

# Watching Pages, Reading Pictures



Watching Pages, Reading Pictures:  
Cinema and Modern Literature in Italy

Edited by

Daniela De Pau and Georgina Torello



Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Watching Pages, Reading Pictures: Cinema and Modern Literature in Italy,  
Edited by Daniela De Pau and Georgina Torello

This book first published 2008

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2008 by Daniela De Pau and Georgina Torello and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-84718-917-2, ISBN (13): 9781847189172

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ..... ix

Introduction ..... 1  
Daniela De Pau and Georgina Torello

## **SECTION 1: THEORETICAL ESSAYS**

Chapter One..... 30  
Translation, Adaptation, Transposition: A Semiotic Challenge  
Nicola Dusi

Chapter Two ..... 39  
Literature and Cinema: Adaptation, Translation, Transmutation, Citation  
Antonio Costa

Chapter Three ..... 57  
From Literature to Film: Typologies of Transfer  
Raffaele Cavalluzzi

Chapter Four ..... 75  
*Vadetezum*: A Manifesto of Inter-Media Re-creation  
Carlo Testa

## **SECTION 2: FIDELITY**

Chapter Five ..... 96  
Tarchetti's *Fosca* e Scola's *Passione d'amore*: A Comparison  
Marco Arnaudo

Chapter Six ..... 117  
Archibugi, A "Writer" on the Set  
Daniela De Pau

Chapter Seven.....	131
Cristina Comencini, Novelist and Filmmaker: From <i>La bestia nel cuore</i> to <i>Don't Tell</i>	
Flavia Laviosa	
Chapter Eight.....	150
Of Body and Soul: From Pirandello to the Taviani Brothers. Literature, Theatre, Cinema	
Manuela Gieri	
Chapter Nine.....	167
Francesco Rosi's <i>La tregua</i> : A Time Odyssey	
Gaetana Marrone	
<b>SECTION 3: BETRAYAL</b>	
Chapter Ten .....	184
Engendering Fidelity: The Film Adaptation of Pavese's <i>Tra donne sole</i>	
Valerie A. Mirshak	
Chapter Eleven .....	198
Look Who's Talking: <i>Nessuno torna indietro</i> , From Alba de Céspedes to Alessandro Blasetti	
Gloria Monti	
Chapter Twelve .....	218
To untie the tangle: Pietro Germi and <i>That Awful Mess on Via Merulana</i>	
Stefania Benini	
Chapter Thirteen.....	242
Dog Bites Dog: The Method of Disrespect in Ferreri's Adaptation of Flaiano	
Riccardo Boglione	
Chapter Fourteen .....	262
Visconti's melancholies between Marcel Proust and Mario Praz: <i>Conversation Piece</i>	
Simone Dubrovic	

Chapter Fifteen .....	279
“A writer cannot believe two stories at once”: Modes of adaptation in <i>La lunga notte del '43</i> (Florestano Vancini, 1960) Federica Villa	

#### **SECTION 4: STRATEGIES OF TRANSLATION**

Chapter Sixteen .....	294
Beyond the Figurative: <i>The Desert of the Tartars</i> between Literature and Film Nicola Dusi	

Chapter Seventeen .....	312
Fascism from Stage to Screen: Film Adaptations of Shakespeare’s <i>The Taming of the Shrew</i> and Paola Riccora’s <i>Sarà stato Giovannino</i> Jacqueline Reich	

Chapter Eighteen .....	324
How to Deal with Female Penetration and not Die in the Attempt Georgina Torello	

Chapter Nineteen .....	340
With Eyes Wide Shut: From <i>Pricò</i> to <i>I bambini ci guardano</i> Piero Garofalo	

Chapter Twenty .....	361
Declares Pereira: A Witness in Search of an Identity Elena Benelli	

#### **SECTION 5: BLURRED BOUNDARIES**

Chapter Twenty One .....	378
The Amphibolic Nature of Pasolini’s <i>Theorem(s)</i> Luca Caminati	

Chapter Twenty Two .....	393
<i>Romanzo criminale</i> : The Novel and the Film through the Prism of Pasolini Millicent Marcus	

Chapter Twenty Three .....	406
Improvisation and Novelization in the recasting of Italian Identity in <i>Non ci resta che piangere/Nothing Left to Do But Cry</i> (1985) Carlo Celli	
Chapter Twenty Four.....	418
Text-Image, Departure and Return: <i>Io non ho paura</i> Viva Paci	
Contributors.....	434

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have offered every kind of assistance in this project, and now that it finally sees the light in the form of a book, it is to each one of them that our most sincere gratitude goes. We wish to thank June and John Stubbs, Marella Feltrin-Morris, Piero Garofalo, Jamie Richards, Sarah Grey, Monica Hanna, Meriel Tulante, Elissa Popoff and Stefania Sidoli-Stewart for their wonderful job as translators, and Vivienne Pettman for her patience in helping us proof-reading the book, together with John Newell and Meriel Tulante. Others who have read the manuscript and gave us priceless pieces of advice are Massimo Alacca, Stefania Benini, Emilio Irigoyen, Massimo Pastorelli, and Macarena Silva. Lastly, we want to thank Marco and Riccardo for their patience and generosity. We apologize in advance to anyone we might have omitted from this list. It goes without saying that none of the above has anything to do with possible mistakes, inaccuracies, etc. and that those, if present, are entirely our responsibility.



# INTRODUCTION

DANIELA DE PAU  
AND GEORGINA TORELLO

There are many internationally well-known genres in Italian cinema: the groundbreaking experience of Neo-Realism, Comedy “Italian-Style,” Spaghetti Westerns, and the horror films of the seventies. However, a “genre” that is rather unfamiliar to large audiences is its crucial and enduring affair with literature. In fact, from the very beginning, literature deeply influenced how Italian cinema defined itself and grew.<sup>1</sup> This book provides an empirical approach to this complex and fruitful relationship. The aim is to present discussions of meaningful Italian film adaptations from literary material that greatly exemplify the vastness of modes, viewpoints, and attitudes produced by such an alliance throughout the different epochs. Included among the adaptations discussed, are those that have followed trends and critical debates, and, at times, have rendered them more problematic.

The book consists of four essays dealing with theoretical issues, and of twenty close-studies, divided into categories, highlighting the major approaches to adaptation. This preface supplies a concise historical account of this practice, and provides the framework for approaching the close-studies.

