

Adapting the “Other”: Andrea Arnold’s (2011) Adaptation of *Wuthering Heights*

Nermin Ahmed Mohamed Haikal

Assistant Professor of English Literature

Faculty of Women for Arts, Science and Education

Ain Shams University

nerminhaikal@yahoo.com

Abstract

Literature, the study of human nature, has always appealed to people of different cultural backgrounds all over the world. Adaptation of classics to another medium or genre is the ideological attempt to modify an already existing study of human nature to suit another medium. In order to assess literary adaptations, it is quite essential to identify the kind of adaptation that the filmmaker has chosen and find out whether the filmmaker succeeds in her/his choice to suit the adaptation’s ideology. The aim of this study is to explore how far Andrea Arnold’s (2011) adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* has managed to challenge British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by choosing the “fidelity” approach with minimum alterations in her attempt to adapt the ‘Other’. This study aims to assess Arnold’s adaptation by using Sarah Cardwell’s three contexts: “generic context”, “authorial context” and “[cinematic] context (and performance)” (55). An English filmmaker and former actress, Arnold is both the director and script writer of her third film *Wuthering Heights* based on the nineteenth century classic of Emily Bronte and starred Kaya Scodelario and James Howson. Taking into account that any film adaptation entails an ideological activity, the main focus of this paper is to investigate one ideological idea, that of challenging British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by propagating a toleration of the ‘Other’. The current study aims to highlight the different ways in which Andrea Arnold’s (2011) adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* challenges British nineteenth century discrimination which are often based on race, color, class, or their combinations. Echoing Bronte’s text that gave voice to Heathcliff through Nelly’s narration, Arnold’s adaptation’s focus on Heathcliff’s point of view is an attempt to challenge British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by tolerating the ‘Other’. Allowing a black man the point of view to tell the story of a British nineteenth century white woman’s dilemma, that ends by a wrong choice once she follows the social norms and cultural values of her age, reveals as well Arnold’s appreciation of the Other’s perspective. Hence, Arnold’s choice of the fidelity approach with alterations is both appropriate and effective in serving the adaptation’s ideology.

Key Words

Adaptation – Other – *Wuthering Heights* – Fidelity Approach – Sarah Cardwell

Introduction

Sarah Cardwell states in “Literature on the small screen: television adaptations” that since the birth of cinema, “filmmakers have adapted an eclectic range of sources, including many and varied sub-genres of literature – from classic eighteenth and nineteenth-century novels to ‘pulp’ fiction, from thrillers to romances, from melodramas to ghost stories. The breadth and variety of film adaptations is clearly visible to most cinema-goers” (181). Adaptation is not “a new practice; authors, playwrights, directors, composers, choreographers, and designers have been adapting material since civilizations arose”, still, considering the practice of adaptation would always reveal new information (Kinney 7). Though early adaptation studies have usually depended on using “fidelity” approach, later, the fidelity approach has been underestimated by different adaptation theories. Nevertheless, both Brian McFarlane and Sara Cardwell have moved beyond the strict rejection of fidelity approach in their studies of literary adaptations for different reasons. McFarlane claims that since an adaptation is based on another work, it should always be regarded as an adaptation of that work and not as a totally separate entity. While Sara Cardwell claims in “Adaptation Studies Revisited: Purposes, Perspectives, and Inspiration” that a comparative approach helps “to explore some aspects of film in contrast with literature” (52).

The aim of this study is to explore how far Andrea Arnold’s (2011) adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* has managed to challenge British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by choosing the “fidelity” approach with minimum alterations in her attempt to adapt the ‘Other’. This study attempts to assess Andrea Arnold’s (2011) adaptation of Emily Bronte’s *Wuthering Heights* (1847) by using Sarah Cardwell’s three contexts: “generic context”, “authorial context” and “[cinematic] context (and performance)” (55). The study aims to show that Arnold’s choice of the fidelity approach with alterations is both appropriate and effective in serving the adaptation’s ideology of challenging British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by tolerating the ‘Other’.

Arnold’s adaptation has been awarded three prizes: the Best Cinematography at the Venice Film Festival in 2011 for its visuals, the Golden Osella for Best Cinematography at the 68th Venice International Film Festival and FIPRESCI Prize at the International Istanbul Film Festival in 2012. Arnold’s adaptation has also been critically acclaimed. *The Telegraph* considers it “[a] totally alien adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* . . . a triumph” (Collin 1). While James Gilmore declares that “*Wuthering Heights* is probably the best adaptation you’ll see all year” (1). Gilmore further depicts that “Andrea Arnold and her filmmaking team stir our various senses” due to “the film’s employment of the

camera, its ability to capture beauty in the landscapes as well as complexities in the characters” (1).

Adaptation Theory

In assessing literary adaptations, it is quite essential to identify the kind of adaptation that the filmmaker has chosen and find out whether the filmmaker succeeds in her/his choice to suit the adaptation’s ideology. In *Novel to Film: An Introduction to Theory of Adaptation* (1996), Brian McFarlane points out that, in evaluating the film version of a novel, “it does seem important . . . to try to assess the kind of adaptation the film aims to be. Such an assessment would at least preclude the critical reflex that takes a film to task for not being something it does not aim to be” (22). Nevertheless, there is no clear cut classification in the process of adaptation or assessment that can be followed and usually there is an overlap between the different types to suit the adaptation’s ideology. Wagner declares that “[t]here can be no neat pigeon holes in this area”(228). “Most adaptations cannot be fit into one category exclusively but rather can be seen as sharing characteristics of more than one mode”(Chung 8-9).

