

UNIVERSIDADE DO VALE DO RIO DOS SINOS - UNISINOS
UNIDADE ACADÊMICA DE GRADUAÇÃO
CURSO DE LETRAS - INGLÊS

RAQUEL CASCO ARAUJO

THE LORD OF THE RINGS – THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING:
A Comparative Analysis of the Book and the Screenplay

São Leopoldo

2021

RAQUEL CASCO ARAUJO

THE LORD OF THE RINGS – THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING:
A Comparative Analysis of the Book and the Screenplay

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso apresentado como requisito parcial para obtenção do título de Licenciado em Letras – Habilitação Inglês, pelo Curso de Letras da Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos – UNISINOS.

Orientadora: Profa. Dra. Andrea Ferras Wolwacz

São Leopoldo

2021

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my mother and my father who were proud of me when I decided to change courses and become a teacher – in 2017 – and who I hope can continue proud of me 4 years later. Mom and Dad, thank you for all the support and assistance you have provided me throughout my university time. You are the best people in my life.

To my most beloved friend Andrieli who believes and trusts me with all her heart. You are the one that was there when I was happy or sad, laughing or crying, in a bad mood or in a good mood. You are the one who is always there. Thank you for being my *duplinha*. Always and forever.

To my sweetest friend Milena who spends more than two hours on the phone hearing me talking nonsense just because I need it. Thank you for helping me go through university with *chimarrão* and your joy. You are the best friend I could have asked for.

To my amazing friends Bruno and Amanda who made me laugh every Friday night during our literature classes and made my journey at Unisinos more fun and incredible.

To my poet friend Roger for listening to me and making me calmer. We have known each other since we both entered Unisinos together, and I will never forget your orange juice every day we met.

To the most incredible adviser Andrea who was the one who kindly accepted my ideas for this final thesis and guided me along the way.

To the kindest person, Alice, who provided me assistance with *Normas ABNT* and was extremely patient.

To all the people who are not in my journey anymore. Thank you for making me stronger.

A special thank you to Professor Ana Cristina Ostermann who helped and advised me when I decided to enter the world of research and changed me into what I am today and to Professor Christine Siqueira Nicolaidis who is now supervising my research and who is advising me to take a master's degree.

“In a hole in the ground there lived a hobbit. Not a nasty, dirty, wet hole, filled with the ends of worms and an oozy smell, nor yet a dry, bare, sandy hole with nothing in it to sit down on or to eat: it was a hobbit-hole, and that means comfort” (TOLKIEN, 1937, p. 1).

ABSTRACT

This final thesis seeks to undertake a literary comparative analysis of the book *The Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring* (2004) by J. R. R. Tolkien and the screenplay of the movie *The Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring* (c2001) whose screenwriters are Fran Walsh, Philippa Boyens, and Peter Jackson. Most studies on adaptation and literature are about the book and the movie; however, it is important to highlight that the script is the one being analyzed and compared in this thesis, even though the movie is mentioned and used to complement the analysis and the final remarks. This work is organized in four chapters. The first chapter is the introduction, which states the objectives of this project and its importance. The second chapter – the theoretical background – is divided into two subchapters. The first subchapter focusses on the theories of adaptation and presents several lenses of adaptation which include Hutcheon (2006), Stam (2000a), Balázs (1953), Bazin (1967), Andrew (1984), Bluestone (1961), Kraucauer (1960), Mitry (1971), and Leitch (2007). The second one gives an overview of the script and explains how it was turned into a screenplay. The third chapter is dedicated to the comparative analysis of the book and the screenplay through its similarities and differences – more specifically, the similarities and the differences regarding narrator, language, characters and characterization, plot, and poetic insertions. The fourth chapter presents the final remarks arising from thesis which aligns with the theories of Hutcheon (2006), Stam (2000a), Balázs (1953), Bluestone (1961) and Mitry (1971) which portrays an adaptation as a new entity containing a kernel of truth (concerning the main source). Furthermore, I encourage new studies in the literary and cinematic areas.

Key-words: *The Lord of the Rings*. Literature. Adaptation. Screenplay. Comparison.

RESUMO

Este trabalho de conclusão busca realizar uma análise comparativa literária do livro *O Senhor dos Anéis: A Sociedade do Anel* (2004), em sua versão nativa, por J.R.R. Tolkien e o roteiro do filme *O Senhor dos Anéis: A Sociedade do Anel* (c2001) cujo roteiros são Fran Walsh, Philippa Boyens, and Peter Jackson. A maioria dos estudos sobre adaptação e literatura são sobre o livro e o filme; entretanto, é importante destacar que, neste trabalho, é o roteiro que está sendo analisado e comparado apesar de que o filme é mencionado e usado para complementar a análise e a conclusão do mesmo. O trabalho é organizado em quatro capítulos. O primeiro capítulo apresenta os objetivos do projeto e sua importância. O segundo capítulo – a fundamentação teórica – é dividido em dois subcapítulos. O primeiro subcapítulo foca nas teorias de adaptação e apresenta os diversos pontos de vista de adaptação na qual incluem os autores Hutcheon (2006), Stam (2000a), Balázs (1953), Bazin (1967), Andrew (1984), Bluestone (1961), Kraucauer (1960), Mitry (1971), e Leitch (2007). O segundo provê uma visão geral do roteiro e explica como o mesmo tornou-se um roteiro a partir do livro. O terceiro capítulo é dedicado a análise comparativa do livro e do roteiro por meio das suas diferenças e similaridades – especificamente, as similaridades e diferenças com relação ao narrador, a linguagem, às personagens e suas caracterizações, o enredo e as inserções poéticas. O quarto capítulo apresenta a conclusão decorrente deste trabalho de conclusão que alinha-se com as teorias de Hutcheon (2006), Stam (2000a), Balázs (1953), Bluestone (1961) e Mitry (1971) descreve a adaptação como uma nova entidade contendo uma essência de verdade (com relação à fonte principal). Além do mais, eu encorajo novos estudos nas áreas literárias e cinemáticas.

Palavras-chave: O Senhor dos Anéis. Literatura. Adaptação. Roteiro. Comparação.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	7
2 ADAPTATION THEORIES	9
2.1 Adaptation of Literary Sources into Films.....	9
2.2 The Script	15
2.3 From the Book to the Script	17
3 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	20
3.1 Characters and Characterization	20
3.1.1 The Hobbits	20
3.1.2 Dwarves	24
3.1.3 Elves	24
3.1.4 Men.....	26
3.1.5 Gandalf	28
3.1.6 Gollum/Sméagol.....	28
3.1.7 The One Ring	29
3.2 The story and its nuances.....	31
3.2.1 Narrator, poetry (and songs) and languages	31
3.2.2 Plot.....	35
4 FINAL REMARKS	44
REFERENCES	47
ANNEX A – THE HERO'S JOURNEY - MYTHIC STRUCTURE OF JOSEPH CAMPBELL'S MONOMYTH.....	52
ANNEX B – THE HERO'S JOURNEY MODEL	53

1 INTRODUCTION

Innumerable books and literary works have been adapted into the cinematic industry, and what is mainly questioned by the literary critic audience is how much of the movie/screenplay is concerned with the main source and its fidelity. This was the main topic of a conversation between the adviser of this thesis and I which led to the formal idea of writing about adaptation concerning a book and a script.

According to Hutcheon (2006, p. XII), “[...] an adaptation is likely to be greeted as minor and subsidiary and certainly never as good as the ‘original’”. This means that even though an adaptation ought not to be faithful to its source text, it is still judged by literary critics as poor because of its lack of fidelity to its original story. Nevertheless, an adaptation is a new form of interpretation and “[...] [it] is a bit like redecorating” (UHRÝ cited in HUTCHEON, 2006, p. VI).

The person who is writing the adaptation, usually a screenwriter, uses his/her style in the work being created causing disruptions in the way people see the work being adapted. Boyens, one of the screenwriters of the screenplay that is being analyzed in this final thesis, says: “We all love these books [...] and this world. This is our interpretation, our vision, our attempt to bring it to life” (BERANEK, 2013, p. 17). With this in mind, the idea of a faithful screenplay adaptation of a book is what drives this comparative final thesis.

This monograph aims to undertake a comparative analysis between the book *The Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring* (2004) by J. R. R. Tolkien and the screenplay of the movie *The Fellowship of the Ring* (c2001) whose screenwriters are Fran Walsh, Philippa Boyens, and Peter Jackson. It is important to mention that the screenplay is not the final version because the version was not available online nor did we have access to the printed final version. Nonetheless, the screenplay represents the screenwriters’ point of view and differs from the director’s perception about the final version of the movie. Furthermore, it is important to highlight that the script is the one being analyzed and compared in this thesis, even though the movie is mentioned and used to complement the analysis and the final remarks.

Concerning the research problem, this work investigates the similarities and/or the differences, of the book and the screenplay, regarding narrator, language, characters and characterization, plot, and poetic insertions in *The Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring*. Excerpts will be used to improve the methodology – that is, a literary analysis of both

mediums – although this work will not use the excerpts to judge its fidelity. The excerpts are a support to demonstrate its similarities and differences.

The final thesis that follows is organized in three chapters, besides the introduction. The second chapter is divided into two subchapters. The first subchapter focusses on the theories of adaptation and presents several lenses of adaptation which include Hutcheon (2006), Stam (2000a), Balázs (1953), and Bluestone (1961). The second one gives an overview of the script and explains how it was turned into a screenplay. The third chapter is dedicated to the comparative analysis of the book and the screenplay through its similarities and differences. The fourth chapter presents the final remarks arising from the thesis and encourages new studies in the literary and cinematic areas.

2 ADAPTATION THEORIES

This chapter deals with theories of adaptations. It is divided into three subchapters. In the first section, different views concerning film adaptation of literature is discussed. In the second section, the importance of the script is explained. In the third section, the progression of book *Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring* into the script is deliberated.¹

2.1 Adaptation of Literary Sources into Films

Adaptations of literary works into films have been discussed by a number of scholars. Acevedo - Muñoz (2008, p. 136) asserts that “[...] films based on novels often have the disadvantage of being compared to their original sources and judged based on their fidelity to the content, structure, mood, or spirit of the story”. This section deals with diverse theories of adaptations – some which corroborate with this statement, and others which take a different point of view. Therefore, adaptations of literary works will be analyzed through the lenses of authors such as Hutcheon (2006), Balázs (1953), Stam (2000a), and others. These lenses include adaptation as a new entity; adaptation as faithful as it can remain to its main source; adaptation as uncinematic or cinematic; adaptation as a process; and adaptation as inferior compared to literature.

It is not possible to deny that literature and cinema are intrinsically interwoven, even though the critical audience may disagree. An adaptation does not have to be faithful to its source text, but it is still judged by literary critics because of its lack of fidelity to the original story. Hutcheon (2006, p. XII) affirms that “[...] an adaptation is likely to be greeted as minor and subsidiary and certainly never as good as the ‘original’” – confirming the point of view (theory) of those critics (or literary critics). However, Dudley Andrew (1984, p. 97) explicitly describes that “[...] the making of film out of an earlier text is virtually as old as the machinery of cinema itself”, creating a certain gap between both theories. The Chicago School of Media Theory (2016) corroborates the gap when theorizing that as long as adaptation have been done, there has been tension between literature and film. To complement, Bennett and Royle (2004, p. 142) state:

We are all familiar (if not bored to tears) with talk of ‘the film of the book’ and even ‘the book of the film’, with discussion of how the film-version is or is not faithful to

¹ It is important to mention that even though this thesis is examining the script in its second and third sections, the script is dependent of film adaptation and vice versa.

the ‘original’ book-version, of whether the film is as good as the book or vice versa. We want to get away from such talk: to put it simply, the film of the book is a film, it’s not a book.

Hutcheon (2006, p. XIII) underscores that “[...] in practice, it has tended to privilege or at least give priority (and therefore, implicitly, value) to what is always called the ‘source’ text or the ‘original’”, but, despite this claim, she decides to explore adaptation as an adaptation – “[...] deliberate, announced, and extended revisitations of prior works” (HUTCHEON, 2006). To validate her statements, Hutcheon cites Walter Benjamin (BENJAMIN, 1992, p. 90 apud HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 2), and two literary critics - T. S. Eliot, and Northrop Frye (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 2). “Walter Benjamin insights that ‘storytelling is always the art of repeating stories’ (1992: 90)”. “The critical pronouncements of T.S. Eliot or Northrop Frye were certainly not needed to convince avid adapters across the centuries of what, for them, has always been a truism: art is derived from other art; stories are born of other stories”.

Furthermore, Hutcheon contributes to the study of theories of adaptation by defining adaptation according to three different but intertwined perspectives: the first perspective is to see adaptation as a formal entity or product. In this case, the adaptation is a transposition of a specific work.

