novel. Both novel and film may work on a global level, so cultures must be considered. While there are interfering agent such as the element of marketing for the film, just looking at the human viewer is complex enough a task to be taking on and leave the marketing factor for later. The viewer; in addition to all the elements influencing the actor's performance: experiences, cultures and personal beliefs; in most cases, may have the element of language, given the fact the main-stream film culture is based on the American culture and the actors in the main-stream films are usually either native to English and the culture(s) involved or at the very least, well aware and are accustomed to the codes within the main-stream film culture. The case of the viewer is not as simple. This is where the marketing factor returns into focus. Most films' release dates and locations are decided with the agenda of making profits. The release information made behind films are decisions made by equally complex source as actors and viewers: human. Here all the mentioned various background details for each individual applies, with yet another addition: agenda. The agenda of the marketers' is usually profit, in terms of money and fame. In the process of marketing, decisions made in the film production getting overruled by marketing-agenda reasoning is not unheard of. Because of the influencing and extremely complex mechanism (human) involved in film, it is safe to suppose that the relationship between the story being presented on screen and the story being received by the viewer in the form of film is much less straightforward and stable than that in the form

of novel. However, the novel is not without game-changing factors. The same with the viewer for the film, the reader for the novel may have the same background variants such as language, culture, personal beliefs and agenda (from the marketing part of the promotion). In comparison, it appears the same issues exist in both novel and film, but the complexity within film production raises the influences the human factors have in the relationship. It is possible that such complexity could make the story richer than the novel, but if that is better or not depends on different ways of looking at what in the story presented should be honoured.

The placement of focus is of one major difference between novel and film. A story usually consists of plot, character and narrative, altogether it sends a message. In the novel, the story's plot, character and narrative are contained in one medium: words, sometimes maybe with an assisting and additional medium such as illustrations. The message in the story should be as clear as the words with their meanings in the description of the story are. On the other hand, the film contains (spoken) words, sounds, music, image and (sometimes) drawing, all of which present to the receiving end a much wider spectrum of choice to select and produce the supposed message with. While the message and theme of the story may be successfully communicated from the origin (novel or film) to the receiving end (reader or viewer), the debate over if the simpler communication of the novel is better or the richer presentation of the film is better remains entirely up in the air because it is simply a matter of subjectivity.

Subjectivity may be of central concern in the comparison between novel and film, therefore it is natural that the novel and film should be looked at and compared by examining controllability. Within controllability, there are the control of speed and the control of attention to be evaluated. For the reader, the speed of the story being revealed is decided by the reader. The reader may choose to proceed reading at the speed of one page of the novel per day or one page per five minutes. On the other hand, the speed of the story in the film is entirely decided by the film production, the viewer has no power whatsoever to negotiate at what speed the story may be presented in other than choosing to remain seated or walking out of the cinema. Regarding the controllability of attention, the position of the powerfulness and powerlessness is switched. The reader may not decide on what to focus on in a story presented in the form of novel, given the fact that the story is written and portrayed with one stream of written messages and the reader is only able to read one word at a time, no matter how fast the speed, the control over what to pay attention on in the story for the reader is practically non-existing. On the other hand, the viewer receiving the story through the form of

film may, at any given point of the presentation, decide to focus on something else on the screen that is not strategically placed and designed for paying the most attention on.

Lastly, the ability to reach out should be compared between the novel and film. While the novel is much more portable and can therefore be brought to the most remote places in the world like the Bible has been brought to ends of the world by missionaries, the film, when having just been released, is situated in one place and the interested people must choose to go to that location on their own. The novel may be read by different readers at their own various speed and may be finished within a day or two, whereas the film can be watched by however many people the viewing hall is able to contain and be finished within a matter of hours. The Narnia story may have been viewed in the form of the film for a great amount of filmgoers, but it is still much more likely that the story is known by more readers than viewers, considering the book was published over half a century ago and had gained much popularity and acknowledgement in at least the UK and the United States. To be able to read the novel, the reader simply needs to be having one's eyes that one is born with and be literate in the language the book is printed in. On the other hand, after the film is no longer available in the cinema, the film's DVD would require the interested viewer to be equipped with a DVD player and a screen of some sort for him/her to be able to watch the story. After the film's DVD is available in the market, the Narnia story in the form of a film becomes as portable as a novel, but it still requires more equipments of the receiving end than the novel. However, with the advancement of technology, both the electronic version of a book and online film stores such as iTunes, Amazon and Netflix make both forms much more instantly accessible for those interested in getting to know the story of Narnia within a click on the electronic device used.