McFarlane states that while “many film-makers are on record as being reverently disposed towards reproducing the original novel on film. . . . many adaptations have chosen paths other than that of the literal minded visualization of the original or even of ‘spiritual fidelity’, making quite obvious departures from the original”(22). Hence, McFarlane considers it “wiser to drop terms like ‘violation’, ‘distortion’, ‘travesty’, and those others which, like them, imply the primacy of the printed text” (22). Morris Beja, in *Film and Literature* (1979), also questions the “fidelity” approach by asking whether there are “guiding principles” for the film-maker adapting literature to follow, and “[w]hat relationship should a film have to the original source? Should it be ‘faithful’? Can it be? To what?”(80).

Scholars’ attempt to avoid depending on fidelity approach as a single means of assessment in describing the different kinds of adaptation from novel to film have led them to suggest alternative classifications. “Some writers have proposed strategies which seek to categorize adaptations so that fidelity to the original loses some of its privileged position” (McFarlane 10). In *The Novel and the Cinema*, Geoffrey Wagner suggests “three possible categories which are open to the film-maker and to the critic assessing his adaptation” (10). The first category is called “transposition”, in which “a novel is given directly on the screen with a minimum of apparent interference” (222). The second category is called “commentary”, in which “an original is taken and either purposely or inadvertently altered in some respect . . . when there has been a different intention on the part of the film-maker, rather than infidelity or outright

violation”(224). The third category is called “analogy”, which represents a considerable departure that aims at making another work of art (226). Wagner implies that the critic “will need to understand which kind of adaptation he is dealing with if his commentary on an individual film is to be valuable” (McFarlane 11).

Michael Klein and Gillian Parker in *The English Novel and the Movies* (1981) suggest another system of classification that closely corresponds to Wagner’s categories. The first category is called “fidelity to the main thrust of the narrative”; the second approach “retains the core of the structure of the narrative while significantly reinterpreting or, in some cases, deconstructing the source text”; while the third category regards “the source merely as raw material, as simply the occasion for an original work”(9-11).

In later studies of adaptation, these three categories have been minimized to two categories. McFarlane distinguishes between “transfer” and “adaptation proper”. According to him, “there is a distinction to be made between what may be transferred from one narrative medium to another and what necessarily requires adaptation proper”(12). The term ‘transfer’ denotes “the process whereby certain narrative elements of novels are revealed as amenable to display in film”(12). While the widely used term ‘adaptation’ refers to “the processes by which other novelistic elements must find quite different equivalences in the film medium, when such equivalences are sought or are available at all”(12).

Nevertheless, McFarlane claims that “[n]othing is likely to stop the interest of the general film-viewer in comparing films with their source novels, usually to the film's disadvantage” (23). Hence, McFarlane depicts the importance of an “objective and systematic appraisal of what has happened in the process of transposition from one text to another” (23). He further explains his view saying,

Given the prevalence of the process, and given that interpretations and memories of the source novel are powerful determining elements in the film's intertextuality, there is little value in merely saying that the film should stand autonomously. So it should, but it is also valuable to consider the kinds of transmutation that have taken place, to distinguish what the film-maker has sought to retain from the original and the kinds of use to which he has put it. (23)

Linda Hutcheon, a prominent Canadian theorist, “moves the argument about adaptation beyond fidelity, which seems primarily invested in chasing loss, into far more productive critical territory”(Whittington 405). In *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006) Hutcheon considers adaptation in terms of a “product” and a “process”. As a product, adaptation, “cannot remain entirely faithful to its

original text, otherwise questions of plagiarism arise; adaptation must differ enough from the original text while still maintaining the source's fundamental ideas" (Kinney 8). As a process, adaptation "becomes an act of appropriating and salvaging while trying to give new meaning to a text. Therefore, novelty gives adaptation its value" (8). Hence, "[a]daptations are intertextual and become part of the public history of a story. As a result, all previous adaptations become part of our understanding of all later adaptations" (Kinney 8). Hutcheon sums up the process of adaptation as follows:

An acknowledged transposition of a recognizable other work or works.

A creative and an interpretive act of appropriation/salvaging.

An extended intertextual engagement with the adapted work. (Hutcheon 8)

Hutcheon depicts the fact that though adaptations have always existed as secondary with assumed inferiority, adaptations are quite pervasive and most awards are given to film adaptations. Concluding that "an adaptation is a derivation that is not derivative – a work that is second without being secondary" (9).

In considering the audience's reception of adapted works Hutcheon observes: "[p]art of this pleasure, I want to argue, comes simply from repetition with variation, from the comfort of ritual combined with the piquancy of surprise. Recognition and remembrance are part of the pleasure (and risk) of experiencing an adaptation" (4). Hutcheon further explains in her interview with Eleanor Wachtel on "Adaptation & Remakes" how the experience of watching an adaptation feels:

When I watch an adaptation of a book, a film adaptation of a book that I know, it's like watching a palm sets, there are two things going on and what is happening for me is that I'm oscillating between the work that I already know, the novel or the book in this case, and the film I'm watching and I'm flipping between the two and I'm not necessarily comparing them (I probably am but not evaluating that comparison) I'm just noticing that this is the same and that this is different.

