

**Sérgio Paulo Guimarães de Sousa. *Literatura & Cinema: Ensaios, Entrevistas, Bibliografia*. Coimbra: Angelus Novus, 2003.**

Ângela Sarmiento

Beginning with its title, Sérgio Sousa's book is a call for a comparative approach to two autonomous art forms. The author offers his own version of genre intertwining through texts that are hybrid themselves: theory and practice are mixed in the essays, the interviews imply the conjunction of oral and written modes as well as the presence and absence of the speakers, and then there is the bibliography, brief yet enriching.

These diverse registers are articulated by "a kind of parallel editing," and there is no lack of photographic images, as close-ups preceding the interviews. In this way, the writing travels mimetically, as if it were the "stylo-caméra" mentioned in the book, inverting Astruc's original concept of "caméra-stylo." So, the book must be considered within a range of traditions of writing: about directors who are writers; or about writers who are directors; or about literature and cinema in general.

In the first essay, Sérgio Sousa studies the influence the seventh art has exerted on literary composition techniques. He chooses *Azul-Turquesa*, by Jacinto Lucas Pires, as an example of "a book that is almost a film," in the wake of authors like Hemingway or Faulkner or even the Portuguese neo-realistic writers, who make use of "behaviouristic" speech, concentrating on external focalization, on the "a-psychology" of the characters, in short, on the "objective" representation of the real. Literary speech is considered to operate in a "showing" format, marked by the non-existence of the narrator and the consequent lack of "deictics," which contribute to the concreteness of the audio-visual image. The reader of such texts also becomes a spectator, facing the spatialization of time and the temporalization of space, in which the anaphoric and cataphoric circumvolutions and the progression of the plot are indicated by visual icons, within a paratactic discourse of an eternal present, broadly speaking, like an editing technique.

The author emphasises that this is *one* possible reading/watching of a literary text. He does not ever negate the possibility of other discursive strategies in the text, at the very level of cinematographic code importation, which he mentions further on during his interview with Lucas Pires.

In the second essay, Sousa considers film transpositions from literary texts. He questions the concept of "fidelity," supported by several semiotic theories from both literary and cinematic studies (Bazin, Zumalde, Genette, Greimas), and tries to establish limits between an "adaptation" and an "inspiration," that is to say, he tries to distinguish between heuristic and hermeneutic liberty and libertinism, which the reader/director should be allowed to perform. He reminds us that, in spite of traditional closed theories (tending to open gradually), in practice there have been prolific betrayals and sterile fidelities.

The interviews allow the author to explore these questions in a more direct tone. It is as if a camera shot in a continuum the spontaneous interactions between the two speakers, led by the interviewee. Nevertheless, you immediately realise that the interviewer is subtly commanding the movements and the editing; not much, though just the amount necessary to give coherence to the whole, like bringing verisimilitude to the "spoken world." Over a three-year time span, five people are interviewed, all differently connected with writing and cinema. Jacinto Lucas Pires, the aforementioned author of *Azul-Turqueza* is a protean creator who feels nearer to directors than writers; Artur Ribeiro is a Portuguese director living in New York, who tells the difference between adaptation and inspiration based on his own practice; Adília Lopes is writer of multiple genres, strongly influenced by cinema; Manuel António Pina is a multimode writer as well, who preferred to use e-mail to answer the questions posed; and Anabela Dinis Branco de Oliveira is a specialised reader and commentator, who develops a thesis about the reception of the cinematic technique and language in Portuguese contemporary novels.

The central question of the relationship between literature and cinema is therefore spread in different directions. Starting from the autonomous claim of each of the two art forms, their main difference is considered in terms of "means," as it was for Aristotle in his matrix of all aesthetics. Other themes are connected with this one, such as technological development or communicative ability, either more or less mediated. You are then confronted with the problem of language and writing genres, with the specificities of the cinematic versus the literary codes and with those of other genres as well. Other questions arise, about the themes that motivate each artistic representation, questions of boundaries,

of hybrid nationalities, or about the difference (or not) between male and female expressions, or the different worlds and functions of the (two) art forms.

The bibliography presents titles related to these topics. In general, they represent very recent works, or classics, and they point to a variety of methodologies, focusing more on theory *or* on practice, on literature *or* on cinema. Essential references also appear at the end of the two essays as well as scattered throughout the interviews.

**Ângela Sarmiento** is a research assistant at the Institute of Comparative Literature, Oporto University, with an MA in Brazilian poetry. She is currently preparing a doctoral thesis on literature and cinema. Email: [asarmento@letras.up.pt](mailto:asarmento@letras.up.pt)