This ‘transcoding’ can involve a shift of medium (a poem to a film) or genre an epic to a novel), or a change of frame and therefore context: telling the same story from a different point of view, for instance, can create a manifestly different interpretation (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 7-8).

The second one is adaptation as a process of creation, which means that the adaptation involves re-interpreting and re-creating the product – also called appropriation and/or salvaging. In the third perspective, adaptation is seen as a process of reception in which an adaptation is a form of intertextuality – “[...] we experience adaptations (as adaptations) as palimpsests² through our memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation” (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 8). In short, an adaptation “[...] is a derivation that is not derivative—a work that is second without being secondary. It is its own palimpsestic thing” (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 9).

Alternatively, Balázs argues that film script – in this case, the adaptation – is an entirely new literary form or an entirely new entity. He (1953, p. 246-247) says that a new

² Palimpsests are, according to Cambridge Dictionary, “[...] very old text or document in which writing has been removed and covered or replaced by new writing”. In other words, palimpsests are scrolls whose text was eliminated to enable its reuse.

script “[...] is just as much specific, independent literary form as the written stage play-there is nothing to prevent them from being literary masterpieces- the film script is an entirely new form”.

As reported by him, the novel is to be considered a raw material to be transformed by the will of the screenwriter.

[...] a film script writer adapting the play may use the existing work if art merely as raw material, regard it from the specific angle of his own art form as it were raw reality, and pay no attention to the form once already given to the material (BALÁZS, 1953, p. 263).

Balázs also emphasizes that an adaptation is an independent work, meaning that an adaptation has its own characteristics, so it can be considered original; nonetheless, he highlights, and so does Robert Stam (2000a), that an adaptation still bears a grain of truth even if it is a new work.

Nevertheless, Bazin (1967) declares that cinema is young, and literature, theater, and music are just as old as history. He remarks that film-makers adapt first-rate novels by which they feel justified in treating simply as very detailed film synopses (BAZIN, 1967). Bazin also insists that literature must have its recognition towards the adaptation and not the other way around. His theory intersects Robert Stam’s (2000a *apud* HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 4) argument that “literature will always have axiomatic superiority over any adaptation of it because of its seniority as an art form”. Bazin supports the idea that the main source is crucial for the adaptation. According to him, film adaptation enhances the nuances of the original source, but he separates adaptations of quality literary texts from popular literary texts:

The more important and decisive the literary qualities of the work, the more the adaptation disturbs its equilibrium, the more it needs a creative talent to reconstruct it on a new equilibrium not indeed identical with, but the equivalent of, the old one (BAZIN, 1967, p. 56).

Stam, whose theories meet Bazin, Andrew, and partially, Balázs, says that:

When we say an adaptation has been ‘unfaithful’ to the original, the term gives expression to the disappointment we feel when a film adaptation fails to capture what we see as the fundamental narrative, thematic and aesthetic features of its literary source (STAM, 2000a, p. 54).

Because of this axiomatic superiority of literature, Stam proposes that there are some factors that privilege literature over film: seniority, “[...] the assumption that older arts are necessarily better arts” (STAM, 2000a, p. 58); iconophobia, “[...] the culturally rooted

prejudice [...] that visual arts are necessarily inferior to the verbal arts” (STAM, 2000a, p. 58); and logophilia, “[...] a belief in the primacy of the written word, and anti-corporeality (distaste for the ways in which the medium of cinema engages with the body of the spectator)” (ADAPTATION, 2016).

Concerning fidelity, specifically, Stam explores the connection between film and literature by analyzing diverse types of fidelity in adaptation of which only three out of five will be discussed. The first one is *The Chimera of Fidelity* in which he questions whether fidelity is even possible to adapt (even though it is not possible to adapt fidelity) or if an adaptation is automatically different and original due to medium change. On the one hand, Stam (2000a, p. 57) acknowledges that “[...] a novel ‘contains’ an extractable ‘essence’”; on the other hand, there is not a “transferable core” (STAM, 2000a, p. 57). The second type of fidelity is about the medium-specificity, in which the adaptation should be faithful to the essence of expression and should not be necessarily much faithful to the literary source. This approach affirms that every medium is good at certain things and bad at others (STAM, 2000a). Fidelity in adaptation can also be seen as a translation and/or a transformation which is, nevertheless, a process of transposition with gains and losses typical of any translation (STAM, 2000a).

Along with Bazin and Stam, Dudley Andrew (1984, p. 96) explicates that “Adaptations claiming fidelity bear the original as a signified, whereas those inspired by or derived from an earlier text stand in a relation of referring to the original”.

Since, for Andrew, adaptation is a foreground process – the original source is the goal – he highlights three modes of adaptation between the film and the text: borrowing, intersection, and fidelity of transformation. Borrowing happens when “[...] the artist employs, more or less extensively, the material, idea, or form of an earlier, generally successful text” (ANDREW, 1984, p. 98). In other words, it is when the writer *literally borrows* most of the source text, and the main concern of this mode is the ‘generality of the original’. Intersecting, the opposite of borrowing, occurs when “[...] the uniqueness of the original text is preserved to such an extent that it is intentionally left unassimilated in adaptation” (ANDREW, 1984, p. 98). Fidelity of transformation has its focus on film versus literature and vice-versa. The main task of adaptation, in such mode, is to reproduce in the cinema something about the original text in a way that “The skeleton of the original can, more or less thoroughly, become the skeleton of a film” (ANDREW, 1984, p. 100).

George Bluestone (1961) states, by opposing to the translation theory of adaptation proposed by Robert Stam, that an adapter is a true author and not a translator of another’s

work, thus meeting Balázs and Hutcheon's theories. Moreover, these three authors agree that a film adaptation will inevitably become a whole new entity or an entirely new literary form (BALÁZS, 1953; BLUESTONE, 1961; HUTCHEON, 2006). Bluestone (1961, p. 5-6) affirms that "[...] changes are inevitable the moment one abandons the linguistic for the visual medium" and "[...] whatever the cultural status of the source, cinema can find its own methods for creating quality and significance" (BLUESTONE, 1961 *apud* BOOZER, 2008, p. 12).

An adaptation can be considered cinematic or uncinematic according to its faithfulness to its main source. This theory was proposed by Siegfried Kraucauer who asserts that an adaptation is at the disposal of its literary text as long as the adaptation can remain visually faithful to the source. If an adaptation does not remain faithful, it is because the novel chosen to be adapted was uncinematic – it was not adaptable. Kraucauer and Bluestone agree that specific novels were not made to become adaptations and that the failure of an adaptation happens because these specific novels are cinematic or uncinematic.

[...] novels which keep within the confines encompassed by film can naturally be expected to favor cinematic adaptations. In case of such novels the similarities between the literary and the cinematic medium tend to prevail over the differences between the respective universes (KRAUCAUER, 1960, p. 240).

Differing from Balázs, Mitry says one cannot consider a literary text as a *raw reality* because it can no longer be a raw reality, "[...] but a reality which has been mediated upon and interpreted" (MITRY, 1971, p. 6). He too diverges from Stam's theory of translation by postulating that adaptation is not a matter of passing from one language to another, but a matter of passing from one form to another – "[...] a matter of transposition of reconstruction" (MITRY, 1971, p. 1) – because it is not possible to signify adaptations with images and literature with words and vice versa.

In his theory of adaptation, Mitry also proposes two topics to be discussed: the adapter's dilemma and, similarly to Kraucauer, if it is possible to transfer a literary form into a cinematic one. The adapter's dilemma is that the adapter must be faithful to the letter or the spirit. Being faithful to the letter means the adapter needs to follow a step-by-step procedure that matches its novelist – the adapter is going to be *translating* word by word and page by page so that the circumstance area is the same. Being faithful to the spirit is to express "[...] similar ideas and analogous sentiments, but to arrive at them by slant routes" (MITRY, 1971, p. 4). In other words, the adapter is keeping the *essence* of the main source, but he or she is conscious that it is not the same piece of work; it is an entirely new material.

Kraucauer divided adaptation of a literary text into cinematic and uncinematic. As seen previously, an adaptation is considered one or the other if the original source is adaptable or not – cinematic or uncinematic. Mitry (1971, p. 1) suggests that “[...] the problem is to know if the significations inherent in literary forms are transferable to the cinema” by recreating them in visual forms and/or if the cinema can be more than a visual externalization of its source; “Yet it is clear that to transpose a work from one mode of expression to another, to ‘adapt’ it, is to assume the equivalence of what is signified despite the difference of the significations” (MITRY, 1971, p. 4). Nevertheless, according to Leitch, there are two ways in which the studies of adaptation privilege literature over film:

By organizing themselves around canonical authors, they establish a presumptive criterion for each new adaptation. And by arranging adaptations as spokes around the hub of such a strong authorial figure, they establish literature as a proximate cause of adaptation that makes fidelity to the source text central to the field (LEITCH, 2007, p. 3).

Nevertheless, he (2007, p. 127) acknowledges that “[...] every case of attempted fidelity is exceptional not only because faithful adaptations are in the minority but because they are so likely to be different from one another”.

As it is possible to read through the lenses of these theorists, adaptation can be studied from different perspectives, but what is mainly predominant is that adaptation is an original material, a new entity, a new work of art. It is not necessarily tied to its source text – meaning that even with the idea of fidelity, the original source, literature as a superior art form, judgment of literary critics over the inferiority of adaptations, and the negligence of screenplay on film studies, a movie adaptation can be considered an original material, even if it contains a grain of truth related to the main source. Therefore, this is the issue this final thesis will explore.

To contribute to this conclusion, Bennett and Royle (2004, p. 145) argue that

One of the most important differences between literary narrative and film narrative is that, with the former, the reader is almost always presented with a knowledge of what is going on in the thoughts and feelings of a specific narrator or character. With literary narrative you get ‘inside information’ as to what is going on in the mind and body of a character. This is particularly the case when the story is told by a so-called omniscient or (perhaps more accurately) telepathic narrator. More generally, however, a fictional exposure of ‘secret’ interiority is at the very heart of literature and there is something eerie about this – about the idea of being able to read the mind of the author, a narrator or character. This interiority is fundamentally alien to film: the ‘eye of the camera’ is doomed to the visible. The only way that film can provide ‘inside information’ is through strategies or techniques from literature (the ‘telling’ voice-over, in particular).

In the next section, adaptations of literary sources into film script are discussed by scholars who argue that the script is not just a translation of the book, but it is a new form created by another – in this case, an original source. To support such claim, the history and the characteristics of the screenplay are exposed by using the theories of Mitry (1961) and Boozer (2008).

2.2 The Script

This section deals with the script of film adaptation focusing on the theory that the screenplay is a transposition of one medium into another. Based on Mitry (1971) and Boozer's (2008) theories, this section first comments on the negligence of the scripts and then explains the relevance of the script to adaptation studies, its main characteristics and format as well as and its relationship to the adaptation and the main source.

Mitry acknowledges that adaptation is not a matter of passing from one language to another, but a matter of passing from one form to another – “[...] a matter of transposition of reconstruction” (MITRY, 1971, p. 1). In Boozer's words (2008, p. 1), “Literature-to-film adaptation involves the textual transposition of a single-track medium of published writing into a document that embraces the scenic structure and dramatic codes of the multitrack medium of film”.

According to Boozer (2008), the script has mostly remained invisible to a movie-going public, being no more visible than on a ceremony like the Oscar or Globe Awards. “[...] although the script per se has received little extended treatment as the key step in the process of adaptation” (BOOZER, 2008, p. 3), it is the composition of the script that will illuminate “[...] the evolution of ideas that will determine the film production's relationship to its source text” (BOOZER, 2008). However, its studies are still neglected (ELLIOTT *apud* BOOZER, 2008, p. 3).

Historically, the adapted screenplay has been viewed only as an interim step in the binary focus on the source literature (usually the novel) and on the film. The script has been deemed merely a skeletal blueprint for the adapted film and thus unworthy of serious consideration in its own right. There are several reasons for this binary critical emphasis, beginning with the essential point that a work of fiction or drama typically has a single author and a readily consumable existence in published form, just as an adapted film can be recognized as a finished entity on screen. The adapted screenplay, however, has had no comparable existence as a finished artifact for public consumption (with the exception of published transcripts). Interest in the adapted screenplay mainly follows from an initial critical or public interest in the adapted film. But whereas the audience of an adapted film might rush to purchase copies of the source text (underscoring an adapted film's direct value to publishers),

a much smaller readership will seek the film transcript, and only a tiny group will seek a late screenplay draft or shooting script, assuming such is even available. Other reasons for disregarding the screenplay in adaptation study include the multiple revisions a script undergoes during development (at times by different hands) (BOOZER, 2008, p. 2).