Hutcheon ends her book by comparing "artistic adaptation to biological adaptation and evolution, proposing that for our stories to evolve and be relevant they must adapt" (Kinney 9). Hence, suggesting that "there is a subversive power in adaptation by which we can change our cultural understandings by altering what we know and expect" (9).

Another leading figure in the field of Adaptation Studies is Sarah Cardwell. In "Adaptation Studies Revisited: Purposes, Perspectives, and Inspiration",

Cardwell declares her focus on “what might be considered the core conundrum of the field: comparative versus noncomparative approaches”(51). She states that, “the term *adaptation studies* has historically implied a perspective of *comparison*, which admits a fundamental and determining relationship between ‘this book’ and ‘this film’ and leads frequently to ‘fidelity criticism’”(51-52). In this study Cardwell attempts “to establish more rationally which approach is suitable in which circumstances and to evaluate what the future potential of each approach is” (52).

Cardwell refers to the fact that though in her earlier work on adaptation, *Adaptation Revisited* (2002), she has argued against a comparative approach to adaptations “rejecting comparison with source books”(Cardwell 52), she states, “it is intriguing to realize that . . . I have found myself being drawn back to a comparative approach in order to explore some aspects of film in contrast with literature”(52). Cardwell further explains that “when we undertake a comparison of a book with a film adaptation” (59), we should always ask, “what’s the point?” maintaining, “why looking at literature . . . tells us anything about film” (59). Cardwell’s final appeal to the comparative approach is clear in her direct statement: “I see the uniquely valuable use for comparative studies of adaptation, and this is to offer a significant and singular contribution to film and television aesthetics and our understanding of literature”(59). Concluding that both perspectives “contribute in different ways to the development of an aesthetics of adaptation” (52), Cardwell suggests regarding the adapted work “as part of an artwork” by “appreciating more fully its references to its artistic and cultural contexts and its medium. In this case, that means considering its locus within three contexts: its generic context, its authorial context, and its television context” (55).

Cardwell differentiates between two approaches: one approach is to regard adaptations “as films (or programs) in their own right – that is, not in relation to a source book”(52), another approach, is to regard the adaptation in comparison with the source novel, claiming that “to take this approach is to ignore the program’s own agenda, its artistic choices, its emphases and ‘voice’”(55).

The current study attempts to assess Andrea Arnold’s (2011) adaptation of Emily Bronte’s *Wuthering Heights* (1847) by using Sarah Cardwell’s three contexts: ‘generic context’, ‘authorial context’ and ‘cinematic context (and performance)’. The study argues that Arnold’s faithfulness to text with few alterations clearly suits the adaptation’s ideology because it seems to echo the author’s ideology in the written text. Hence, regarding Arnold’s adaptation in comparison to the source novel, has proved quite effective in depicting the film’s “agenda”, its “artistic choices”, its “emphases” and “voice”.

Authorial Context

Cardwell depicts that, "specific expectations are raised regarding the [adaptation's] authorial context. Its place alongside examples of [film-maker's] recent works implies something more particular for the knowing viewer" (56) adding that "a certain tone or point of view . . . can be broadly understood" (56) from the film-maker's attitude in recent works.

Applying this definition of authorial context, it is worth noting that Andrea Arnold is always "drawn to the marginalized and excluded" (O'Hagan 1). Arnold's dislike of upper class and middle class privileges is clear in her statement, "I have a lot of love for people in their raw human form. Their lives are kind of beautiful and hard. They don't let fear get in the way" (O'Hagan 1). Hence, Arnold is clearly a "maverick with a social conscience at a time when we certainly need independent voices" (1).

Generic Context

Sara Cardwell points out that the "generic identity" of British classic-novel adaptation "is marked by broad indications" (55). "This genre provides its framework, its ground rules, and a set of expectations for the audience. . . . They will have preconceptions about representations of the past, of gender and class in this genre; they will expect certain narrative and formal conventions" (56) Cardwell explains.

Arnold's adaptation does not evoke the "broad indications" of the "generic identity" of British classic-novel adaptation. Robbie Collin states that though Arnold's adaptation is both "astonishing" and "impressive", still "it's so far removed from any normal expectations of the genre"(1). Arnold's work seems to be directed to a subtle reader of the novel. Her faithfulness to the original text defines the adaptation with alterations. Arnold's selection is based on her ideology in adapting the text that of challenging nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by tolerating the 'Other'. Arnold's focus on the first generation only in which half the original text has been cut down aims at presenting Heathcliff sympathetically. Hence, focusing on the first half of the book clearly serves the film's ideology. Arnold's skillful emphasis on the first generation while ignoring Heathcliff's revenge serves in stimulating people's sympathy for Heathcliff, the 'Other'. The image Arnold gives to people of color is totally different from that given by British nineteenth century society at that time. Arnold's focus on highlighting most of the characters' racial attitude towards Heathcliff aims at challenging British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values. In Arnold's adaptation, Heathcliff has been called 'nigger' by Hindly and Edgar Linton on different occasions to verify the British nineteenth century discrimination on racial, color and class basis. Hence, the

image Arnold has given to Heathcliff is one of oppression as a result of British nineteenth century injustices and discrimination of race, color and class.

