



Universidad de Valladolid

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras

Grado en Estudios Ingleses

How differently can the same story be adapted? A Comparative Analysis of the Cinematic Adaptations of *The Great Gatsby*

Julia Alejandro Cid

Tutor: Santiago Rodríguez Guerrero-Strachan

Departamento de Filología Inglesa

Curso: 2022-2023

ABSTRACT

This dissertation aims to analyse three important narrative elements for cinematic adaptations: the narrator, the focalization, and the analepsis. In order to achieve that, I conducted a comparative analysis between two cinematic adaptations of *The Great Gatsby*. The two films chosen were: Jack Clayton's 1974 version and Baz Luhrmann's production of 2013. For the analysis, I conveyed a close reading of Fitzgerald's novel, focusing on three aspects to later compare how they were portrayed in both films. The first aspect is the homodiegetic narrator, concentrating on the impact of Nick's presence or absence as narrator. The second aspect is the focalization on Gatsby by the narrator of the story. The last aspect is the role of the analepses, showing how they can help or confuse the viewer when interpreting the storyline. To conclude, the comparative analysis shows how differently the same story can be adapted depending on the director's choice.

Keywords: cinematic adaptation, *The Great Gatsby*, Nick, homodiegetic narrator, focalization, analepsis.

RESUMEN

Este TFG pretende analizar tres elementos narrativos importantes para las adaptaciones cinematográficas: el narrador, la focalización y la analepsis. Para ello, he realizado un análisis comparativo entre dos adaptaciones cinematográficas de *El Gran Gatsby*. Las películas elegidas fueron: la versión de Jack Clayton de 1974 y la producción de Baz Luhrmann de 2013. Para el análisis, realicé una minuciosa lectura de la novela de Fitzgerald, centrándome en tres aspectos para después comparar cómo fueron plasmados en ambas películas. El primer aspecto es el narrador homodiegético, concentrándome en el impacto de la presencia o ausencia de Nick como narrador. El segundo aspecto es la focalización en Gatsby por parte del narrador de la historia. El último aspecto es el papel de las analepsis, mostrando cómo pueden ayudar o confundir al espectador a la hora de interpretar el argumento. Para concluir, el análisis comparativo muestra lo diferente que puede ser adaptada una misma historia en función de la elección del director.

Palabras clave: adaptación cinematográfica, *El Gran Gatsby*, Nick, narrador homodiegetico, focalización, analepsis.

Index

Introduction	1
1. What is an adaptation	3
1.1 Defining adaptation	3
1.2 Characteristics of cinematic adaptation	6
2. Narratology	9
2.1 Types of narrators	9
2.2 Narrative time	11
3. Analysis of the cinematic adaptations of <i>The Great Gatsby</i>	13
3.1 Homodiegetic narrator	13
3.2 Focalization	20
3.3 Analepses	22
Conclusion	31
References	35

Introduction

Cinematic adaptations of novels have been a source of creativity as regards narrative strategies. During the second half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, there has been a substantial increase in the production of cinematic adaptations. Adaptations of classical or well-known works tend to be the directors' preferred ones, mainly due to economic reasons, since they usually have a better reception from the public. Nevertheless, this decision can also lead to a major debate, the question of fidelity. Which rules to follow when creating an adaptation has been a matter of discussion for a long time, causing a split of opinions that has yet to be solved. As a result, two cinematic adaptations of the same literary work will differ significantly, presenting almost contrasting storylines.

The Great Gatsby by F. Scott Fitzgerald is a distinguished literary work regarded as part of the Great American Novel (Eble, 35). This acknowledgment results from the author's indirect critique of American society in the 20s. Though at first sight it may appear to be a simple love story, the eccentricity of the parties and their ostentatious lives hide a major problem that Fitzgerald attempts to condemn. The main issue with this novel is that such frivolous portrayal may deviate the attention from the author's critique, causing a wrong interpretation of the story. It is not only a reader's mistake, but it can also be a difficulty for the directors that have attempted to adapt this classic. By trying to fit the complicated storyline into the film, Fitzgerald's true intention is sometimes forgotten.

The main purpose of this dissertation is to present the divergences between two adaptations of the same novel, in this case, *The Great Gatsby*; and consequently explain the consequences of the alterations of the story. In order to achieve my purpose, I have conducted a comparative analysis of two cinematic adaptations of Fitzgerald's novel. The first adaptation is from 1974, directed by Jack Clayton, and the second one was directed by Baz Luhrmann and released in 2013. Said comparative analysis will focus on three aspects: the homodiegetic narrator, the focalization, and the role of analepses.

The dissertation will be divided into three different chapters. The first chapter will be dedicated to presenting a definition for the term 'adaptation', as well as explaining various controversies surrounding the cinematic adaptation field. The following chapter will deal with the narratological terms used for the analysis, each one explained in a different sub-chapter. The final chapter contains the comparative analysis of the two films chosen, where every aspect taken into consideration for the analysis is placed in a different sub-chapter. This dissertation will end with a conclusion and a list of the references I have consulted to write it.

This dissertation does not try to take sides on whether one adaptation is better than the other; it simply works as an analytical comparison between two cinematic adaptations of the same novel. Because of this, even though the debate around the question of fidelity is mentioned, the final judgment on which of the two films is the best cinematic adaptation lies in the hands of the reader, allowing them to decide based on their preferences.

1. What is an adaptation

1.1 Defining adaptation

It is a rather difficult task to reach an agreement about the definition of adaptation and its defining characteristics. However, over the last century, it became more prominent in the field of media studies. In one of his essays, Timothy Corrigan explains that the debates regarding adaptation in media studies have started to focus on issues such as “the differences and similarities of writing and filmmaking as modes of expression and viewing and reading positions as distinctive activities that adapt works to new contexts” (Corrigan 28).

The notion of adaptation has gradually changed during the twentieth century, and with it, the approach that was considered correct for the creation of an adaptation. During the 60s and 70s, adaptations were dismissed in film and media studies, which caused a hiatus in the debate on fidelity inside the adaptation field. Nevertheless, the experimental movements that relegated adaptation, “served as a gateway to new developments and definitions of adaptation” (Corrigan 30). In the 1980s, Dudley Andrew wrote an essay in which he distinguishes between three types of adaptations: “borrowing”, which he describes as an adaptation in which an artist “employs the material, idea or form of a previous text”; “intersecting” in which the artist preserves “the uniqueness of the original text” and leaves it “unassimilated” in the adaptation; and lastly, “transforming”, in which “faithful or unfaithful adaptations measure the reproduction of something essential about an original text” (Corrigan 30).

In the early 2000s, Linda Hutcheon wrote *Theory of Adaptation*, in which she summarized the latest definitions and theories on adaptation and proposed a revolutionary approach that was closer to the adaptations created during the last decade of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st. She developed a very extensive and detailed work in which she presented a series of questions ‘What?’ ‘Who?’ ‘Why?’ ‘How?’ ‘Where?’ ‘When?’, that helped her focus on the different aspects to theorize about regarding adaptation. This differentiation “allows her to address different forms and media of adaptation, its various

motivations and legal or economic constraints, the different modes of engagement with the audience and consumers elicited by adaptation, and the cultural and historical determinants of adaptation” (Corrigan 33). Some of the aspects that Hutcheon discusses more in-depth are “[t]he pleasures of adaptation” (114), the distinction between “[k]nowing and unknowing audiences” (120), and the various “[d]egrees of immersion” (133), which take into consideration the role of the audience in connection with the adaptation.