In Italian cinema, the first literary adaptations date back to 1907 and involved the much abbreviated versions of international classics, including a superb series on Shakespeare’s tragedies, which have recently been restored, as well as other wonders. The short duration of these abridged versions, conceived to entertain and at the same time to educate the public, explains why the term for *adaptation* in Italian was *riduzione* (reduction), a word that directly and fully pertains to the quantitative, rather than the qualitative characteristics. According to the producers of the epoch, who

---

<sup>1</sup> On the subject of interdisciplinary approaches to the study of the relationship between cinema and literature (in Italy) see, for example, the book West and Costa. For an analysis of cinematic influences on literary language see Bonsaver, McLaughlin and Pellegrini 2007.

were trying to interpret the rules of the market, a literary source almost certainly guaranteed the success of a film. This clarifies why the spectrum of cinematic adaptations was relatively large, and did not only include the classics: it also drew material from the “best-sellers” of the time. Since the first decade of cinematic production, this unashamed mix of highbrow and lowbrow material constituted the cultural legitimization of the new industry and, at the same time, a way of capturing the largest range of tastes and social classes possible. In 1908, the first two film adaptations of Italian novels were released: Alessandro Manzoni’s classic *I promessi sposi* and Francesco Mastriani’s popular *La sepolta viva*. As Bragaglia states:

Scelte emblematiche, che sembrano preludere a quello che diverrà lo stabile rapporto tra cinema e letteratura: da un lato si cerca ‘autenticazione’ nei classici (sia pure quelli che si trovano in ogni piccola biblioteca), dall’altro ci si rivolge al romanzo d’appendice, tentando così di soddisfare (per riprendere l’immagine dannunziana) sia la dama che la plebea (Bragaglia 1993, 9).<sup>2</sup>

Emblematic choices that seem to presage what will become the stable relationship between cinema and literature: on one hand there is the search for “authentication” in the classics (even those that are found in small libraries), on the other hand an interest in appendix novels, trying to satisfy (to recall D’Annunzio’s image) both the lady and the plebeian/working girl.

Although the theories and analysis of adaptation have dealt, with the question of fidelity (Mityr 1971; Fried 1987; Marcus 1993; Stam 2000) for at least the past thirty years, it has finally been decided to worry less about “faithfulness,” and more about “readings, critiques, interpretations, and rewritings of prior material” (Stam 2000, 76). Since the beginning of Italian cinema, all this concern appears to have centered on a false problem. Firstly, because the fidelity issue, as is the case with any preconception, has to be inscribed into a broader and more complex context of “originality” and “transmission of traditions.” Secondly, because the problem of fidelity, if present at all, has often been of secondary concern for Italian theorists or proto-theorists.

Adaptation has been such a significant and common practice since the dawn of cinema, that an urge to speculate about this recently created “genre” soon spread in specialized magazines and other similar publications. Practice, and what one might today call proto-theories, were

---

<sup>2</sup> All translations are ours, unless otherwise noted.

born together and continued to proliferate alongside each other: their interrelationship, which was often very controversial, is key to understand Italian cinema as a whole, both in its past and present incarnations.

At that time, for instance, commentators were especially concerned with the success of the visual effects and the techniques of the new medium, rather than with the actual rendition of the supposed “original” message and/or effects. One of the reasons for this position can be explained by the environment in which this kind of debate appeared. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the debates and essays about cinematic adaptations were not accepted for publication in the cultural or literary magazines of the day, nor were they included in the daily or weekly popular publications. They were published, almost exclusively, by film magazines, and were primarily dedicated to the analysis of the development of filmic language, rather than comparing it to actual novels or poetry. The presence of literary personalities in the film industry, during those years, oscillated between a few to none, so that any question of the fidelity of the new medium to the old medium was hardly relevant. The readership of such magazines was almost fully composed of non-specialized readers, who were far more attracted by the beauty and charm of the stars of the silver screen than by any other matter, (as is more or less the case today)

Se è un dramma o una commedia che si deve produrre, sia su basi storiche o romantiche, deve essere tracciata in precedenza con gli stessi metodi di cui si serve il poeta per scrivere i propri lavori. Solo, l'azione cinematografica essendo più rapida, è necessario che il *fatto* sia abbreviato, spogliandolo di particolari inutili, ma facendo risaltare invece i momenti salienti della concezione (Micciché 1980, 93).<sup>3</sup>

If it is a drama or comedy that needs to be produced, on either a historical or romantic basis, it should be outlined beforehand with the same methods used by a poet in writing his own works. But, because the cinematographic action is faster, it is necessary that the *fact* is abbreviated, depriving it of useless details and instead underlining the relevant moments of its conception.

---

<sup>3</sup> The quote continues: “Abbreviare però non vuol dire quel rincorrersi di personaggi e di gesti, quei cambiamenti repentini di movimenti che stancano la vista, intorbidano la mente, confondono la chiarezza del soggetto, producendo un affastellamento di azioni delle quali nulla resta di poesia, di vita, di arte” [To abbreviate does not mean chasing after characters and gestures, those sudden changes that tire the eye, that trouble the mind, and confuse the clarity of the subject, producing a bundling of actions in which nothing remains of poetry, life or art] (Micciché 1980, 93).

This anonymous article from 1910 is strictly focused on the method of film crafting, and decidedly oriented towards a fast, concise production, therefore omitting any useless details. If this search for essentiality appeared, among other things, to have been initially dictated by the technical constraints of the medium—before 1910 films were on average no longer than 400 or 500 meters—by 1912 however, the new industrial possibilities made it feasible to produce feature films from 1000 to 1500 meters in length, and even *film a puntate* (i.e. serial films). According to some detractors of the films, this would prevent the “sacrilegious mutilation” of the literary pantheon (Micciché 1980, 156). It is easy to assume, then, that “l’*abbreviato*” was not a forced choice, given the primitive technology of the time; it was instead the preferred *modus operandi* for cinematic creation.<sup>4</sup> In any case, the way in which directors and screenwriters understood the shortening of the plot is very complex and based, at times, on individual idiosyncrasies, and therefore not relevant for the current discussion.

The early preoccupation with finding an organic language for the new medium, something “faster” than literature, but not as “furious” in terms of the speed of production (as other industrial productions required), continued over subsequent years.<sup>5</sup> Dynamism and realistic representation were a prerequisite for the new medium, as Egisto Roggero persuasively asserts in a 1914 issue of *La vita Cinematografica*:

mentre nella letteratura la parola deve dar vita a tutto un mondo ideale, qui—ove la parola tace—è la vita stessa, ch’è movimento continuo [...] e, ripeto, *continuo*, che forma l’ininterrotto romanzo, o dramma, o commedia che noi viviamo ogni giorno e che chiamiamo vita. La vita è dunque un’azione continua: e *l’azione* è la base unica e vera d’ogni quadro che si proietta sullo schermo (Micciché 1980, 228, emphasis added).

---

<sup>4</sup> For instance, Luciano Zúccoli wrote in 1913: “Nella creazione di soggetti per la cinematografia, si deve tener conto di due caratteristiche di questa nuova arte: la potenza della sintesi e la larghezza e varietà della scena” [In the creation of subjects for the cinema, it is important to consider two characteristics of this new art: the power of the synthesis and the width and variety of the scene] (Micciché 1980, 193). See also Dall’Asta and Bertellini 2000, 300-307.

<sup>5</sup> In 1913 *La vita cinematografica* publishes an article by a.l.p. that opens the discussion about the need for professional writers to participate in the scripts. According to it, directors won’t hire writers because they ignore “numerosa conoscenza tecnica” [numerous technical knowledge] a common knowledge among screenwriters (Micciché 1980, 184). See also Micciché 227-231.

