

LITERARY COMPARATIVE STUDIES ON THE EXAMPLE  
OF KAZAKH LITERATURE AND CINEMA

Zhanna NURMANOVA<sup>1</sup>, Marzhan ZHAPANOVA<sup>2</sup>,  
Amangeldy SHURENTAYEV<sup>3</sup>, Aitmukhanbet YESDAULETOV<sup>4</sup>,  
Ardak YESDAULETOVA<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Turkology, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National  
University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>Department of Russian Philology, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National  
University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>3</sup>Department of Journalism and Communication Management,  
A. Baitursynov Kostanay Regional University, Kostanay, Republic of  
Kazakhstan

<sup>4</sup>Department of Printing and Publishing, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian  
National University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>5</sup>Department of International Relations, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian  
National University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan

**Abstract:** *The article "Literary comparative studies on the example of the interaction of Kazakh literature and cinema" highlights current trends in modern literary criticism. The authors describe and analyze some aspects of the modern literary process. They touch upon such issues as the cinematic aspects of writing, the adaptability of literary means to cinema, and cinema of prose. The main attention is paid to the establishment and development of cinema in Kazakhstan through the prism of literary comparative studies. The analysis of the activities of the domestic writers in cinema is given. It is also indicated that cinema acts as a generator of literary works. The study has also showed the importance of the role of writers in the formation and development of cinema. It should be noted that today there is no systematic description of the cinematic aspect of the work of writers. The research has showed that the study of the cinematographic activity of writers in the context of comparative literary criticism allows us to form a more holistic view of writer's cinema. The collaboration of literature and the art of cinema, which was considered in the system of genetic, historical and ontological kinship, reveals their belonging to the narrative arts.*

**Keywords:** literary comparative studies, cinema, film adaptation, image, film script.

Literary comparative studies are a multidimensional scientific field, which includes the study of various forms and artistic interactions. Until recently, studies in the field of comparative literature were limited to the study of inter-literary relations. Meanwhile, modern comparative studies are based not only on international, but also interdisciplinary relations, among which a special place belongs to the study of the dialogical boundaries of literature and cinema, which need systematizing and rethinking of established scientific traditions. The history of the development of this issue has passed a long way from “cinema-centrism” (“cinema does not need literature”) (F. Fellini) to

“literature-centrism” (“the enchantment of cinema by literature”) (B. Mansurov).

As a scientifically significant area of comparativism, this issue was quite fruitfully developed in the USA, France, and Germany. One of the main figures in comparative literature is the American scientist R. Welleck, who wrote in 1949 in the USA, in collaboration with O. Warren, one of the most popular books in the West – “Theory of Literature”, which examined the key problems of comparative literature. In the chapter “Literature and Other Arts”, the authors conclude that the comparative history of literature and the arts is still at the threshold of the scientific stage of its development: “It is much more likely that we will not discover parallel lines, but a complex interweaving of converging and branching lines”.<sup>1</sup>

In France, the initiators of including issues of the interaction of literature and art in the register of scientific comparative studies are authoritative scientists K. Pishua and A.-M. Russo. They designated this area of comparative literary criticism as the problem field of “the convergence of literature with other areas of expression and knowledge”, meaning the latter is a different kind of art.<sup>2</sup> The followers of the French comparativists reduced it to a laconic formulation: a comparative study of works belonging to different cultural areas. This problem has found a special sounding in the monograph of the Slovak scientist D. Dyurishin “Theory of comparative study of literature”, which called for expanding the subject of scientific comparative studies by including literature links with other branches of art, “having real grounds in the form of objective connecting threads between them, noticeable even by an inexperienced reader's eye”.<sup>3</sup>

This author distinguishes two types of “intermediary relations” of literature and art: the first, when the text of literature acts as an organic component of the text of art (in theater and cinema), the second, when art becomes the impulse to create a literary work. In Russia, the methodological substantiation and consistent development of this scientific direction of literary comparative studies was received in the works of academician M.P. Alekseev. In the work considered as the classics of Russian literary criticism – “Interaction of literature with other types of art as a subject of scientific research”.