As it is known, adaptation implies a relation between two or more works in different media. Gérard Genette was one of the first scholars to theorize about adaptation and the relationship between texts (intertextuality). An adaptation is what he would call a “second degree text” (Genette, *Palimpsestes* 5), that is created and then received in relation to a prior text (Hutcheon 6). Although this was not a particularly exhaustive definition, it worked as a starting point for adaptation studies, and it helped for the acquisition of more significance in relation to other fields such as media studies or literary studies.

One of the most important differentiations that Linda Hutcheon proposes in her work is the view of adaptation as a product and adaptation as a process. She explains that when looking at the definition of the verb ‘to adapt’, it is possible to find it defined as “to adjust, to alter or to make suitable” (7), but without indicating an exclusive way of doing it. For that reason, the same word – adaptation – is used to refer to the process and the product (Hutcheon 7).

Taking first the approach of adaptation as a product, Linda Hutcheon defines it as an “announced and extensive transposition of a particular work or works” (7). This transposition may be a change not only of medium, such as from a novel to a film, but also of genre, although it is less common. As to the approach of adaptation as a process, Linda Hutcheon reminds the reader that adapters are “first interpreters and then creators” (18). They carry out a double process, in which they have to comprehend and interpret the source text they work with and, select the elements of the story that will be relevant for their adaptation. With that information, they will create a new work, that will be unique, but which, at the same time, will preserve the essence of the original text.

The role of the audience is sometimes forgotten when dealing with adaptations. Nevertheless, they are the ones who receive and interpret the adaptation, and can react to it in different ways, depending on their level of knowledge of the story. If the audience is familiar with the original work, they will be able to “fill in any gaps with the information from the adapted text” (Hutcheon, 121). It will be easier for them to recognize the story, and most importantly, the elements that are not included in the adaptation. However, there is also the possibility that part of the audience does not identify the literary work. In that case, they would perceive the work in front of them as any other film, since “they do not know that what they are actually experiencing is an adaptation” (Hutcheon 120). The problem comes when the director relies excessively on the previous knowledge of the viewers, creating an adaptation that would not make sense for those not capable of ‘filling in the gaps’. The difficulty in producing a successful adaptation lies in finding the balance between the recognition as such by knowing and unknowing audiences (Hutcheon 121).

Another topic discussed in Hutcheon’s study is the critiques towards the role and significance of adaptations inside film or literary studies. For a long time, literary studies accused adaptations of usurping literary texts, while film studies tried to be established as an independent art form (Cartmell 7), leaving film adaptations out of this field. This exclusion of adaptation from both fields led to a false categorization of adaptations as plagiarism or appropriations. Nevertheless, Hutcheon provides a clear differentiation between an adaptation and the works that cannot be considered adaptations, such as sequels, prequels, and fanfiction (9).

The question of fidelity is always on the table when discussing adaptations, as well as the reasons behind why an adaptation is created. Although there may be specific and different reasons, Linda Hutcheon claims that, for the most part, adapters may choose a particular story to economically and artistically supplant the prior works (20). After all, adapters are artists who want to create new artistic works, and constructing a new interpretation of previous work may be an appealing challenge for them. Because of that, “the rhetoric of fidelity is less than adequate to discuss the process of adaptation” (Hutcheon 20). Adapters tend to choose well-known works because they will be easily recognized by the spectator, and therefore, more

successful than less-known ones. As Bluestone stated, “when a film becomes a financial or critical success, the question of its faithfulness is given hardly any thought” (114).

1.2. Characteristics of cinematic adaptation

Despite the large number of media used for adaptations, according to Hutcheon, the commonest adaptations move from “the telling mode to the showing mode” (38), in which the literary text becomes a real live performance. When a written work is adapted to the big screen, a lot of criticism arises regarding the creation of such work, highlighting the lack of elements that were present in the literary work. This ‘loss’ that many critics tend to use as an argument, usually refers to the “reduction of scope” (Hutcheon 37). In other words, the shortening of the length of narration or narrative time, the simplification of details or descriptions, and the substitution of commentaries for visual images to exemplify it. Even though it can be thought that omitting these elements from the original work may affect the adaptation, Chatman explains that only the deletion of major events of the narrative (or ‘kernels’ as he calls them) would lead to the destruction of the narrative logic (53-54).

Although there are parts that are lost in cinematic adaptations, the ‘gains’ of adapting a literary work into a film are almost always ignored, for example, the use of music and sound effects, which cannot be depicted in a literary text. The music becomes part of the “aura” of the film, which is just as important as the visual part of it (Hutcheon 40). The soundtrack of a film works as an additional narrative element, that can intensify or express certain emotions that cannot be portrayed on paper; as well as provoke certain emotions in the viewer (Ondaatje 13).

In spite of contraries like McFarlane (12) and Leitch (16) that believe in the superiority of literary texts, other theorists like Lothe propose that cinematic adaptation should be considered as another form of narrative communication, as valid as narrative prose (25). He considers that “the fiction film is narrative in the sense that it presents a story, but in contrast to literary fiction, it communicates ‘filmically’” (Lothe 25). These differences in the way of communication are what “allows further possibilities for creative transposition of equivalent

narrative units within the bounds of the different media” (Perdikaki 23). The elements that can be found in both media (such as the plot, narrator, and time of narration) will be explained more extensively in the following sections, as well as the way in which they differ.

2. Narratology

As I have stated in the previous chapter, there are several reasons why cinematic adaptation (and films in general) should also be considered narrative communication. In his work *Coming to Terms. The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*, Chatman re-states some of his previous arguments about narration and provides new ones regarding the acceptance of film as a way of narrating. He based his dissertation on Genette's proposal, where he differentiates between diegesis and mimesis. Diegesis, or non-iconic representations refers mainly to novels and other literary texts; while mimesis, or iconic representation refers to films, although novels can be considered partially mimetic too. (Chatman 111). There are some theorists who are opposed to the thought that "to show" a narrative is "to present it narratively", nevertheless, Chatman argues that there is no reason why "to narrate" should only mean "to tell" (Chatman 113-114). From his perspective, any work that "presents a sequence of events performed or experienced by characters is a narrative" (Chatman 117). In conclusion, he states that "at a fundamental level they are all stories, and the fact that one kind of story is told (diegesis) and the other shown (mimesis) is secondary" (117)

Once it is clear that both novels and films can be considered narratives, it can be said that both share common elements that are essential for the production of the narration, such as the chronology of events, the set of characters, the setting, or the narrator. Since the narrator is an important constituent of narratives, that determines the point of view, the focalization, and, consequently, the way the story is told. In this part of the dissertation, I will be focusing on the types of narrators that exist, to later understand which kind of narrator can be found in *The Great Gatsby*, as well as some elements related to the narrative time, such as temporal shifts.

2.1 Types of narrators

Although each theorist provides a slightly different definition for the set of narrators that exists, I have attempted to summarize the definitions for each narrator, focusing on the one that best adjusts to the type of narrator I will describe in my analysis. The most important

element in a narrative is the narrator, i.e., the person who tells the story. Even though it is not the case for *The Great Gatsby*, it was important to illustrate how the perception of the narrator might be changing over time.