Though adapting nineteenth-century novels usually reveals nostalgia to the British past with its sense of integrity, Andrea Arnold's adaption of *Wuthering Heights* is different. Arnold does not attempt to evoke nostalgia to the British past or to evoke the sense of integrity of the nineteenth century British society for Arnold is always "drawn to the marginalized and excluded"(O'Hagan 1). Her dislike of upper class and middle class privileges is quite obvious in her adaptation. Arnold's adaptation clearly focuses on the author's challenge of the nineteenth century social norms and cultural values as well as her rejection of the discrimination based on color and race. Hence, both adaptation and text clearly challenge British nineteenth century sense of integrity. A.O. Scott points out how "Arnold imagines the past not as a simpler, more innocent time but as an era blighted by older versions of the same cruelties – rooted in differences of sex, race and social position – that afflict our time"(1).

Arnold's adaptation has been studied by Vincent Bucheler who points out that since 1920 the novel has been adapted more than sixteen times. His approach mainly focuses on "the few similarities and highlight the numerous disparities between Bronte's novel and the producer's modern remake" (Bucheler 1). She concludes her study by pointing out that Arnold's emphasis is on "the social realism already present in her previous work" (4).

The current study aims to highlight the different ways in which Andrea Arnold's (2011) adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* challenges British nineteenth century racism, color discrimination as well as class discrimination. Just as Emily Bronte's novel has challenged British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by giving voice to the 'Other' through Nelly's narration, Arnold's adaptation clearly defies British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by allowing the 'Other' the merit of point of view through her appropriation of this novel. Allowing a black man the merit of point of view to tell the story of a British nineteenth century white woman's dilemma that ends by a wrong choice once she follows the social norms and cultural values of her age reveals as well Arnold's appreciation of the Other's perspective.

Cinematic Context (Performance)

The film starts by showing James Howson who plays the character of Heathcliff brutally smacking his head on a wall which turns out to be the result of the devastating impact of Catherine's death on him. The place is Catherine's room; this is clear to a reader of the text from the letters and names inscribed on the wall. The letters 'C' and 'E' stand for Catherine Earnshaw, followed by the names 'Catherine' and 'Heathcliff' reveal the aim of the adaptation to focus on

Heathcliff’s relationship to Catherine. Ignoring the relationship between ‘Catherine’ and ‘Linton’ that is present in the text and results in the circular structure of the novel, announces as early as the introductory scene that the adaptation cuts the text in half by dealing only with the first generation.

This introductory scene is directly followed by a flashback to the time of Heathcliff’s arrival to the Heights by Mr. Earnshaw to be faced by everybody’s rejection of that outsider. Arnold’s adaptation depicts Heathcliff’s point of view just like Bronte’s text dealt with Heathcliff’s “history” (Bronte 76). Arnold chooses two dark actors in her representation of Heathcliff’s character; Heathcliff is played by Solomon Glave as a young boy and as an adult by James Howson “to reinforce the sense of his ‘difference’ from those surrounding him at *Wuthering Heights*” (McCartney 1). Hence, as early as the opening scenes, Arnold’s focus on the representation of Heathcliff’s color aims to depict that his color is the main reason for the discrimination he has been exposed to.

Another scene that shows how Arnold’s adaptation depicts Heathcliff’s point of view is the scene of Catherine’s confessions to Nelly about her acceptance of Edgar Linton’s marriage proposal. The film, like the novel, depicts Catherine’s guilt feelings and reveals her powerful feelings towards Heathcliff. Yet, in the film, Catherine stops short once Heathcliff leaves the room unlike the text in which she is given space through Nelly’s narration to justify her choice. Moreover, Catherine’s confessions to Nelly stops directly after his disappearance even her voice calling in the rain diminishes once Heathcliff is far enough not to hear it and the course of events is only restored with Heathcliff’s return three years later.

This shows that Arnold has given Heathcliff the merit of point of view; the whole adaptation is given from his perspective, elaborating thus on Bronte’s text which partially gave Heathcliff visibility in the nineteenth century, and allowed a narration of his “history”. Nevertheless, the nineteenth century’s negative critical reception of Bronte’s story due to her tolerance of the ‘Other’ and defiance of the era’s social norms and cultural values contrasts sharply with the critical acclaim of Arnold’s (2011) adaptation of *Wuthering Heights*, which celebrates her acknowledgement of the different ‘Other’.

The relationship between most of the characters and Heathcliff stands for the British attitude to non-Westerners as ‘Other’ on account of color difference. While Catherine’s early acceptance of and involvement with Heathcliff reflects the author’s lack of prejudice towards people of color and those of unknown origins. Catherine’s later rejection of Heathcliff and acceptance of Edgar’s marriage proposal after her introduction to the nineteenth century codes of behavior through her acquaintance with the Linton’s family reveal the impact of

“civilization” on her. On the political level, Bronte’s direct statements and clarifications that Catherine was wrong in her choice and that her failure in this decision have brought about her down-fall reveals the author’s challenge of the social norms of her age. While Arnold’s focus on depicting British discrimination of color and class in her adaptation reveals a much bolder rejection of the social and cultural norms of the nineteenth century, and marks out as well the manner she decides to speak to the earlier text.