---

<sup>1</sup> R. Walleck, O. Warren, *Theory of literature*, Progress, Moscow, 1978.

<sup>2</sup> M.Kh. Madanova, *Kazakh-French literary relations of the XX century and the problems of reproachful literary criticism*, Gılm, Almaty, 1999.

<sup>3</sup> D. Dyurishin, *Theory of comparative study of literature*, Progress, Moscow, 1979.

## Materials and methods

The works and provisions set forth by prominent Soviet scientists, such as Manevich, Guralnik, Weissfeld, Zaitsev, Rybak, Arutiunian<sup>4</sup> have served the basis of the research. The works of these and many other scientists have not yet lost their theoretical significance. Among Kazakhstani authors, one should single out Kamalov Smailov.<sup>5</sup> Other researchers have addressed the topic of cinema and literature. Among them is Rymgali Nurgaliev.<sup>6</sup>

The study was based on numerous materials. Literary works of such writers as Mukhtar Auezov, Gabit Musrepov, Ilyas Dzhangugurov, Zein Shashkin and others have been studied. Kazakhstan films have been analyzed, such as “Shindagi Shynar” (Chinara on the rock) by K. Mukhamedzhanov based on the novel by M. Auezov “The Tribe of the Young”, “Kek” (Revenge) of the screenwriter S. Elubaya based on the work of Abish Kekilbayev's “Ballad of Forgotten Years”, an adaptation of Mukhtar Auezov's novel “Abai”, called “Songs of Abay”,<sup>7</sup> the film directed by S. Khodzhikov “Kyz-Zhibek” according to the scripts of the writers Kamal Smailov and Gabit Musrepov and many others.

To study the relationship of literature and cinema, methods such as the method of comparison, induction and deduction, analysis of the genres of literature and cinema have been used. The study was based on the fundamental principles of cultural studies, aesthetics, semiotics, and philosophy. The term “film adaptation” itself, due to its ambiguity, needs to be clarified. He was traditionally understood as creating a film based on literary works, regardless of the degree of its proximity to the original source. Subsequently, the concept of film adaptation was considered as:

- the “frontier” of the interaction of literature and cinema;<sup>8</sup>
- “drive belt” between literature and cinema;

---

<sup>4</sup> I. Manevich, *Narrative genres in film drama*, Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1965; I. Manevich, *Cinema and literature*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1968; V.A. Guralnik, *Russian literature and Soviet cinema. Screen adaptation of classical prose as a literary problem*, Nauka, Moscow, 1968; I. Zaitseva, *Cinema and literature*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1975; L.A. Rybak, *Read by screen: Cinema and school*, BPSK, Moscow, 1975; I. Weissfeld, V. Demin, V. Mikhailovich, *Meetings with X muse: talks about cinema. Vol.2*, Prosveshcheniye, Moscow, 1981; S. M. Arutyunyan, *The screen version of literary works as a specific type of interaction of arts*, 2003. Available at <http://cheloveknauka.com/ekranizatsiya-literaturnyh-proizvedeniy-kak-spetsificheskii-tip-vzaimodeystviya-iskusstv#ixzz5qXXUc5IT>

<sup>5</sup> K. Smailov, *The film is born*, Oner, Almaty, 1981; K. Smailov, *Kazakh cinema history*, Almaty, Bilim, 1999; K. Smailov, *Cinema jeanne is adept. Collected works 3 volume. Vol. 3*, Kazigurt, Almaty, 2004.

<sup>6</sup> R. Nurgaliev, *The poetics of drama. The origins and trends of the development of Kazakh drama*, Jazwşı, Almaty, 1979.

<sup>7</sup> G. Musrepov, “*Songs of Abay*”. *Features of the era*, Jazwşı, Almaty, 1986.

<sup>8</sup> L.A. Rybak, *Read by screen: Cinema and school*, BPSK, Moscow, 1975.

