

ABSTRACT

In this B.A. dissertation, I compare the Tennessee Williams's play *A Streetcar Named Desire* and Elia Kazan's film adaptation. I demonstrate that each of these versions are independent and that the elements of their works constitute a new piece of art. After a short introduction to my work, I analyse the similarities and differences between theatre and film. Then I explore in depth the main items of the theatre and film versions: characters, literary text and settings. Finally, I discuss the concept of "the third story" and its consequences in the adaptation of Williams's play. The conclusion reached at the end of this dissertation is that theatre and film are independent types of art and that the film, though, faithful adaptation, can change the overall message of the work.

Keywords: Tennessee Williams, Elia Kazan, Theatre, Film, *A Streetcar Named Desire*, Film Adaptation.

En este trabajo de fin de grado comparo la obra de teatro de *Un tranvía llamado deseo* de Tennessee Williams y la adaptación fílmica de Elia Kazan. Demuestro que cada una de estas disciplinas es independiente y los elementos de cada una de ellas constituyen una nueva pieza de arte. Tras una breve introducción a mi trabajo, he analizado las similitudes y diferencias entre el teatro y el cine. Después he analizado detalladamente los elementos más importantes del teatro y del cine: personajes, texto literario y escenografía. Después he expuesto el concepto de "la tercera historia" y sus consecuencias en la adaptación de la obra de Williams. La conclusión alcanzada al final de esta disertación es que el teatro y el cine son tipos de arte independientes y que la película, aunque es una fiel adaptación, puede de cambiar el mensaje completo de la obra.

Palabras clave: Tennessee Williams, Elia Kazan, Teatro, Cine, *Un tranvía llamado deseo*, Adaptación fílmica.

Index

Introduction	3
Analysis	
1. Theoretical Framework: The Filmed Adaptation of a Literary Work	6
1.1. Similarities between theatre and film	8
1.2. Differences between theatre and film	9
2. Characters.	10
2.1. Characters in the theatre play and film script.....	10
3. Settings and Literary Text.....	14
3.1. The literary text in theatre and film script.....	15
3.2. Settings in theatre and film script.....	19
4. The third story.....	21
5. Conclusion.....	22
6. Bibliography.....	23

Introduction

Such things as art, as poetry and music,
such kinds of new light have come into the world since then!

In some kinds of people some tenderer feelings
have had some little beginning!

That we have got to make grow!
And cling to, and hold as our flag!

(Williams 74)

Literature and film are strongly connected to each other. However, if we compare the amount of academic researches that have been done on literature and film, there is not a large amount regarding this latter art. According to Cristina Manzano Espinosa in her book *La adaptación como metamorfosis* (2008), the trailblazer of film studios George Bluestone was the first man who wrote about how film directors turn novels into movies in 1957, but still he concentrated his attention on novels rather than on other disciplines such as fairy tales or theatre. The first author to write an essay on films and literature was the well-known feminist writer Virginia Woolf. She wrote *The Cinema* in 1926 in which she shows that films would no longer be regarded as an add-on of the literature (9).

Nowadays, it can still be noted that there is a gradation within the field of art in which the screen adaptation is less esteemed than books or plays. This is largely due to the industrial dimension and the historical trajectory that surround the film industry. Nevertheless, film is an art that may be a valuable tool in the adaptation of various branches of art. One example of this is the access and the use of the plot of a novel or stage play in order to create a film, however, creating an adaptation does not necessarily mean that the work has been provided with less talent or ambition. In language, written words can be followed by an image in the mind of the observer, this can be a part of the imagination or creativity of a movie director or reader.

For these reasons, I am going to focus on the transfer between the theatre play and films; I am going to analyse how the play *A Streetcar Named Desire* by the American playwright Tennessee Williams comes to the big screen by Elia Kazan who is also a stateside film director.

Film can transform the content of other arts with its own devices. What is more, the film adaptation may be a sterling companion for the literary work; there are items that the novel or the play alone cannot provide, such as the various film sets, the ability to create visual characters, the diverse types of movie shots, the kind of music that sets the scene, the film director's perspective, etc.

Nevertheless, one element is particularly affected by the differences between literature and film: the reader/spectator. In the case of film, the most concerned constituent is the viewer because his involvement in the text is confined. The spectator cannot develop his own creativity, because he receives the film director's perspective of the story directly instead of using his imagination to produce his own story. But, according to *Teorías sobre adaptación cinematográfica*, it is Chatman who says that it does not mean that the film has not indeterminations (Rodríguez Martín, 6). The fact that a movie shows the visual information directly is not to say that a film cannot make the viewer think or dream, though, a film may be inaccurate because of the story telling, the appearance, ellipses and so on.