Even with its downside, the script is of immense importance because it is the basis for the film to be produced and directed. “An adapted film begins as a screenplay transformation of a source, and eventually becomes a film derivation from that screenplay” (BOOZER, 2008, p. 21).

A screenplay contains unique characteristics. Firstly, it can be considered an original or an adapted document/material. As an original material, the script was written with the purpose of making a new movie that has not been *seen, heard, or read* before. As an adapted document, the screenplay is the one that was written using a source text as its main essence, but it is not necessarily a faithful copy of the source. It can be a whole new entity or an entirely new literary form (BALÁZS, 1953; BLUESTONE, 1961; HUTCHEON, 2006).

Secondly, the basic format of the screenplay “[...] conveys [its] practical specificity. [Its] goal is to portray drama through concrete descriptive passages and character dialogue within individual scenes, which are designated as either interior or exterior locations” (BOOZER, 2008, p. 5). Besides, there is more than one version of the script.

There are two entirely different versions of any screenplay. There is stuff that is written before the film is a go project, and there is what’s written once the movie is actually going to be shot. And sometimes they have very little to do with each other. The purpose of the earlier version is to make it happen. The purpose of the latter version or versions is to be as supportive to your director as you can (GOLDMAN *apud* BOOZER, 2008, p. 6).

Finally, the last characteristics of the screenplay are:

[...] scripts are usually written to fit within exhibitors’ preferred two-hour maximum running time (120 script pages), as well as to appeal to mass audiences, efficiency and clarity in story and characterization have been standard practice. The adapted screenplay usually pares down dialogue and avoids metaphorical style in description. All of this is intended to set a mood and tone, as well as tell a story in the eventual service of an audiovisual design. The expressive language of fiction in paragraph and chapter form describes circumstances, attitudes, and feelings that readers are left to invoke (“imagine”) directly for themselves, while the screenplay is structured to work in the service of a narrative that is read in the moving scenic terms of imaging for the camera (BOOZER, 2008, p. 5).

Thus, the format of the script can appear to be intrusive to a reader and its written style can be less intimidating and richer than fiction (BOOZER, 2008).

It points to the potential specificity and power of fully realized, framed, and mobile iconic imagery ready for editing. The page layout and story elements of the adapted script demonstrate its media-transformational function for the performance of film narrative (BOOZER, 2008, p. 5).

It is the screenplay, not the source, that guides all the film adaptation, and its role is more important than it is thought by film and literary critics. It is the script that influences “[...] the screen choices for story structure, characterization, motifs, themes, and genre.” (BOOZER, 2008, p. 4). “It indicates what will or will not be used from the source” (BOOZER, 2008, p. 4). It is the script that commands the relationship between film and literature and the creation of the new entity.

The next section is about the progression of the book *The Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring* into the film adaptation script written by Peter Jackson, Fran Walsh and Philippa Boyens.

2.3 From the Book to the Script³

During a test at the university, J. R. R. Tolkien turned the test over and, on that blank page, he (1937, p. 1) wrote: “In a hole on the ground, there lived a hobbit”. This was the start of a *fever* that would sell around a hundred million copies worldwide (CLEAR, [2020?]). Seventeen years later, *The Lord of the Rings* was written and sold one hundred fifty million books (CLEAR, [2020?]). The first movie, *Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring*, has a box office of around nine hundred million US dollars (SENHOR..., [2002?]). This section tells the story of how Peter Jackson and his wife Fran Walsh started their journey into the world of adaptation of *The Lord of the Rings*, and how the book was turned into a screenplay.

Peter Jackson read *The Lord of the Rings* for the first time when he was seventeen years old and was fascinated by it. In 2001, he decided to adapt *The Lord of the Rings*, alongside with his wife Fran Walsh (LORD..., 2019). Jackson knew that it would not be an easy job to adapt this novel because of the fans, the expectation, and the faithfulness to the story, and, as he himself declares, “There's so much detail, you can't recreate the world of *The Lord of the Rings* with everything in the books” (LORD..., 2019). He emphasized that Tolkien had created new languages, a whole new world, and that it would be hard to adapt, but that it would still be Tolkien's words in the movie.

³ *From book to script* is the name of the documentary on the extended version of the film *The Lord of the Rings* that I did not have access to.

Jackson was aware that he would be confronted with a large fan base and high audience expectations. This meant that he had to remain faithful to the original text but at the same time he had to take the demands of non-readers into account (BERANEK, 2013, p. 16).

The journey starts when a company called Miramax wanted to make one movie out of the three books⁴. Jackson and Fran wanted to make two movies, but since the company wanted just one, they turned the three books into a 90-page script. Nonetheless, something unexpected happened. New Line Cinema, a movie company, invited Jackson and Walsh to make three movies. With such proposal, Walsh and Jackson accepted and invited a friend Philippa Boyens to be the third scriptwriter.

The trio had to rewrite and elaborate everything in three scripts. The scripts were in constant update because Jackson, both director and screenwriter, wanted them to be as faithful as they could be.

Executive producer Mark Ordesky has recalled that “virtually everyone in a significant position on the movie knew the books inside out—had been obsessed with them for years.” This obsession translated into a passionate desire to recreate Tolkien’s world as fully and faithfully as possible (FROM BOOK TO SCRIPT, 2002 *apud* LEITCH, 2007, p. 128-129).

Jackson made everybody on the set to have a copy of the book to help provide information that they thought it was important to have in the movie. Orlando Bloom declared that “[...] we were incredibly lucky to have [Tolkien’s book] as source material, as reference material, that kind of bible to keep turning back to” (FROM BOOK TO SCRIPT, 2002 *apud* LEITCH, 2007, p. 133). Christopher Lee tells that even though they were training to remain faithful, there were a lot of things in the film but not in the book, because people just had to see it.

[...] Both Selznick and Jackson repeatedly compromise their attempts at fidelity by their search for something more: more detail, more intensity, more expressiveness, more symbolic resonance, the larger scale appropriate to an epic canvas that, in the end, takes precedence even over their beloved source texts (LEITCH, 2007, p. 143).

Jackson, Walsh and Boyens created a whole new work of art when they wrote the script adaptation of *The Fellowship of the Ring*. However, Jackson says that the screenplay is all using the words and the essence of Tolkien – containing that kernel of truth. Boyens,

⁴ It is of common knowledge that when Tolkien wrote *The Lord of the Rings*, it was supposed to be one book and not a trilogy. However, as years went by, publishers and even Tolkien’s son, Christopher Tolkien, decided to split it into three. So, in this final thesis, *The Lord of the Rings* will be treated as a trilogy.

quoted by Beranek (2013, p. 17), says: “We all love these books [...] and this world. This is our interpretation, our vision, our attempt to bring it to life”.

In the next section, the comparative analysis of both mediums concerning the characters’ characterization and the story and its nuances is made.

3 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

This chapter deals with the comparative analysis of the book and the screenplay. It is divided into two subchapters. In the first section, the characterization of the characters is explored. In the second section, the plot of the story is examined. Furthermore, in the second section, the narrative structure is studied along with the languages created by Tolkien and its differences in the script and the book. Moreover, the songs in the book are analyzed and compared to the ones in the script.

3.1 Characters and Characterization

This section deals with the characterization. It is divided into seven subsections: Hobbits; Dwarves; Elves; Men; Gandalf; Gollum/Sméagol, and The One Ring.

3.1.1 The Hobbits

The Hobbits live on the Shire, a region on the Northwest of Middle Earth. They are smaller than dwarves and they are both an ancient and an elderly people. Tolkien (2004, p. 1-2) describes them as:

Hobbits are an unobtrusive but very ancient people, more numerous formerly than they are today; for they love peace and quiet and good tilled earth: a well-ordered and well-farmed countryside was their favourite haunt. They do not and did not understand or like machines more complicated than a forge-bellows, a water-mill, or a hand-loom, though they were skilful with tools. Even in ancient days they were, as a rule, shy of 'the Big Folk', as they call us, and now they avoid us with dismay and are becoming hard to find. They are quick of hearing and sharp-eyed, and though they are inclined to be fat and do not hurry unnecessarily, they are nonetheless nimble and deft in their movements. They possessed from the first the art of disappearing swiftly and silently, when large folk whom they do not wish to meet come blundering by; and this art they have developed until to Men it may seem magical. But Hobbits have never, in fact, studied magic of any kind, and their elusiveness is due solely to a professional skill that heredity and practice, and a close friendship with the earth, have rendered inimitable by bigger and clumsier races. They are not that much shorter than dwarves, but they are less stout and stocky. In ancient days, they were taller, but now, their height varies between two and four feet of measure. The Hobbits are a merry folk who dress in bright colors – especially yellow and green and they do not wear shoes "[...] since their feet had tough leathery soles and were clad in a thick curling hair, much like the hair of their heads, which was commonly brown.

Tolkien (2004, p. 2) also characterizes them as:

Their faces were as a rule good-natured rather than beautiful, broad, bright-eyed, red-cheeked, with mouths apt to laughter, and to eating and drinking. And laugh they did, and eat, and drink, often and heartily, being fond of simple jests at all times, and of six meals a day (when they could get them). They were hospitable and delighted in parties, and in presents, which they gave away freely and eagerly accepted.

The Hobbits are a people who would remain hidden' for many years if it were not for Bilbo Baggins. Bilbo - who was a person that never thought of going on an adventure – leaves the Shire for an unexpected journey with 13 dwarves and a wizard and becomes famous worldwide because of his tales about it; however, *The Lord of the Rings* is not about Bilbo, but his long distant cousin Frodo Baggins.

Frodo was adopted by Bilbo as his heir and was brought to live at Bag End. In both the script and the book, Frodo is remarkably similar to Bilbo, concerning personality and style, and thinks about having an unexpected journey too, but, at the same time, he loves the Shire and cannot imagine himself leaving such place.

The two grew very close in the following years; Frodo learned much of the Elvish language during his time with Bilbo, as well as much of the lore of Middle-earth. The two shared the same birthday, September 22 by Shire Reckoning (around September 12–14 of our calendar), and a party of special magnificence was held at the beginning of The Fellowship of the Ring when Frodo came of age of thirty-three and Bilbo hit the peculiar year of 111 (FRODO..., [2021?]).

In the book, Frodo is an enthusiastic person who is always getting into trouble with his best friends Meriadoc Brandybuck (Merry) and Peregrin Took (Pippin) for stealing food from farmer Maggots. He is shy and curious and has an intense passion for the Shire. This passion is what makes him delay his journey into Mount Doom as much as he can. One example of such behavior is when Gandalf tells him that he must leave as soon as possible, and he postpones it: “‘You ought to go quietly, and you ought to go soon,’ said Gandalf. Two or three weeks had passed, and still Frodo made no sign of getting ready to go” (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 85); nevertheless, in the script, once Frodo, learns about the ring and his quest, he leaves immediately. He is a simple person and his relationship with friends is not revealed in an explicit view. He travels with Sam, and along the way, he encounters Merry and Pippin who join him.

Frodo faces multiple difficulties being the ring-bearer in both mediums and he is always being saved by the others. The stories seem to characterize Frodo as a strong person for resisting the Ring's power and influence, but, at the same time, he is weak for depending on the Fellowship, especially on Aragorn (also known as Strider). Most Hobbits consider him

odd because he is curious about the outside world. Furthermore, he is kind and compassionate.

Related to Frodo's physical appearance, the book does not describe Frodo in detail. The only information the book provides is the physical aspect of the Hobbits and Gandalf's description of Frodo as being "[...] taller than some and fairer than most, (with) a cleft in his chin: perky chap with a bright eye" (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 218). In the movie, Frodo is interpreted by Elijah Wood who is portrayed such as the Hobbit provided by Tolkien: thick curly brown hair, smaller than a dwarf, does not wear shoes and dresses in bright colors. Furthermore, due to the influence of the Ring, Frodo, who is fifty, according to the book, is described as looking around thirty or so. In both the movie and the script, Frodo is thirty-three years old.

Samwise Gamgee is Frodo's gardener. He is considered a friend as well, but the book focuses more on the fact that he is the gardener. Sam's first appearance is right at the beginning of the book when he is sharing news about strange people walking on strange lands with his friends; nonetheless, in the screenplay, Sam is both his friend and gardener from the beginning. His first appearance is at Bilbo's birthday party.

In both the script and the book, he is a very observant and curious hobbit and because of his curiosity, Sam eavesdrops on Gandalf and Frodo's conversation about the ring. Gandalf makes Sam go with Frodo to protect him. Sam saves Frodo multiple times, especially because he has promised Gandalf to protect Frodo at all costs.

Sam is organized and methodic. During the journey, he is the one that plans, organizes, and rations their provisions throughout the story. He is also kind and compassionate, especially with animals. In chapter 11, *A Knife in the Dark*, the four hobbits buy Bill – a horse – to help in the journey. When Sam has to let Bill go, he feels sorrowful.