While in literature the word needs to give life to a whole ideal world, here—where the word is silent—it is life itself, that is a continuous movement [...] and, I repeat, *continuous*, that forms the uninterrupted novel, or drama, or comedy that we live every day and that we call life. Life is therefore a continuous action: and the *action* is the single and only true base of every painting that is projected onto the screen.

In this respect, it is very productive to see how the action/acting duality had been perceived in the American magazine *Moving Picture World* just two years before: “It looks very much as if Edison and the foreigners were the only ones not bitten by the lightning bug, with the result that his releases are, to my mind, the only ones that are really drama. The others have lots of action, but no acting and no chance for any” (Brewster 1997, 109).<sup>6</sup> The two quotes exemplify the gap between Italy’s perception of its own cinema, a combination of action and drama, and the foreign perception of it as a dichotomy between identical terms.

By 1916, the discussion shifted towards the necessity of not only finding original screenplays—at least a departure from literature—but also towards separating cinema from other art forms, especially its closest relative, the theatre. The main principle under discussion, at that time, could be summed up as “avvalersi delle risorse che il cinematografo possiede” [making use of the resources that cinema possesses] (Micciché 1980, 283) to record reality. This was the possibility of a truthful reproduction of “qualsiasi cielo, qualsiasi (sic) vastità di orizzonti, varietà di paesaggi, qualsiasi elemento della nature” [any kind of sky, any vastness of horizons, variety of landscapes, any elements of nature] (285); in short, the mechanical possibility of duplicating the world by means of photography in motion. Obviously, the opposite topic, though connected, was cinema’s potential to create “alternative” realities, i.e. “costruendo nella fotografia impressioni e fenomeni che non possiamo suscitare e creare nella nostra vita” [through photography constructing impressions and phenomena that we cannot conceive of and create in our life] (285). It is useful to remember to what extent critics, as well as early directors, perceived the style of cinematic language as an autonomous art that needed not only to be differentiated, but rather to be severed from other forms of artistic creation. Although undeclared but fully understood, what was at stake there was the increasing importance of montage, the ultimate device to alter actuality, something that in following years would become arguably the primary “constituent” of cinema. According to Rosso, the use of “reality” did not mean that a production had to be exclusively interested

---

<sup>6</sup> On the binary action vs. acting style see Gambacorti 2003, 101.

in “‘serie dal vero’: il dramma ci deve essere—più intenso, più ricco di *movimento*, più *rapido* che nel teatro—ma il meraviglioso contributo della natura, della realtà multiforme deve penetrarvi come un soffio d’aria libera e pura” [in “episodes from reality” drama needs to be present—more intense, richer in *movements*, *faster* than in theatre—but the marvelous contribution of nature, of multiform reality must penetrate like a breath of free and pure air] (285, emphasis added). Several months later, another journalist, Giuseppe Lega, begged for the end of adaptations,<sup>7</sup> because “il cinematografo vuole *azione* non *analisi d’anime*; movimento non stasi o acrobatismi di passioni e sentimenti...” [cinema wants *actions* and not analysis of souls, movements nor stillness, nor jiggling of passions and sentiments...] (333).

Although this last request was never heeded, having added little to the discussion at hand, it still represented a compelling way of conceptualizing adaptation at the time. It should now become evident that the interest in vitality, action and movement in cinema was the focus of the debates, since by then everyone was conscious of the fact that what really distinguished films from books and even from theatre, was its dynamism and the visual turbulence that captivated the spectator. Cinema has since learnt how to capitalize on this difference, and has sought its own language.

More important than the question of fidelity in understanding or measuring the relationship between films and books is the struggle between two different languages that both attract and repel each other. Gian Piero Brunetta understands the early relationship between cinema and literature as clearly “parasitical” (Brunetta 1976, 1) and explains:

Nella partita di dare e avere che letteratura e cinema hanno aperto fin dall’inizio del Novecento, i debiti del secondo si sono venuti accumulando per lungo tempo senza possibilità alcuna di contropartita. Ciò potrebbe spiegare la mia scelta di dare una vettorialità prevalente al discorso nel senso letteratura→cinema, in quanto, *nonostante lo sforzo compiuto dal cinema fin dagli esordi per conquistare una propria autonomia espressiva*, la sua storia è anche storia di un rapporto continuo ed interrotto con le strutture letterarie che lo precedono e lo condizionano (1).

---

<sup>7</sup> “Auguriamoci, subito, che l’epidemia attaccaticcia delle riduzioni passi, e passi presto. Soprattutto delle riduzioni del teatro, che è quanto di più banale e illogico e antitetico si possa compiere” [Let us hope that the craziness for adaptations will soon disappear. Especially, those taken from theatre, which is the most illogical, banal and antithetic thing one could do] (Micciché 1980, 332).

In the game of give and take that literature and cinema initiated at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the debts of the latter kept piling up for a long time without any chance of a rematch. This could explain my choice of wishing to give a prevalent vectoriality to the literature→cinema discourse, because, *in spite of the cinema struggle, since its beginning, to achieve its own expressive autonomy*, the story of cinema is also the story of a continuous and interrupted relationship with the literary structures that precede it and condition it.

According to Brunetta, this early ‘parasitical’ relationship changed radically with the advent of sound: “l’avvento della parola, alla fine degli anni venti, sconvolge l’assetto teorico e lo sforzo espressivo di raggiungere una totale autonomia” (Brunetta 1976, 4) (towards the end of the 1920s, the advent of sound, upsets the theoretical system and the expressive effort to reach a total autonomy). As voice appeared on the scene, even more intellectuals answered positively to the call of writing scripts and dialogues for the newly relevant media. Among their ranks were such professional authors as Cecchi, Pirandello, Soldati, Viviani, Zavattini, Alvaro, Marotta, Debenedetti—all with ongoing and stable careers. Therefore, the employment of literary subjects persisted even with the invention of sound. Indeed, the first Italian talkie<sup>8</sup> is *La canzone dell’amore* (1930), directed by Gennaro Righelli and loosely based on the novella *In silenzio* by Luigi Pirandello. Although considered almost unanimously a dreadful film, *La canzone dell’amore* is pivotal for many reasons. To begin with, it anticipates, although symbolically, the strong liaison between the “second part” of film history (that of sound cinema) and the world of the novel. Righelli’s extremely loose adaptation of Pirandello underlines the irrelevance of fidelity, in the translation process, between the two art forms. Secondly, according to Brunetta, its huge success was linked to the *leit-motiv* of the song *Solo per te Lucia* (Brunetta 1979, 232), thus instantly connecting the new marvel of cinema with catchy songs in the collective unconscious of the audience. This music connection was further developed through the huge interest in the merging of opera and the big screen (Brunetta 1979, 233). Finally, as the ultimate expression of sound, music permitted the desirable, new technical language of cinema to reach full maturity and discarded the vestiges of a sponging relationship with literature, by offering something that literature could not. The film presents

---

<sup>8</sup> The first truly spoken film produced in Italy was *Resurrezione*, by Alessandro Blasetti, production finished in 1930, but only distributed one year later.

un insolito dinamismo dei movimenti di macchina e sfrutta la profondità di campo visiva e sonora (voce e canzoni off) in modo originale. Tra le scene più significative in questo senso c'è un vero e proprio piano sequenza (da un gruppo di giovani per la strada si passa all'incontro tra i due protagonisti nascosti dietro un albero e poi si ritorna di nuovo ai ragazzi), dove il virtuosismo registico riesce a creare quell'atmosfera lirico-sentimentale che l'intreccio e i personaggi contribuiscono solo a banalizzare (Mereghetti, 297).

an unusual dynamism of the machine's movements and exploits the depth of field vision and sound (voice and songs off) in an original way. Among the most significant of such scenes, is a true long shot that goes from a group of youths in the street, to the meeting of the two protagonists hidden behind a tree, and then all the way back to the youths again). Here the director's virtuosity succeeds in creating that lyrical-sentimental atmosphere, which the plot and the characters only trivialize with their contributions.