- “translation of the written text into a visual image”<sup>9</sup> and “translation into the language of screen plastics”;<sup>10</sup>
- “cinematic creative recreation of literary images”;<sup>11</sup>
- “cinema production entering into an equal dialogue with the source”;
- “on-screen otherness of literature”.<sup>12</sup>

At first, the film adaptation was reduced to illustrations of well-known episodes of literary works, “living pictures” and seemed “a miserable ersatz of great literature”.<sup>13</sup> With the development of cinema, the film adaptation gradually gained depth of interpretation and artistic independence, becoming, over time, a cinema staging, that is, a “processing of a literary work in a new structure and combination”,<sup>14</sup> interpretation (the result of thoughtful reading) and improvisation (free presentation of a literary work).

The screen version is limited and constrained by the time format, as a result of which it cannot include all the plot lines, characters, dialogs of heroes, author's comments. In addition, any literary text contains subtext as a second semantic series. Hence the inevitability of losses in the “transition of a work from one art to another”, which was warned by Kazakh academician R.N. Nurgali.<sup>15</sup>

Screen adaptation as a model of a creative union of literature and cinema is quite fully reflected in the works of foreign researchers. Summarizing the main provisions of the works of scientists, we can conclude that there are various approaches to film adaptation as a phenomenon of re-formed aesthetic reality. Here are some of them:

1. Cinematographic approach to film adaptations;<sup>16</sup>
2. Literary approach to film adaptations;<sup>17</sup>

In the mid-sixties of the 20th century, Professor U. Guralnik spoke for the first time of the need for a literary approach to film adaptations, noting that with the birth of the first film based on a literary work, “the history of cinema is closely intertwined with the history of literature” and was very sorry that this

---

<sup>9</sup> Yu.M. Lotman, *The nature of cinema*, Iskusstvo, St. Petersburg, 2005.

<sup>10</sup> L. Annensky, *Leo Tolstoy and cinema*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1980.

<sup>11</sup> A. Vartanova, *Images of literature in graphics and cinema*, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Moscow, 1961.

<sup>12</sup> V.A. Guralnik, *Russian literature and Soviet cinema. Screen adaptation of classical prose as a literary problem*, Nauka, Moscow, 1968.

<sup>13</sup> A. Plakhov, *From novel to series: television and literature*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1983.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>15</sup> R.N. Nurgali, *Update tree. Traditions and the modern literary process*. Jazwşı, Almaty, 1989.

<sup>16</sup> I. Manevich, *Narrative genres in film drama*, Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1965; I. Zaitseva, *Cinema and literature*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1975.

<sup>17</sup> V.A. Guralnik, *Russian literature and Soviet cinema. Screen adaptation of classical prose as a literary problem*, Nauka, Moscow, 1968.

circumstance is not enough considered by literary criticism.<sup>18</sup> Various aspects of this problem were analyzed in a series of monographs and studies by A. Vartanova<sup>19</sup> and L. Pogozhayeva 1978.<sup>20</sup>

1. Intertextual approach to film adaptations;<sup>21</sup>

2. A comparative approach to film adaptations, consisting in the fact that the film adaptation status is established in relation to a work of art.<sup>22</sup>

In our article, examples of film adaptations are considered under the scientific perspective by M. Madanova: as a study of the status of film adaptations in relation to an artwork, as a “new version of a literary work”, as a dialogue between a writer and a director. The study of the complex “literary original – film” is an extensive material for the analysis of the processes of the visual image encoded in the text.

The writers' attitude to the film adaptations was distinguished by the inconsistency and ambiguity of judgments. They had different attitudes towards the “migration” of their stories to the field of cinema. N. Dumbadze could not reconcile himself with the inevitable losses on the screen, and only after a while, having gained considerable experience in the cinema, he admitted that “the prose and the plastic of the cinema are different things. Each of them has its own way of expression. In cinema, just the look of a main actor can replace several pages of prose. The film is, after all, the work of the director, and the writer must put up with it”.<sup>23</sup>

Filmmakers have left a lot of valuable thoughts about the art of film adaptation. G. Kozintsev in the very term “film adaptation” heard the mechanical echo of the spirit of “rehearsed product”. The director explained his vision of the film adaptation as follows: “You need not only to understand the images of the author, you need to unwind the associations that created them, and create your own associations on this way, find your own material”.<sup>24</sup>

The approach to the adaptation of literary classics may be different. We single out several types of film adaptations: canonical, free, modernized, serial format. In canonical adaptations (the actual adaptation), the accuracy of following the original source, “fidelity to the letter and spirit of the literary primary principle”, the maximum desire to preserve the artistic identity and the author's intention<sup>25</sup> are being followed. The scrupulous following of a literary work, the desire to accurately and thoroughly retell the plot on the screen,

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>19</sup> A. Vartanova, *Images of literature in graphics and cinema*, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Moscow, 1961.