Gerard Genette is one of the first theorists to present a clear classification of the different categories and levels of narrative: *voice*, *mode*, and *tense* (Fludernik 98). He makes a first distinction between voice and mode, which he explains as referring to “Who speaks?” (narrator or character) and to “Who sees?”, in other words, “the perspective from which the story is presented” (Fludernik 98). When talking about the perspective in narratives, the term *focalization* is the prevalent one. In addition, the term *focalizer* refers to the character that presents the narrative, through whose eyes the elements of the narration are represented (Nieragden 688); and the term *focalizer*, “is the point from which the elements are viewed” (Bal 149).

In the category of voice, the most significant division is the opposition between *heterodiegetic narrator*, who does not take part in the events of the story, and *homodiegetic narrator*, who is involved in the action (Fludernik 98). The principal divergence between the two is their presence in the story itself. Regarding the heterodiegetic narrator, the narrator “can only report what happens from a post outside [perspective]” (Chatman 123) because he/she/it “never occupied the story world and does not literally see or experience the events at the moment of speaking them” (Chatman 144). On the other hand, a *homodiegetic narrator* is a person who is both narrator and character that describes other characters’ events in the story. (Chatman 48). In contrast to the *heterodiegetic narrator*, the *homodiegetic* is a participant in the story so he/she/it sees the events and objects which he/she/it narrates. Apart from the participation in the story, the *homodiegetic narrator* “speaks from discourse time and space but previously inhabited story time and space” (Chatman 145). In other words, the narrator recounts past events in the present moment of narration, so “what he conveys can only be memories of perceptions and conceptions internal to the story, not the perceptions and conceptions themselves” (Chatman 145).

The next level that Genette proposes is the mode or *focalization* in the narrative. He defines it as “a restriction imposed on the information provided by a narrator about his characters” (Edmiston 729). In his analysis, Genette proposes three types of restriction: *zero focalization*, *internal focalization*, and *external focalization*. *Zero focalization* means that “the narrator is unlimited spatially and unrestricted in psychological access to the characters” (Edmiston 730). This type of focalization is usually associated with the omniscient narrator (a type of *heterodiegetic narrator*), as he has access to the mind of all characters almost equally. Since the focalization is not “restricted to any one point of view” (Fludernik 102), the reader can obtain a general overview of every character of the story. In respect of *internal and external focalization*, Mieke Bal points out that “if the focalizer coincides with [a] character, that character will have an advantage over other characters” (Bal 149). The reason for that lies in the reader because if he “watches with the character’s eyes”, he most likely “will be inclined to accept the vision presented by that character” (Bal 150). Focusing on *internal focalization*, it can be said that “the narrator is limited spatially but has access to the mind of the focal character” (Edmiston 730). Despite involving spatial limitation as well, when there is *external focalization* “the narrator has no psychological privilege and is limited to the role of witness” (Edmiston 730). Nevertheless, the *external focalizer* has a small advantage in comparison to the *internal focalizer*. Rimmon-Kenan explains that “an *external focalizer* has at his disposal all temporal dimensions of the story, whereas an internal focalizer is limited to the ‘present’ of the characters” (78).

2.2 Narrative time

Narrative time has a “double temporal sequence”, which means that “there is the time of the thing told and the time of the narrative” (Metz 18). However, this concept is more problematic than expected. This is because, strictly speaking, “[text-time] is a spatial, not a temporal dimension” (Rimmon-Kenan 44). According to Genette, narrative time alludes to “the order in which events or temporal sections are arranged in the narrative discourse with the order of succession these same events or temporal segments have in the story” (*Narrative Discourse* 35), which is one of the ideas I will discuss in my analysis. Usually, the result of

that comparison is a discrepancy between the story-order and the text-order, which Genette defines as ‘anachronies’ (Rimmon-Kenan 46). There are two types of discrepancies: *analepsis* or ‘flashback’, and *prolepsis* or ‘foreshadowing’. *Analepsis* is described as “a narration of a story-event at a point in the text after later events have been told. The narration returns, as it were, to a past point in the story” (Rimmon-Kenan 46). *Prolepsis* is understood to be “a narration of a story-event at a point where before earlier events have been mentioned. The narration, as it were, takes an excursion into the future of the story” (Rimmon-Kenan 46). Of the two anachronies, *analepsis* is much more commonly used in narratives because *prolepsis* sometimes requires a certain degree of understanding to recognize this shift in time, which is usually only achieved by experienced readers.

Both narrator and narrative time are important constituents of the narrative, either literary or cinematic, and I will explore both constituents in detail in the novel as well as in the cinematic adaptations.

3. Analysis of the cinematic adaptations of *The Great Gatsby*

This part of the dissertation will be dedicated to the comparative analysis of the cinematic adaptations of *The Great Gatsby*. The films chosen are Jack Clayton's 1974 adaptation of the classic (which will be referred to as TGG74), and the most recent adaptation by the director Baz Luhrmann, released in 2013 (which will be referred to as TGG13)¹. Although there is another cinematic adaptation released in 2000, I decided to compare Clayton and Luhrmann's because they are quite apart in time, which helps to exemplify the various ways in which a cinematic adaptation is created.

I have decided to focus on three main narratological aspects: the homodiegetic narrator, the focalization, and the role of the analepses. Each aspect to be analysed will be developed in a different sub-chapter, in which a variety of scenes have been chosen to explain how those aspects are reflected. Although both films are full of elements that would contribute to the analysis of this work, I have only selected the most important ones for the storyline, to show what are the main consequences of the changes in the narrative. In this case, I have prioritized the extensive analysis of fewer scenes rather than trying to discuss every aspect of the movie on a surface level. Since both films are quite different from each other, their divergences will provide an interesting insight into the world of cinematic adaptations, as well as into the debate of fidelity.

3.1 Homodiegetic narrator

The main reason for the selection of the homodiegetic narrator as one of the aspects to analyse is its relevance in the original text. In the book *The Great Gatsby*, Nick is the homodiegetic narrator of the story, which means that he narrates the events of the story once he has been part of them, as I explained in the previous chapter. From the first page of the book, it is possible to identify Nick as the narrator of the story because he starts the narration by telling

¹ The idea for the abbreviation of the names of both films has been taken from Carolina Crespo Steinke's master's dissertation, in which she uses these abbreviations as well.

the reader about himself: “in my younger and more vulnerable years my father gave me some advice that I’ve been turning over my mind ever since [...] In consequence, I’m inclined to reserve all judgments” (5). This sets a preface to the story, indicating that throughout the text it will be possible to find Nick’s opinion and thoughts constantly— “I realized”, “I wanted” or “I understood” (5) exemplify quite easily Nick’s role in the story. Not only does Nick provide details about his life and his feelings once he moved to the East, but he also shares who the key figure of the story is: Gatsby. “The man who gives his name to this book” (5) are the words Nick uses to refer to him, evidencing that the whole purpose of the narration is to share Gatsby’s story, instead of his own, which may appear strange considering he is the narrator.