In terms of the Narnia film and its evangelical potentials in Taiwan

The Narnia film is widely considered a Christian film basing on the source novel by C.S. Lewis, who is known for his defence of Christianity. In his 'Narnia as a Site of National Struggle: Marketing, Christianity, and National Purpose in The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe,' James Russell points out that the marketing aspect of the production of the 2005 Narnia film may has a strong contribution to the outcome of the film being perceived as a Christian film. Russell reports that the Narnia film 'was sold less as a "faith experience," with no specific religious meaning, and more as an evangelizing

opportunity, which allowed Evangelical groups to disseminate their message of Christian salvation to the general community—in fact, to the “general audience,” which made up the majority of filmgoers (72).’ Russell’s report focuses on the United States in general, but the same ‘faith-affirming experience that reached far beyond the limits of the film narrative itself (76).’ applies to viewers in other countries, including, but not limited to, Taiwan. In conclusion, Russell writes that regardless if all humans involved in producing the film are genuine and believing Christians, the result is still a film that he earlier describes to ‘spread the Christian message beyond the confines of [the] community by both reminding viewers of the defining moment of Christian sacrifice... (72),’ and therefore making the film ‘dangerously powerful (76).’

In comparison with the novel, the film version of the story draws a lot more attention as cinema is generally considered a common place to find entertainment in Taiwan, especially in the cities. The novel version of Narnia is readily available in Taiwan, but one obstacle remains: language. Although there are translated version of the story made accessible in Taiwan, the issues of how translations work in a written story can result in a need for another thorough examination that the present thesis does not have the scope or capacity to include. As the discussion regarding translation version of the story in the novel form is excluded in this discussion, the point remains that there is still the linguistic difficulty in reading English in an English-as-second-language context, such as Taiwan. Naturally, the same translation issues may exist in the form of the film. But because of the multiple elements in the form of film, with the help of either dubbing or subtitles in a film, a film with English audio presents less challenge than a translated Narnia novel does to convey the story to its receivers.

As analysed in the Case Study, love is at the core of Christianity and learning to love is one of the greatest commandments from Jesus:

...Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: ‘Love your neighbor as yourself.’ All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments (Matthew 22:37-40).

Lewis explains in his *The Four Loves* of the difference between ‘nearness-by-likeness’ and ‘nearness-of-approach (5),’ that nearness-by-likeness is about man-kind being created in God’s image (Genesis 1:27) and nearness-of-approach is about working one’s way to be more like God. In the case of Christianity, following the commandment and learning to love like

God does qualify as nearness-of-approach. In his Charity love, Lewis also explains a divine-gift love that loves those considered unlovable. It is this love that lies in the core of God's love that is shown to His people all throughout the Bible. It is also this love that is the most needed to bring hope in a world that is now filled with hate, misunderstandings, hurt and anger.

In a social aspect, evangelism happens mostly naturally in conversations, where there are people in dialogues, if not entirely one-sided as it does in a preach. To have the opportunities to be able to evangelise people, there must be a time and space to allow that. For the novel form of the Narnia story, unless there is a book club that is established for this specific book, the chances of a window for evangelism through the novel is slim. For the film version of the story, however, there is a time (when the film is being shown) and space (most likely in the cinema) provided with just the viewing of the story. When people have already voluntarily participated an event held by a church to watch the Narnia film in a cinema, a conversation or discussion regarding the content of the film would not be often or easily declined by the participants of the event. From perspective of the evangelised, accepting any invitation is a commitment. When the first approach of the invitation is to participate in what is regarded as the relaxing entertainment (film), the possibility of acceptance is higher than if the invitation presented were to join a book-related event (book club) for Narnia. When one is invited to a film, the motivation of following through that commitment is easily raised than the commitment one must feel to accept when invited to a book club for the Narnia novel, where presumably more serious discussions may be sure to follow.

In 2017, Taiwan became 'the first place in Asia'⁶ to legalise homosexual marriage. Years prior to this point, conflicts rose between those who approved such change and those who did not approve as this change first worked its way from changing the content of textbooks regarding sexual orientation teaching in a part of the sexual liberation movement. As the majority of the disapproving voice come from the Christian community in Taiwan, misunderstanding could occur to the general public that Christian faith is all about condemnation to the different. However, love, as presented, is at the heart of Christianity and should therefore bring out understanding and tolerance in a conflicting situation that exists in Taiwan.

