

LOOKING FOR HETEROGLOSSIA AND CHRONOTOPE IN NEW YORK AND LONDON: PACINO AND LONCRINE'S ADAPTATIONS OF *RICHARD III*

Mohammad Reza Hassanzadeh Javanian

University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

The relationship between a cinematic adaptation and its literary source has sparked scholarly debates in the field of adaptation studies. Developed by the Russian literary critic, Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975), dialogism can shed new light on the adaptation-source tie as it highlights the mutual interaction between the two sides. The present study argues that Al Pacino and Richard Loncraine's versions of William Shakespeare's *Richard III* (1593) stress such a dialogic aspect of the adaptation process. Within this dialogic framework, Pacino's *Looking for Richard* (1996) establishes a heteroglossial relation with the play as it seeks to eliminate the gap between Shakespeare and the movie's modern viewers. Loncraine's *Richard III* (1995), however, is marked by a significant chronotopic strategy which situates Richard in new social and political contexts through a change in the play's temporal and spatial elements.

Keywords: dialogism, heteroglossia, chronotope, adaptation studies, Mikhail Bakhtin, William Shakespeare

Article history:

Received: 30 November 2018;

Reviewed: 7 March 2019;

Accepted: 18 April 2019;

Published: 1 June 2019

Copyright © 2019 Mohammad Reza Hassanzadeh Javanian



This open access article is published and distributed under a [CC BY-NC 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. Permissions beyond the scope of this license may be available at mrjavanian@ut.ac.ir. If you want to use the work commercially, you must first get the authors' permission.

Citation: Hassanzadeh Javanian, M. R. (2019). Looking for Heteroglossia and Chronotope in New York and London: Pacino and Loncraine's Adaptations of *Richard III*. *English Studies at NBU*, 5(1), 59-76.
<https://doi.org/10.33919/esnbu.19.1.3>

Mohammad Reza Hassanzadeh Javanian, Ph.D. is currently a lecturer of English language and literature at the University of Tehran, Iran. He teaches literary movements, drama and literary prose there. His research interests include drama, adaptation studies, comparative literature and gender studies. Hassanzadeh Javanian has, in particular, concentrated on the notion of dialogism as developed by the philosopher and literary critic, Mikhail Bakhtin.

E-mail: mrjavanian@ut.ac.ir  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7121-5872>

William Shakespeare's *Richard III* (1593) has long been popular among filmmakers as it elaborates on the details of a significant part of English history through its alluring protagonist. Laurence Olivier, Richard Loncraine, Al Pacino and Jeremy Whelehan are only some of the directors who have recently focused on different dimensions of the play in their cinematic projects. The present article is set to focus on Pacino and Loncraine's adaptations of the play.

The study will apply the theory of dialogism by the Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin (1985-1975) to the investigation of relationships between the two adaptations and their dramatic source. In particular, the study finds that Bakhtin's notions of heteroglossia and chronotope can be useful and insightful tools for a clarification of distinctions between the approaches of Pacino and Loncraine's cinematic versions toward the play.

Using heteroglossia and chronotope, the study argues that each of the two movies highlights a distinctive feature of dialogism in its approach toward Shakespeare's history play. While both seek to remove the cultural divide between Shakespeare's text and language and their contemporary socio-cultural contexts, *Looking for Richard* carries out its project through focusing on heteroglossia while Loncraine's movie adopts an intricate chronotopic strategy to fulfill its aim. The next section will dwell on heteroglossia and chronotope as discussed by Bakhtin. The study, then, will investigate the heteroglossial nature of Pacino's film. Next, the idea of chronotope underlying Loncraine's *Richard III* will be elaborated on. Finally, the chapter will draw on some of the main conclusions of the study.

Heteroglossia, Chronotope and Dialogic Adaptation

Several attempts have been made recently to give credit to those film adaptations of literary texts which seek to engage with their contemporary cultural and historical contexts in a process that is often referred to as recontextualization. As a result of this recontextualization, the literary source no longer remains an absolute and inviolate center which the adaptation has to strictly adhere to. According to Jack Boozer, "any preoccupation with fidelity to the literary original and its presumed superiority also tends to constrain the discussion of each film's immersion in its own particular cultural and historical moment" (2008, p. 10). One important development that can help

highlight the importance of contextual forces is Bakhtinian dialogism which contains, among others, concepts of heteroglossia and chronotope.

Bakhtin's idea of heteroglossia, "the Tower-of-Babel mixing of languages" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 278) illustrates the presence of a multiplicity of social languages and utterances organized in a text. These languages never stop changing. In other words, "Bakhtin used heteroglossia to refer to the contextual specificity of meaning in the utterance, the radical heterogeneity of the utterance in its centrifugal and centripetal elements" (Hitchcock, 1998, p. 84). While centripetal elements seek to enforce the stability in hierarchies, the centrifugal forces of heteroglossia destabilize established contexts and hierarchies. These forces show that aspect of our experiences which can be called, to use another Bakhtinian term, carnivalesque. Every utterance marks the point where these forces interact with each other.