Concerning his physical appearance, the book does not describe Sam in detail. In the movie, Sam is interpreted by Sean Astin. Sam can be described as a normal Hobbit just as Tolkien (2004) has written about them: with curly brown hair, smaller than a dwarf, does not wear shoes, and dresses in bright colors. He also has big feet and is considered overweight.

Merry Brandybuck is considered one of the most intelligent of the hobbits. According to the book, he has known about the quest for a long time even though it is not mentioned explicitly how he learned about it. He says he knows Frodo has a dangerous adventure ahead and that he will follow Frodo. He is Frodo's cousin and Pippin is his best friend. In the script and on the movie, Merry is "[...] mostly used for comedic relief, along with Pippin" (MERIADOC..., [2021?]). He is, most of the time, in a good mood and laughs when it is

possible – especially when drinking. Merry is simple and always tries to impress others by doing extraordinary things like stealing Gandalf’s fireworks and lighting them up. His first significant appearance occurs when he and Pippin steal food from farmer Maggots and when they help Frodo run away from the Nâzgul. Merry does not have a major role in the first movie. However, he and Pippin are extremely important in the next two scripts and movies.

Merry is the typical hobbit regarding his physical aspect: curly red-blond hair, smaller than a dwarf, does not wear shoes and dresses in green, yellow, and shades of brown. In the movie, he is played by the actor Dominic Monaghan. The book does not describe him in detail.

Pippin Took is the youngest and the smallest of the four Hobbits. He is considered a clumsy Hobbit – Merry says that he is like this because he has smoked too much of Pipe-weed. In the book, Pippin also knew how perilous the journey would be before joining the other in the quest. In both the script and movie, Pippin is foolish and a comic relief.

In *The Fellowship of the Ring*, he was a worthy accomplice to Merry's plans, although he showed his age as well; he was a cheerful if not a sometimes thoughtless Hobbit, and seemingly had a knack for doing the wrong thing at the wrong time, but throughout *The Lord of the Rings* he becomes increasingly mature and courageous (PEREGRIN..., [2021?]).

Pippin is also remarkable for his insistence on having more than three meals a day as a nature Hobbit would eat:

ANGLE ON: The HOBBITS suddenly stop and unstrap their knapsacks.
 STRIDER: Gentlemen, we do not stop till nightfall.
 PIPPIN: What about breakfast?
 STRIDER: You’ve already had it.
 PIPPIN: We've had one, yes ... what about second breakfast?
 ANGLE ON: STRIDER stares at PIPPIN blankly, then turns away, shaking his head.
 MERRY: I don't think he knows about second breakfast, Pip.
 PIPPIN: What about Elevesens, Luncheon, Afternoon tea, dinner ... he knows about them, doesn't he? (THE LORD..., c2001, p. 69).

Pippin has curly golden hair, is smaller than a dwarf, does not wear shoes, and dresses in green, yellow, and shades of brown (just like Merry). This is how he is portrayed in both the script and the movie. Billy Boyd interpreted Pippin. The book does not describe him in detail.

3.1.2 Dwarves

The only dwarf mentioned throughout *The Lord of the Rings* in both script and book is Gimli.

The book describes the dwarves as being taller than hobbits but smaller than Elves and Men. They are much broader and heavier than these three peoples. Also, “[...] most dwarves had thick, luxuriant beards in which they took great pride, and often forked or braided them and tucked them into their belts” (DWARVES..., [2021?]). They are strong, can resist higher and lower temperatures, and reach the age of 250. Gimli is a traditional dwarf, and he is described exactly as one.

All dwarves are diligent and enjoy crafting since most of them are miners. During The Third Age¹, they discover a new mineral that was more valuable than gold or silver: *mithril*. This mineral is light, soft, malleable, and extremely rare. It is used generally to create durable and hard armor.

Concerning dwarves’ personality (DWARVES..., [2021?]),

Dwarves were typically stubborn, secretive, and fiercely loyal to friends and family. They treat and care for each other, even strangers among their kind like family. They cared greatly about mining, crafting, crafts, gold and gems, their acquisition of which often fueled the envy of the Elves. Dwarves were easily offended by rude comments and had a propensity to hold long-lasting grudges. Dwarves were often seen as greedy, but their nature gave them resistance to many external influences.

Besides, dwarves are extremely competitive regarding Elves. Both mediums represent this with Gimli’s relationship with Legolas. From their first encounter, on Rivendell, when Legolas pleads his bow and arrow to Frodo, Gimli pleads his ax to Frodo as a way of ‘saying’ that if an Elf goes to war, the dwarves will go too. The rivalry continues throughout the book and the script until the end when they become friends.

3.1.3 Elves

The elves are an ancient people and, despite being similar to Men, they are immortal. They live in Rivendell in the North of Middle Earth and Lothlórien in the Center of Middle Earth. Rivendell is ruled by Lord Elrond and Lothlórien is governed by Lady Galadriel.

¹ “Ages are large spans of Time in which the Wise and the loremasters divided the history of Arda. The division was made according to large historical events such as the overthrowing of a Dark Lord” (AGES, ...[2021?]). “The Third Age saw the gradual fading of the Elves and also the rise of Sauron against the Númenorian kingdoms, until he was defeated during the War of the Ring. The Age ended some years later with the departure of the White Ship from Mithlond” (AGES, ...[2021?]).

Once the elves reach maturity, their bodies do not age, and they do not become elderly anymore. They are considered powerful because of their healing processes, their intelligence, and their immortality.

The elves are also:

[...] light of foot, can travel long distances without leaving tracks, and often can walk lightly across snow where the boots of Men would sink. They do not require sleep but are able to enter a waking meditative state to regain their strength which means they can be exhausted and tire (ELVES..., [2021?]).

Concerning their physical appearance, they are a beautiful people whose man and woman are not distinguishable if not for their reproductive organs. Typically, an elf has brown or blond hair, is extremely tall and thin.

Most of the elves are associated with fairies, even though they are different. The movie and screenplay portray Legolas (Orlando Bloom) as the description above: blond hair, thin, tall, lightfooted, does not require sleep, and strong. Nonetheless, Tolkien did not want his elves to have this *fairy-like* image (LEGOLAS..., [2021?]), so he described Legolas as:

He was as tall as a young tree, lithe, immensely strong, able swiftly to draw a great war-bow and shoot down a Nazgûl, endowed with the tremendous vitality of Elvish bodies, so hard and resistant to hurt that he went only in light shoes over rock or through snow, the most tireless of all the Fellowship (TOLKIEN, 1992 *apud* LEGOLAS..., [2021?]).

Legolas has a participative role, but his major appearances and contributions are in the two other books and scripts. Nonetheless, there are two important elves to be mentioned: Glorfindel and Arwen.

Most characters from *The Lord of the Rings*, if not all from the book, are male characters. Peter Jackson realized this situation, and since he had to attend to all the cinematic public, he switched Glorfindel for Arwen, so, in the book, Tolkien writes about the elf Glorfindel, and Jackson writes the script using Arwen instead.

Arwen is deeply described on the Appendices of *The Lord of the Rings*. She is the daughter of the Lord of Rivendell, Elrond. She is mostly known for her relationship with Aragorn, a mortal man. She abandons her immortality to share a lifetime with him: “I would rather share one lifetime with you than face all the Ages of this world alone” (THE LORD..., c2001, p. 95).

In the movie, she is portrayed by the actress Liv Tyler and her physical appearance is of a typical elf. Tolkien (2004, p. 295-296) describes her briefly in chapter one in *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*.

In the middle of the table, against the woven cloths upon the wall, there was a chair under a canopy, and there sat a lady fair to look upon, and so like was she in form of womanhood to Elrond that Frodo guessed that she was one of his close kindred. Young she was and yet not so. The braids of her dark hair were touched by no frost, her white arms and clear face were flawless and smooth, and the light of stars was in her bright eyes, grey as a cloudless night; yet queenly she looked, and thought and knowledge were in her glance, as of one who has known many things that the years bring.

Alternatively, Glorfindel is the elf in the book that saves Frodo from the Nine Black Riders. He appears and provides suggestions regarding the fate of the Ring during the Council of Elrond in Rivendell. He is an “[...] elf of great bodily, nobility, heroism and spiritual structure, wisdom, and bravery” (GLORFINDEL..., [2021?]).

In chapter *Many Meetings* of the *Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*, he is also described as: “[...] tall and straight; his hair was of shining gold, his face fair and young and fearless and full of joy; his eyes were bright and clean, and his voice like music; on his brow set wisdom, and in his hand was strength” (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 295).

To conclude, even though they *play the same role*, the same *scene*, the same story, Arwen is the elf in the script and Glorfindel is the elf in the book.

3.1.4 Men

Similarly, to the Elves, Men are a mortal race. They are as tall as the Elves and taller than the Hobbits and Dwarves. They can be considered normal for the literary and cinematic audience because they are similar to a person from the real world.

Men are scattered around Middle Earth. Yet the two main lands of men are Rohan and Gondor, both on the South of Middle Earth. Related to both mediums, two important men belong to the Fellowship: Aragorn and Boromir.

Aragorn is the heir of Isildur - the late king of Gondor. Despite having the same blood as the man that killed Sauron, he does not want to be like his ancestor. Because of such decision, he decides to become a Ranger whose nickname would now be Strider because of his personality and accomplishments. His character is extremely important in both the script and the book, because of his personality and his story.

Strider is interpreted by Viggo Mortensen and the only description of his appearance in the book is that he is lean, dark, and tall with "[...] a shaggy head of dark hair flecked with grey, and in a pale stern face a pair of keen grey eyes" (Tolkien, 2004, p. 205). Concerning his personality, he is kind, passionate, devoted, hard-working, and a leader. Besides, he has the hero's complexity even though it is in an indirect mode. Bronzite ([201-?]) describes the hero's journey in 12 stages, most of which Aragorn matches most of them, in both the book and the screenplay (ANNEX A). These stages were proposed by Joseph Campbell (2004) and adapted to screen by Christopher Vogler (VOLGER, 1992; VOYTILLA, 1999) (ANNEX B). The first one is the *Ordinary World*, which presents "[...] where the Hero exists before his present story begins"; the second is *Call to Adventure*, in which "[...] the Hero's adventure begins when he receives a call to action"; the third is *Meeting the Mentor*, when "[...] the Hero desperately needs guidance he meets a mentor figure who gives him something he needs"; the fourth is *Crossing The Threshold*, in which "[...] the Hero is now ready to act upon his call to adventure and truly begin his quest, whether it be physical, spiritual or emotional"; the fifth one is *Tests, Allies, Enemies* which "[...] the Hero must overcome each challenge he is presented with on the journey towards his ultimate goal"; the sixth is *Approach To The Inmost Cave* – "[...] location in which lies a terrible danger or an inner conflict which up until now the Hero has not had to face"; the *Reward (Seizing The Sword)* is the seventh, in which "[...] the Hero is ultimately transformed into a new state, emerging from battle as a stronger person and often with a prize"; Finally, *Resurrection* "[...] is the climax in which the Hero must have his final and most dangerous encounter with death".

Hence, Boromir is the son of the Stewart of Gondor. He is known for his courage and bravery. In the book, he is exceedingly valiant and is held in great esteem by men (BOROMIR..., [2021?]) in both Gondor and Rohan. In the movie, "Boromir is portrayed by the English actor Sean Bean, who is also in Peter Jackson's trilogy, as a brave and skilled warrior whose loyalty to Gondor tempts him to take the Ring for himself" (BOROMIR..., [2021?]).

Concerning both mediums, he is described and portrayed very similarly. However, there is one distinctive difference: in the movie and script, Boromir dies while saving Merry and Pippin from Uruk-Hai (a mixture of orcs and men/elves). In the book, he does not die until chapter one of the *Two Towers* (1954).

Jackson said that he took some of the chapters from *Two Towers* and *The Return of the King* (1955) and anticipated some events because he wanted to cause more impact on the first movie. Also, he declared that he left the action scenes for the script of *The Fellowship of Ring*

and the script of *The Return of the King* because they thought the second movie needed to be a smother *passage* between both movies. As a result, Boromir's death was brought forward from the second book to the first script.

3.1.5 Gandalf

Gandalf is one of five wizards that were sent to Middle Earth to aid its population against major threats. He comes to Middle Earth in the shape of an old man in a grey robe. His role is to be as counselor, wanderer, and influencer. Furthermore, he has a long beard and is always with his cane. Tolkien (2004, p. 32) describes him as the following: "He wore a tall pointed blue hat, a long grey cloak, and a silver scarf. He had a long white beard and bushy eyebrows that stuck out beyond the brim of his hat". In both the script and the movie, he (Ian McKellen) wears a grey hat matching his long grey robe, but he does not wear a scarf. His beard is a mixture of white and grey.