Whenever a cinematic adaptation is produced, the director and the scriptwriters are the ones in charge of deciding which approach they would like to follow for its creation. As for the first pages of any book, the opening of a film takes a crucial role in the audience’s understanding and perception of the story. In TGG74, the opening scene begins with a short voiceover by Nick, in which he repeats the first paragraph of the book almost word-by-word (00:03:45). Nevertheless, his voiceover is abruptly interrupted as the action rapidly moves to the Buchanan’s house, where he meets with Tom, Daisy, and Jordan, characters about which the viewer has very little information.

Compared to the book, one of the main differences that can be found is the reduction of homodiegetic elements at the beginning of the film. Since Nick’s voiceover is shortened, the viewer is not able to receive as much insight into his life or opinions as in the book, and therefore, the main consequence is “the loss of Nick’s narrative function” (Crespo, 23). As there is not so much presence of him as a homodiegetic narrator, the spectators may see Nick as a secondary character in the story, directing their attention to other characters, such as Gatsby. In fact, this lack of the narrator’s presence is maintained throughout the majority of the film.

What can be deduced from this significant change is that Clayton decided to produce a less subjective film, removing Nick’s relevance in the story, and therefore, giving the spotlight to

Gatsby instead. The initial credit scene may go unnoticed by some viewers; however, its significance is much larger since it hints at Gatsby's life instead of Nick's. The film begins with images of Gatsby's mansion, his car, and his personal belongings, but what the camera focuses on are Daisy's pictures and newspaper cuttings that Gatsby kept (00:01:15). From the beginning, the director makes the audience wonder who the mystery woman is, as well as hinting that the film may deal with a romantic plot, instead of a personal story (Crespo, 24). Although this is an acceptable approach for the adaptation, it drastically changes the storyline, moving away from Fitzgerald's original idea.

In contrast, Baz Luhrmann preferred to maintain Nick's relevance in the story as the homodiegetic narrator and witness of the events told in the film. In the case of TGG13, the opening scene is Nick's voiceover reciting the first paragraph of the book, which also happens in TGG74; nevertheless, the beginning is far from similar to Clayton's adaptation. The 2013 film sets Nick in a sanatorium, where he is recovering from alcoholism and depression, triggered by Gatsby's death 7 years earlier (00:02:03). This innovative element is not part of the original text, but it functions as a way of emphasizing Nick's role as narrator, from whom the audience would get every detail and view of the story. Not only that, but by presenting Nick in such a state, it is up to the viewer to decide if they would trust Nick's perspective over the events, or whether they become slightly skeptical about his memory.

Apart from mentioning his addictions, Nick expresses how much he despised the rich East people, except for one person, the only friend he could find, Gatsby. He starts to tell the doctor about his friend and why he was different from the rest, creating a mythicized image of the protagonist of the story (00:02:28), following the description presented in the original text. The fact that Luhrmann decided to preserve Gatsby's initial representation indicates that he would maintain Fitzgerald's approach of focusing on Gatsby as Nick's friend and not as Daisy's lover. By doing this, the role of Nick as a homodiegetic narrator would be enhanced since he is seen as Gatsby's person of trust, making the audience aware of his importance in the story.

Not long after discovering Tom's affair during lunch at his house, Nick becomes part of one of the most fascinating scenes in my opinion. After being joined by Myrtle, Nick is welcomed to Tom's apartment in New York, where a party is already taking place. From the moment he enters, Nick adopts the role of observer, describing every detail of the room, as well as the actions of the characters around him. What can be deduced from his narration is that he was a kind of ghost wandering around, avoiding contact with the other assistants since he did not feel like he fitted in. This feeling of being 'invisible' may also be motivated by the effects of alcohol, which he acknowledges in the book: "I have been drunk just twice in my life, and the second time was that afternoon; so, everything that happened has a dim, hazy cast over it" (22). After several attempts of abandoning the party, Nick finds himself looking out the window to the surrounding buildings. Out in the streets, he sets his gaze on a "casual watcher" (27), with whom he identifies himself: "I was him too, looking up and wandering" (27), admitting he has become an observer in the city as well.

Although there were various instances in which Nick revealed that he was the narrator of the story, this chapter has the first clear reference to himself as an observer. Being "within and without" (27) is how Nick describes his role in the story because although he is present at the events he is narrating, most of the time, he does not take part in them. It could be said that he is on 'neutral ground', where his only duty is to gather information, which he would write about years later. This duality tends to cause an existential crisis in him because, in spite of being present in almost every event, he rarely explains his involvement in them since he does not consider himself to be relevant.

This necessity of blending in without attracting attention from the rest is quite well portrayed in both cinematic adaptations. In TGG74, when Nick enters the apartment, he tries to go unnoticed by the guests of the party by staying to one side without interacting with the rest of the characters. From that spot, he can analyse every detail of that place, as suggested by the close-ups of selected elements or characters in the room (00:16:17). Thanks to the camera movements, the audience can understand that Nick's role is to be an observer, although he does not refer to himself as such in the film. One of the only moments in which it can be more clearly seen is when Myrtle has a private conversation with a girl next to her and the

camera zooms in as she speaks (00:21:15). This is a resource used by the director to suggest that Nick might be spying on their conversation from a distance, fulfilling his role of watcher.

In the book, Myrtle has that conversation with Nick instead, but Clayton decided to modify the scene so he could achieve the representation of Nick being almost invisible in the party because he suppressed the moment in which Nick refers to himself as the “casual watcher”. On the contrary, Luhrmann decided to be more faithful to the original story and he kept that crucial moment of Nick’s narration, giving his personal touch to the scene. To begin with, the majority of the scene of the party is narrated through Nick’s voiceover, describing how he felt during that party, especially thanks to the alcohol (00:21:00). As it can be seen, the director decided to rely on the voiceover resource quite often, to follow the structure of the book, in which Nick tells the reader every feeling he had, something that can only be achieved through voiceover in a cinematic work.

If we compare Nick’s attitude in both films, the spectator can clearly see that he is more present in the action in TGG13 than in TGG74, where he basically remains in the background, so he does not have to interact with the rest of the characters. In Luhrmann’s adaptation, Nick is highly affected by the large amount of alcohol he drinks, which explains his sudden change of personality into a more extroverted person, acquiring the protagonist role for this scene. However, he does not lose his role of observer completely, and he serves the audience with the most fascinating moment in the entire scene. As he approaches the window, his voiceover begins, in which he reflects on how that apartment “had contributed to their share of human secrecy to the casual watcher in the streets” (26). The interesting part comes when he admits feeling the same as the casual watcher on the street, and once the image focuses on the man, it is in fact his face (00:22:03). This resource introduced by the director depicts almost perfectly Nick’s thoughts when seeing that man, and it also reflects his state of inebriation, which made him confuse the watcher’s face with his own. Baz Luhrmann achieved to show in the most accurate way Nick’s feelings during the party, setting the focus on him, not only as an observer in the shadow but also as a homodiegetic narrator that experiences the events narrated.

As the story continues, Nick starts to gain more importance and confidence, and once Gatsby dies, he finally reveals his true personality, not afraid of speaking his mind. Chapter IX begins with Nick expressing how he found out about Gatsby's death and its repercussion in the city, which caused him great distress since the majority of reports were only focused on the grotesque part of the incident, instead of seeing it as a tragedy. Although he was quite offended by Gatsby's portrayal in the newspapers, what infuriated him the most was finding out how every supposed friend of Gatsby had abandoned him when they had to show their loyalty: "I found myself on Gatsby's side, and alone" (105). At that moment, Nick realized that Gatsby's 'so-called' friends were using him for his money, and they did in fact not care about him. Since he considered Gatsby as his friend, he took this treason as a personal attack: "I began to have a feeling of defiance, of scornful solidarity between Gatsby and me against them all" (106). This is one of the most important instances in which Nick truly exposes himself as the homodiegetic narrator because he shows a more vulnerable side of him demonstrating how much Gatsby's death affected him, but most importantly, proving that he is not only an observer.