Therefore, we deal with languages and not a single language. Each of these languages reflects one specific aspect of the world we experience. As a result of these reflections, we are invited to contemplate more on and remain active participants in the process of social experiences. Thus, an adapted cinematic version of a literary work, "through its heteroglot system of effects (visual, audio, written and so on), points at such 'varied horizons', impelling us to engage with other aspects of social experience and other members of the interpretative community, generating a network of 'creative perception' and dialogic participation" (Flanagan, 2009, p. 10).

A heteroglossial text "reflects the fundamental other-languagedness or 'double-voicedness' of human experience", revealing "the simultaneous constitution and transgression of boundaries relating self to the other in the medium of historical time" and integrating "the situated freedom to transform existing structures with a recognition of the embeddedness of human activities in pre-existent space-time frameworks" (Sandywell, 1998, p. 197). The concept underlines that a text, as a discursive event, is not an isolated unit in a specific culture. All ideological structures and value systems of a particular cultural influence and are influenced by a certain text.

Although Bakhtin's theory of heteroglossia has important social and historical implications, his focus on verbal arts prevented him from investigating heteroglossial

applications in other areas. Adaptation studies, in particular, can base its analysis of adapted versions of literary works on this concept. The interpretation particularly works well for those adaptations that intend to recontextualize classic texts and relate them to their contemporary issues and discourses.

Another important concept in Bakhtin's theory of dialogism is chronotope; a name used to describe "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 84). Despite its seemingly simple definition, chronotope is not restricted to time and space but it is a value-laden concept as situatedness in a particular time and space necessarily invokes certain values. As Michael Holquist maintains, chronotope "brings together not just two concepts, but four: a time, plus its value; and a space, plus its value" (2002, p. 152).

Since our situatedness in a specific time and space invokes certain values, it exerts considerable influence on our ethical decisions as well. For instance, Liisa Steinby argues that the adventure chronotope, which Bakhtin associates with the ancient Greek romance, indicates that "human action does not arise from human will alone, understood abstractly as totally free. On the contrary, what a hero can actually do is strictly limited by the chronotope in which the events take place. Of course, he still has to make choices – and he is ethically judged accordingly – but the spectrum of his choices is chronotopically restricted" (2013, p. 118). This is another way of saying that "a human being is always conditioned by his surroundings in his action, although he never loses his ethical autonomy" (Steinby, 2013, p. 118).

In addition to the first type of chronotope that Bakhtin finds in the ancient Greek romance, he elaborates on two other major chronotopic types in what he calls ancient "*adventure novel of everyday life*" (1981, p. 111; emphasis original) and ancient "*biographical novel*" (1981, p. 130; emphasis original). His discussion of forms of time and space in the novel also includes such minor chronotopes of road, threshold, inn, and castle. As for Bakhtin the utterance is "intimately linked to the space-time (chronotope) that constitutes the speech as well as narrative" (Aronowitz, 1995, p. 128), these chronotopes, despite their differences, have the ability to shape the story as "they are the organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 250) of the story.

Moreover, Bakhtin's interpretation of time and space elements contributes to his life-long emphasis on the open-endedness and unfinalizability of a given utterance. Jonathan Stone contends that "the very idea of a chronotope, an appreciation of time that is dependent on the position of the actor, requires a degree of instability that excludes the possibility of absolute time and space" (2008, p. 412).

A chronotope's potential to defy the absoluteness of time and space, its emphasis on the value-systems evoked by certain spatial and temporal elements, and its role in creating a network of relations between textual elements and multiple contextual forces suggest that it can address some of the contemporary debates in adaptation studies.

In what follows, the article argues that Al Pacino's movie takes Shakespeare's text as an emblem of high culture in the canon of Western literature to bridge the cultural divide between the Bard and the contemporary popular culture or mass culture in the United States. It further contends that elaborating on the modification of Loncraine's treatment of chronotope can shed new light on the connections he creates between his adaptation, his contemporary audience and Shakespeare's play.

Al Pacino and Looking for Heteroglossia

Al Pacino's *Looking for Richard* is a half-cinematic, half-performance adaptation of one of Shakespeare's most complex history plays. Through his meta-cinematic method, Pacino revolutionizes the whole idea of adaptation. The movie's unusual arrangement of traditional performance scenes, hectic neighborhoods of New York City and rehearsal meetings has made it a unique adaptation of not only *Richard III*, but of all Shakespearean films.