In any event, both the theatre play and film script have a standard tool which is the literary text, as opposed to other disciplines that have other kind of features such as the narration, it is composed not only of dialogues but also descriptions. This literary text is a film or theatre script in which the text is more concise than a narration, in other words, it has fewer environment descriptions and physical or psychological specifications of the characters. It is one of the reasons why we can turn literature into films, since they form significances or stories in similar terms. In this way, it is easy to transform one discipline into another.

For this reason, the objective of this study is to present the similarities and differences between the theatre play and movie script, even though the latter art is an accurate adaptation of the former. There are a great number of elements involved, such as turn words or metaphors into a type of light, music or settings; reduction of the number of characters; concentration of several items into one action and so on.

that transform the stage play into a movie. These components allow the change from theatre language to film language. In this manner, I am going to analyse the similarities and differences between the theatre play and the film adaptation of *A Streetcar Named Desire* in order to prove it.

To achieve this, the study is divided into different chapters in order to analyse the several resources that are found in each of the techniques I have previously mentioned. The first of them sets out the critical importance of the notion of adaptation, the general similarities and differences that can be found in each of these artistic disciplines and how these items affect the theatre and film structures. Then, chapter two and three discuss how characters, settings and literary texts are represented in the original theatre work and how these elements are turned into a movie based on the perspective of the film director, in other words, how the screen adaptation makes major alterations to the original work. This penultimate point is important because one of the major characteristics of film adaptation is the dissemination of classical works. A large amount of people have cultural knowledge based on the screen adaptation of the original classical work. Finally, chapter four explains in depth the notion of “the third story” and how it has implications for the audience. In addition, it is important to explain that I will be analysing the dramatic text instead of its theatrical performance.

With this study, my intent is not to create a method that the reader can apply in the analysis of any screen adaptation but to endeavour to show the aspects which stimulate this process of metamorphosis

But prior to doing so, there is a need to raise awareness of an important factor when the reader has to assess the text: the cultural awareness involved in the work. This aspect is not within the relationship between film and theatre or literature as we can use it to understand any kind of work of art. Despite this, it is an important item that helps the reader or the viewer to get a better understanding of the play or the film. Bearing this in mind, here with I am going to explain certain characteristics and intentions of the *A Streetcar Named Desire*'s authors.

Williams is a great American playwright who normally used outcasts and unstable characters. This is because, among other things, he thought himself to be one of these rejects due to his sexual orientation. For this reason, in the theatrical version of *A*

Streetcar Named Desire, we can observe a supporting character who is homosexual, Blanche's husband, who finally kills himself because of this. Similarly, Blanche, who is also neglected by the puritan society of that period, despises her husband and for that reason she is regarded as being damaged. In this way, Williams criticizes the intolerance and brutality of the era in the mentioned work.

On the other hand, Kazan directed this movie which was adapted from Williams' play. According to Brenda Murphy in *Tennessee Williams and Elia Kazan: A Collaboration in the Theatre*, Williams participated actively in the adaptation of his own work. In this form, the playwright was added to the production process and he reviewed the script along with the director (2-9). Nevertheless, the screen version has scenes and places which are not in the original version but this will be explained further on.

1. Theoretical Framework: The Filmed Adaptation of a Literary Work

Before starting the analysis of these versions, we have to shed light on the tools that allow us to turn novels or theatre into movies and the notion of good adaptation. According to Espinosa, the massive cinema distribution is based on four key elements as follows:

Firstly, the notion of synthesis must be kept in mind, it is based on the short-duration of the film compared with the novel length. Then, there is the notion of universalization which relies on the need of being successful in the international film industry. Another key element is the simplification, it is the need to fulfil and satisfy demand. Lastly, the idea of modification should be included, this key element operates in accordance with its interests and it is going to be discussed in this investigation (16).

When observing these implements, it can be seen that there is a great imbalance between the diffusion of books or theatre and films. As it has been previously stated, this is connected with the widespread dissemination and the industrial scope of the film industry.

The last point of this classification is the aspect which is going to be analysed in depth in this study. In this part, the content and the meaning of the messages conveyed are more important than the language used. It is possible that the substance of these two disciplines may not be exactly the same, but it is one of the reasons why we can say that these two fields complement one another.

We must take into account that film adaptation cannot be compared with other kinds of arts; rather, it has a self-contained identity. Both theatre and film are uniform subjects, even though they receive some type of influence from classical works, they are independent disciplines. In this sense, we cannot analyse a screen adaptation if we continue to believe that the concepts of good and bad film adaptations exist. Furthermore, the fact that each reader or viewer can come up with their own understanding of the play is a type of adaptation in itself. Each reader or viewer may create his own adaptation of the work when they perform their reading.