<sup>20</sup> L. Pogozhaeva, *From the history of film adaptations*, Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1978.

<sup>21</sup> M. Yampolsky, *Memory of Tiresias. Intertextuality and cinema*, RIK “Kultura”, Moscow, 1993.

<sup>22</sup> M. Madanova, *Introduction to comparative literature*, DOIVA – Bratstvo, Almaty, 2003.

<sup>23</sup> N. Dumbadze, “Call”, in *Soviet Screen*, 1979, no. 19, p. 12-18.

<sup>24</sup> G. Kozintsev, *Collected works in 5 volumes. Vol.3*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1983.

<sup>25</sup> L. Annensky, *Leo Tolstoy and cinema*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1980.

often turned its opposite for the creators. Being just a copy of the original, the film adaptation turned out to be stillborn. L. Anninsky described this case as “everything is “in compliance with the text”, “and everything is missing”.<sup>26</sup> There is only one way out of the situation: in order to “restore spirit, one must sacrifice the letter”.

Free adaptation (adaptation based on motives) is a variation of a literary work in which the authors of the film point out to the source, but relieve themselves of the responsibility to strictly adhere to it. The director acts as a free interpreter of the classics, freely managing literary material, expressing a subjective attitude to the work. In search of spectacular equivalents, it is possible to go beyond the limits of one work of the author, expand the artistic space by including other works, redistributing within the material united by new compositional logic, introducing new and episodic characters. Contamination is possible, with the help of which the director destroys the linear structure of the work and introduces elements such as flashback, which offset the narrative dating. They are called “daughter works” in relation to the works of classics – writers.

The modernized film adaptation (modern film adaptation) is a form of modern reading of the classics, a free variation on the literary theme with a change in the chronotomy, historical and national color. The directors modernize the events and characters of the literary source, transfer the conflict to a different national environment, historical era. At the same time, events, life and customs are being reconstructed, being styled in the era. The film is interpreted in the spirit of an interpreter. “Nowadays, modern readings are in use. Let Olesya turn into a Sorceress, but the twentieth century! And what!”, – L. Anninskii took up arms against this kind of adaptation.<sup>27</sup>

The master of the modernized adaptations in Kazakhstan is considered rightfully the film director D. Omirbaev, who shot the experimental version of the Tolstoy’s novel “Anna Karenina” and the Chekhov’s novel “About Love” (2007). In its version, the time (20th century), the place of action (Almaty and Astana), the names of the heroes (Anna Karenina – Shuga, Vronskii – Aydos) were changed, and only one storyline remained from the novel. The last type of film adaptations is movie series. This path, adopted by the directors, is denoted as “movement after the author.” In this mode, the authors of the film manage to reveal all the polyphonic layers of the narrative, while preserving the main plot lines and the psychological motivation of the heroes' behavior, which seemed impossible before. The production of multi-screen adaptations is a fashionable trend of recent years. The most successful adaptations stimulate the viewer to appeal to the original literary text. But it should be

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem.*

noted that such a film adaptation leads to the fact that the literary text begins to be perceived through the prism of screen culture rather than reading one.

## Results

Based on the research, the following conclusions have been drawn. The collaboration of literature and the art of cinema, which was considered in the system of genetic, historical and ontological kinship, reveals their belonging to the narrative arts. It is possible to distinguish two stages according to the "manner of entering the film process", the first – early (1920-1930) and the second – transformative – creative (1940-1970). Two areas of mutual cooperation between literature and cinema should be identified. (1) Interaction at the personal level; and (2) Interaction at the impersonal level. The interaction at the personal level has manifested in the fact that writers became participants in the creative process of creating films. In other words, there is a cinematic aspect of the activities of Kazakh writers. At the impersonal level, aspects such as textual links and intra-textual links should be highlighted. In turn, textual links turn into intertextual links (intertext). A literary work, when "transcoded" into the language of cinema, undergoes a transformation of the genre, plot and images. Let's consider it in more detail.