Gandalf is a wizard who acts with reason and determination. His mission is to help and guide every people of Middle Earth in the best way possible. Likewise, he is compassionate, patient, and wise. His story begins with Bilbo Baggins in *The Hobbit* when helping the Dwarves of Erebor. In *The Lord of the Rings*, his appearance happens right at the beginning when assistant Frodo with Bilbo's party.

3.1.6 Gollum/Sméagol

Sméagol was one of the first Hobbit-type during the Third Age. He was extremely similar to a Hobbit in all aspects: shorter than a dwarf, peaceful, kind, dressed in bright colors, loved to eat several meals, and was hospitable. Differing from the Hobbits, he had long straight dark hair.

His story and how he was tempted and possessed by the Ring is told in *The Lord of Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring* in the second chapter of the book. The script and movie, on the contrary, only share his story at the beginning of the movie *The Return of the King*.

Gollum and Sméagol are the same characters, but Gollum is the person who Sméagol turned into when he became obsessed with the Ring. The creature Gollum does not have a precise description.

In the first edition of *The Hobbit*, Tolkien made no reference to his size, leading several illustrators to portray him as being very large. Tolkien realized the omission,

and clarified in later editions that he was of average hobbit size and in "The Lord of the Rings" there is a reference to Sam being "little less in height" than he is. Tolkien describes Gollum as either dark, bone-white or sallow (pale yellow) (GOLLUM..., [2021?])

Related to his personality, Gollum has a good survivor instinct since he has survived over 500 years in possession of the Ring. Because of his hands, he became a sort of *fisherman*. He could spot and catch fish in any water. Also,

He was known to eat almost anything that was living or edible and could stomach anything raw and uncooked. He was also very good at not being seen and was an excellent waterman making use of anything that could float which made it possible for him to follow the Fellowship for so long (GOLLUM..., [2021?]).

Sméagol does not appear in the movie or script, but Gollum has a minimal appearance in the first movie and script. His major focus is on the third movie.

3.1.7 The One Ring

This character is of extreme importance since this entire story is about it. According to Philippa (LORD..., 2019), The One Ring is a major source of evil and it has to be animated, in the movie, almost as if it is a character of the movie and the script. She mentions that the Ring has intense relationships with Frodo and Gollum and a powerful relationship with both Gandalf and Lady Galadriel; nevertheless, authors such as Klautau (2006) understands the One Ring as a symbol – “as an expression of power and evil” (KLAUTAU, 2006, p. 1).

Klautau (2006, p. 1) also analyzes the One Ring starting from a perspective of Saint Augustine “[...] where free will and the original sin gain fundamental proportions in the interpretation of the symbol”. Nonetheless, this final thesis analyzes the One Ring following Philippa’s ideas of The Ring of Power as a character.

The One Ring has an ancient story that goes back to the Second Age. The story starts when the Great Rings were forged. Three were made for the Elves; seven to the Dwarf-lords; and nine to Men. As it is written in the book, “Three Rings for the Elven-kings under the sky, Seven for the Dwarf-lords in their halls of stone, Nine for Mortal Men doomed to die” (Tolkien, 2004, p. iii).

These rings are a way to make explicit that these are the rulers of each people and location on Middle Earth. Nonetheless, during the Second Age, another ring was made to rule over all of the Great Rings. The Dark Lord Sauron, in the flames of Mount Doom, in Mordor,

created the One Ring that had the purpose to govern over all the other rings, so that he could take control of Middle Earth.

One for the Dark Lord on his dark throne
In the Land of Mordor where the Shadows lie.
One Ring to rule them all, One Ring to find them,
One Ring to bring them all and in the darkness bind them
In the Land of Mordor where the Shadows lie (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. VI).

The One Ring was made out of the flames of Mount Doom using all of Sauron's malice and hate. It is of golden color, and it can fit to be used by whoever possesses it. On it, there are inscriptions written in the dark language of Mordor: "*Ash nazg durbatulûk, ash nazg gimbatul, ash nazg thrakatulûk, agh burzum-ishi krimpatul*" (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 331). Its closer translation into English would be: "One ring to rule them all, One ring to find them, One ring to bring them all and in the darkness bind them" (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 331).

Nonetheless, during a war between Men, Elves, and Sauron and his army, Isildur cuts off Sauron's hand off along with the Ring. In this way, Sauron dies but his *spirit* remains in the Ring. The Ring can be considered an entity and a living object since it is an extension of Sauron himself.

Isildur is not in possession of the One Ring for much time. The Ring betrays him and remains hidden for more than two thousand and four hundred years until a Hobbit-type finds it – Sméagol's best friend Déagol.

The One Ring has powers, and it grows darker into the ring bearer's mind. Bilbo himself describes that he felt "[...] thin and stretched" and that he felt something dark growing in his mind (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 62) – meaning that the Ring is taking over him. Also, the Ring creates a bond with its owner, making the ring bearer having an excessive attachment to it extending the ring bearer's life into several years. Gandalf provides more details about its power and influence when telling Frodo about it.

In Eregion long ago many Elven-rings were made, magic rings as you call them, and they were, of course, of various kinds: some more potent and some less. The lesser rings were only essays in the craft before it was full-grown, and to the Elven-smiths they were but trifles – yet still to my mind dangerous for mortals. But the Great Rings, the Rings of Power, they were perilous.

A mortal, Frodo, who keeps one of the Great Rings, does not die, but he does not grow or obtain more life, he merely continues, until at last every minute is a weariness. And if he often uses the Ring to make himself invisible, he fades: he becomes in the end invisible permanently, and walks in the twilight under the eye of the Dark Power that rules the Rings. Yes, sooner or later – later, if he is strong or well-meaning to begin with, but neither strength nor good purpose will last – sooner or later the Dark Power will devour him (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 60).

Despite all of its powers, Frodo, who receives the Ring from Bilbo who does not know its power and importance, has an unexpected resistance to the Ring. Unlike other characters that heard the voice of Sauron through the whispers of the Ring, Frodo does not let himself be overpowered by it and that is why he volunteers himself to destroy the Ring. It is important to mention that One Ring always tries to go back to its master.

In both mediums, the Ring is treated as an entity that can act upon objects and people – so that is why, in this final thesis, the Ring is also treated in the third person of singular and as a character. In the movie and script, the story of One Ring – concerning the Second Age – is told as the prologue. Jackson said that he had to explain this story in the beginning for the non-literary audience. Moreover, in the book, the story about the One Ring is told by Gandalf to Frodo approximately nine years after Bilbo's birthday party.

In the next section, the plot, the languages created by Tolkien, the way the narrative is presented, and the lack of songs are assessed through the lenses of DiYanny (1986) and Kullmann (2014).

3.2 The story and its nuances

This section deals with the plot in both the script and the book. Additionally, this section analyzes the way the narrative is presented, the languages created by Tolkien, and the presence of the songs in the mediums.

3.2.1 Narrator, poetry (and songs) and languages

Every story is narrated according to a specific point of view. The point of view refers to how the story is told and who is telling it (DIYANNI, 1986). Ross (2016) explains that there are three ways of describing points of view: first-person – I/we perspective; second-person – you perspective; and third-person – he/she/it/they perspective. She (2016) writes that:

Plenty of stories and novels are written in the third person. In this type of story, a disembodied narrator describes what the characters do and what happens to them. You don't see directly through a character's eyes as you do in a first-person narrative, but often the narrator describes the main character's thoughts and feelings about what's going on.

The Lord of the Rings is not different when compared to these novels and stories. Tolkien wrote it in the third-person (he/she/it/they) using an omniscient narrator in which the

narrator is “all-knowing”, and he/she can write about the characters’ motives, thoughts, and feelings (DIYANNI, 1986). However, the script of *The Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring* has a unique writing and narrator. The screenplay is described in both the first- and third-person.

At the beginning of the script, Lady Galadriel, interpreted by the actress Cate Blanchett, tells the story of The One Ring to give a contextualization of the story to the non-literary audience. At this moment, the use of third-person narrator is being used. An example of this narrator is:

GALADRIEL (V.O.)

It began with the forging of the Great Rings.

Three were given to the Elves: immortal, wisest ... fairest of all beings.

Seven to the Dwarf Lords: great miners and craftsmen of the mountain halls.

And Nine ... nine rings were gifted to the race of Men, who above all else desire power (THE LORD..., c2001, p. 1).

In contrast, when Frodo’s story starts, it is told from the point of view of a first-person narrator since each character is acting on their specific roles and telling their own stories. DiYanni (1986) describes that the first-person narrator focuses on only one character’s consciousness limiting to the first-person experiences, inferences, or through talking to other characters. To exemplify:

BILBO (CONT’D)

I feel thin ... sort of stretched, like

butter scraped over too much bread. I

need a holiday ... a very long holiday

and I don’t expect I shall return ...

in fact, I mean not to (THE LORD, c2001, p. 20).

Despite the script having these two points of view, according to the excerpts, the screenplay usually does not have a specific narrator. It is a text written in the present describing the story as it will be seen on the screen. It can be considered a ‘cold’ and technical description of what is happening in the story. Besides, the script is impersonal, and it is not a reading for people (in general). The persons who read the script are the technical personnel such as producers, actors, and directors.

Additionally, to the narrator, Kullmann (2014) expatiates on the narrative prose of the book that is supplemented by songs and poems. Kullmann (2014, p. 283) explains that “[...] concerning the poetic insertions in *The Lord of the Rings*, [...] all of them appear to fulfill a function within the narrative; they are all part of the plot and motivated by narrative

developments”. Jackson (LORD..., 2019) mentions that Tolkien had created new languages and a whole new world – which include songs and poems.

Tolkien had a major degree in Languages and Philology, which made him have access to a variety of languages and dialects which inspired him to create the songs and the poems. According to Kullmann (2014, p. 284) “[...] the origins of some of these genres (of poems and songs) go back to Anglo-Saxon poetry”. He (2014, p. 284) adds that “[...] the nature poems (no. 6) may remind us of songs in Middle Earth, like the Harley Lyrics, and their French and Provençal antecedents”. Furthermore, “[...] others of the poems and songs in The Lord of the Rings belong to genres or traditions which are part of English ‘folklore’ (KULLMANN, 2014, p. 284). In other words, “[...] the poems and songs found in The Lord of the Rings are thus reminiscent of a wide range of English poetic traditions and practices” (KULLMANN, 2014, p. 284).

By adding poems and songs to the story, Tolkien

[...] seems to draw attention to the wealth of a literary and cultural undercurrent which (while it has been the object of antiquarian and folklore societies and individual researchers since the sixteenth century) has not usually been recognize by representatives of the literary establishment (KULLMANN, 2014, p. 287).

As an example of a poem, Gandalf recited one:

Three Rings for the Elven-kings under the sky,
Seven for the Dwarf-lords in their halls of stone,
Nine for Mortal Men doomed to die,
One for the Dark Lord on his dark throne
In the Land of Mordor where the Shadows lie.
One Ring to rule them all, One Ring to find them,
One Ring to bring them all and in the darkness bind them
In the Land of Mordor where the Shadows lie (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 66).

Tolkien shifts from the prose to poetry by serving as way of ‘calling’ the reader’s attention “[...] away from the meaning to sound and form, from the *signifié* to the *significant*” (KULLMAN, 2014, p. 288).

Another example of poem is present when Frodo, Merry, Pippin and Sam have already left the Shire. Frodo “spoke, aloud but as if to himself, saying slowly” (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 96):

The Road goes ever on and on
Down from the door where it began.
Now far ahead the Road has gone,
And I must follow, if I can,
Pursuing it with weary feet,

Until it joins some larger way,
Where many paths and errands meet.
And whither then? I cannot say.

Kullmann (2014, p. 289) analyzes the poem by explaining that “[...] to Frodo, this poem conveys the notion of the world beyond the confines of the known world, the Shire. [...] this experience of crossing boundaries is represented”.

Kullmann (2014, p. 290) also argues the importance of the characters regarding poetry, especially the Hobbits.

The main phenomenon which characterizes the poetry found in *The Lord of the Rings* is the embedding of those poems in the narrative: the characters do not just recite or listen to poetry, they usually set about commenting on it or interpreting it. Their interpretations do not primarily consist in elucidating the meaning; indeed, sometimes uncertainties are left as they are. What interests the characters more is the provenance of these poetic texts. The poems and songs of *The Lord of the Rings* have a history which is often discussed by the listeners and sometimes proves to be relevant to the plot; like the ballads mentioned above, they also appear to be part of a living tradition, as some of the characters are shown as being engaged in translating and communicating ancient as well as more recent poetry.