Even though there were numerous passages where he openly discussed the aspects he disliked, in the last chapter he finally gains the self-confidence to tell Tom and Jordan what he really thought of them, something he had not been capable of doing before: "You know what I think of you" (115). This sudden boost of confidence shows a personal development as a character, escaping from the secondary position he has been relegated to throughout the entire story. He is not only the homodiegetic narrator who wrote Gatsby's story, but also Gatsby's friend and confidante, the only person who stood by him and defended him against those who wanted to slander his name.

In spite of its importance, the final scene is portrayed quite differently by Clayton, suppressing Nick's anger towards Gatsby's 'fake friends' into a sadder and more melancholic sentiment (02:12:24). Although he re-affirms to some of the journalists that "he was his friend" (02:12:08), he does not seem to have the need to defend Gatsby's reputation because he does not consider it as a personal attack, especially since the number of people he contacts after Gatsby's death is highly reduced in comparison to the novel. Nick only expresses his

anger the time he sees Tom, knowing that he incriminated Gatsby, and therefore he was responsible for his murder. For this film, the director chose to show a grieving Nick, who lost his friend, a true gentleman that no one else valued, instead of presenting him “against them all” (106). As Martina Žeňuchová explains “the main source of critique in the book are Nick’s private comments which are vanished from the film because of Nick’s absence as a narrator” (23), therefore, the film results in a serious alteration of the purpose of the novel, a critique of the 20s society.

On the other hand, Luhrmann opted for a more faithful representation of the last chapter, showing Nick’s frustration and ire after Gatsby’s death. The scene begins with a long voiceover of Nick telling the viewer what happened and how he felt after the tragedy. This voiceover follows the original text almost entirely, portraying Nick as the homodiegetic narrator of the story. In addition to that portrayal, the director wanted to put into image Nick’s feelings, which are so explicitly expressed in the book by Nick himself, and so perfectly shown in the film. Not only he could not reach Daisy for Gatsby’s funeral, causing him tremendous disgust towards his cousin and her husband (02:04:44), but he also had to deal with the indiscreet journalists who will not respect Gatsby’s privacy, provoking him an outburst of rage against them (02:04:58). The last scene concludes with another voiceover of Nick wandering around Gatsby’s mansion, while he reflects about all the people who failed Gatsby, as well as expressing his pity for Gatsby and how his destiny turned out to be the contrary of what he dreamt.

After analysing Nick’s role as a homodiegetic narrator, it can be said that there is a great contrast in the way both films portray the narratological importance of Nick’s character in the story. In TGG74, Clayton barely includes any voiceovers, which makes it more difficult to see Nick as the narrator, as well as suppressing his view and opinion of the events happening. Meanwhile, in TGG13, there are constant voiceovers where Nick shares his thoughts and criticism with the viewer, apart from providing a great number of details, which helps the audience to better understand the context of the story.

3.2 Focalization

Although I have stressed the importance of Nick as the homodiegetic narrator, the protagonist and key figure in the story is Gatsby, as the name of the novel suggests. In the story, Gatsby's central role comes from two factors: first, from the narration, which is dedicated to presenting the story of his life, sharing details about his childhood, his desires, and his love story. But secondly, from Nick's focalization, that is set on Gatsby, which means that we are told the story from Gatsby's perspective, having access to his feelings numerous times and to his secrets, making the reader slightly sympathetic to him. Even though the novel is replete with allusions to Gatsby's subconscious, these elements are not so easy to find in the cinematic adaptations, since it is a difficult resource to portray. For that reason, I have decided to only discuss the beginning of the novel, which I consider to be the key to the understanding and development of Gatsby's story.

In the novel, the first instance in which it is possible to know that Gatsby is the focal character is when Nick highlights Gatsby's qualities in comparison to the rest of the Eastern men he has met since he came to New York. The first words Nick uses to describe Gatsby's personality have tremendous significance because they make the reader inclined to have a favorable impression of the protagonist of the story, as Nick suggests in the following quote: "Only Gatsby, the man who gives name to this book, was exempt from my reaction" (5). The peculiarity of this first reference to Gatsby is that the reader is able to learn about a character that has not yet appeared, and that will not meet Nick in another two chapters. The purpose of this character's initial presentation is to portray a contrast between the individuals Nick despises, and Gatsby, who represents everything Nick admires: "It was an extraordinary gift for hope, a romantic readiness such as I have never found in any other person and which it is not likely I shall ever find again" (5). Despite not giving a direct glimpse into Gatsby's mind, the way in which he introduces his friend—providing hints about his future—indicates that the focalization throughout the story would be assigned to Gatsby: "Gatsby turned out all right at the end" (5). In addition, by presenting Gatsby in such a positive light, the reader is

manipulated into liking Gatsby from the start, without noticing that this is all caused by Nick's subjectivity.

In TGG74, the first reference to Gatsby happens quite late in the film, once the viewer has already met the other three crucial characters in the story: Daisy, Tom, and Jordan (00:10:47). Although the beginning is a bit altered in comparison to the clear focalization in the novel, it is possible to deduct that none of the three characters that first appear will be the focal character since no internal information is provided about them. Nevertheless, the main issue about not receiving any insight about Gatsby is that the reader can make a good impression of the other characters, before knowing how much affection Nick had for Gatsby, especially since Nick does not provide any negative information about them. In fact, Gatsby is mentioned by Jordan instead of by Nick, which erases his focalization on Gatsby and changes it into a more neutral point of view because we recognize Gatsby as the protagonist, but without having access to his thoughts.

In TGG74, the delay of Gatsby's presentation affects the entirety of the film because the viewer is not manipulated from the beginning into sympathizing with Gatsby, so he can create his own opinion about the characters based on their actions only. What is especially shocking is that, although the initial voiceover follows almost word by word the thoughts expressed by Nick in the novel at the start of Chapter I, in the case of this film, the majority of those words are said after Gatsby's death (02:12:25), so it does not have the same impact as if they were said in the first few minutes. Once again it can be seen how the director tried to portray the story in the most neutral and external way possible by simply presenting the events, avoiding Nick's interventions in the story which could manipulate the audience's perception of Gatsby.

Compared to Clayton's film, in TGG13, Gatsby is mentioned at the very beginning, following the original order of the story (00:02:14), so in this sense, it is closer to the novel. Although the words said by Nick are not exactly the same as in the book, it has the essence of it: showing how Gatsby was the only respectable man in the East Egg, and how he challenged the image of the 'typical rich in New York'. This 'premonition' creates a perfect

image of Gatsby in the audience, so, before they discover about his ostentatious parties and his enormous mansion, they know ‘the real Gatsby’. Not only that, but they can recognize him as the most important character in the story, whose point of view will be presented, evidencing that he is the focal character. Luhrmann’s decision of maintaining Gatsby’s reference before presenting the rest of the characters achieves the same objective as Fitzgerald: to influence the audience’s opinion about Gatsby. The focalization of the story succeeds in achieving its purpose because the director’s decision pressures the spectator into having a much more subjective view than if they had not learned about Gatsby so early on.