According to Sanchez Noriega, the definition of the notion of film adaptation shall be as follows:

“ Globalmente podemos definir como adaptación el proceso por el que un relato, la narración de una historia, expresado en forma de texto literario, deviene, mediante sucesivas transformaciones en la estructura (enunciación, organización y vertebración temporal), en el contenido narrativo y en la puesta en imágenes (supresiones, comprensiones, añadidos, desarrollos, descripciones visuales, dialoguizaciones, sumarios, unificaciones o sustituciones), en otro relato muy similar expresado en forma de texto filmico”. (Espinosa, 47)

Bearing this definition and what has been previously explained in mind, we can say that the statement saying that filmic story is a less intellectually discipline is not correct. It is considered that cinema is a subject area with more commercial features than artistic properties. Meanwhile, we can say that the film adaptation not only has an artistic purpose but it also tries to expand the public's knowledge. It not only transforms a literary story into images, sounds and movements but it also promotes cultural circulation. But there are other possibilities too, a movie director may choose to make a screen adaptation because of the assured success that it will have.

Consecutively, I am going to explain some of the similarities and differences that we find in these two types of art, based on the criteria of the novelist and scriptwriter Juan Madrid. (Espinosa, 55)

- Similarities between theatre and film.

A common element between films and theatre is the property of their own ways of communicating their stories, this is what Gaudreault and Jost call absence narrations (Espinosa, 49). This means that someone, in this case the playwright or the film director, leaves a message, but it has to be uncovered by the reader or viewer. In this sense, it exists when there are others that are going to assimilate this message or content. This implies that there is no direct correlation between the author and the public, this is the opposite case of oral tradition.

Thus, the essential common issue is the presence of the story telling. We can find some equivalence between the literary and the cinematic language. We can use several statements to justify the similar values between the literary and cinematic language. For instance, we can say cinematic language can use different types of movie shots in order to describe relevant events of the storytelling while theatre uses literary figures to highlight the importance of each of the facts of the storytelling.

Another important common point is that literary and cinematic narrations are connected because of the reader or viewer perspective. In both narrations, the reader or viewer can ignore the figure of the narrator who provides the narration of the story, this allows them to receive the story without intermediaries in order to believe the narration could be real. In cinematic narrations, there are also instances when, the audience can discover the type of film director present behind the screen. This occurs when the movie director is known because of his distinctive characteristics. A good example of this is the case of Quentin Tarantino or Tim Burton whose hallmarks are so evident that the audience can identify the participation of a specific film director. Though the same does not apply to the theatre play, it also has a physical format that reminds of the presence of the playwright. One can face the same situation when the spectator identifies the narrator

with the main actor or actress. The spectator does not identify themselves with Samuel L. Jackson but with how Samuel L. Jackson portrays his own character. An example of this would be a female viewer that feels identified with Kim Hunter because she is an abused woman.

Finally, we can find another revealing and recent point common to both disciplines (Espinosa, 58-60). It is what is known as “the third story”; it is based on the additional information which may not be immediately available in the end result that we strike the screen or play. That means that there are further details around the original telling and their characters such as deleted scenes, an extended version, a making of, a prologue and so on.

1.2. Differences between theatre and film

We also find several significant differences between these two artistic fields in the aforementioned definition of the notion of film adaptation. One of the most remarkable differences is that cinema has a great quantity of expression tools while literature, a dramatic text in this case, has a single implement which is language. It means that a film has more options when it comes to telling a story whereas we uniquely find linguistic data and performing annotations in the dramatic text. In this sense, cinema has the ability to turn the theatrical text into camera actions. We can observe this in *Snatch* (2000) directed by Guy Ritchie, in which there are four different storylines that are narrated at the same time. Conversely, in literature, the reader focuses their attention on a single discussion or information. Sequentiality vs. Simultaneity.

Another significant difference is that there are no physical barriers in literature, there are no obstacles imposed by reality. It is because the author is able to use language to communicate anything he can imagine. Conversely, in films, there are plenty of things that can be achieved thanks to cinematographic tools; but the director may find barriers related to the budget, scenes that are physically impossible and so on.

And finally, regarding the relationship between the reader or viewer and the work, one of the differences is the total amount of time spent in this relationship. Whereas the readers determine the length of time they are going to invest in reading, the audience cannot program the time they are going to invest. It is because the screen time of a film is an unbiased factor which is shared equally by all viewers.