However, cinema in Italy (as elsewhere) continued to "use" literature, but, from the 1930s on with a different attitude. With the advent of sound, screenwriters gained space and centrality in the industrial process of film because of the prominence of spoken dialogues which, at that point, were far more articulated than their predecessor, the inter-text. Cinema was thus extremely hungry for professional writers who were at ease creating conversation pieces. The 1930s and the first half of the 1940s was the period when the exchange between the two worlds really ignited. Before 1940, four films were based on Pirandello's novellas; Corrado Alvaro and Vitaliano Brancati actively participated in the writing of screenplays; and Emilio Cecchi, who had started managing the Cines studio in Rome in 1932, began recruiting major literary figures such as Pirandello, Alvaro, and Levi as scriptwriters and advisors, while being involved in many other cinematographic productions. Two other preeminent figures of the Italian literary landscape, Cesare Zavattini and Mario Soldati, stepped into the world of cinema at this moment, and their cinematographic careers will be just as successful and long-lived as their experiences in literature. During the years of Fascism, the trend in adaptations was undoubtedly that of translating novels and plays removed from the social realities of the time: an attitude typical of the fascist ideology and that became ever more acute when the war began, though unwillingly, leaving room for exceptions. Aside from a few classics,<sup>9</sup> favorite sources derived from: the literature of

---

<sup>9</sup> Most notable, Carlo Campogalliani's *Il medico per forza* (1931), taken from *Medicin malgré lui* by Molière, starring a brilliant Petrolini; *Manon Lescaut* by Prevost, made film by Carmine Gallone in 1940; *I due Foscarei* by Byron, directed

the turn of the of the century, i.e. from the 19<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>10</sup> historical themes such as Blasetti's *Ettore Fieramosca* (1938) by Massimo D'Azeglio, and contemporary narratives and plays mostly concerned with the sentimental problems of the bourgeoisie<sup>11</sup>—the public Mussolini was most eager to get consensus from. Together with a couple of national treasures, such as a *I promessi sposi* by Camerini, and a *La locandiera* by Chiarini, directors mostly used works from consolatory the classics for middle-class sentiments, notably Edmondo De Amicis,<sup>12</sup> some works by Giovanni Verga<sup>13</sup> and an abundant use of popular novels, among which

---

by Enrico Fulchignoni in 1942 (a silent version had already been made in 1923 by Mario Almirante); and *Dente per dente* (1943) by Marco Elter, based on Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*.

<sup>10</sup> For instance, Luigi Capuana, whose work was adapted by Luigi Mannini and Gustavo Serena in *Zaganella e il cavaliere* (1932), based on the play *Lu cavaliere Pedagna* (1909), and by Ferdinando Maria Poggioli in *Gelosia* (1942), based on the famous novel *Il marchese di Roccaverdina* (1901); in 1940 Poggioli also brought to the screen *Addio giovinezza*, a play by Nino Oxilia and Sandro Camasio (1911), in 1942 *Morte civile*, a play by Paolo Giacometti (1861) which had previously been adapted for the screen three times (by Lo Savio, Del Colle, and Bencivenga, in 1910, 1913, and 1919, respectively) and Aldo Palazzeschi's *Sorelle Materassi* (1934); Matilde Serao was adapted by Luigi Charini in *Via delle cinque lune* (1942) based on the 1889 tale *O Giovannino o la morte*, and by Gianni Franciolini in *Addio, amore!* (1943) based on the homonymous novel (1890), and on *Castigo* (1914).

<sup>11</sup> Among others, the plays by Giuseppe Giacosa *Come le foglie* (1900) and *Tristi amori* (1887) were turned into films in 1934 and in 1943 by Mario Camerini, and Carmine Gallone, respectively; and the comedies by Alfredo Testoni, *Il cardinale Lambertini* (1905), *Il successo* (1911), *El noster prossum* (1910), were adapted for the screen by Parsifal Bassi in 1934, Mario Bonnard (as *L'albero di Adamo*) in 1936, and Gherardo Gherardi with the collaboration of Aldo Rossi in 1943, respectively. It is worth noting that both authors had already been used as sources for several silent cinema productions.

<sup>12</sup> De Amicis' works had already been used extensively during the 1910's and 20's when four films were based on episodes from his internationally successful *Cuore* (1886). In 1942, Flavio Calzavara, with the help of Corrado Alvaro on the script, realized a version of a tale taken from *La vita militare* (1868) titled *Carmela* (1942). The following year, Calzavara adapted one of the most famous episodes of *Cuore*, *Dagli Appennini alle Ande*. A later reduction of *Cuore* (1948) was made by Duilio Coletti and Vittorio De Sica, who also played the leading role.

<sup>13</sup> Amleto Palermi, a director who worked extensively in the silent era, produced in a version of the *Cavalleria Rusticana* in 1939, by far Verga's most cinematographed work (four versions were made just between 1910 and 1924). Four years later, Gennaro Righelli directed *La storia di una capinera*.

Emilio Salgari's adaptations predominated.<sup>14</sup> The general tendency was thus for cinematographers to use literature as a well-stocked pond from which to fish when in search of an instant success.

During the post war period, despite the famous anti-literary bias of Neo-Realism that Zavattini emphatically promoted (and which was sustained by critics such as Carlo Bo and Luigi Chiarini), it is both remarkable and indicative of the long-lasting relationship between cinema and literature that, out of what could arguably be considered the triad of neo-realist masterpieces—*Paisà*, *La terra trema* and *Ladri di biciclette*—the latter two were based on novels (Verga's *I Malavoglia* and Bartolini's homonymous book): a reality that reflected the general trend of regarding literature as a warehouse of possible stories.