3.3 Analepses

One of the most interesting innovations in the adaptations is the use of analepsis. While the novel and TGG13 make frequent use of this narrative strategy, TGG74 uses it only once. This makes both films entirely different: in TGG13, the viewer receives a lot of information about the past of the characters, and therefore, has a better understanding of the events that are happening or that will happen. However, in TGG74, the omission of so many important analepses changes the storyline and can confuse the viewer on several occasions. Meanwhile, Luhrmann’s film starts with a clear analepsis, in which Nick recalls his early days in New York, suggesting that everything he narrates about that summer in 1922, would be an analepsis. Due to that, it can be said that TGG13 is presented as a ‘whole analepsis’ in which the narration comes back and forth between the present time, the year 1929, and the past time, the summer of 1922. For the analysis of the analepses, I have chosen the most relevant ones for the development and comprehension of the storyline, although I will explain why some of them are not present in TGG74.

In spite of making his first appearance in Chapter III, it is not until Chapter IV that the reader learns a bit more about Gatsby’s life and the reason for his importance in the story. In the fourth chapter, Nick meets with Jordan, who gives him a message from Gatsby: he wants Nick to invite his cousin Daisy for tea, so he can come and meet her too. Nevertheless, Miss Backer decides to share with Nick what she remembers about Gatsby, and why he wants to see Daisy. “One October day in nineteen-seventeen” (50) are Jordan’s first words of one of

the most crucial analepsis in the novel, where the reader discovers Daisy and Gatsby's love story. In this flashback, she tells Nick about the first time she saw Gatsby with her friend, and how much their love meant to Daisy, causing her a breakout moment in which she almost canceled her wedding with Tom when she received a letter from Gatsby the day before the celebration.

This analepsis is key to the storyline because it helps the reader understand why Gatsby would want to reunite with Daisy in private, and why would Gatsby ask Jordan to persuade Nick into agreeing to the secret meeting. Thanks to this analepsis, it is possible to know a bit more about Gatsby and the intention behind such big and beautiful parties which he never attended: his purpose was to attract Daisy's attention to win her back. After learning about Gatsby's feelings, the reader realizes that he was not like the other 'rich gentlemen', he was not interested in anyone else's opinion but Daisy's because he did all that for love and not for creating a better reputation.

As I have explained before, in TGG74, most of the analepsis are omitted, or substituted by another resource, which complicates the understanding of the storyline. This is the case for Jordan's analepsis of Gatsby and Daisy's relationship, which is completely erased from the plot. In the film, Jordan simply asks Nick to invite Daisy for tea so Gatsby can meet her, without giving him any reasonable justification for that request (00:45:38). Since there is no apparent evidence that they are acquainted, but just Gatsby's infatuation with her, this leads to great confusion. The viewer is left wondering why Gatsby did not directly approach Nick rather than sending a messenger, and why was Gatsby nervous before meeting her. In fact, it is not only the viewer who questions the motive for so much secrecy but also Nick, whose doubts are not cleared up by Jordan. While in the novel Jordan tells Nick every detail about Gatsby and Daisy's love, in TGG74, she keeps on avoiding his questions, setting an environment of mystery around the imminent meeting that will happen at his house.

This lack of information due to the analepsis' omission drastically changes the storyline, inevitably confusing the audience about the intentions of each character, especially since Nick does not give any hint about their feelings because he does not have any idea about their

past. Since it is not mentioned that Gatsby and Daisy have been in love before, it might appear that Gatsby is a simple admirer that has never had the chance to see her. However, once they reunite, it is Daisy who confesses they have not met for years (00:52:10), proving they have in fact known each other for a long time, sharing a bit of light to the confusion caused by the omission of the analepsis. Nevertheless, it is not until much later that Gatsby and Daisy discuss their past relationship (01:01:24), finally confirming what the audience may have imagined.

On the contrary, in TGG13, the director decided to keep the whole analepsis, so Nick would understand the reasons for Gatsby and Daisy's meeting. At first, Nick is quite hurt because he thinks that Gatsby and Jordan are plotting against him, but when Jordan tells him about their love story, he then realizes it has nothing to do with him (00:45:20). The way in which she narrates the analepsis is almost the same as in the book (00:45:45), sharing a lot of details, so Nick would now accept the request knowing Gatsby's good intentions.

As in the book, this analepsis is essential in the storyline, not only for Nick, so he starts trusting his neighbor a bit more, but also for the viewer who for the first time understands the meaning behind Gatsby's parties and his odd behavior with Nick. In fact, thanks to the analepsis, it is possible to empathize more with Gatsby, after knowing how complicated his and Daisy's love story has been. From that moment in the film, the audience is able to put the pieces together and interpret Gatsby's attitude toward Daisy, without the need for Nick's voiceovers (although they are still part of the film). Comparing both films, it can be seen the consequence of the omission or preservation of the analepsis: in TGG74, the viewer is confused for a long time because there is no clear reason for that meeting, however, in TGG13, the audience is able to sympathize with Gatsby and is also fully aware of the reasons behind the meeting.

Continuing with Gatsby and Daisy's love story, once the narration continues, the reader receives more information about the magnitude of their love, which explains why he has not been able to forget her after so many years separated. On page 73, Nick narrates one of Gatsby's most important nights, when he realized that Daisy would be the only woman he

could be with. This analepsis is told after Gatsby confesses to Nick all the plans, he has for him and Daisy, and how much he has worked during all those years to achieve this life for her. Gatsby is convinced that he will be able to repeat the past and that he will put all effort necessary into achieving his dream life with her. The insistence is understood after he tells Nick how he has felt wedded to Daisy since that night when she gave herself to Gatsby for the first time. As he was not rich when they first met, he believed he was unworthy of her, so he was determined to become wealthy enough to provide her with the life she deserved, and eventually marry her. Once again, it is due to the analepsis that the reader can learn more about their love story, and especially about Gatsby's character, a man who appears to be selfish but in reality, is incredibly generous, putting himself in a second position.

In TGG74, this scene is the only analepsis that appears in the whole film, which suggests that "Clayton gave more importance to the love story giving special prominence to Gatsby and Daisy's meetings" (Vella, 37). This flashback is shown while Gatsby and Daisy dance in his uniform, and it is quite short, giving almost no details about that night. In the image, it can only be seen how the two of them kiss outside of Daisy's house, as Gatsby's voiceover explains how he felt at that moment (01:21:15). If we compare it to the novel, it may seem that there is a lack of information in the analepsis itself, as well as in the reason why they would remember that moment. Nevertheless, this scene, although short, is one of the most important ones in the film, since it brings light into their love story, which has not been fully explained. Before this analepsis, the viewer has to figure out what has happened between the two, simply by their conversations at Gatsby's house (01:07:26); but once they see these images, they start to get a better picture of their relationship. However, the analepsis is slightly altered, making it less explicit than it is narrated in the novel, where Gatsby confesses that Daisy "blossomed for him like a flower and the incarnation was complete" (73). In the film, this part is substituted with a close-up of the roses placed behind Daisy, as the two of them walk away, symbolizing what will happen afterward.