In the novel, Mrs. Earnshaw’s rejection of Heathcliff is followed by her quick death shortly after his arrival. The mother’s expression of repulsion, which gets emulated by Hindly and Catherine in different degrees is totally cut down by Arnold. In her adaptation, the mother, the source of “culture” in the domestic realm, is totally absent and her absence is skillfully employed as a tool to justify Catherine’s difference from the Linton’s children in her attitude towards Heathcliff.

The relationship between Catherine and Heathcliff is a representation of a human relationship that is free from the discrimination of color, race and class until the introduction of the confining rules of “culture”, represented by the introduction of the new neighbors at Thrushcross Grange and the emphasis on race and class distinctions through the Linton’s family. The introduction of “culture” changed Catherine from the free girl to a reserved woman confined within the social norms of her age and class. Arnold’s adaptation depicts the drastic impact of Catherine’s conformity to the nineteenth century social norms and cultural values. Catherine’s development into a “civilized” young woman, both in the novel and in Arnold’s adaptation, damages her relationship to Heathcliff which eventually destroys her life and devastates Heathcliff.

Arnold’s adaptation skillfully defies nineteenth century social norms and cultural values by celebrating nature. The celebration of nature over culture stands for liberty and freedom where hierarchy is not valid. This ideological stance represents a direct challenge to the confinement of individuals imposed by the British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values.

Before the introduction of the Grange, Catherine and Heathcliff are represented as part of nature. They belong to the plants, animals and birds, they are part of the landscape and the whole ecosystem reflects their feelings. Their freedom is contrasted to the confines of “civilization” as represented in the aristocratic and luxurious life at Thrushcross Grange whose inmates not only respect but also stand for British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values. The Lintons’ clear discrimination of race, color and class defines most of their behavior.

Nature is used by Arnold as a medium to convey feelings and as a remedy for healing only for the characters who belong to nature. Before the introduction of the Grange, Catherine uses natural remedies for healing. The scene in which Catherine uses natural seeds crushed instead of eye-drops is an example that shows that she does not need medication produced by civilization.

In Arnold's adaptation birds are used as part of her celebration of nature. Arnold took one trope that exists in nature and applied it to her adaptation aiming to show that nature celebrates tolerance in its magnificent harmony between black and white in one bird's feather hoping that this should be echoed in life. Arnold highlights Catherine's display of her belongings (a variety of gathered birds' feather that she has collected from the moors) to Heathcliff on the first day of his arrival. Catherine knows the name of each bird's feather that she shows Heathcliff. In that scene, Catherine points out the feather of her favorite bird that of a 'lapwing'. The feather of the lapwing's clear union of black and white is a message to humanity for half the lapwing's feather is distinctly white while the other half is darkly black. Catherine repeats the word 'lapwing' and asks Heathcliff to pronounce it. In fact the lapwing is the only feather that she asks him to pronounce its name and it is the first word that Heathcliff utters in the film. As she passes the feather on his face and the white part of the feather touches his mouth, he starts to smile to its texture. Catherine's interest in gathering bird's feathers and her preference of the lapwing is an alteration from text but it reveals her belonging to nature.

Arnold's adaptation celebrates the lapwing in particular by using it as a leitmotif. When Hindly Earnshaw, Catherine's elder brother, is sent to study abroad leaving the Heights, there appears in the bright sky two lapwings flying freely after each other. This reflects that Hindly's absence is going to be a time of peace for both Catherine and Heathcliff, the latter's smile is another reassurance.

Arnold employs domestic birds once more in her adaptation when Mr. Linton pays a visit to the Heights after the dogs have caught Catherine's leg and she is forced to stay in the Grange until she gets better. Mr. Linton's visit to Hindly aims to guide him to the welfare of his sister and his warnings concerning Catherine's life and her manners. Mr. Linton tells Hindly that it is his responsibility to pay more attention to his sister's upbringing after their father's death. He dictates that she should not be allowed to roam with an outsider in the moors. The scene following his visit shows two white geese going side by side revealing both men's intention to allow Catherine and Edgar Linton a suitable environment for their acquaintance to prosper.

As mentioned earlier, Arnold's adaptation uses nature as a medium to convey feelings whether positive or negative. Arnold represents Heathcliff's

anger to the idea of his separation from Catherine in his brutal attitude to animals. After Mr. Linton's visit, when Hindly dictates to Heathcliff his future separation from Catherine announcing that it is going to be forbidden to talk to her after her return from the Grange, Heathcliff brutally inserts the knife in the sheep's neck. Arnold's demonstration of the painful impact of Heathcliff's ruthless act on the sheep he was carrying aims to reflect Heathcliff's injured feelings as a result of Hindly's ruthless plans of separation. Heathcliff's unaccepted ruthlessness towards the sheep shows that the intended separation between him and Catherine is not going to be easy and that whoever intends or manages to separate him from Catherine will be dealt with without mercy. Though Heathcliff's brutal response towards the sheep shows a direct violation on animals, Arnold's representation of man's violation of nature is an indirect plea that challenges white man's violation of non-Westerners on account of race or color.

Later, after noticing Catherine and Edgar riding horses side by side, Heathcliff's anger and jealousy are clear in violating nature is repeated through his ruthless killing of the trapped rabbits that he was gathering. Again, Arnold's adaptation shows that violating humans' right is rejected just like violating animals' right is rejected.