Moreover, neo-realist critics and filmmakers who gravitated around the journal *Cinema* and whose ideas laid the ground for *Ossessione* (1943, itself a free adaptation of Cain's *The Postman Always Rings Twice*) by Visconti, made Verga and verism their cultural point of departure, notwithstanding controversy from certain critics who championed cinematic autonomy. Interestingly enough though, *La terra trema*, which represents Visconti's highest tribute to Verga, is a film where the literary adaptation is used to mark the independence of cinema. Later on, in his critical re-reading of tradition, Visconti continued to adapt the classics (i.e. Boito's *Senso*, Tomasi's *Il Gattopardo*, and D'Annunzio *L'innocente*) in order to express a need for a cinema of ideas based on literature as a privileged source of inspiration. His cinema provided a sophisticated interpretation of reality that would serve as a critical analysis for the creation of a new society. Whereas non-neo-realist cinema had a mostly diminishing effect on its literary sources through didactic and dreary revisions, it is Visconti and De Sica (*I bambini ci guardano*, *La ciociara*, *L'oro di Napoli*)<sup>15</sup> who fully succeeded in rejuvenating their sources.

Yet, the "soon-to-be" classic narrators of the neo-realist era, Vittorini, Pavese and Calvino, did not have much of a relationship with cinema

---

<sup>14</sup> Once again, it is Palermi who directs the first sound version of a Salgari novel, *Il corsaro nero* in 1937. After that, a cascade of Salgari's adaptations follows: *La figlia del corsaro verde* (1940) and *I pirati della Malesia* (1941) by Enrico Guazzoni; *Le due tigri* (1942) by Giorgio Simonelli; *I cavalieri del deserto* (1942) by Gino Talamo and Osvaldo Valenti, screenplay by Federico Fellini and Vittorio Mussolini; *Capitan Tormenta* (1942), *Capitan Tempesta* (1942) and *Il leone di Damasco* (1942) by Corrado D'Errico; *Il figlio del Corsaro Rosso* (1943) and *Gli ultimi filibustieri* (1943) by Marco Elter.

<sup>15</sup> The first was adapted from Viola's *Pricò*, the second from Moravia and the latter from Giuseppe Marotta.

although Calvino was a cinephile and a film critic,<sup>16</sup> and Vittorini and Pavese were both influenced by cinema in their writings. In fact, it was not until 1955 that the posthumous adaptation of Pavese's *Tra donne sole* by the young Antonioni (*Le amiche*) appeared, and one should wait twenty more years to see a novel by Vittorini turned into film, precisely *Garofano rosso* (1976) by Luigi Faccini. In the 1950's, in the middle of what has been called a crisis of narrative structures, a remarkable group of screenwriters (Cecchi D'Amico, Guerra, Age, Scarpelli, etc.) often working together, created, along many original stories, several adaptations that were often convincing and compelling. However, the further one advances into the decade, the more the situation seems to stagnate, regardless of the increase in the employment of classic authors, especially Russians.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, on a general level, one could say that the re-newed cinema industry used books as a mere *repertoire* to create products of innocuous entertainment. As Brunetta effectively describes it:

La letteratura, vista e usata nella sua morfologia più ampia, anche in ambito neorealista, funziona così come un immenso giacimento di luoghi comuni, di idee ricevute, di situazioni e sentimenti consacrati e canonizzati. Nelle singole battute, nei gesti, nelle situazioni ripetute di film derivati da soggetti letterari, si ritrovano le regole che cerca di darsi e di rispettare un sistema produttivo che vuole ricostruirsi (Brunetta 1993, 302).

Literature, seen and used in its more ample morphology, also in a ne-realist environment, functions as an immense deposit of commonplaces, of received ideas, of situations and feelings, which have been consecrated and canonized. In its single lines, in the gestures and in the repeated situations of films derived by literary subjects, one again one encounter the rules of a new productive system that looks to reconstruct itself, to assign itself respect.

It is emblematic that Pasolini's first film dates from 1960. The work of the Friulan poet—probably the finest and most accomplished example of a

---

<sup>16</sup> Calvino collaborated in cinema productions only once, co-writing with Arpino the screenplay of Monicelli's *Renzo e Luciana*, an episode of *Boccaccio 70* (1962). A few of his short stories has been used as ideas for films of the late 1950's and early 1960's, most notably the tale *Furto in pasticceria* for Monicelli's *I soliti ignoti* (1958). The only case of adaptation of one of Calvino's novels occurred in 1969 when Pino Zac directed *Il cavaliere inesistente*.

<sup>17</sup> Visconti gave his personal reading of Dostoyevsky's *White Nights*, in his 1957's *Le notti bianche*; Alberto Lattuada's rendition of Pushkin's *The Blizzard* came out in 1958 under the title *La tempesta*; in 1959, Riccardo Freda adapted the novella *Haji Murad* by Leo Tolstoj, in a film titled *Agi Murad il diavolo bianco*.

famous, controversial, intellectual and author who becomes a leading screenplay writer and director<sup>18</sup>—might be seen as embodying the events of the decade. In fact, his “*empirismo eretico*” [heretical empiricism] throughout the sixties indicated the way to the abandonment of (conventional) literature in favor of cinema. In 1960, *La dolce vita*, written by Flaiano and Pinelli, with the help of Pasolini and Rondi, refused to follow the linear structure of the novel, in favor of a *subgenre*: the diary; thus, given the freedom of expression inherent to the medium, many writers began to approach cinema for inspiration.<sup>19</sup> In general, during this time, novels (more rarely plays) were turned into films not just for the purposes of having a recognizable plot or ready-made material, but rather to express the directors’ visions and ideological stands. Among those used in cinematic adaptations, few authors did not belong to the 20<sup>th</sup> century (in particular Sophocles, Euripides, Boccaccio, Chaucer, Sade as filmed by Pasolini, and Petronio reworked by Fellini).<sup>20</sup> Conversely, various works of the names that counted in the Italian literary pantheon of that period were transposed into films: Fenoglio, Moravia, Pratolini, Brancati, Cassola, Bassani, Tomasi di Lampedusa, Sciascia, Bianciardi, Carlo Levi,

---

<sup>18</sup> One should not forget that this era was “occupied” by another screenwriter with a strong, independent literary trajectory, Ennio Flaiano. Numerous other screenplay authors experienced considerable success as narrators (for example Tonino Guerra), and various directors composed both poetry (for instance, Bernardo Bertolucci and Nelo Risi) and narrative (Michelangelo Antonioni and Pasquale Festa Campanile, among others) at least once in their lives.

<sup>19</sup> A few collaborations between soon-to-be famous directors and writers should be mentioned. *L’Italia non è un paese povero* (1960), the troubled documentary directed by Joris Ivens with the assistance of the Taviani brothers was born out of a collaboration between the three and Moravia. Bertolucci debuted as director with a screenplay written by Pasolini, *La comare secca* (1962). Worth remembering that Bertolucci’s third and fourth film are very free adaptations of Dostoyevsky’s *The Double* (*Partner*, 1968) and Borges’ *Theme of the Traitor and the Hero* (*La strategia del ragno*, 1970). Goffredo Parise collaborated with Ferreri in *L’ape regina* (1963). Alberto Arbasino co-wrote the screenplay of *Amate sponde* (1963) with director Mario Missiroli, adapting his own novel. Between 1967 and 1975, Ermanno Olmi and Corrado Stajano produced various television documentaries about Italy’s latest history; Olmi also co-wrote his *Recuperanti* (1969) with Mario Rigoni Stern. One of Rosi’s best film, *Mani sulla città* (1963) generated by the cooperation between the director and Raffaele La Capria, who also wrote the screenplay for another memorable Rosi’s feature, *C’era una volta...* (1967).