In TGG13, the analepsis is presented almost exactly like the novel, but this time, it is narrated by both Gatsby and Nick. It is a curious combination since Nick narrates it in the form of voiceover and Gatsby is telling the story directly to Nick, explaining to him how he felt

during that night with Daisy so many years before (01:23:25). This flashback returns a couple of times to their present time, but still, it is longer than the analepsis in TGG74, providing more details that help the audience understand why that night was so important for Gatsby. In fact, the director kept part of their night of love, making it even more explicit than in the book, so the spectator can get a full picture of their love story, without any misunderstandings. Despite this analepsis, in general terms “Luhrmann keeps some distance from the romantic storyline of Gatsby and Daisy because all the events are filtered through Nick’s eyes since the whole story is actually part of his memoirs” (Žeňuchová, 28).

As in the book, the purpose of this scene is to explain Gatsby’s persistence of “repeating the past” to finally be with Daisy and give her everything that she deserves. Compared to the novel, in this scene, Gatsby’s feelings are told in the first person, which adds another insight to the analepsis. However, there is a small change from the analepsis in the original text because, in the film, Nick states that Gatsby came to Daisy’s house by accident, and it was there where he met her. While in the book, it is said they knew each other before that autumn night, which explains why he would finally decide to kiss her, knowing the consequences of it. Right after the analepsis, Gatsby confesses to Nick that he regrets losing Daisy by not marrying her, but that he will keep waiting for Daisy to come back to him (01:23:45). This confession shows Gatsby’s vulnerability and complete devotion to his dearest love, which combined to the analepsis of their night of passion, may provoke in the viewer a sentiment of compassion for Gatsby, a sentiment that Nick has too.

Although the analepses mentioned before helped to understand Gatsby’s mysterious personality and background, it is thanks to the analepsis of his younger days, that the reader and viewer can truly know the protagonist of the story. This analepsis is the longest of the three and provides highly detailed and extensive information about Gatsby’s childhood, how he always knew he would be someone important, and how he achieved his wealth. The story of Gatsby’s life and his real name is told quite early on in the narration (pages 65-67), but he did not share his story with Nick until the very last night they spent together. However, due to its importance, Nick explains he decided to tell it to the reader in Chapter VI, so they would not believe the lies people would spread at his parties: “He told me all this very much later,

but I've put it down here with the idea of exploding those first wild rumors about his antecedents, which weren't even faintly true" (67). Nick feels the need to defend Gatsby and show the reader that he is a good and honest man, who worked very hard to achieve all he has, and not a mere rich boy who wasted his family's wealth. Gatsby represented everything that Nick admired: a humble man that did not grow up surrounded by the money and arrogance of the East, making him 'immune' to the selfishness of the rich.

In addition, he tries to show how Gatsby was born to be someone important in the world because he always had that vision of himself and worked as hard as he could to achieve his dream. In fact, he was so confident in his vision that he changed his name so that when he became a relevant person, he would have a name that truly represented who he was, since "his imagination never really accepted [...] his parents at all" (65). It was Dan Cody whom he looked up to because he was who taught him to be a true gentleman, a lesson that he would never forget since he was the first man to ever see the potential in him. He believed in Gatsby so much that he left him "a legacy of twenty-five thousand dollars" (66), and even though he could not keep that money, he did not lose the education he gave him, and that helped him to become Jay Gatsby, the respected man he always knew himself to be.

Thanks to this analepsis, the reader may see the evolution of Gatsby's life and the steps taken to become the successful businessman that everyone envied. By learning about his background, the reader may comprehend why Nick wanted to defend Gatsby from the false rumors people spread about him, characterizing him as a stereotypical rich man who did not care about others. Gatsby did not deserve that treatment by those who took advantage of his parties and gifts, rather than showing him gratitude. Once the reader reaches the end of the novel, he may see Gatsby as the tragic hero who, despite working hard and being kind to everyone, had a terrible ending.

In TGG74, there is no analepsis of Gatsby's background, instead, the story is told by Gatsby's father (02:14:20). After Gatsby's death, his father comes to the mansion, where he meets Nick, to whom he tells about Gatsby's past. He expresses his pride for such a hardworking son, who has always been an ambitious man, knowing his self-worth and intelligence. Since

the director omits the entire analepsis, they need to introduce Gatsby's story somehow, so the viewer does not miss this essential part of the storyline. However, this element does not provide as many details as are given in the novel's analepsis, so the viewer misses relevant information about Gatsby's childhood and the way in which he achieved his wealth. In fact, the conversation between Nick and Gatsby's father is also part of the original text, and it also happens after Gatsby's death, therefore, this element is not new to the plot. Although preserving this part of the story is a good solution for the omission of the analepsis, it still lacks key details about the process of becoming the relevant man he is now, leaving the audience with the wrong idea about him, due to the false accusations revolving around him.

Luckily, in TGG13, the director preserved the analepsis of Gatsby's life, which follows quite similarly the original text (01:08:09), although some details are a bit exaggerated (i.e. how poor Gatsby's parents were, or Dan Cody being an alcoholic). The analepsis, which is also told in the form of a voiceover, appears as Nick leaves Daisy and Gatsby dancing together in the mansion, while he wonders if that moment would have been enough for Gatsby, instead of making Daisy part of his grand vision. This flashback is shown at the perfect moment in the film, so the viewer can know the real Gatsby and somehow, trust him; especially since the analepsis is followed by the scene in which Tom and Daisy come to Gatsby's party, where Tom plans to gather information to incriminate him (01:10:25). So, once the audience has the details about Gatsby's background, and his noble heart, they would not question Gatsby's past or intention as Tom does. This analepsis has the same purpose as the one in the book: to defend Gatsby against false accusations and to show his true self before the events that follow that scene may portray Gatsby as the contrary to what he is.

As I have explained before, the analepses work as a way of clarifying details or misunderstandings that can appear during the story, in addition to offering information about the character's background. In his film, Luhrmann truly understood the importance of such analepses, preserving the ones who truly affected the storyline, showing them at the exact moment required, and giving the exact number of details needed. It is thanks to the analepses that the viewer can get a complete picture of the story and sympathize with Gatsby on a greater scale. On the contrary, Clayton decided to omit key points in the story, causing a lot

of confusion in the audience, and forcing them to imagine or deduce some of the key details of the plot. Not only that but, by suppressing those analepses, the film is only able to show events of their present time, which in a way, alters the original text written by Fitzgerald. As Canby summarizes in his article, the feeling one can have after watching Clayton's film is of "seeing almost everything and comprehending practically nothing". In conclusion, the analepses are an essential part of the storyline, and once omitted, they alter Gatsby's story entirely, consequently providing almost two different stories in each film.

Altogether, it is quite obvious how different these adaptations are. The comparative analysis showed the main consequence of the omission or maintenance of major events of the narration: the same story can be portrayed in two distinct ways depending on the director's choice. Due to these alterations, the storyline can differ dramatically from the original text, and most importantly, from the author's intention. Therefore, it can be said that Clayton decided to create an adaptation focused on the most superficial level of the novel, presenting Gatsby and Daisy's love story as the main narrative. Meanwhile, Luhrmann chose to preserve Fitzgerald's critique by concentrating on Nick's role and moving away from the romantic plot. This analysis does not take sides on whether one cinematic adaptation is better than the other, it simply states the differences between two films adapting the same story.