Arnold's adaptation thus repeatedly contrasts nature with culture. In her celebration of nature there is an indirect attack on the impact of culture and "civilization" on humanity. Heathcliff's rejection of civilization and his preference of nature is depicted early in the baptism scene. He clearly rejects conforming to the confines of social norms and cultural values of which baptism is emblematic. He runs away outside the church and escapes to the moors. Catherine's attitude to his elopement reveals the same temperament. She runs after him and they both escape in nature, spending all day running freely in the moors, which shows that they both share wild and pure nature that has not been contaminated by "civilization". When they return, Joseph calls them heathens while the disappointed father who rejects their deed hits them and tells them to go and ask God's forgiveness. At that point, both of them still belong to nature before the introduction of the social norms and the cultural values of the nineteenth century as represented in the Linton's family and their impact on Catherine.

In Arnold's adaptation, the mud scene is the last scene depicting Catherine as part of nature before her introduction to the British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values. Directly before the father's death, both Catherine and Heathcliff still enjoy being part of nature. Catherine's teasing of Heathcliff by throwing mud on him is directly answered by the latter's throwing her in the mud and staining her clothes and her body. Catherine's yielding after several

attempts to free herself reveals Heathcliff's power over her. His male presence is subduing both land and women.

In Arnold's adaptation, the father's death and Hindly's rapid return to the Heights with his wife restore the social order of the place and its inmates. The first scene on his arrival shows that Hindly's attitude to Heathcliff exceeds his earlier prejudice. Hindly attacks Heathcliff and orders him to move with the animals where he belongs. Hindly's verbal abuse to Heathcliff paves the way to future class and color discrimination aiming first at revenge and second at the separation between his sister and this outsider. Hindly's first attack is that of class followed by color discrimination. He orders Heathcliff to carry the boxes inside calling him "nigger". Hindly's cruel and determined look while commanding Heathcliff, "work or leave" depicts drastic change. While Heathcliff's yielding to such treatment coming after a quick thoughtful look on Catherine communicates the message that this yielding is for her sake.

The scene following Hindly's degradation depicts the restoration of the shift of privilege back to Catherine. Though she aims to offer Heathcliff some sweets and enjoy his company, his attempt to stop Catherine's teasing hand is strictly stopped by Catherine's powerful pulling of a dark lock of his hair out of his head and carelessly leaving it to fly in the air followed by a lapwing feather. The defying look in her eyes shows that she realizes that she is more powerful than him. Heathcliff does not resist this time; it is Heathcliff who yields to the new distribution of power structure. This scene clearly contrasts with the earlier mud scene in which her childish attempt at throwing mud at him was followed by his pulling her to the ground, staining her clothes and body, seizing her arms until she yields. The shift of power aims to reflect the restoration of the division of classes, in which Heathcliff the outsider is out of orbit.

Arnold's adaptation highlights the extent to which Heathcliff is severely punished for leaving work in the farm and going out to play in the moors with Catherine. Following Hindly's commands, Joseph violently flips Heathcliff on his back with a whip until his shirt is stained with blood. While Catherine's pleas to Hindly to have sympathy, "he is our brother" and her begging for kindness are in vain. The brutal and unkind punishment on account of Hindly's orders reveals the amount of hatred and humiliation that Heathcliff faces after the death of Mr. Earnshaw. Though Heathcliff is ruthlessly treated as 'Other', he bears oppression silently due to his emotional bond to Catherine.

Arnold depicts the impact of Hindly's physical abuse on Heathcliff. The back of Heathcliff's shirt is stained with blood. In Heathcliff's oppression, Arnold depicts the British racial attitude towards the 'Other' which denotes both verbal and physical abuse. Arnold's focus on the shirt stained by blood refers to

the price paid by non-Westerners for the British nineteenth century integrity. The following scene depicts Catherine's use of nature in healing. As she looks at Heathcliff's back she starts licking his wounds in order to pacify his pain. Nevertheless, Heathcliff's injury seems deep enough to hurt, tears fall from his eyes as Catherine sucks his injured body. This is the final scene in which Catherine and Heathcliff mingle with nature before the Lintons' interference which occurs in that same scene as they go racing in the moors and reach the Grange. The introduction of the Grange and the Lintons' family serve as the introduction of the British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values.

In Arnold's adaptation, though the father's death and Hindly's return mark a drastic change to Heathcliff, still Hindly's degradation has not separated him from Catherine. It is the first visit to the Grange on account of a childish impulse to go racing which denotes the real change in the course of events with its devastating impact on their relationship. Once they reach the Grange, the verbal abuse that Heathcliff receives at the Grange reveals discrimination of race, color and class indicating that the Grange is a symbol of the British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values.

Arnold's adaptation, unlike the text, shows more than one reference to the fact that the Lintons are the new neighbors in an attempt to reveal that the social norms and cultural values that they stand for are new to the neighborhood. Hence, the nineteenth century British injustices can be read as new to the history of British people who previously used to be part of the natural order.

Though the Linton's family is the one responsible for Catherine's "reform" in accordance with the nineteenth century social codes and cultural norms, and though what they disseminate is both conventional and appropriate, their racial attitude in achieving this is both immoral and disgraceful. In order to separate them, an expensive price has been paid. The separation is done first through the degradation of Heathcliff as 'Other' on account of his color. The amount of racial oppression and humiliation that Heathcliff faced in both text and adaptation which Arnold has successfully portrayed is pervasive. The cruelty, ruthlessness and brutality to the dark boy in the attempt to separate them reflect the British racial discrimination of people of color. Both the Linton's family and Hindly's racial attitude towards Heathcliff are clear in their verbal abuse. By calling him "nigger" the British racial attitude to non-Westerners on account of color difference is clearly depicted and is rejected in both text and adaptation.