<sup>20</sup> Noteworthy are a 1962’s version of Svevo’s *Senilità* by Carlo Lizzani and Alberto Lattuada’s *La Mandragola* (1965) by Machiavelli.

and more.<sup>21</sup> Each of these adaptations, though at times born out of the commercial success of the book, somehow reworked the original texts, creating fresh and compelling readings, without fear of great departures from the original stories. Best accomplishment of this trend could be the version of Cortázar's tale *The spider-web* given by Antonioni in his masterpiece *Blow up* (1966). The 1970's witnessed a great number of adaptations as well. A few were revisions of classics, such as Pasolini's *Decameron* (1971); the tv-film *Le avventure di Pinocchio* directed by Luigi Comencini in 1972; Visconti's last work, *L'innocente* (1976) by D'Annunzio and Casanova's autobiography filmed by Fellini in *Il Casanova* (1976).<sup>22</sup> However, the vast majority were films with a focus on problematic and unresolved matters of recent Italian history. These centered on both past and contemporary—and still “hot”—issues. In fact, not only were these films about the rise of Socialism (as in Bolognini's *Metello*, based on Pratolini's novel) and about Fascism (Bertolucci reading of Moravia's *Il conformista*), but there were also films about the 1968 turmoil (Pietrangeli's *Porci con le ali*, based on the novel by Radice and Ravera), about terrorism (Cerami's *Un borghese piccolo piccolo* adapted by Monicelli), and about political corruption (Elio Petri's version of *Todo modo* by Sciascia).<sup>23</sup> By the end of the decade, though, the situation had

---

<sup>21</sup> Best examples are Vitaliano Brancati's *Il bell'Antonio* transposed in 1960 by Mauro Bolognini (with the screenplay by Pasolini and Brancati himself); Florestano Vancini's *La lunga notte del '43* by Giorgio Bassani; Visconti's reading of Tomasi di Lampedusa's *Il Gattopardo* (1963); Luigi Comencini's version of *La ragazza di Bube* (1963) by Carlo Cassola; Francesco Maselli's rendition of *Gli indifferenti* (1964) by Moravia; Valerio Zurlini's *Cronaca familiare* (1962) by Vasco Pratolini; Carlo Lizzani's *La vita agra* (1964) by Luciano Bianciardi; Giorgio Trentin's *Una questione privata* (1966) by Beppe Fenoglio. Special attention deserves the work of director Damiano Damiani, who adapted several Italian novels during the 1960's: *L'isola di Arturo* (1962) from Laura Morante's success, *La noia* (1963) by Moravia, and *Il giorno della civetta* (1969) by Leonardo Sciascia.

<sup>22</sup> 19<sup>th</sup> century classics are represented by Edmondo De Amicis, source for Luigi Filippo D'Amico's *Amore e ginnastica*, and Romano Scavolini's *Cuore*, both from 1973, and by Alessandro Manzoni, cinematographed by Nelo Risi in his *La colonna infame* (1972). Almost no ancient classics were proposed on screen, with the exception of the politicized and free adaptation of Sophocles' *Antigone* by Liliana Cavani in her *I cannibali* (1970).

<sup>23</sup> Various examples can be found of directors who worked with foreign novels, tales and plays. To name just a few, Visconti shot a very successful version of *Morte a Venezia* (1971) by Thomas Mann; Carmelo Bene's brief incursion in the world of cinema, ended with two English classics completely reworked, Wilde's *Salome* (1972) and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, *Un Amleto di meno* (1973); in 1976,

radically changed again. Italian film productions became increasingly chaotic. The films of the 1980's for the most part were either born out of small productions and directed by amateurs/novices with little or no distribution, or they were blockbusters tailored around famous comedians (Nutti, Benigni, Troisi, the Vanzinas' "crew", etc.). The use of literature in cinema was, apparently, less important than what it was to previous generations—something that could be ascribed to the cultural formation of the young screenplay writers and directors, who were evidently influenced by both television and cinema as much as they were by books, if not more so. Analogous to this is the so called crisis of the written word, in favor of the image (in all its manifestations, cinema included), which fostered a disaffection on the part of the writers towards adaptations, although several exceptions do exist. It is difficult to pinpoint trends due the scarcity and heterogeneity of adaptations of this time. Old and "new" classics were neglected, for the most part, with the gaudy exceptions of Salvatores' first feature, *Sogno di una notte d'estate*, feebly based on Shakespeare, Silvio Soldini's adaptation of Hemigway's tale *Paesaggio con figure*, and Parise's *Il prete bello* "translated" by Carlo Mazzacurati in his 1989 homonymous film. What emerges is a strong interest, on the part of the directors, in shooting the novels of their writer peers, or at least in the books published during their formative years. Among the best examples of this are *Fratelli* by Loredana Dordi, based on the novel by the same title by Carmelo Samonà, and *Mery per sempre*, Marco Risi's screen version of Aurelio Grimaldi's first book. It should be remarked that in these cases, writers participated actively in the creation of the screenplay. This tendency to simultaneousness, and a blurring between the writing and the filming phases continued into the 1990s and, to some extent, still goes on today. In spite of the fact that this last period began with two films that contained very personal (and fuzzy) rewritings of such universal masterpieces as Homer's *Odyssey* (Piavoli's *Nostos, il ritorno*) and De Laclos' *Dangerous Liaisons* (Cristina Comencini's *I divertimenti della vita privata*), the attention of directors and producers alike has been focused mainly on "recent" best sellers. Indeed, every literary

---

Lattuada adapted Bulgakov's novel *Cuore di cane*. Among adaptations of Italian works one should at least remember *Profumo di donna* (1974), Dino Risi's cinematographic version of the novel *Il buio el miele* by Giovanni Arpino; Giuliano Montaldo's *L'Agnese va a Morire* (1976) by Renata Viganò; Mario Monicelli's *Caro Michele* (1976) from Natalia Ginzburg's novel; the all-female production of Sofia Scandurra's only film *Io sono mia* (1978), based on Dacia Maraini's *Donna in guerra*, and the remarkable Rosi's reading of *Cristo si è fermato a Eboli* (1979) by Carlo Levi.