Conclusion

The main aim of this dissertation was to conduct a comparative analysis of the two cinematic adaptations of F. Scott Fitzgerald's novel, *The Great Gatsby*, to show how differently can the same story be adapted. The homodiegetic narrator, the focalization, and the role of the analepses were the elements chosen for the analysis.

As regards the homodiegetic narrator, Fitzgerald provides a harsh but realistic critique of the 20s American society through Nick's comments and opinions. In Clayton's film, I observed the reduction of homodiegetic elements, especially, the lack of voiceovers. The outcome of this alteration was the loss of Nick's significance in the story, giving the spotlight to Gatsby instead. Meanwhile, I noticed that Luhrmann kept the homodiegetic narrator of the story, by portraying Nick's opinions and anger towards the rest of the characters. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that the role of Nick as an observer is maintained in both films, although it is clearer in Luhrmann's adaptation.

The second element was Nick's focalization on Gatsby, as he is the protagonist of the story, and the character about whom the reader knows the most. Because of the difficulty to represent narratorial focalization in a cinematic adaptation, I chose the initial scene to analyse how Gatsby is introduced to the viewer. The delay of Gatsby's mentioning in TGG74 affects the image the viewer creates of the protagonist of the story, while in TGG13, the audience understands his relevance in the story and his positive qualities from the first minutes of the film.

The last element was the significance of the analepses because Fitzgerald uses them as a tool to provide extra information to the reader for a better understanding of the plot. This element created one of the biggest contrasts between the two films since in Clayton's there is almost no trace of them, while Luhrmann's film is full of them. As Clayton only includes one analepsis, the viewer is left out with very little information about the background of the characters, which can lead to several misunderstandings of the storyline. However, Luhrmann decided to follow Fitzgerald's original text, by including almost every analepsis,

helping the reader to understand the plot and to empathize with the characters. Thanks to the endless details provided in the analepses, he avoids confusion in the audience and creates a more cohesive film.

After the comparative analysis, I have demonstrated that Clayton's portrayal of the story is a cinematic adaptation of *The Great Gatsby* only on a surface level. In terms of narration, TGG74's storyline is presented as a love story, due to the omission of most of Nick's presence in the film. In fact, there are various scenes in which Nick is not involved at all, such as Tom and Myrtle's meeting in her apartment, or Gatsby and Daisy's endless afternoons together, which suggests that Nick is a mere secondary character when in reality he should have been one of the protagonists. In addition, there is almost no hint of Nick's focalization on Gatsby, since their interactions are drastically shortened, which hinders the comprehension of Gatsby's personality and thoughts. Lastly, Clayton did not give as much significance to the analepses as Fitzgerald, whose novel is full of them. The main consequence of the suppression of the analepses is a limited understanding of the plot since many questions are left unanswered. Although it is important to remember that Clayton's film did not have the same technological advancements as Luhrmann's, produced almost 40 years later; his portrayal of the story differs greatly from the original text, creating practically a new story.

Considering that in both films the camera is used in an omniscient way, and not as the eyes of the narrator, the first-person narration perspective may be lost. For that reason, the directors had to find a suitable solution so the audience would recognize Nick's significance as the narrator. Regarding Luhrmann's adaptation, it could be said he succeeded to portray Nick's role as a homodiegetic narrator almost perfectly. Not only he kept the majority of Nick's voiceovers, symbolizing his relevance in Gatsby's life and a key figure in the narration, but he also gave him the space to express his opinion, preserving Fitzgerald's critique of the 20s American society. Additionally, Luhrmann produced an adaptation filled with analepses, which enabled the viewer to obtain a complete view of the story, avoiding misunderstandings or unanswered questions. Not only that but thanks to the preservation of

most of the analepses, the viewer learns about the background of the characters, which helps them to understand and sympathize with the character's actions and decisions during the film.

After all the conclusions gathered from the comparative analysis, it is possible to state that the omission or maintenance of main events in the story affects on a great scale the way in which the novel is adapted, providing two quite different cinematic adaptations.

References

- Andrew, Dudley. "Adaptation." *Concepts in Film Theory*. Oxford University Press, 1984, pp. 96-106.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 3rd ed., University of Toronto Press, 2009
- Bluestone, George. *Novels into film*. University of California Press, 1957.
- Canby, Vincent. "A Lavish 'Gatsby' Loses Book's Spirit: The Cast." *The New York Times*. 28 March 1974. Web. <https://www.nytimes.com/1974/03/28/archives/a-lavish-gatsby-loses-book-s-spirit.html> (last accessed: 18/05/2023).
- Cartmell, Deborah. "100+ Year of Adaptations, or, Adaptation as the Art Form of Democracy." *A Companion to Literature, Film and Adaptation*. Edited by Deborah Cartmell, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2012, pp. 1-13.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Coming to Terms. The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Corrigan, Timothy. "Defining Adaptation." *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*. Edited by Thomas Leitch, Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 23-35.
- Crespo Steinke, Carolina. *The Newer The Better? A Comparison of the 1974 and 2013 Film Adaptations of F. Scott Fitzgerald's Novel The Great Gatsby*. 2013. University of Granada, Master Dissertation.
- Edmiston, William F. "Focalization and the First-Person Narrator: A Revision of the Theory." *Poetics Today*, vol. 10, no. 4, 1989, pp. 729-744.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *The Great Gatsby*. Edited by David J. Alworth. W. W. Norton & Company. 2022, pp. 1-117.

- Fludernik, Monika. *An Introduction to Narratology*. Translated from the German by Patricia Häusler-Greenfield and Monika Fludernik. Routledge, 2009.
- Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second*. Seuil, 1982.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2006.
- Eble, Kenneth. "The Great Gatsby." *College Literature*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1974, pp. 34-47.
- Leitch, Thomas M. *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to The Passion of the Christ*. The John Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Lothe, Jakob. *Narrative in Fiction and Film: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film. An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Metz, Christian. *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. Translated by Michael Taylor. Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Nieragden, Goran. "Focalization and Narration: Theoretical and Terminological Refinements". *Poetics Today*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2002, pp. 685-697.
- Ondaatje, Michael. *The conversations: Walter Murch and the art of editing film*. Vintage Canada, 2002.
- Perdikaki, Katerina. *Adaptation as Translation: Examining Film Adaptation as a Recontextualised Act of Communication*. 2016. University of Surrey, PhD dissertation. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/5a4a5bb22db26dd03ac5f40e971c83e1/1?cbl=51922&pq-origsite=gscholar>

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. Routledge, 2003.

<https://usosapps.uw.edu.pl/apps/f/2kbqFXgu/Rimmon-Kenan.pdf>

The Great Gatsby. Directed by Baz Luhrmann. Warner Bros., 2013.

The Great Gatsby. Directed by Jack Clayton. Paramount Pictures, 1974.

Vella, Jeanelle. *A Thematic-Content Comparison of the 1974 and 2013 The Great Gatsby Film Adaptations in the light of Contemporary Film Adaptation Theory*. 2014. University of Malta, Bachelor's Thesis.

Žeňuchová, Martina. *Between the Novel and Film: A Comparative Analysis of F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby and its two Film Adaptations*. 2015. University of Masaryk, Bachelor's Diploma Thesis.