⁶ Accessed 7. March 2018. < https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/24/world/asia/taiwan-same-sex-marriage-court.html?_ga=2.11389748.1048566811.1520420109-1628876434.1520420109>

7. Conclusion

Although the production of a novel and a film is hugely different from one another, the main message of the story remains in both forms in order to make the connection of the two. In film adaptation, McFarlane terms this connection fidelity to include both scenarios of the story being kept 'to the letter' and 'to the spirit.' As discussed throughout the present thesis, the two forms: novel and film, are received in very different manners and have different effects on the receiver. While the novel presents the story in words and provides clear definitions on more abstract concepts, the film presents the story in image and gives a literal 'bigger picture' of the story, providing details that the novel is not able to do, such as sounds and image. The most common debate regarding film adaptation and its source novel has been that the film is not the same, if not that it is not as good, as the imagination of the reader. As Leitch posits, the best adaptation of the story is basically to not have the adaptation at all but to have only the texts remain as themselves. But having only texts does not make the field of film adaptation. Considering all the variants in novel and in film, the two forms are too different to be comparable, despite the fact that they present the same story. With the element of auteur in mind, it seems logical to consider a film, adaptation or not, as a piece of art as original as a written and published novel.

In regards to the evangelical aspect of the 2005 Narnia film specifically, the film seems to be placing a much richer influence on its viewers than the story does to its readers. Most likely the novel has brought a significant amount people to contemplate on Christianity and led them to conversion since the novel was published more than 50 years ago, but it is also possible that the rate of conversion through reading the novel is not as fast as that through watching the film. The film provides what the novel does not, actual living human beings. As reading words in the novel requires the reader to imagine the characters in order to be able to relate regardless how great the writer is, the image in the film provides an illusion of physical presence to its viewers and can more easily stimulate recognition of shared feelings, be it the shame of being revealed to be a traitor in the face of the betrayed, the fear of seeing someone powerful slaughter like a powerless victim, the anguish of losing someone one loves to the enemy, the happiness of reuniting with a long-lost loved one, the joy of seeing a loved but lost or deceased one back to life or the relief of knowing one has received forgiveness and the freedom of knowing that all are well and that there is hope. Considering the film may be able to summon strong emotions better than the words on the page of the novel can, the fact that the film contains the same theme as the novel such as love is

imperative for the film to be used as an evangelical tool in Taiwan where conflicts appears in the context of an absence of love.

8. Bibliography

- Andrew, Dudley. 'Adaptation.' *Concepts in Film Theory*. Oxford University Press, 1985, pp. 96-106. Edited by Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. 2nd Ed. Routledge, 2012, pp. 65-73.
- Astruc, Alexander. 'The Birth of a New Avant-Garde La Caméra-Stylo.' Edited by Graham, Peter, *The New Wave*. Doubleday, 1968, pp. 17-23.
- Bazin, André. 'Adaptation, or the Cinema as Digest.' Edited by Naremore, James, *Film Adaptation*. The Athlone Press, 1997, pp. 19-27.
- Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. London: University of California Press, 1973, pp. 1-64.
- Boozer, Jack. 'The Screenplay and Authorship in Adaptation.' *Authorship in Film Adaptation*. University of Texas Press, 2008, pp. 1-30. Edited by Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. 2nd Ed. Routledge, 2012, pp. 199-220.
- Cobb, Shelly. 'Film Authorship and Adaptation.' Edited by Cartmell, Deborah, *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2012, pp. 105-121.
- Corrigan, Timothy. 'Analytical Terms and Categories.' Edited by Corrigan, Timothy, *Film and Literature, an Introduction and Reader*. 2.ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2012, pp. 427-434.
- Corrigan, Timothy. 'Major Topics in Adaptation Studies.' Edited by Corrigan, Timothy, *Film and Literature, an Introduction and Reader*. 2.ed. Routledge, 2012, pp. 435-447.
- Davidson, Elijah. 'How movies express the spiritual longings of the their makers (and watchers)' *Christianity Today*, July/August 2017, pp.86-87.
- Dillion, Christine. 2012. *Telling the Gospel Through Story: Evangelism that Keeps Hearers Wanting More*. [Kindle Keyboard Version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com

- Dong, Fang-Yuan. *The Religions in Taiwan*. Avanguard Publishing House, 2008, pp.65-129.
- Falke, Cassadra. 'Good Reading: The Ethics of Christian Literary Thoery.' Edited by Falke, Cassandra, *Intersections in Christianity and Critical Theory*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 46-56.
- Fjeld, Trude A. 'Letters or Image, or Both? A Study of How and Why People engage in Novel- and Film version of Popular Narratives.' M.A. Thesis. University of Stavanger, 2010. Web. 22 February 2018, pp. 6-9.
- Giles, Jeff. 'NEXT STOP NARNIA.' *Newsweek*, 7 November 2005, Vol. 146 Issue 19, pp. 72-74.
- Goh, Robbie B. H. 'film-as-maturion: faith, healing and "the body" in evangelical oriantalism.' *Material Religion*, 2016 vol. 11, Issue 4, pp. 465-483.
- Hooten, Jessica. 'After Theory, After Modernity: Reading Humbly.' Edited by Falke, Cassandra, *Intersections in Christianity and Critical Theory*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 23-32.
- Horton, Chris. 'Court Ruling Could Make Taiwan First Place in Asian to Legalize Gay Marriage.' *The New York Times*, 24 May 2017. Accessed 7 March 2018. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/24/world/asia/taiwan-same-sex-marriage-court.html?_ga=2.11389748.1048566811.1520420109-1628876434.1520420109
- Hutcheon, Linda. 'Beginning to Theorize Adaptation.' *A Theory of Adaptation*. Routledge, 2006, pp. 1-32.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 'How? (Audiences).' *A Theory of Adaptation*. Routledge, 2006, pp. 113-140.
- Jones, Mary 'The White Stag.' *Celtic Literature Collection and Jones's Celtic Encyclopedia*. 2004. Accessed 10 January 2018. <http://www.maryjones.us/jce/whitestag.html>
- Larsen, Josh. 2017. *Movies are Prayers:How Films Voice Our Deepest Longing*. [Kindle Android Version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com
- Leitch, Thomas. 'Adaptation and Intertextuality, or, What isn't an Adaptation, and What Does it Matter?' Edited by Cartmell, Deborah, *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2012, pp. 87-104.