“phenomenon” of the last twenty years, on a cultural or simply profit-making level, has been transposed into film. Over and above the results that obviously vary from case to case, this tendency bitterly speaks of a cinema that is overly concerned with commercial success: a film is thus produced when the book had already become successful and made a great profit.<sup>24</sup> Although a few interesting adaptations of critically successful novels of Italy’s literary past, as well as more recent publications, have found appealing cinematic renditions (for instance, Tozzi’s *Con gli occhi chiusi* by Francesca Archibugi, Elena Ferrante’s *Amore Molesto* by Martone, and Pino Cacucci’s *Puerto Escondido* by Salvatores) and despite the presence of a few directors who consistently work with adaptations of Italian and foreign literary works,<sup>25</sup> what seems to be leading the industry is the idea of the successful exploitation of “new” books, rather than that of resuscitating the canon. At the same time, the novel has unquestionably conquered the film industry, whereas plays are only occasionally transposed, and poetry almost never.<sup>26</sup> This general trend seems to be confirmed by the great success of two films that came out last year, Antonello Grimaldi’s *Caos Calmo*, based on a novel by Sandro Veronesi, and the literary phenomenon of *Gomorra*, the socially engaged novel/essay by Roberto Saviano, adapted for the screen by Matteo

---

<sup>24</sup> An account of the major films produced in this manner would include: Lara Cardella’s *Volevo i pantaloni* (1988, directed by Maurizio Ponzi in 1990), Susanna Tamaro’s *Va’ dove ti porta il cuore* (1994, directed by Cristina Comencini in 1996); Aldo Brizzi’s *Jack Frusciante è uscito dal gruppo* (1994, directed by Enza Negroni in 1996); Alessandro Baricco’s *Novecento. Un monologo* (1994, directed by Giuseppe Tornatore in 1998 with the title *La leggenda del pianista sull’oceano*); Niccolò Ammaniti’s *Io non ho paura* (2001, directed by Gabriele Salvatores’ in 2003), Melissa Panariello’s *Cento colpi di spazzola* (2003, directed by Luca Guadagnino in 2005 with the title *Melissa P.*); Margaret Mazzantini’s *Non ti muovere* (2001, directed by Sergio Castellitto in 2004) and Federico Moccia’s *Tre metri sopra il cielo* (2004, directed the same year by Luca Lucini).

<sup>25</sup> Notably, Roberto Faenza who based six of his fourteen feature films on notorious books by Arthur Schnitzler, Dacia Maraini, Abraham Yehoshua, Elena Ferrante, Federico De Roberto; Emidio Greco, who directed in the last 34 years only six films, four of which are adaptations of novels and tales by Adolfo Bioy Casares, Karen Blixen and Leonardo Sciascia.

<sup>26</sup> Lately, though, there has been an interest in depicting poets’ lives, such as in Tullio Giordana’s *Pasolini un delitto italiano* and Placido’s *Un viaggio chiamato amore*, about Dino Campana and Sibilla Aleramo. A playwright, and later film director on his own, whose plays have often been adapted for the cinema is Umberto Marino (for instance, *Italia-Germania 4-3*, *Volevamo essere gli U2* by Andrea Barzini, and *La stazione* by Sergio Rubini).

Garrone. Symptomatic of this is the fact that when Paolo Giordano's *La solitudine dei numeri primi* won the Premio Strega in 2008, the author had already sold the rights to the film version of the novel.

As was mentioned above, this book opens with four theoretical essays by Nicola Dusi, Antonio Costa, Raffaele Cavalluzzi, and Carlo Testa, which frame and systematize the relationship(s) between film and literature. Thereon, follow twenty case studies.

Dusi approaches the relationship between literature and cinema from a semiotic point of view. He underlines that a text is never isolated but firmly inserted within a context (and thus contaminated by many other writings) and that studying a film taken from a text entails at least two choices: either relate the film to its "departing" universe of meanings (source oriented), or relate it to its "arrival" cultural system (targeted oriented). After a discussion about recent Italian trends of study (Eco's idea of inter-media translation as a form of interpretation, Fabbri's inter-sensitive approach, Calabrese's concept of transposition, etc.), Dusi remarks that recent semiologists distinguish between a strict and a loose form of equivalence between texts. The latter is the one he is more interested in, because it allows one to consider multiple elements of the same text and conceives the translation, or transposition, as a "global" relation. The analysis of an adaptation as an inter-semiotic translation focuses on the comparison of narrative structures and of enunciative strategies, which enables one to consider the film as an aesthetic text. Precisely by pursuing aesthetics at the level of expression, Dusi claims, a cinematographic transposition constructs internal systems of resonance and signification that are analogous to the lyricism of the literary text.

Costa analyzes the dynamics of exchange between literature and cinema across multiple parameters, showing how their interaction (and mutual interferences) were beneficial and multifaceted from the beginning. From an empirical point of view, the distance between the iconic nature of the image and the symbolic nature of the written word is shortened through different means (citations, subtitles, the presence of pages of a book etc, noticeable in the opening credits of recent films), as well as by the importance the various phases of writing have had on the understanding of the finished product. From a theoretical point of view, their distance has often been abridged by thinkers who considered cinema as ideogram writing, and by semiologists who analyzed the specificity of the cinematographic *écriture* and considered the film as a text. Inversely, 20<sup>th</sup> century literature testifies to such hybridization, acquiring from cinema both cinematographic themes and "modalities" of montage that are

mimetic of it. These reciprocal borrowings produced inspirational and economical advantages for over a century and, as Costa suggests, any comparison between the two “sister arts” needs to be developed according to an inter-textual and an inter-medial discourse.

Cavalluzzi’s article analyzes four different adaptation typologies that have been utilized over the last sixty years. Remarkably, he places the Italian situation in a dialogue with a broader, international context. In an investigation that goes from the simple “illustration of a text” (for instance in *Soldati*, and *De Sica*), to the radical “reinvention of the text” (as is often the case with Antonioni, Ferreri, and Pasolini) via different “re-elaborations” (Visconti and Bellocchio), he reveals all these categories by giving solid and convincing examples, while at the same time illustrating an exhaustive corpus of Italian adaptations of the post-war era.

Testa’s essay recounts the three stages of the separatism paradigm (Avant-Gardes, Futurists and Formalists, Jean Mitry and his subsequent North American followers) that began crippling the literature-cinema relationship at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and continues to this day. Before the conventional date of 1895 though, as Testa recalls, *imitatio* had been a commonly accepted practice of dialogism between past and present, one that, for centuries, has produced fruitful inter-media and intra-media exchanges. Linking fidelity issues with the more recent “separatist” trend, Testa refers to it as a built-in ontological prejudice against any derivative work of art with respect to the original work. He thus advocates the substitution of the word “adaptation” with that of “re-creation,” not intended as “forgery” but rather as the intelligent reproduction of an equivalent function. Such re-creation needs to be thought out and practiced as a system continuously striving for the highest level of complexity.

The twenty case-study essays that follow are grouped into four categories, arranged according to a conceptual rather than chronological order. The first category is based on films whose adaptations are explicitly “faithful” in various ways.

Marco Arnaudo’s essay discusses Ettore Scola’s *Passione D’amore* (1981), an adaptation of Iginio Ugo Tarchetti’s *Fosca* (1869). In his essay, Arnaudo points out the three main strategies that allowed Scola to remain faithful to the “sense and the atmosphere” of the book as well as retain his personal themes and style. Firstly, the necessary changes owing to the different medium; secondly, the retention of two features (the thematic and the formal one) typical in his films, namely the gathering around a meal, and keeping history in the background of the characters’ story (as opposed its center), and finally, the elements that connect the specific identity of his film to *Fosca*. In doing so, the director created a “sister work” in which the

vampiric elements of Tarchetti's book are translated into a realistic study of his characters, of the elements that, sublimated, become a metaphorical tomb of the Comedy "Italian-Style" and the birth of a new cinema for the director.