The night Catherine is kept at the Grange, Arnold shows that Heathcliff spends alone in the moors signifying that Catherine is no longer part of nature. His sleeping the night outside away from the Heights and not returning home

without her show that his existence in the Heights is only due to her and for her sake.

The scene depicting Catherine's return from the Grange few weeks later shows the brutal price paid for her refinement demonstrated at the back of Heathcliff's shirt. The physical abuse and violence committed against Heathcliff for Catherine to become a lady echoes the price paid by non-Westerners for the British nineteenth century integrity and propriety. As Catherine is welcomed at the carriage, Arnold shows Heathcliff from his back watching her return from behind walls showing the back of his shirt stained with blood. The look of relief and salvation on his face reveals his capacity to endure physical and emotional abuse for her sake.

The scene depicting Heathcliff's departure after he hears Catherine's secret that she confides to Nelly reveals the impact of her words on him. Catherine announces that she accepted Edgar Linton's marriage proposal claiming that "It would degrade [her] to marry Heathcliff" reveals the powerful impact the Lintons have on her. Hence, Catherine yields to the confines of culture by conforming to the nineteenth century class consciousness and betraying her own heart. Heathcliff's return three years later as a gentleman does not help him in gaining Catherine back having already been married to Edgar Linton.

Arnold depicts the new power skills that Catherine has acquired after becoming the lady of the Grange. Though she warmly receives Heathcliff, his reproach for the last words he heard from her before his departure does not take long and he promises not to leave her again. Nevertheless, as they all go riding in the moors, Catherine reproaches Heathcliff for his departure saying "[h]ow could you have left this?" followed by another reproach, "[h]ow could you have left me?" Catherine's enquiry about Heathcliff's ability to leave nature before enquiring about leaving her reflects her knowledge that he belongs to nature. Nevertheless, Catherine's power is clear in her stepping with her shoes on Heathcliff's face. This sadly occurs in the same spot where they used to celebrate their belonging to nature. In spite of the marvelous landscape, her belonging to British nineteenth century aristocracy after her marriage unfortunately changed her.

Arnold's adaptation shows how Heathcliff's revenge on Hindly for separating him from Catherine starts from the day of his return to the neighborhood. Being offered a room at the Heights at a low price, Heathcliff finally returns to sleep in Catherine's room. When he notices Hindly losing money in gambling, Heathcliff starts lending him money for shares in the Heights. Hence, his ownership at the Heights starts until he successfully

becomes the legal owner of the Heights after Catherine's death. This shows that Hindly paid for his discrimination of the 'Other' to the extent that he wastes his son's share at the Heights leaving him degraded of both land and education.

Arnold's adaptation shows that though Catherine manages to settle with Edgar Heathcliff's visits to the Grange, the latter's coming visits shows that he rapidly starts to feel at home there; he opens the gate for himself, opens the door and enters the house without permission and moves around the house freely until he starts to make use of Isabella's feelings towards him to arouse Catherine's jealousy.

Arnold's adaptation differs from the text in the confrontation scenes. Unlike the text, Catherine slaps Heathcliff on the face directly before the scene of the physical confrontation between him and Edgar. Catherine's beating her heart by her fist significantly reflects the tormenting impact of the two men's hostility on her. Her realization that she has destroyed her life by her wrong choice is clear though she announces that they both broke her heart due to the damaging impact of the physical confrontation on her. Another alteration in this scene is Heathcliff's offer to Catherine to come with him and that he will raise Edgar's child. This offer is a direct violation of the British nineteenth century code of manners which is totally rejected by the reserved Catherine.

The scene depicting Heathcliff's last meeting with Catherine is not given the space it is given in the text after which he spends the night until Nelly announces Catherine's death. Heathcliff's shouts, "[m]ay she wake in agony" with the scar on his forehead and moving to the inscribed names on the wall reveals the end of flashback. His brutal reaction reveals his tormented soul.

Arnold's adaptation is faithful to the text when it comes to Catherine's burial for her body is buried in the moors and not with the Linton's family. Hence, Catherine is restored to nature after her death. Though she has paid her life as a price for her wrong choice, death reclaims her to nature.

The final scene shows one lapwing flying, Heathcliff walks in the moors while the song "The Enemy" is played. Arnold skillfully ends her adaptation by this inspiring song which is not present in text. The significance of Arnold's final song is quite remarkable. It aims at filling the gaps in the original text and at summing up her liberal ideology in the adaptation. The song speaks on behalf of Heathcliff, the first stanza starts with a plea for "hope" stating that it is "easier" and "kinder" even if it is not directly stated. The song depicts the damaging impact of "heartbreak" on man stating that it injures the soul. "[a]nd tell me not of heartbreak . . . it breaks my soul, it breaks my soul." Depicting Arnold's tolerant adaptation of the 'Other', the song states, "I'm not the enemy" then repeats "It isn't me the enemy". The song sums up Heathcliff's "history" as

an ‘Other’ who comes to the Heights by Mr. Earnshaw in one line, “But I came and I was nothing”. Explaining his experience in life, the song states that time has not always been in his favor, “time will give us nothing”. This reveals that time is not always capable of healing deep injuries of the soul. The song questions Catherine’s class-conscious choice of marriage determining that she failed in her choice. “So why did you choose to lean on . . . A man you knew was falling”. Arnold’s rejection of a class-conscious marriage is a direct challenge of the nineteenth century social norms and cultural values through her tolerance of the ‘Other’. While the term “falling” refers to Edgar’s values whose cultural norms are clearly falling in the twentieth century to be replaced by equality and acceptance.