Related to the script, the screenplay does not give much emphasis to poems and songs, but it does have some such as:

ANGLE ON: FRODO looks at SAM with a delighted smile.
FRODO (whispers): Sam! Wood-Elves!
ANGLE ON: A group of ELVES pass slowly through the forest, some on horseback, some walking, some with banners. The group seems to shine of its own light, their white garments softly glowing against the purples and midnight blues of the woods. Their haunting song continues.
ELVEN VOICES (Elvish):
a Galad ren i veniar
hi' aladhremmin ennorath
A Elbereth Gilthoniel
ithil nâ thûl, ithil lîn hen
O Light to us that wander here
Amid the world of woven trees!
O Elbereth! Gilthoniel!
Clear are thy eyes and bright thy breath! (LORD, c2001, p. 47).

The Frodo's poem is not treated as in book in both the criteria used above (to analyze the poems and songs) and the languages. In the book, the poems and songs are written in English and are analyzed through metrics, rhythm, and other aspects (KULLMANN, 2014) which can influence the story. In the script, the poem is written in Elvish and in English and does not have much importance to its cinematic audience. It is important to mention that in

the movie, all the poems and the songs were taken out since some critic movie audience could consider the movie to be a musical. Another distinctive fact is that in the movie, Jackson explored the languages created by Tolkien as much as he could – meaning that all the scenes in which he could use Elvish, or the language of Mordor, or the language of Dwarves, he used them. For instance, in most scenes in which Arwen and Aragorn interact, they mix Elvish and English:

STRIDER (Elvish: with subtitles):
Dartho guin Berian ... rych le ad tolthathon.
 Stay with the Hobbits. I will send horses for you.

ARWEN (Elvish: with subtitles):
Hon mabathon. Rochon ellint im.
 I am the faster rider. I'll take him.
 [...]

ARWEN: I do not fear them.

STRIDER(Elvish: with subtitles):
 Be iest lîn.
 As you wish (THE LORD, c2001, p. 80).

To conclude, the book has songs and poems and they all have major importance to the story while the script has some poems, but they are not important for the film narrative. The movie has a sound track, but it does not have any poem or song correspondent to the ones that were analyzed in this final thesis. Moreover, in the book, the poems and songs were written in English. In the script, the poems were written in English and Elvish (most of the times if not in another language). And, in the movie, there is a high use of the languages created by Tolkien over English.

3.2.2 Plot

The plot is a series of events that are related to each other creating a story. Most stories do not have a specific format to follow or do not follow the format created by Freytag (1900) and followed by authors such as DiYanni. DiYanni (1986) reinforces Freytag's (1900) five steps to organize the story: exposition – the conflict, the characters, and the setting are presented to its audience; rising action – events that occur before the turning point/climax of the story; the climax itself – the high point of the story; falling action – events that occur after the climax; and resolution – the end of the story.

The book starts with Bilbo's birthday party planning in which he is preparing to leave the Shire to have one last adventure: to see the elves. Frodo does not know that Bilbo has planned this adventure, and that Bilbo will leave everything in his possession to Frodo. Gandalf arrives to see an old friend and celebrate his eleventh-first birthday. During the party, Bilbo gives a speech and vanishes using his magic ring.

Once he is back home, Gandalf confronts him over the ring and asks Bilbo to leave it to Frodo. Gandalf has always been very suspicious of Bilbo's ring over the story he has told in *The Hobbit* (1937) of how he obtained it. Gandalf asks Frodo to hide the ring while he seeks more information. Until Gandalf's return, the story will advance nine years.

In the script, the story starts with an introduction of the One Ring's story for the non-literary audience containing major details and information which will be relevant to its context. After this initial part, the story is basically the same one written above, but with one crucial difference. In the script and movie, time is quantified differently – meaning that for the cinematic audience, it seems that Gandalf's return has lasted one or two days and not nine years.

This time difference can be seen in several moments, but two moments are highlighted: the difference of time-related to the beginning of both mediums and the perception of Gandalf's return (nine years or one-two days). In her final thesis, Luz (2018, p. 11, our translation) writes about *The Lord of the Rings'* temporality of both narratives related to the beginning of both mediums:

The time factor matters in both narratives, because if there is no clear segment between events, readers/viewers will feel confused and are likely to lose interest in the story. At the beginning of the first book of the trilogy *The Lord of the Rings* (2001), by J. R. R. Tolkien, the starting point of the plot is centered on the birthday party of the character Bilbo Baggins, after which the character Frodo will inherit the Ring of Power. But at the beginning of the respective adaptation, the film *The Fellowship of the Ring* (2002), an explanation is given about Middle-earth, the battles fought in the past, and the trajectory of the Ring until it reached Bilbo's possession. It became necessary to contextualize the story to the viewers to give meaning to the narrative. To synchronize the story of the book with that of the film, it was necessary to go back a little in the chronology, presenting the facts that resulted in the events of the present.²

² “O fator temporal importa em ambas as narrativas, pois se não houver um segmento claro entre os acontecimentos, os leitores/espectadores se sentirão confusos e propensos a perder o interesse pela estória. No início do primeiro livro da trilogia *O Senhor dos Anéis* (2001), de J. R. R. Tolkien, o ponto de partida do enredo está centrado na festa de aniversário do personagem Bilbo Bolseiro, após a qual o personagem Frodo receberá como herança o Anel de poder. Mas no começo da respectiva AD, o filme *A Sociedade do Anel* (2002), é dada uma explicação sobre a Terra-Média, as batalhas travadas no passado e a trajetória do Anel até chegar à posse de Bilbo. Tornou-se necessário contextualizar a estória aos espectadores para conferir sentido à narrativa. De modo

Nine years later, Gandalf comes back to the Shire and tells Frodo the story of the One Ring and says that Bilbo has been carrying it for all these years. To prove its authenticity, they throw the Ring of Power into the fire and the inscriptions start to appear. Gandalf warns Frodo about Gollum by telling his story and how he became the ring-bearer for all these years. He also stays with Frodo for two months while preparing him for the journey to destroy the Ring and searching for more information.

In the script, Gandalf researches about the Ring in what seems to take one or two days and returns to the Shire to share everything with Frodo. He then prepares Frodo for his journey. Sam, Frodo's gardener and friend, eavesdrops on the conversation and, by Gandalf's command, joins Frodo in his quest. Gollum's story is not told in script and movie. It will only be told on the last movie and in the script *The Return of the King* (O SENHOR..., 2003).

From chapters three to nine, Frodo is leaving the Shire, along with his best friends Merry and Pippin, and his gardener Sam. The Nazgul is already searching for Frodo – making them seek various places to stay, like Old Maggot's farm and Tom Bombadil's³ home.

In the script, this journey is described relatively quickly. Frodo leaves with Sam and encounters Merry and Pippin on the way when they are stealing food from Old Maggot's farm. A Nazgul intersects them on the way, but they manage to escape by the river. Peter Jackson mentioned that he kept asking himself questions of Tom's relevance to the story and could not find appropriate moments to include him in the adaptation. Philippa said that this part of the book was just left untold (LORD..., 2019).

At the Sign of The Prancing Pony is chapter nine of the book in which Frodo and his companions arrive at the Prancing Pony, a small bar/inn in the city of Bree. Gandalf told Frodo that he would encounter them there, but he does not arrive on time. He has already passed through the inn and has left a letter to the inn's owner to hand it to Frodo. In the letter, he apologizes for having to leave and that they should trust a Ranger called Strider. Their encounter with Strider, also known as Aragorn, was when Pippin decided to sing while drinking. They should have maintained a low profile and Frodo uses to ring to disappear with him. Once he removed the ring, Strider helps them. Also, chapter ten is about the analysis of the letter and the story of Aragorn.

a sincronizar a estória do livro com a do filme, foi preciso voltar um pouco na cronologia, apresentando os fatos que resultaram nos acontecimentos do presente”.

³ Tom Bombadil is a *superior* being that has lived through several ages, but, concerning *The Lord of the Rings*, his story is not of much relevance, except from the fact that he supported Frodo and his companions with a place to eat and sleep and saved them at least two times.

In the script, Gandalf did not give the letter to the inn's owner because he was supposed to meet them there, but he was being held prisoner by Saruman, the White Wizard. While setting themselves at the inn, Pippin starts to drink and reveals Frodo's real name to several people in the bar. Frodo slips on the floor when trying to get Pippin out of the bar and puts on the Ring. After he removes the Ring of Power, Strider takes him to his room to talk and discloses that he is going to keep them safe, and that Gandalf is probably in trouble if he has not arrived yet.

The next two chapters are the end of book one. When they are about to leave the Prancing Pony, the Black Riders invade Bree. They enter the Hobbits' room and carve their swords into their bed where they are sleeping; nevertheless, Strider knew they had discovered and changed their rooms. Once the riders leave and they believe it is safe to move on, they start their journey. Aragorn leads the Hobbits towards Rivendell. Their journey is described in detail, but its major event is when the Nine Ringwraiths find them again and attack, but this time Frodo is stabbed with a poisoned blade.

The group tries to delay the poison, but they have to reach Rivendell to save Frodo. During their journey, Glorfindel finds them and decides to ride with Frodo because he has the fastest horse and is a good rider. Other elves would get Merry, Pippin, Sam, and Aragorn. The riders pursue Glorfindel and Frodo until they reach the river which marks the entrance into the realm of Rivendell. The Riders could not enter the river since it is sacred; nevertheless, the Ringwraiths advance into the river even though they fear it. Glorfindel uses an enchantment, and the river swallows them.

In the script, the description of their egress of Bree is portrayed exactly the same. Nonetheless, in the script, Glorfindel does not rescue Frodo and his companions. The elf Arwen does. According to Jackson (LORD..., 2019), Arwen had a small part in the book and he, along with the other screenwriters, wanted her to have more prominence in the story – so they created more material for her by using the appendices of the book.

In book two, Frodo wakes up in Rivendell and meets Gandalf. He explains why he had left the letter and why he could not be present – The White Wizard held him hostage. Also, Frodo encounters Bilbo.

As soon as Frodo is out of danger, the Council of Elrond is reunited. For the Council, elves came from Lothlórien and Rivendell, Men from Gondor, and Dwarves from Minas Tirith. They all share the news from each land and discuss how an ancient dark power has risen again. Gandalf, Aragorn, and Frodo describe all the events they have experienced since they came in contact with the One Ring. To complement, Lord Elrond, who was present when

Isildur cut Sauron's hand and did not destroy the Ring, retells the story to those who do not know it. Besides, they discover that Gollum has been held prisoner in Mordor but escaped.

Once the Council is deliberated, Frodo is going to take the Ring to Mordor and Lord Elrond would choose his companions that formed the Fellowship. After two months, the One Ring could no longer stay in Rivendell, so the Fellowship left. In their journey, they encounter multiple difficulties.

In the script, Frodo wakes up and sees Gandalf beside his bed. Gandalf does not provide why he was late in detail. Frodo encounters Bilbo.

The Council of Elrond is reunited with the same people described in the book. Aragorn, Frodo, and Gandalf do not share their events, because the audience has already seen them in previous scenes. They discuss the ring and that it cannot be used – it must be destroyed. Frodo affirms that he shall take the Ring although he does not know how to get there. At this moment, Gandalf, Legolas, Gimli, Aragorn, and Boromir volunteer, they are not chosen as in the book, to assist Frodo in his quest. Sam, Merry, and Pippin invade the Council and claim they will not let Frodo leave without them. They form the Fellowship of the Ring. Their journey is not without complications.

Throughout their journey, it is important to highlight two moments: their passage through the Mines of Moria and their stay in Lothlórien.

After having problems along the journey, Gandalf suggests the group should go to the Mines of Moria even though he is afraid of taking such path. Once they reach their destination, they encounter The Doors of Durin. To enter, they have to decipher:

‘The words are in the elven-tongue of the West of Middle-earth in the Elder Days,’ answered Gandalf. ‘But they do not say anything of importance to us. They say only: *The Doors of Durin, Lord of Moria. Speak, friend, and enter.* And underneath small and faint is written: *I, Narvi, made them. Celebrimbor of Hollin drew these signs*’ (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 397).

Merry does not comprehend the passage and asks for an explanation. Gimli tells the story of Durin, and Gandalf solves the puzzle by saying *friend* in elfic: *mellon*.

When they enter the Mines, they realize that everybody is dead, and Gandalf's fears were correct. They cannot return because of the monster on the river near the Mines that destroyed the entrance when it captured Frodo. They do not have any other choice but to move on through the Mines.

After walking for a long period of time, they discover Balin's tomb – Balin was the Lord of the Mines and Gimli's cousin. Around the tomb, they find orcs' swords and plan to

leave there as soon as possible; but the orcs get to them first. While battling the orcs, Frodo is hit with a spear. They all suffer and believe that Frodo is dead; nevertheless, the young Hobbit was using *mithril* and was saved by the armor.