- Transformation of the genre.

The genre in the movie is “a kind of code, a way of the artist’s conversation with the audience”.<sup>28</sup> The change in the genre nature of the film adaptation of the work sometimes leads to unexpected results. So, when transferring to the screen the story of B. Sokpakbaev “My name is Leather” acquired the features of a purely comedic genre.

- The role of the author and the role of the narrator when translating to the screen.

The originality of the functions of the author and the narrator in the literary and on-screen narration is also not sufficiently taken into account when “translating” the text of the book into the language of the movie, sometimes it is interpreted simplistically or mechanically, which leads to a violation of the artistic logic of the original source and deprives the film of internal integrity.

- Plot composition, text contaminations, bias and discrepancies.

In the literary work of filmmakers, a purely “eventual” side is often attracted to everything. The literary plot should be suitably matched with a cinematic equivalent. Film critic L. Pogozhayeva came to the conclusion that “not a single film adaptation has ever transmitted, did not include all lines, all scenes, all themes, all the wealth of the original source”.<sup>29</sup> The plot composition in the movie requires the transformation of the verbal text,

---

<sup>28</sup> G. Kozintsev, *Collected works in 5 volumes. Vol.3*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1983.

<sup>29</sup> L. Pogozhayeva, *From the history of film adaptations*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1978.

primarily its stopping (reduction), since not all lines can be transferred to the screen.

By the degree of complexity of the "translation" of their works into the language of cinema, authors are easily translatable and difficult to translate. The latter type includes Oralkhan Bokey, Mukhtar Magauin, Sattar Erubaev. The practice of film adaptations convinces us that the most unforeseen shifts and turns are possible. By reproducing and completing a previously created work, the artist realizes the right to his own creative style.

- Transformation of the image. The implementation of the system of literary images in the cinema.

A character in literature receives the status of a description object, and in cinema – a status of an image and a demonstration object. The plot presence or textual behavior of individual characters may vary depending on the author's script and director's concept. Often during the film adaptation new faces are found, or, conversely, their number is reduced, names are changed. Some characters' characters are emphasized, stand out, the other fade into the background or shade. In films – adaptations of Shaken Aimanov, Sultan – Akhmet Khodzhikov, Abdull Karsakpaiev, literary characters appear as "finished, objectified".<sup>30</sup> Yu. Lotman notes that in Kazakhstan, in the age of "spectacular culture", cinema acts as a powerful generator of literary plots. In recent years, the flow of adaptations has resumed. Cinema began to turn more and more boldly to literary classics.

## Discussion

### *The Cinematic Aspect of Writers' Activity*

The study of the role of writers in the formation and development of cinema is important. It should be noted that today there is no systematic description of the cinematic aspect of the work of writers. Despite the fact that many personalities were identified in literary criticism (V. Mayakovskii, Yu. Tynianov, M. Auezov), some of the artists of the word, as before, remain "behind the scenes". The "reanimation" of cinematic episodes of writers, the study and comprehension of their acting, cinematographic, propaganda and editorial activities at the "dream factory" will make up for the missing link in the creative biography of the word artists.

Writers and actors are representatives of the creative profession, and therefore have much in common. It is no accident that the writer is sometimes called the "actor of one theater", and the actor is called the "interpreter and commentator" of the writer. What unites them is that they are the creators of cultural values in the field of art, "collecting characters and facts" (A. Piotrovskii), and have the gift of reincarnation (let's recall F. Dostoevskii

---

<sup>30</sup> Yu.M. Lotman, *The nature of cinema*, Iskusstvo, St. Petersburg, 2005.