These are some of the differences and similarities that are found in each of these disciplines. As it has been said previously, images are part of written words, they are implied in the narrative. Images and written words are not enclosed units. As Juan Madrid says, “opino que el guión de cine forma parte de la literatura. Las películas uno las sueña en el guión.” (Espinosa, 55)

2. Characters.

To describe changes in the adaptation process, I am going to make a comparison in order to show the differences and similarities between these two disciplines in a defined and effective way. To do so, I will consider the character functions that can be found in both the original theatre play and its screen adaptation.

A Streetcar Named Desire has three main characters: Blanche DuBois, Stella Kowalski and Stanley Kowalski. On the theatre stage as well as in the film version, all of them are defined by themselves. Throughout the story, they are well defined by the use of certain tone of voice, a way of speaking or their own actions. We must bear in mind that in the play we cannot see the physical expressions of the characters but we receive these images in films. Linda Seger in *Creating Unforgettable Characters* uses the different functions of the characters to perform a classification of the various kinds of personalities (223-244) and I am going to base on her research in order to create our own classification.

2.2. Characters in the theatre play and film script.

Despite there are being several important characters, there is a figure on which the work is focused. It can be debated that the principal character would be Blanche in both

stories, since it is her character who opens and closes the story. In the play, she starts the narration when she goes to Stella's home; while in the film, she does it when asking for the address of the aforementioned house. The story also ends when she goes away with the doctor in both works. Even so, she is the single figure that is defined by the rest of characters. The reader or viewer knows about Blanche's personality features because of what the characters say about her life, so we have more information on her than any other character of the story. For example, we can see this in the following excerpt:

“STELLA: Now please tell me quietly what you think you've found out about my sister. (...) what have you heard and who from?

STANLEY: Our supply-man down at the plant has been going through Laurel for years and he knows all about her and everybody else in the town of Laurel knows all about her. She is as famous in Laurel as if she was the President of the United States (...)” (Williams, 106)

This part of the work provides some needed information about the character which the public should know in order to follow the plot and the character's progress. However, we do not have details about the past of the rest of the characters, but this is because the audience does not require a substantial amount of information about the life of the rest of the cast of players since the work is not focused on them.

As I stated before, in the theatrical play, we imagine her appearance but it is not described in depth. The following description is the only information related to her physical appearance that we find:

“Her appearance is incongruous to this setting. She is daintily dressed in a white suit with a fluffy bodice, necklace and earrings of pearl, white gloves and hat, looking as if she were arriving at a summer tea or cocktail party in the garden district (...)There is something about her uncertain manner, as well as her white clothes, that suggests a moth” (Williams, 3)

In this sense, the reader imagines Blanche as an upper middle-class person. But, Blanche is further described throughout the course of the play as observed below:

“BLANCHE: I know, I know. But you are the one that abandoned Belle Reve, not I! I stayed and fought for it, bled for it, almost died for it!” (Williams, 18)

These statements reveal the image of a doughty female survivor who has dealt with adversities. She seems kind and sweet, conversely, she had a difficult past in which she witnessed a great quantity of deaths in Belle Rêve. These events and the suicide of her husband helps us picture the character as a strong female subject. Nevertheless, we find a really sweet woman whose voice, gestures and expressions seem to be of a docile girl in the film.

The character of Stella is the opposite case; she is fully dependent on Stanley in both versions as follows:

“STELLA: When he's away for a week I nearly go wild! (...) And when he comes back I cry on his lap like a baby ... “(Williams, 17)

Even though Stella not being described as a sweet and sensitive woman, we can recognize her vulnerability in all her expressions, she lives through and for her husband. We can also observe this dependence when her husband beats and hits her. After she has been physically abused during pregnancy she says:

“BLANCHE: (...) how could you come back in this place last night? Why, you must have slept with him!

STELLA: Blanche, I'd forgotten how excitable you are. You're making much too much fuss about this.

BLANCHE: Am I?

STELLA: Yes, you are, Blanche. I know how it must have seemed to you and I'm awful sorry it had to happen, but it wasn't anything as serious as you seem to take it. In the first place, when men are drinking and playing poker anything can happen. It's always a powder-keg. He didn't know what he was doing.... He was as good as a lamb when I came back and he's really very, very ashamed of himself.” (Williams, 64)

In this dialogue with specific sentences such as “it wasn’t anything as serious as you seem to take it”, we can observe how Stella sees as normal what Blanche thinks is awful. But as it has been previously stated, the final scene of the film shows a new Stella. She decides to rule her own life while the Stella in the theatre play is still an enslaved woman. In the film, she decides to leave Stanley as a form of punishment because of him raping Blanche.