Gandalf continues to guide them until they reach The Bridge of Khazad-dûm. The bridge is being protected by an ancient demon named Balrog. Gandalf dies fighting the demon to save his companions.

In the script, this scene is of extreme importance since all audience is in constant attention to what will happen. The scene is described in detail just as in the book; however, in the movie, it is not Gimli, Pippin, and Gandalf that decipher the passage to enter Moria, but Frodo and Gandalf. Gandalf tries several enchantments to open the door, but Frodo is the one who solves the riddle. The rest is similar to the book.

Their stay in Lothlórien is after Gandalf's death. They enter the forest where an elf receives them and provides them with a place to sleep. This elf explains that later he will take the Fellowship to see Lady Galadriel and the Lord.

In the presence of both, the companions explain their journey and their loss. Lady Galadriel provides space for them to stay for some days. During the night, she asks Frodo and Sam to look into her mirror.

‘Many things I can command the Mirror to reveal,’ she answered, ‘and to some I can show what they desire to see. But the Mirror will also show things unbidden, and those are often stranger and more profitable than things which we wish to behold. What you will see, if you leave the Mirror free to work, I cannot tell. For it shows things that were, and things that are, and things that yet may be. But which it is that he sees, even the wisest cannot always tell’ (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 470-471).

Frodo does not immediately answer the Lady's question. Nonetheless, Sam decides to look into the mirror. He sees the Shire being destroyed, and the stairs that lead to Mordor – a path Frodo, Sam, and Gollum shall take further into the story. He also sees Frodo being consumed by the One Ring.

Finally, Frodo looks into the mirror. He sees Gandalf or someone who looks like him – he sees a man wearing a white robe and a cane. Moreover, he sees the Eye of Sauron and he possesses all the rings of power. He steps back and Galadriel says:

‘I know what it was that you last saw,’ she said; ‘for that is also in my mind. Do not be afraid! But do not think that only by singing amid the trees, nor even by the slender arrows of elven-bows, is this land of Lothlórien maintained and defended against its Enemy. I say to you, Frodo, that even as I speak to you, I perceive the Dark Lord and know his mind’ (TOLKIEN, 2004, p. 474).

Lady Galadriel retrieves to the North, so Sauron does not perceive the presence of her ring of power. The Fellowship leaves the forest of Lothlórien with boats and presents provided by Galadriel.

Concerning the script, once Gandalf's death occurs, Aragorn leads them to the forest where they are introduced to the Lady and the Lord. Galadriel 'read' and 'talked' to them through their minds. While all are sleeping, Frodo wakes up and feels her presence. He follows her into the Mirror of Galadriel.

Upon a low stone pedestal, carved like a branching tree, sits a shallow SILVER BASIN. GALADRIEL leads FRODO into the small GLADE.
 GALADRIEL: Will you look into the mirror?
 ANGLE ON: FRODO looks with apprehension at the silver basin.
 FRODO (warily): What will I see?
 GALADRIEL pours water into the basin from a silver jug ... a GLOW rises from the water.
 GALADRIEL: Even the wisest cannot tell. For the mirror shows many things ... things that were ... things that are ... and some things that have not yet come to pass (THE LORD..., c2001, p. 144).

Frodo sees the Shire being destroyed and its people turned into slaves. Also, he sees the Fellowship breaking apart. Galadriel says "The Fellowship is breaking. It is already begun. He will try to take the Ring. You know of whom I speak. One by one, it will destroy them all" (THE LORD..., c2001, p. 146). Frodo knows what he has to do but he is preoccupied: "FRODO: I cannot do this alone. GALADRIEL: You are a Ring-bearer, Frodo. To bear a Ring of Power is to be alone" (THE LORD..., c2001, p. 146).

In the script, Lady Galadriel also retrieves to the North and provides boats and presents to the companions.

During their journey, in the boats, before they reached Aragorn kin's land, Frodo and Strider talk about Gollum who has been following them. When they stop by the shore, they give Frodo an hour to decide what to do and where to go. While walking in the forest, Boromir tries to take the One Ring from Frodo, but Frodo uses the Ring to escape from him.

Frodo does not believe that he should continue with his companions. He decides to get one of the boats and go to Mordor alone. Sam sees Frodo leaving and joins him in his quest.

Related to the movie, Gollum has been following them since before the Mines of Moria. When they stop by the shore, Frodo is getting wood to make a fire when Boromir tries to steal the Ring. Frodo uses the Ring to escape and encounters Aragorn. He tells Strider what has happened and asks if he would destroy it and not let him be taken by the influence of the Ring.

ARAGORN: Frodo?
 FRODO (numb): It has taken Boromir.
 ARAGORN moves towards FRODO...
 ARAGORN (urgent): Where is the Ring?
 FRODO backs away from ARAGORN ... ARAGORN is shocked by the movement.
 FRODO: Stay away!
 ARAGORN: Frodo ... I swore to protect you.
 FRODO: Can you protect me from yourself?
 CLOSE ON: FRODO uncurls his fist ... in his palm lies the RING!
 It glints, gold and beautiful in the afternoon sun ... ARAGORN'S eyes are drawn to it.
 FRODO (CONT'D): Would you destroy it?
 THE RING: Aragorn. Aragorn. Elessar.
 ARAGORN (kneeling to Frodo): I would have gone with you to the end ... into the very fires of Mordor.
 FRODO: I know. Look after the others, especially Sam ... he will not understand (THE LORD..., c2001, p. 162-163).

Aragorn looks at Frodo's sword, which glows blue when orcs are near, and tells Frodo to run. Strider fights the orcs for Frodo so he might have a chance to escape. Legolas and Gimli arrive and help Aragorn.

The orcs spread into the forest searching for the halflings (how they call the Hobbits) and capture Merry and Pippin. Before being taken, Boromir finds them and tries to defend them. He sounds the hornet of Gondor asking for help because the number of orcs is enormous. Boromir is shot three times using arrows by an Uruk-Hai. His death is marked, especially, by his final words.

BOROMIR (painful gasp): They took the little ones...
 ARAGORN quickly tries to staunch the flow of BLOOD from BOROMIR'S shoulder.
 BOROMIR (CONT'D) (panicked): Frodo ... where is Frodo?
 ARAGORN: I let Frodo go.
 BOROMIR holds Aragorn's gaze.
 BOROMIR: Then you did what I could not. I tried to take the Ring from him.
 ARAGORN: The Ring is beyond our reach now.
 BOROMIR: Forgive me. I did not see ... I have failed you all.
 ARAGORN: No, Boromir. You fought bravely. You have kept your honor.
 ARAGORN tries to bind BOROMIR'S wound.
 BOROMIR: Leave it! It is over ... the world of Men will fall and all will come to darkness and my city to ruin ... Aragorn...
 ARAGORN: I do not know what strength is in my blood, but I swear to you ... I will not let the White City fall, nor your people fail...
 BOROMIR: Our people ... our people...
 ARAGORN places BOROMIR'S sword in his hand. BOROMIR'S fingers tighten around the hilt.
 BOROMIR (CONT'D) I would have followed you, my brother ... my captain, my king.
 ARAGORN lays BOROMIR down. He is dead (THE LORD..., c2001, p.167-168).

Frodo manages to get one of the boats and escapes. Sam follows him and says that he will not leave Frodo because of the promise he has made to Gandalf.

Boromir's death occurs in the first chapter of the book *Two Towers*. Peter Jackson mentioned that he decides to bring forward his death and make *Two Towers* a smoother movie. He also said he brought moments from the second book and the third one (*The Return of the King*) into the first movie.

The next section is about the final remarks of this work in which the adaptation theories and the comparative analysis are reviewed.

4 FINAL REMARKS

This final thesis had as its main objective to compare two mediums: a book and a screenplay. According to Andrew (1984), as mentioned previously, “[...] the making of film out of an earlier text is virtually as old as the machinery of cinema itself”. Also, as mentioned earlier, The Chicago School of Media Theory (2016) stipulates that as long as adaptation has existed, there has been tension between literature and film. Using the book and script from *The Lord of the Ring – The Fellowship of the Ring*, this final thesis proposed to analyze such topic using adaptation theories through several lenses which include adaptation as a new entity; adaptation as faithful as it can remain to its main source; adaptation as uncinematic or cinematic; adaptation as a process; and adaptation as inferior compared to literature.

Authors such as Hutcheon (2006), Stam (2000a), Balázs (1953), Bazin (1967), Andrew (1984), Bluestone (1961), Kraucauer (1960), Mitry (1971), and Leitch (2007) provided the theories that complement the theoretical background of this thesis. Also, there is a section dedicated to the script which described its main characteristics, its negligence towards film studies, and its relevance to film adaptation studies based on Boozer (2008) and Mitry’s (1971) theories. Furthermore, the progression of book *Lord of the Rings – The Fellowship of the Ring* into the script was deliberated.

Next, a comparative analysis was written to demonstrate the differences and similarities between both mediums. For this chapter, the characters and characterization were explored. Additionally, the plot of the story was examined along with the narrative structure, the languages created by Tolkien, and the songs in the book.

Thus, concerning the adaptation theories compared to the analysis of the script, I have concluded that despite an adaptation being seen as inferior to literature and even unfaithful when compared, the screenplay is a new entity, a new work of art, a new material (BALÁZS, 1953; BLUESTONE, 1961; HUTCHEON, 2006) – aligning with the points of view of the theorists. Yet, it can still contain a grain of truth – the main source (BALÁZS, 1953; STAM, 2000a). Moreover, Bluestone’s (1961) theory explicates that an adapter is a true author and not a translator of another’s work – meaning that an adaptation is a “[...] a matter of transposition of reconstruction” (MITRY, 1971, p. 1).

Regarding the differences and similarities of both mediums, most characters do not match their description when compared. The main examples are the elves. Legolas is interpreted by Orlando Bloom and is portrayed as a fairy-like personality and as physical appearance. In contrast, Tolkien describes him as a warrior and with a dark personality.

Another major difference is the substitution of elves: Glorfindel and Arwen. In the book, Tolkien writes about the elf Glorfindel, and Jackson writes using Arwen in the script.

In the section Narrator, poetry and languages, the difference between the narrator of the script and the book is considerable since the script does not have a specific narrator; it is written in the present, it is impersonal and has a technical description. The point of view used in the book is in the third-person omniscient narration. In addition, the book is divided into two sections: book one and book two. Nonetheless, the script is a single text divided into moments and scenes. When comparing the book to the screenplay, the events are well interwoven so that there are not loose ends. Moreover, the screenplay does not contain certain parts of the book – more specifically, all book one.

The poems (and songs) are intermixed with the prose throughout the book. Nevertheless, they are not present in the movie and play a minor role in the script. About the poems and songs in the book, Kullman (2014, p. 238) mentions “[...] concerning the poetic insertions in *The Lord of the Rings*, [...] all of them appear to fulfill a function within the narrative; they are all part of the plot and motivated by narrative developments”. Related to the languages, both the script and the movie explore the languages created by Tolkien. In the script, the lines are written in both English and Elvish (most of the times). In the movie, the characters speak using the Elvish and other languages. However, the book is all in English.

The plot was analyzed through the lenses of DiYanni (1986) who reinforces Freytag’s (1900) structure for stories. Neither the book nor the script follow Freytag’s structure accordingly since they change and mix the proposed order – the mediums do not follow the pattern. There is the exposition of the story in the beginning, but other main characters and settings are discovered throughout the story. The rising action, the climax, and the falling action occur in a mixed order. Also, there are several of these points in the story causing the disruption of steps. Concerning the resolution, the book – originally it is not a trilogy as it was analyzed in this work – has a continuation in the book *Two Towers* starting with Boromir’s death. The script is also left with an open ending to continue its story in another script and movie. Furthermore, book one was not adapted into the script since the screenwriters could not prove the existence of Tom Bombadil and did not think his story was important to Frodo’s journey. As Philippa (LORD..., 2019) affirms “[...] we don't know if they went to the forest. It is just left untold”.

The approach used in this final thesis was to demonstrate the similarities and differences between the book and the screenplay using the lenses of adaptation as a new entity and a new work of art as proposed by Balázs (1953), Bluestone (1961), and Hutcheon (2006).

I did not analyze the book and screenplay using Stam (2000a), Bazin (1967), Andrew (1984), and Kraucauer (1960) since these authors theorize that an adaptation should be as faithful to its main source as possible, and that was not the main purpose of this work. Also, it is important to highlight that this final thesis is not value judging the similarities and differences over the lenses proposed.

Therefore, I suggest further research on the comparison of the book and the screenplay based on the authors mentioned above like Kraucauer (1960), who still theorizes the idea of a book and adaptation as cinematic or uncinematic; Bazin (1967) who insists on the recognition of literature towards the adaptation; and Stam (2000a), who privileges literature over film. Moreover, another research would be to compare the entire trilogy with its scripts and/or movies.