and O. de Balzac, who “lost” replicas in their creative laboratory for their characters). Both the actor and the writer cannot fully express their creative potential without feedback from the reader and viewer. Acting abilities were possessed by many writers and poets who seriously mastered this profession. The Russian poet V. Mayakovskii and the Kazakh prose writer S. Sanbaev tried their hand in the acting field. Poets I. Dzhangisugurov and Dzhangisbul Dzhabaev starred in episodic roles. The first Kazakh writer to “cut a window” into the mysterious world of cinema was I. Dzhangisugurov.<sup>31</sup> The “involuntarily” actor was D. Dzhabaev, who fell into the lens of the movie camera of “the first-born of Kazakh cinema” – “Amangeldy”. In one of the mass scenes of the film with sarbases, an old man with a dombra sits and carefully watches the riders, and the audience does not realize that there is a real akyn Dzhangisbul on the screen. His presence on the screen is nothing but a cameo – an episodic role of a celebrity who plays himself in a movie. The most textured Kazakh writer is S. Sanbaev, who got roles of a large-scale and historical character in the cinema – Khan Abylai, commissioner Alibi Dzhangildin, Sultan Tezektor and scientist Kurmanov. Of course, D. Nakipov is right, who concluded that “only a writer is given the opportunity to simultaneously carry the signs of the past and present”.<sup>32</sup> And this writing, creating “simultaneity”, is most likely to be realized most of all in acting. Acting in the movie stimulated the writing of S. Sanbaev: for the filming period of the film “A Road in a Thousand Miles,” he wrote the first novels. The author has repeatedly admitted that he owes N. Zhanturin the creation of the image of Myrzagali from the story “White Aruana”.

In the history of literature, there are frequent cases when a writer has mastered the profession of a filmmaker. The realization that without a director there is no screenwriter, writer, author, without him there is no work of art, often led the writer, without breaking with literature, to go completely into directing. So it was with V. Shukshin, L. Filatov, S. Narymbetov, T. Temenov, who considered their author's cinema as a direct and organic continuation of their prose. Having acquired the director's profession, they got the opportunity to become auto-interpreters (“self-screener”) of their own compositions. At first, they translated their own prose into the language of cinema, and then they performed the opposite process – the script was “grown up” to the format of a movie story. The phenomenon of their work should be called “boomerang”, when prose creatively responded to the author’s cinema and returned to the reader in a formatted movie script, thereby contributing to the thickening and densification of the artistic world of writers-directors.

---

<sup>31</sup> I. Dzhangisugurov, *Documents, letters, diaries (1920-1964)*, Ush Kiyan, Almaty, 2006.

<sup>32</sup> D. Nakipov, *White Aruana*, Russkaya kniga, Moscow, 2003.

***Cinematographic Activity of Writers in the Prism of Scientific Comparative Studies***

Screenscripts of writers are the least known part of their creative heritage, as a rule, “falling out” from the field of view of literary critics. The attitude to this kind of creativity is almost always arrogant and neglectful, as to insignificant, “passing” things, which occupy the lowest level in the hierarchy of artistic creativity of writers. Studying the cinematographic activity of writers in the context of comparative literary criticism will fill this gap and form a more holistic view of writer's cinema.

Cinema art began with the involvement of professional writers. Many writers came from literature to cinema as already established artists, with their aesthetics and creative manner, with their themes and characters. Initially, movie scripts were created on the basis of already written literary works. This was the period when the culture of “piece professionalism of a cinematographic writer” reigned.<sup>33</sup> Playwrights were the first to enter the ranks of scriptwriters, since the technique of “cinema literature” was initially considered close to the art of drama. Then prose writers began to come to film drama – a phenomenon that promotes the uptake of cinema elements by prose elements close to it. Today it is difficult to name in contemporary literature even one major prose writer who would not be a screenwriter or film his own works. It is worth noting that poets were least often seen on the scenario path.

As a work intended for translation into the text of another semiotic system, the script can be defined as the pretext of cinema (the text preceding the creation of the movie). Considering the tendency of recent years, when many scenarios come out after a movie showing in the form of books, the movie script can be interpreted as a post-text – a literary work created on the basis of an existing or expected film, if we talk about “novelization of films” or “film books”, as it is customary to call now. They are published as an advertising product, which should be released or have already been shown. It can also be a film screening, intended for reading and having independent value. Thus, the screenplay can be called an intermediary text between literature and cinema, acting as the pretext or post-text of the feature film. For writers, scriptwriting has become an experimental field of their activity, which had a significant impact on the formation of their prose, having enriched their language.