In this sense, all things considered, it should be noted that Blanche, Stella and their respective relationships with Stanley are the key points of the story line. These two female characters represent the conformist roles of women in the patriarchal society of the time. On one side, we find the picture of Stella, that represents the women who are their husbands' slaves, while, on the other side, we find the figure of Blanche that shows the kind of treatment a woman receives when she is unmarried and has no obligations.

We also find another important figure in Stanley: he is the best-portrayed character according to his description in the stage play. One of the key aspects of this good characterization of Stanley is the performance of Marlon Brando.

We can say, in terms of the classification in use, that he is the antagonist. This is due to the fact that DuBois, who is the main character, has to deal with him in both versions. The main character and the antagonist are fiercely opposed to each other because of the same objective: the Kowalski's household. That is why Stanley tells Mitch about the past of Blanche, he knows Mitch is the reason why Blanche has the opportunity to live in that part of New Orleans and he wants to throw her out.

Apart from this, one of the characteristics of the antagonists is they should have a special feature that makes them unique such as being highly intelligent, a certain ability or a physical feature, it is important in this type of character because he has to be remembered. Stanley measures up to stereotypes of masculinity in this case, he embraces a violent manner of manhood. This masculinity is represented by three main elements: his way of speaking, his violent behavior and his physical appearance. The first two features are exemplified below:

“STELLA: Your face and your fingers are disgustingly greasy. Go and wash up and then help me clear the table.

[He hurls a plate to the floor.]

STANLEY: That's how I'll clear the table!

[He seizes her arm]

Don't ever talk that way to me! "Pig--Polack--disgusting--vulgar--greasy!"--those kind of words have been on your tongue and your sister's too much around here! What do you two think you are? A pair of queens? Remember what Huey Long said--"Every Man is a King!" And I am the king around here, so don't forget it!

[He hurls a cup and saucer to the floor]

My place is cleared! You want me to clear your places?

[Stella begins to cry weakly. Stanley stalks out on the porch and lights a cigarette]" (Williams, 115-116)

This excerpt shows us his abusive behavior when he begins to destroy the crockery and the cutlery in the midst of a birthday celebration. This also demonstrates his violent way of speaking with sentences such as "I am the king around here, so don't forget it" or "My place is cleared! You want me to clear your places?" This men's dominant male behavior at home shows how he abuses his position of power over women.

However, the theatre play cannot show the physical appearance of a character, the movie is the only version which displays this later feature. Marlon Brando's spectacular performance is why we can say Stanley is the greatest defined figure in line with his depiction in the original version.

The film is also an accurate adaptation of the secondary characters of the play, who are those that have roles complementary to the main characters. In this manner, we have noticed that both versions have the same secondary characters such as Harold "Mitch" Mitchell, Eunice Hubbell, Steve Hubbell, Pablo González, Black (Negro) Woman, The Doctor and The Nurse.

Furthermore, in this precise adaptation we have the same types of extras that we can find in the stage play like the Mexican woman who sell flowers and the young man that lights DuBois' cigarette.

3. Literary Text and Settings.

Continuing with the changes of the adaptation process, I am going to analyse in depth the literary text and various settings in order to show the differences and similarities between the theatre play and its screen adaptation.

It should be noted that Williams and Kazan were given the opportunity to create collaboratively this adaptation due to a close artistic connection. Brenda Murphy in

Tennessee Williams and Elia Kazan: A Collaboration in the Theatre claims that they were working on the development of the *A Streetcar Named Desire* adaptation. Taking their own words, Williams claims “Kazan understood to me quite amazingly for a man whose nature was so opposite to mine”. Adding to this, Kazan states, “Our union, immediate, on first encounter was close but unarticulated; it endured for the rest of his life. How did it happen? Possibly because we were both freaks. Behavior is the mystery that explains character” (6)

The result of the collaboration of these two artists was a new class of theatrical language which was known as “the American Style” (Murphy, 7). The nurturing relation of both was based on their creative competences.

3.1. The literary text in the theatre play and film script.

Taking into account that these two artists had been working together, we can therefore understand why the literary text of this movie is a faithful adaptation of the theatre play; however, there are certain variations in each of these versions.

It should be mentioned that the beginning of the adaptation does not match the narration of the play. We can observe that the first scene of the play commences with a stormy conversation as follows:

“STANLEY [bellowing]: Hey, there! Stella, Baby!

[Stella comes out on the first floor landing, a gentle young woman, about twenty-five, and of a background obviously quite different from her husband's]

STELLA [mildly]: Don't holler at me like that. Hi, Mitch.

STANLEY: Catch!

STELLA: What?

STANLEY: Meat!

[He heaves the package at her. She cries out in protest but manages to catch it; then she laughs breathlessly (...)].” (Williams, 2)

Considering this excerpt, it can be said that the original text has a further description about how Stanley makes fun of Stella. Whereas, in the film adaptation this scene has

been omitted, it cannot be observed the scene in which Stanley is throws a piece of meat at Stella in a fairly blunt manner.