Scola's humanistic cinematographic approach holds some similarities with the one used by Archibugi. Daniela De Pau discusses how the director transformed Tozzi's enigmatic writing—defined at the crossroads between Existentialism and Nouveau Roman—into a more realistic tale, using her usual intimist-realistic style. Archibugi, though, differs from Scola in her strategy because she inversely adapted *Con gli occhi chiusi* (1994) choosing to remain faithful to the plot and betray the spirit of the novel instead. By doing so, she ends up re-writing her own version of Pietro's and Ghisola's story, confirming herself as "narrator on the set." The director introduced two main changes in order to present her visual narration. The first change was to reinterpret the story according to the teachings of Lorenzetti's fresco, who wanted to illustrate how to serenely govern a city in his *Allegoria del buon governo*. The second change was to re-orient the spatial-temporal axes of the plot, in order to create a film with both a meta-historical setting and a linear story telling setting, where the reconstruction of events, denied in the book, could better follow the psychological explorations of the characters. Archibugi's reinterpretation aims to take to the big screen a theorem of the spirit, together with Tozzi: living with the eyes closed results in having to face inevitable catastrophes.

Another faithful adaptation, with an interesting spin, is the one by Cristina Comencini, who converted the story of her own best-selling book *La bestia nel cuore*, into a film of the same title (2005). It is discussed in Flavia Laviosa's essay. Here Comencini's adaptation process does not concern the betrayal of the plot, or the spirit of the original novel, but rather as she herself stated, the betrayal of herself. However, Comencini did introduce several structural changes in the plot in order to accomplish the transition between the different media. For instance, in the film version, she omitted the erudite Aeschylus's frame and the more complex analysis of the father's psychopathology, focusing instead on the human tragedy of sexual abuse as seen from the children's perspective and who, as adults, have to find a way to live with such a heavy past. In short, Comencini was able to explore the theme of sexual abuse in two different ways: digging into the psychology in the book and exploring its memory with the film.

The next essay by Manuela Gieri focuses on the Taviani's *Kaos* (1984), a film that faithfully takes Pirandello's short story *L'altro figlio* as

inspiration. While presenting it as only one of the four episodes within the film, the Taviani brothers used it as the thematic and stylistic guideline for the entire film. In fact, the main theme of the film, maternity, is also seen as a metaphor for Pirandello's artistic creation of adapting the story from narrative to theater, which guided the Taviani in their process of translation into cinema as well. Starting with Pirandello's challenging question on the nature of translation—whether it is possible to give to the same thought a different expression and soul—the Taviani brothers decide to confront such a question, and enlarge their views of the project, by infusing the filmic narration with a personal dialogue of Pirandello's macrotext. Therefore, they included also the themes of traveling, fate, and the gaze—so fundamental for the Sicilian writer—and, in their “impossible” scope of translation, ended up trying to recuperate Pirandello's thought in its entirety.

The essay by Gaetana Marrone discusses how Primo Levi, the great memorialist of the Holocaust, inspired filmmaker Francesco Rosi to work on the scenario of *La tregua* in the early 1960s, though realized only in 1997. The critical debates over Rosi's film attest to the director's commitment to fashioning a cinematic equivalent of Levi's novel: the true cost of a man's soul becomes the most shattering measure of surviving in a world where the ideology of evil is the ultimate historical drama. *La tregua* raises many intriguing questions, which invite discussion such as how to recount events that defy language, and whether images are a stronger means of expression than words.

The essay by Valerie Mirshak on Antonioni's *Le amiche* (1955) functions as a transition between adaptations that intended to remain faithful to their original texts, and those that wanted to betray them, which is what the second collection of essays examine. Although Antonioni has declared that he adapted Pavese's *Tra donne sole* (1949) without commitment to faithful adaptation, he chose two women, Alba De Céspedes and Suso Cecchi d'Amico, to pen the screenplay of the novel, because he thought they would be more sensitive in handling the story, and therefore more faithful to its female characters. With Cecchi d'Amico in charge of outlining the psychology of the characters, and De Céspedes handling their dialogues, the screenplay demonstrates that this sexual difference has had detectable and far-reaching consequences. By elaborating meaningful moments among these women, the female screenwriters converted a story about lonely characters, who suffered from a universal human malaise in solitude, into one in which these characters established tight bonds with each other, and lived out their specifically female experience with friendship and cooperation. When the story

returned to male hands, Antonioni kept the emphasis on concrete and real experiences—which were derived from the personal experiences of the two female authors—and he was also guided by the two writers in the retelling of the story. He added elements that showed the contradiction and the struggle in the characters' attempts (and ultimate failure) to maintain and preserve their close female bond. With such an approach, Antonioni, almost inadvertently, appears to remain faithful to all three writers, in his own particular way.

Remaining with issues of gender, Gloria Monti's essay examines Alba de Céspedes' novel *Nessuno torna indietro* (1938), which challenges the standards and expectations of femininity during the *ventennio* period (1925-1945), a time when the boundaries of acceptable behavior for women were dictated by fascist ideology. She also examines the film version of the novel directed by Alessandro Blasetti, who also co-authored the screenplay with de Céspedes. If the collaboration between a notorious anti-fascist writer and one of the most prominent cinematic figures under fascism might appear contradictory, Monti reconciles de Céspedes' and Blasetti's political views by tracing the ideological transformation that Blasetti experienced throughout the *ventennio*, which led to his progressive distancing from fascism. The film was shot in 1942-1943, but its completion was delayed until the end of the fascist regime and the subsequent civil war in 1943. The film was not released until the end of the war, in 1945. By 1942, when filming started, Blasetti was no longer a member of the Fascist Party. However, scholarly works about Blasetti often dismiss his political development and simplistically categorize him as a fascist director. Instead, Monti proposes that the existing discrepancies between the literary voice of de Céspedes and the cinematic voice of Blasetti are motivated by the issue of gender rather than by that of politics.

Stefania Benini's essay introduces us to a director, Pietro Germi, who openly professed to the disregard of the text. While adapting *Quer pasticciaccio brutto de via Merulana* (1957) by Gadda, into the film *Un maledetto imbroglio* (1959), Germi laid claim to the total paternity of the story, and treated the book as a pretext for making the first Italian film in "detective story" genre. Despite his efforts to reduce Gadda's name to a mere vague reference, Germi's encounter with the Milanese writer was a very important one, which influenced him not only in this film, but also in subsequent films, in particular when dealing with a comic style with a resentful and grotesque gaze. In Germi's polemical attitude to literature, there is an echo of the French *Nouvelle Vague* debates of the time, which demanded the status of author for the director, and thought that drawing