---

<sup>33</sup>I.A. Martyanova, *The cinema of the Russian text: the paradox of literary cinematography*, SAGA, St. Petersburg, 2002.

***Cinematography of Literature in the Light  
of Scientific Comparative Studies***

In modern literary criticism, a special concept of cinematography of literature (CL) has formed, which can be interpreted in the status of a terminological definition and defined as an artistic text that includes elements of cinema art. The writer, endowed with a "hint of cinema thinking",<sup>34</sup> works according to the principle of the camera as "an image of the visual order" with an emphasized visual character. Literature can be "cinematic" to various degrees. It can be primordial, with the "genetic memory" of the cinema initially inherent in literature or borrowed. The concept of borrowed cinematography is associated with the names of writers who transferred the practical experience of cinema to the soil of literature.

In the literature, experimental borrowings of terminology were carried out from the field of cinema. The approach of cross-cutting has taken a strong place in a number of literary terms and concepts. The exclusive right to cross-cutting before the cinema appeared belonged to literature, as B. Eichenbaum wrote in his article: "literature was the only art capable of developing complex plot constructions, developing plot parallels, freely changing the scene, highlighting details etc".<sup>35</sup> The cross-cutting turned out to be the cinema approach that managed to fit most organically into the poetics of verbal creativity. Having "migrated" to the field of verbal art, it acquired the status of a literary term and began to be understood as "a way of constructing a literary work in which the discreteness (discontinuity) of the image and its "division" into fragments prevail."<sup>36</sup>

### **Conclusions**

From the very beginning of its appearing, cinematography has attempted to film the best classical works. The development of the literature of our days is inseparable from the development of cinema art. One could say otherwise: the literary process is becoming more complicated, is being enriched thanks to the screen. And the main thing is that literature provides images in a form that makes them be comprehended, and in many ways visualized by the reader on their own. Cinema also provides a finished image – this is its essence. Music, organically included in the artistic fabric of the film, creates an emotional background, and sometimes determines the rhythm of the narrative. A lot in common are found in cinema with painting, graphics, and other plastic arts. However, the strongest and most diverse are its links with fiction. Scripts of

---

<sup>34</sup> B. Eichenbaum, *Literature and cinema*, Iskusstvo, St. Petersburg, 1973.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>36</sup> V. Halizev, *Theory of literature*, Vysshaya shkola, Moscow, 2000.

writers are the least known part of their creative heritage, as a rule, “falling out” from the field of view of literary critics. The attitude to this kind of creativity is almost always arrogant and neglectful, as to insignificant, “passing” things, which occupy the lowest level in the hierarchy of artistic creativity of writers. Studying the cinematographic activity of writers in the context of comparative literary criticism allows us to fill this gap and form a more holistic view of writer's cinema.

Cinema art began with the involvement of professional writers. Many writers came from literature to cinema as already formed artists, with their aesthetics and creative manner, with their themes and characters. Initially, movie scripts were created on the basis of already written literary works. This was the period when the culture of "piece professionalism of the cinema writer" reigned. Then prose writers began to come to film drama – a phenomenon that promotes the uptake of cinema elements by prose elements close to it. Today it is difficult to name in contemporary literature even one major prose writer who would not be a screenwriter or film his own works. As I. Manevich wrote, “not every writer can be a film playwright, but a film playwright must be a writer”.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, such a “writer who perfectly understands what cinema is”.<sup>38</sup> Screen adaptation as secondary formations of the text is associated with the reception of the writer's work and the translatability/ non-translatability of their works in the field of other aesthetics. The way of penetrating in the screen equivalent of a literary work is carried out by observing through the system of registers of correspondence/non-correspondence of the film version with the literary principle, changing the external/ internal transcoding of the literary text, transforming the genre, character images, composition (internal restructuring of the art text).

---

<sup>37</sup> I. Manevich, *Cinema and literature*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1968.

<sup>38</sup> A. Tarkovsky, “Lectures on filmmaking”, 1990. Available at <http://tarkovskiy.su/texty/uroki/uroki1.html>