REFERENCES

- ACEVEDO-MUÑOZ, Ernesto. “Strange and new...”. *In*: BOOZER, Jack (ed.). **Authorship in film adaptation**. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008. p. 131-155. Available at: <https://b-ok.lat/book/694533/f149af>. Accessed on: 19 Oct. 2020.
- ADAPTATION. *In*: THE CHICAGO School of Media Theory. Chicago, 03 Dec. 2016. Available at: <https://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/mediatheory/keywords/adaptation/>. Accessed at: 15 Sept. 2020.
- AGES. *In*: TOLKIEN gateway. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: <http://tolkiengateway.net/wiki/Ages>. Accessed on: 12 Jul. 2021.
- ANDREW, Dudley. **Concepts in film theory**. 1. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/11159744/Dudley_Andrew_Concepts_in_Film_Theory. Accessed on: 08 Mar 2021.
- BALÁZS, Béla. **Theory of the film: character and growth of a new art**. Great Britain: Dennis Dobson LTD, 1953. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/theoryofthefilm000665mbp/page/n11/mode/2up>. Accessed on: 19 Mar. 2021.
- BAZIN, André. In defense of mixed cinema. *In*: BAZIN, André (comp.). **What is cinema?** Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967. p. 53-75. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/31353835/Andre_Bazin_What_Is_Cinema_Vol. Accessed on: 08 Mar. 2021.
- BENNETT, Andrew; ROYLE, Nicholas. Moving pictures. *In*: BENNETT, Andrew; ROYLE, Nicholas (comp.). **Introduction to literature, criticism and theory**. 3. ed. United Kingdom: Pearson Longman, 2004. p. 142-151. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/41644140/An_Introduction_to_Literature_Criticism_and_Theory. Accessed on: 08 Mar. 2021.
- BERANEK, Birgit-Ann. **One ring to rule them all’**: Tolkien on Screen. An Analysis of Peter Jackson’s Adaptation of The Lord of the Rings. 2013. Final Bachelor Thesis (Bachelor in Philosophy) – University of Vienna, Vienna, 2013. Available at: http://othes.univie.ac.at/24823/1/2013-01-06_0147014.pdf. Accessed on: 18 May. 2021.
- BLUESTONE, George. **Novel into film**. 2. ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/novelsintofilm00blue>. Accessed on: 08 Mar. 2021.
- BOOZER, Jack. Introduction: the screenplay and authorship in adaptation. *In*: BOOZER, Jack (ed.). **Authorship in film adaptation**. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008. p. 1-29. Available at: <https://b-ok.lat/book/694533/f149af>. Accessed on: 19 Oct. 2020.
- BOROMIR. *In*: FANDOM. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: <https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Boromir>. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

BRONZITE, Dan. The hero's journey - mythic structure of Joseph Campbell's monomyth. *In: MOVIE outline*. [S. l., 201-?]. Available at: <http://www.movieoutline.com/articles/the-hero-journey-mythic-structure-of-joseph-campbell-monomyth.html>. Accessed on: 15 Apr. 2021

CAMPBELL, Joseph. **The hero with a thousand faces**. The United States of America: Princeton University Press, 2004. Available at: <https://rauterberg.employee.id.tue.nl/lecturenotes/DDM110%20CAS/Campbell-1949%20The%20Hero%20with%20a%20Thousand%20Faces.pdf>. Accessed on: 26 Apr. 2021.

CLEAR, James. Best-selling books of all-time. *In: JAMES CLEAR*. [S. l.], [2020?]. Available at: <https://jamesclear.com/best-books/best-selling>. Accessed on: 24 Mar. 2021.

DIYANNI, Robert. The elements of fiction. *In: DIYANNI, Robert (comp.). Reading fiction, poetry and drama, and the essay*. New York: Randon House, 1986. p. 23-77.

DWARVES. *In: FANDOM*. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: <https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Dwarves>. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

ELVES. *In: FANDOM*. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: <https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Elves>. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

FREYTAG, Gustav. **Technique of the drama**: an exposition of dramatic composition and art. 3. ed. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1900. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/freytagstechniqu00freyuoft>. Accessed on: 05 Jun. 2021.

FRODO baggins. *In: FANDOM*. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Frodo_Baggins. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

GLORFINDEL. *In: FANDOM*. [S. l., 2021]. Available at: <https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Glorfindel>. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

GOLLUM. *In: FANDOM*. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: <https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Gollum>. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

HUTCHEON, Linda. **A theory of adaptation**. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/31992068/HUTCHEON_A_Theory_of_Adaptation. Accessed on: 19 Oct. 2020.

KLAUTAU, Diego. Evil and power: the symbolism of the one ring in "the lord of the rings". **Ciberteologia – Journal of Teology & Culture**, São Paulo, v. II, n. 8, p. 1-11, 2006. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/32284742/Evil_and_Power_The_symbolism_of_the_One_Ring_in_The_Lord_of_the_Rings_. Accessed on: 17 May. 2021.

KRACAUER, Siegfried. **Theory of film**: the redemption of physical reality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960. Available at: https://monoskop.org/images/2/22/Kracauer_Siegfried_Theory_of_Film_The_Redemption_of_Physical_Reality.pdf. Accessed on: 19 Mar. 2021.

KULLMANN, Thomas. Poetic insertions in Tolkien's the lord of the rings. **Connotations**, [s. l.], v. 23. n. 2, p. 283-309, 2014. Available at: <https://www.connotations.de/article/thomas-kullmann-poetic-insertions-in-tolkiens-the-lord-of-the-rings/>. Accessed on: 6 Nov. 2020.

LEGOLAS. In: FANDOM. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Legolas#cite_note-22. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

LEITCH, Thomas. Exceptional fidelity. In: LEITCH, Thomas (comp.) **Film adaptation & its discontents: from gone with the wind to the passion of christ**. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007. p. 127-150. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290904796_Film_Adaptation_and_its_Discontents_From_Gone_with_the_Wind_to_The_Passion_of_the_Christ. Accessed on: 08 Mar. 2021.

LEITCH, Thomas. Literature versus literacy. In: LEITCH, Thomas (comp.) **Film adaptation & its discontents: from gone with the wind to the passion of christ**. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007. p. 1-21. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290904796_Film_Adaptation_and_its_Discontents_From_Gone_with_the_Wind_to_The_Passion_of_the_Christ. Accessed on: 08 Mar. 2021.

LORD of the rings the fellowship of the ring appendices (part 1). [S. l.: s. n.], 10 Nov. 2019. 1 video (40 min 48 s). Published by the channel Everything in Middle Earth. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HPmb3Al25pM&list=WL&index=15>. Accessed on: 10 Mar. 2021.

LUZ, Jenifer Thomann da. **O papel das adaptações na divulgação e nas escolhas de leitura**. 2018. Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso (Licenciado em Letras – Habilitação Inglês) – Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, São Leopoldo, 2018. Available at: <https://ged.unisinos.br/DocuWare/Platform/WebClient?orgId=1>. Accessed on: 19 May. 2021.

MERIADOC, brandybuck. In: FANDOM. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Meriadoc_Brandybuck. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

MITRY, Jean. Remarks on the problem of cinematic adaptation. **The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association**, [s. l.], v. 4, n. 1, p. 1-9, 1971. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/1314966. Accessed on: 08 Mar. 2021.

O SENHOR dos anéis: a sociedade do anel. Directed by: Peter Jackson. Produced by Peter Jackson, Fran Walsh, Rick Porras, Barrie Osborne, and Tim Sanders. Interpreters: Elijah Wood, Viggo Mortensen, Orlando Bloom, Ian McKellen, and others. Screenplay: Peter Jackson, Fran Walsh, and Philippa Boyens. Song: Howard Shore. New York: New Line Cinema, 2001. 1 DVD (178 min), *widescreen*, color. Based on the novel "The Lord of The Rings" by J. R. R. Tolkien.

O SENHOR dos anéis: as duas torres. Directed by: Peter Jackson. Produced by Harvey Weinstein, Bob Weinstein, Robert Shaye, Mark Ordesky, and Michael Lynne. Interpreters: Elijah Wood, Viggo Mortensen, Orlando Bloom, Ian McKellen, and others. Screenplay: Peter Jackson, Fran Walsh, Philippa Boyens, and Stephen Sinclair. Song: Howard Shore. New York: New Line Cinema, 2002. 1 DVD (179 min), *widescreen*, color. Based on the novel "The Lord of The Rings" by J. R. R. Tolkien.

O SENHOR dos anéis: o retorno do rei. Directed by: Peter Jackson. Produced by Peter Jackson, Fran Walsh, Rick Porras, Barrie Osborne, and Tim Sanders. Interpreters: Elijah

Wood, Viggo Mortensen, Orlando Bloom, Ian McKellen, and others. Screenplay: Peter Jackson, Fran Walsh, and Philippa Boyens. Song: Howard Shore. New York: New Line Cinema, 2003. 1 DVD (201 min), *widescreen*, color. Based on the novel “The Lord of The Rings” by J. R. R. Tolkien.

PALIMPSESTS. In: CAMBRIDGE dictionary. England: Cambridge University Press. Available at: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/pt/dicionario/ingles/palimpsest>. Accessed on: 24 Mar. 2021.

PEREGRIN took. In: FANDOM. [S. l., 2021?]. Available at: https://lotr.fandom.com/wiki/Peregrin_Took. Accessed on: 16 Apr. 2021.

ROSS, Britteney. First, second, and third person. In: GRAMMARLY. **Grammarly blog**. [S.l.], 23 Apr. 2016. Available at: <https://www.grammarly.com/blog/first-second-and-thirdperson/#:~:text=First%2C%20second%2C%20and%20third%20person%20are%20ways%20of%20describing%20points,she%2Fit%2Fthey%20perspective>. Accessed on: 17 May. 2021.

SENHOR dos anéis: a sociedade do anel. In: IMDB. [S. l., 2002?]. Available at: <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0120737/>. Accessed on: 31 Mar. 2021.

STAM, 2000a apud HUTCHEON, Linda. **A theory of adaptation**. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006. p. 4. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/31992068/HUTCHEON_A_Theory_of_Adaptation. Accessed on: 19 Oct. 2020

STAM, Robert. Beyond fidelity: the dialogics of adaptation. In: NAREMORE, James (ed.). **Film adaptation**. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2000a. p. 54-76. Available at: <https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/engl485jj/stam2.pdf>. Accessed on: 08 Mar. 2021.

THE LORD of the rings: the fellowship of the ring. Screenwriters: Fran Walsh, Philippa Boyens, and Peter Jackson. In: THE FEMPIROR chronicles. [S. l.], c2001. PDF file of the non-original script based on the novels by J. R. R. Tolkien – posted on the website The Fempiror Chronicles. Available at: <http://www.fempiror.com/otherscripts/LordoftheRings1-FOTR.pdf>. Accessed on: 04 sept. 2020.

TOLKIEN, John Ronald Reuel. **The fellowship of the ring**. Great Britain: HarperCollinsPublishers, 2004.

TOLKIEN, John Ronald Reuel. **The hobbit**. 1. ed. Great Britain: HarperCollinsPublishers, 1937. Available at: https://fb2bookfree.com/uploads/files/2020-10/1602382990_the-hobbit.pdf. Accessed on: 24 Mar. 2021.

TOLKIEN, John Ronald Ruel. **The return of the king**. Great Britain: HarperCollins e-books, 1955. *E-book*. Available at: https://charlton6.weebly.com/uploads/1/0/6/2/10621939/lord_of_the_rings_the_return_of_the_king.pdf. Accessed on: 17 May. 2021.

TOLKIEN, John Ronald Ruel. **Two towers**. Great Britain: HarperCollins e-books, 1954. *E-book*. Available at: <https://books-library.net/files/books-library.online-12222153Wa1D3.pdf>. Accessed on: 17 May. 2021.

UHRYP, Alfred. [Epigraph]. *In*: HUTCHEON, Linda. **A theory of adaptation**. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006. p. vi. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/31992068/HUTCHEON_A_Theory_of_Adaptation. Accessed on: 19 Oct. 2020.

VOGLER, Christopher. Practical guide. *In*: VOGLER, Christopher (comp.). **The writer's journey: mythic structure for storytellers and screenwriters**. California: Michael Wiese Productions, 1992. p. 13-31.

VOYTILLA, Stuart. **Excepts from myth and the movies**. California: Michael Wiese Productions, 1999. Available at: <https://www.tlu.ee/~rajaleid/montaazh/Hero%27s%20Journey%20Arch.pdf>. Accessed on: 27 Apr. 2021.

**ANNEX A – THE HERO'S JOURNEY - MYTHIC STRUCTURE OF JOSEPH
CAMPBELL'S MONOMYTH**



ANNEX B – THE HERO’S JOURNEY MODEL