This scene occurs before the black (Negro) woman starts making fun of Stella, it is followed by a dialogue in which Blanche is asking Eunice for the location of Stella Kowalski's home:

EUNICE: Well, that's where she's at watching' her husband bowl. [There is a pause] You want to leave your suitcase here an' go find her?

BLANCHE: No

BLACK WOMAN: I'll go tell her you come. (Williams, 5)

This fragment belongs to the dramatic text; though, it is Blanche who goes to the bowling alley looking for Stella in the film version.

There are other alterations of the text throughout the romantic date between Blanche and Mitch. The conversation of the stage play is presented in the following extract:

“MITCH [heavily]: I'm afraid you haven't gotten much fun out of this evening, Blanche.

BLANCHE: I spoiled it for you

MITCH: No, you didn't, but I felt all the time that I wasn't giving you much entertainment

BLANCHE: I simply couldn't rise to the occasion. That was all. I don't think I've ever tried so hard to be gay and made such a dismal mess of it. I get ten points for trying! I did try.

MITCH Why did you try if you didn't feel like it, Blanche?

BLANCHE: I was just obeying the law of nature.

MITCH: Which law is that?

BLANCHE: The one that says the lady must entertain the gentleman - or no dice! See if you can locate my door-key in this purse. When I'm so tired my fingers are all thumbs!” (Williams, 90)

Therefore, we can remark that this dialogue does not have the explanation of what the law of nature means in the film. The omission of this reveals that the film dialogues are not freely elected or adapted, the text of the theater play contains explicit social criticism, while the adaptation is limited by restriction in the American society. Such types of conversations as the dialogue discussed above or the incident of the piece of meat are only present in the initial text, we could say that the screen adaptation also displays this truth but the viewer has to deepen the understanding of the film's storyline

in order to find that truth. The former aspects allow us to have a clear overall picture of a woman's role in the slum communities of that period.

Another significant change in the literary text is when Stella is telling the story about what happened with her ex-husband. In the original text, we can observe that the dialogue is as follows:

“There was something different about the boy, a nervousness, a softness and tenderness which wasn't like a man's, although he wasn't the least bit effeminate looking (...) Then I found out. In the worst of all possible ways. By coming suddenly into a room that I thought was empty--which wasn't empty, but had two people in it... the boy I had married and an older man who had been his friend for years. (...) on the dance floor--unable to stop myself--I'd suddenly said--"I saw! I know! You disgust me..." (Williams, 103)

We may note that Blanche justified the suicide of her husband by saying his sexuality is not socially accepted, while, in the movie, he is considered inappropriate because of his steady job as indicated below:

“There was something different about the boy, a nervousness, a softness and tenderness and I didn't understand ... I didn't understand why this boy wrote poetry and seems unable of doing anything else (...) on the dance floor--unable to stop myself--I'd suddenly said--"You're weak! I lost respect for you! I despise you..." (Kazan, 1:12:00-1:14:00)

Therefore, we can contrast how the same character is portrayed with different details as these demands were made by Hollywood. These substantial changes in the dialogue alter the past of Blanche and the message of the work, since both the text and the social content have been modified. It also shows how Williams' theatrical text was censored by Hollywood.

Moreover, there is another fragment of the work that is restructured due to the same reason.

“STELLA: But when she was young, very young, she married a boy who wrote poetry.... He was extremely good-looking. I think Blanche didn't just love him but worshipped the ground he walked on! Adored him and thought him almost too fine to be human! But then she found out...

STANLEY: What?

STELLA: This beautiful and talented young man was a degenerate(...)" (Williams, 110)

Once again, the references related to the character's homosexuality are omitted in the adaptation.

Lastly, we also find modifications in the text of the final scene, but on this occasion, the screen adaptation is the most forward-looking version compared to the original text. This way, we can observe how Stella cries and screams as Blanche leaves with the doctor in both variants. But, it is in the screen version where we find the following statement of Stella:

“STANLEY: Come on, honey

STELLA: Don't touch me, don't you ever touch me again

(...)

STANLEY: Stella! Come on Stella!

STELLA: No, not going back this time... not going back...

STANLEY: STEEEEEEEELLLLLLLLLLAAAAAAAAAAAAA! “(Kazan, 1:59:30- 2:01:03)

This sentence “don't touch me, don't you ever touch me again” holds, at least in part, the temperament of Blanche in the film adaptation. It is after this scene when she goes upstairs to Eunice's home with the baby in her arms instead of leaving with him like in the original text. We also need to highlight that the last thing Stanley says, when he shouts dramatically the name of Stella, has become a classic. It has become so famous that we can find this reference in series such as *Modern Family*.