- Leitch, Thomas. 'Twelve Fallacies in Contemporary Adaptation Theory.' *Criticism*, vol. 45, no. 2. Wayne State University Press, 2003, pp. 149-171. Edited by Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. 2nd Ed. Routledge, 2012, pp. 104-122.
- Lewis, C.S. 2010. *The Four Loves*. [Kindle Keyboard Version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com
- Lewis, C.S. *The Four Loves*. HarperCollinsPublishers, 2012.
- Lewis, C.S. 2009. *The Collected Letters of C.S. Lewis, Volume I: Family Letters 1905-1931*. [Kindle Keyboard Version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com
- Lewis, C.S. 2009. *The Collected Letters of C.S. Lewis, Volume III: Narnia, Cambridge and Joy 1950-1963*. [Kindle Keyboard Version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com
- Lewis, C.S. 2013. *The Chronicles of Narnia Complete 7-Book Collection with Bonus Book: Boxen*. [Kindle Keyboard Version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com
- Leyda, Jay, translator. 'Dickens, Griffith, and the Film Today.' *Film form*. By Eisenstein, Sergei. Harcourt Brace, 1947, pp. 195, 198-201, 204-213, and 232-233. Edited by Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. 2nd Ed. Routledge, 2012, pp. 144-146.
- Li, Rong-Zhen. 2015 'Church Overview Report: 1460000 Christians and Near 4300 Churches in Taiwan.' *The Chinese Christian Tribune*, 20 August 2016. Accessed 7 March 2018. <https://www.ct.org.tw/1290803>
- Mayne, Judith. 'Readership and Spectatorship.' *Private Novels, Public Films*. University of Georgia Press, 1988, pp. 252-261. Edited by Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. 2nd Ed. Routledge, 2012, pp. 252-261.
- McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film*. Clarendon Press, 1996, pp. 1-37, 105-136.
- Moring, Mark. 'The Weight of Story.' *Christianity Today*, May 2008, pp. 72.
- Ray, Robert B. 'The Field of "Literature and Film."' Edited by Naremore, James, *Film Adaptation*. The Athlone Press, 2000, pp. 38-53.
- Russell, James. 'Authorship, Commerce, and *Harry Potter*.' Edited by Cartwell, Deborah. *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2012, pp. 391-407.

- Russell, James. 'Narnia as a Site of National Struggle: Marketing, Christianity, and National Purpose in The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe.' *Cinema Journal*, Summer 2009, vol. 48 Issue 4, pp. 59-76.
- Stam, Robert. 'Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation.' Edited by Naremore, James, *Film Adaptation*. The Athlone Press, 2000, pp. 54-76
- The Holy Bible. New International Version. Biblica Inc. 1984.
- Tolson, Jay. 'An Intimate Epic on a Big Screen.' *U.S News & World Report*, 12 December 2005, Vol. 139 issue 22, pp. 52.
- Tovey, Derek. 'The Collar Reading Christianity Ministry in Film.' *Stimulus: the New Zealand of Christian Thought & Practice*, July 2015 Vol. 22 Issue 2, pp. 57-59.
- Qian, Yu-Shun. *Di Yi Ci Dai Fu Yin Dui Jiu Shang Shou (First-timer Evangelist Handbook)*. Chinese Christian Mission of Taiwan, 2014, pp. 32-38, 55-60.
- Wagner, Geoffrey. *The Novel and the Cinema*. The Tantivy Press, 1975.
- Weng, Li-Yu. *Mission in Business*. CCLM Publishing Group Ltd, 2012.
- Wollen, Peter. 'The Auteur Theory.' *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*. Indiana University Press, 1972, pp. 74-105. Edited by Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. 2nd Ed. Routledge, 2012, pp. 185-198.