The second stanza, repeats the pleas and aspirations for hope even if it is secretly confided as well as the appeal that verbal abuse against people of color should end. The song fills the gap for Arnold’s adaptation in which half the original text has been cut. The song refers to Heathcliff’s aspiration to be buried beside Catherine, “[a]nd bury me beside you” as well as to the nature of his miserable life after her death, “I have no hope in solitude”. The last two lines of the song refers to the fact that all people, regardless of race, color or class are going to die and that they will return back to nature where they all belong “[a]nd the world will follow . . . To the earth, down below.” The last two lines of the song that skillfully ends Arnold’s adaptation echo her daring challenge of British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values and her rejection of discrimination on racial or class basis.

The current study argues that assessing Arnold’s adaptation on account of comparing it to the original is not “to the film’s disadvantage” (McFarelane 23). Arnold’s challenge to British nineteenth century discrimination of color, race and class in her (2011) adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* aims to depict that the impact of such values still exists. The film-viewers of Arnold’s adaptation realize the outcome of the damaging impact of British discrimination against the ‘Other’ and understand the reason behind Bronte’s challenge of social injustices and the racial discrimination prevalent in her age. Yet, whereas Bronte’s somehow subtle rejection of such injustices and discrimination brought her novel a negative critical reception at the time of publishing, Arnold’s adaptation was celebrated for its liberal ideology. Allowing a black man the point of view to tell the story of a British nineteenth century white woman, and depicting that woman’s destruction of her own life by deserting him highlights Bronte’s desire to subvert the social norms and cultural values of her age. Arnold capitalizes on such subversion to the maximum: her adaptation reveals her challenge of the long-acting British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values, and her celebration of the revolutionary spirit of her foremother, Bronte. Furthermore,

by foregrounding Heathcliff's perspective and underscoring his brutal revenge, she does not only show her tolerance of the 'Other' but also her appreciation of the 'Other's' perspective. Ending her adaptation by a song that speaks on Heathcliff's behalf gives him voice and allows him the merit of point of view to demand and question British nineteenth century social norms and cultural values that still haunts the treatment of the 'Other' worldwide. Hence, Arnold's choice of the fidelity approach with alterations is both appropriate and effective in serving the adaptation's liberal ideology which embraces the 'Other' with all his/her difference rather than simply tolerating him/her.

Works Cited

- Beja, Morris. *Film and Literature*. New York: Longman, 1979.
- Bronte, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Great Britain: Penguin Books 1847.
- Butchler, Vincent. "Wuthering Heights: Comparison between the novel and the 2011 adaptation by producer Andrea Arnold." <https://www.academia.edu>
- Cardwell, Sarah. "Adaptation Studies Revisited: Purposes, Perspectives, and Inspiration." pp. 51-63, <https://www.academia.edu>
- . "Literature on the small screen: television adaptations." pp. 181-195, <https://www.cambridge.org>
- Chung, Sooyoung. *A Multidimensional History: Film Adaptation of British Classic Novels in America*. 2005. University of Stony Brook, PhD dissertation. *ProQuest*, <https://www.academia.edu>
- Collin, Robbie. "Wuthering Heights: review." *The Telegraph*. 10 Nov. 2011, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk>
- Gilmore, James. "Two Perspectives on Andrea Arnold's 'Wuthering Heights'." *Film Writing*. 12 Oct. 2012, *MediascapeBlog*.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006. <https://www.academia.edu>
- . Interview by Eleanor Wachtel. "Adaptation & Remakes." *Books on Film*, 25 Feb. 2011, <http://tiff.net>
- Kinney, Michael Evans. "Linda Hutcheon's *A Theory of Adaptation*, by Linda Hutcheon." *Critical Voices: The University of Guelph Review Project*. Fall 2013 pp. 7-15, <https://journal.lib.uoguelph.ca>
- Klein, Michael and Gillian Parker (eds.), *The English Novel and the Movies*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1981.
- "Linda Hutcheon: A Theory of Adaptation [Readings]" <https://www.icosilune.com>
- McCartney, Jenny. "Wuthering Heights: review." *The Telegraph*. 10 Nov. 2011, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk>

- McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- O’Hagan, Sean. “Andrea Arnold: I always aim to get under the belly of a place.” *The Guardian*. 9 October 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com>
- Scott, A. O. “Heathcliff and Cathy, with Lust and Mud.” *The New York Times*. 4 Oct. 2012, <https://www.nytimes.com>
- Wagner, Geoffrey. *The Novel and the Cinema*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975
- Whittington, William. “A Theory of Adaptation (review)” *Comparative Literature Studies*. vol.45, no.3, 2008, pp. 404-406, <https://www.academia.edu>
- Wuthering Heights*. Directed by Andrea Arnold, performances by James Howson and Kaya Scodelario, Oscilloscope Laboratories, 2011.