On the basis of this comparison between each of the literary texts, we can state that the script of the screen adaptation is in general a fairly faithful version of the theatrical text, but there remain significant textual modifications.

A Streetcar Named Desire was still supervised by the traditional and conservative American society of that moment. In this sense, the censure of that critical period entailed changes of particular importance as I have shown. Ronald Bergan in his article *The Dark of Adaptation* explains how Hollywood's Production Code demanded certain changes in the script of Kazan's film (1951) such as to temper the language or drop the sexuality of DuBois' husband. These text alterations can vary the original message of the work since the sexual orientation of Blanche's husband is part of the social criticism in the play; furthermore, in the movie, the past of Blanche becomes almost an anecdote.

Nevertheless, these changes are not major enough to change the message because the main subject matter of the work is not the sexual orientation of Blanche's husband but the social status of women in that period. Moreover, this last subject is noticeably attached to the final scene in which Stella punishes Stanley because of the rape of her sister.

3.2. Settings in theatre play and film script.

In relation to the scenes of the work that I have analysed, it is uncommon that the beginning of an adaptation matches with the outset of the original text. Consequently, we can observe that there is a missing scene in the first act of the play. The opening shot of the film presents the city of New Orleans, whereas the theatre play commences differently as illustrated below:

The exterior of a two-story corner building on a street in New Orleans which is named Elysian Fields and runs between the L & N tracks and the river. The section is poor but, unlike corresponding sections in other American cities, it has a raffish charm. The houses are mostly white frame, weathered gray, with rickety outside stairs and galleries and quaintly ornamented gables. This building contains two flats, upstairs and down. Faded white stairs ascend to the entrances of both. (Williams, 1)

The fact that this stage play excerpt begins by describing the appearance of the Kowalski's reveals the difficulties faced by the screen director.

There are however more cases where we cannot find a certain scene in the stage act, but in the film. Such is the case of the original text in which, following the opening act, the black (negro) woman goes looking for Stella at the bowling alley and, then, Eunice Hubbell asks Blanche if she wants to go into Stella's house and wait for her over there. While, in the fourth minute of the film, it is Blanche herself who picks up Stella at the bowling alley.

Moreover, we find another change of scene when Harold Mitchell and Blanche are on a romantic date. In the dramatic text, the date is taking place at the Kowalskis' home but, in the film, it takes place in a nightclub. We must mention that this alteration of the

initial text is relatively rare because they have the same conversation but in different places, the screen director decided to change merely the atmosphere of the date.

Rather than finding less scenes in the film than in the theatre play, we come across some shots in the film which are absent in the original work such as the act shown below:

“It is late afternoon in mid-September. The portieres are open and a table is set for a birthday supper, with cake and flowers. Stella is completing the decorations as Stanley comes in.

STANLEY: What's all this stuff for?

STELLA: Honey, it's Blanche's birthday” (Williams, 104)

This fragment shows the play commences directly with the preparation of Blanche's birthday celebration. However, the movie begins with a discussion concerning the past of Blanche in order to tear Mitch away from Blanche. In that scene, Stanley talks with Mitch about all the “negative” things that he has discovered about the private life of Blanche. Similarly, in both productions it is evident that Mitch is aware of these issues.

There is also another scene that it is only found in the film. It is when Blanche throws Mitch out of their home and she starts to scream. We can observe how the local community begins to say things like “are you all right, lady?”, “what's the matter lady?” or “there is a cop now”, while she keeps crying in and around the house.

Finally, we can see a last missing scene in the initial text, it is directly related to the fact that these works have different endings as it has been mentioned in the literary text section. In the screen version, Stella is running away from Stanley instead of going home with him, she wants to escape from the place where she has been abused and save her baby. We must highlight that the message of this ending contrasts with the end of the play since the movie ends with her holding the baby and the play finishes with her holding Stanley. It is clear that the endings carry different meanings.

By adding new alterations, Kazan not only teaches us how difficult adapting a play to the big screen is, he also reveals his interest in giving his own personal stamp to the adaptation of the drama.

4. The third story.

As we mentioned in the beginning of this paper, there is a recent notion the so-called “the third story”. We normally use a conventional analysis in order to classify the similarities and differences between these two subjects, but another way to enjoy films has emerged, resulting from the growth of new formats such as online movie services, DVD and so on. This element was demanded by literature claimants but, currently, there are also cinema claimants because of the individual use of films.

This kind of story is made up of supplementary data that we cannot find in the story of the movie. It is composed of further details which are not in the original work. These are elements that are a guiding part of the script construction and can even modify the message received by the public. In the case of literature we find elements such as a preface, epilogue, author’s biography or other resources; whereas in the field of the cinema we find items like director’s comments, deleted scenes or information about how it was made.

We have to take this important development into account because it modifies the relationship between the public and the work. This strategy gives readers/viewers the opportunity to find out more about the book or film they are interested in. Furthermore, it creates a false expectation among the public. It makes people believe they are able to obtain a full knowledge of the work, but, in reality they only acquire what the author wants. It can be a key advertising tool.

Particularly in the field of cinema, this item, despite not being fully developed, brings significant benefits to the viewers and their interaction with the film. It can be said that these kinds of resources may contribute to hold a more comprehensive understanding of the art created. These factors altogether help the audience to value the work behind the screen adaptation.

In the case of *A Streetcar Named Desire*, which does not have a large quantity of added material because of its antiquity, we can only use Kazan’s comments, Williams’

biographical information, data about the artistic connection between them, comparisons of their works or an analysis such as this. Additional information helps audiences to understand better what Kazan and Williams want to transmit in each of the work versions.

5. Conclusions.

On the basis of this study, we have put forward a separate analysis from that of other literary studies. We have shed light upon the relationship between literature and cinema as a commonplace within the area of literature. In this sense, we have demonstrated the independence of these radically different subjects. Each of these disciplines incorporates a number of particular and separate techniques and that is why they deserve to be treated as self-supporting.

This work involves a research in which literature is not compared to film, but they are dealt with as complementary identities. Cinema has its own significances, symbols, methods and influences which fall under the filmic language. What is more, according to Espinosa, the Spanish Society of General and Comparative Literature tends more towards literature studies than other artistic areas. We can specify that this does not apply equally to other places such as United States or Europe (224).

In addition, I intended to use theatre, within the scope of literature, which is commonly analyzed as a performance rather than a dramatic text.

If this artistic discipline did not already hold such a high level of independence, the message of the film production could not be different from the original play. The tools used in the characterization of the characters can vary depending of the art form. The playwright defines their characters by their own actions but he cannot use physical expressions or a certain tone of voice as in films. In this sense, we find characters depicted with different behaviours in each of the versions as is the figure of Blanche.

Considering the comparison between each of the literary texts, it can be said that the storytelling of the theatre play is altered. The social criticism of the film changes as a result of softening the language or themes such as the sexuality of DuBois' husband. Given also the analyses of settings, the missing scene of the original text implies a different ending and meaning from the movie ending. It shows how the film, being an accurate adaptation, is able to modify the overall message of the work by simply changing a single scene.

However, we can conclude that the movie is a faithful adaptation concerning the literary text.

These alterations also show that creativity is crucial in the building of a screen adaptation. As such, Kazan achieves to giving his own hallmark to the drama adaptation, although Williams' signature continuous to be present in the work.

Finally, I also want to allude to the notion called "the third story", since it can be an important tool to educate readers or viewers and it may help them to appreciate a screen adaptation that has had bad reviews or publicity.

6. Bibliography.

- Banfield, Chris. Brenda Murphy Tennessee Williams And Elia Kazan Cambridge University Press, 1992. "New Theatre Quarterly" 8.32 (1992): 396. Web. 4 Apr. 2018.
- Berga, Ronald. "The Dark Art Of Adaptation" *The Guardian*. N.p.,2008. Web. 12 Mar.2018
- C., Robert, and Small JR. *A Teacher's Guide To The Signet Edition Of Tennessee Williams's A Streetcar Named Desire*. New York: Penguin Group, 2004. Web. 1 May 2018.
- Kazan, Elia. *A Streetcar Named Desire*. Hollywood: Charles K.Feldman, 1951. Film.

Manzano Espinosa, Cristina. *La Adapatación Como Metamorfosis. Transferencias Entre El Cine y La Literatura*. Madrid: Editorial Fragua, 2008. Print.

Perez, patricio. "Construcción Del Personaje En Cine y Televisión." Universidad de Extremadura, 2009. Print.

Ritchie, Guy. *Snatch*. United Kingdom: Columbia Pictures, 2000. Film.

Saporito, Jeff. "How Did "Streetcar" Differ From Its Original Stage Version?" *Screenprism*. N.p., 2015. Web.14 Mar. 2018.

Seger, Linda. *Creating Unforgettable Characters*. Johanneshov: TPB, 2012. Print.

Williams, Tennessee. *A Streetcar Named Desire*. New York: Penguin Group, 1951.

Woolf, Virginia. "The Cinema." *British Periodicals, London* (1926). Print.