The movie belongs to a tradition of adaptations that, according to Ariane Hudelet, "do not try to provide a definitive version of the text, but instead attempt to represent rather our relationship to literary works, to capture a specific type of reception at a specific moment" (2012, p. 259). The film shows the director-actor Pacino preparing himself for an adaptation of Shakespeare's play, conducting research on the period, asking residents of Manhattan how they feel about Shakespeare, interviewing scholars and famous Shakespearean actors, casting his crew members, and rehearsing the scenes.

Pacino in this documentary struggles to make New Yorkers interested in Shakespeare's *Richard III*. This dialogic project soon reveals the inherent clash between two languages: Shakespeare's language and the language that people use to communicate in a late twentieth-century metropolitan like New York. The adaptation highlights the heteroglossial aspect of language which is "made up of loosely bound generic wholes, subgeneric wholes, accents, systems, dialects, and constantly fragmented layers of language working together, or at battle, or at play" (Hoy, 1992, p. 765).

The film also follows another confrontation, this time between Pacino and Shakespeare. Early in the film, Pacino encounters one of the biggest challenges of staging or filming a Shakespeare's play. He walks on the stage for his Richard part, but soon realizes that his only spectator is a man who resembles William Shakespeare. The man shakes his head hopelessly, leaving Pacino with no choice but to walk off the stage without saying a word. Pacino, though upset by the reaction, realizes that traditional methods of staging a Shakespeare's play, which stick rigidly to the Bard's text and discard contemporary contexts, will not work anymore. A big change in the adaptation process is required.

Pacino, thus, perceives he must find Shakespeare in the streets of New York to make him accessible for the public. Although he makes small modifications in the language of the play, his primary purpose is not to abandon Shakespeare's language to make a modern *Richard III*. In this documentary, "Shakespeare's language is, for the most part, 'done straight' but in a manner that invites large incursions of urban American speech patterns; involves the compression of long speeches into shorter ensembles of speech-actions; and dislocates entire passages from their moorings in the Shakespearean text in order to restructure our experience of the play" (Cartelli, 2003, p. 189).

In other words, Pacino seeks to show how his contemporary American fellows can speak their modern English and still enjoy Shakespeare's poetic words. His street interviews investigate not only Shakespeare's words, but his speech pattern and famous blank verse. However, Pacino's quest, though acclaimed by some critics, has drawn strong criticism from Shakespearean scholars who argue that the Hollywood star treats every banality about Shakespeare like a great discovery. Charles Marowitz, for example, maintains that *Looking for Richard* is a kind of "Shakespeare For Dummies," with actors

shouting 'Eureka' as they stumble on to every cliché and banality thrown up in over four centuries of remorseless Richardizing" (2004, p. 71). Marowitz adds that another wrong assumption in Pacino's project is his belief that he is supposed to find the Shakespearean spirit in every line of *Richard III*. Pacino's finding-Shakespeare-in-every-word-of-the-play assumption, which turns to a group attempt to decipher Shakespeare's text, makes him forget that before he carried out his project, many directors and actors have created Richards which may be different from that of Shakespeare but equally valid.

What is true about Marowitz's critique of Pacino's film is that almost all his filmic choices are highly affected by his purpose to bold the huge gap between his contemporary language and early modern English language. But what Marowitz misses is that Pacino's project, regardless of his choices, is first and foremost a quest to find heteroglossia. He seeks to construct a world for his film in which these two languages challenge, but not suppress, each other.

The juxtaposition of these two languages in a cinematic context, which is marked by rapid intercuts and irregular past and present scenes, illustrates the postmodern mindset of the director in his heteroglossial quest. The movie also probes such binaries as high culture and mass culture, old and new, and the UK and the US. Emma French argues that "the binary between American 'trash culture' and Shakespeare as both British and universal classic is also exploited by the posters and trailers for the film" (2006, p. 37).

Pacino's task, then, is postmodernizing Shakespeare's text for the consumption of mass culture. He endeavors to fulfill this goal "through a classical mixture of 'high' and 'low' cultural traditions, a mixture that is essentially one of forms: dramatic extracts intercut with what Pacino calls the 'doc-drama type of thing'" (Sinyard, 2000, p. 70). Pacino's preoccupation to depict these binaries emerges in the arrangement of his street interviews which sharply contrast the ones conducted with British Shakespeare scholars. The movie's generic variety is another proof for its decentralized postmodern design. Incorporating various elements of "bardolatry, iconoclasm, and postmodern irony all at once, the bard's cameos in *Looking for Richard* aptly illustrate the signature doubleness with which contemporary popular culture invokes its Shakespearean other" (Lanier, 2007, p. 100).

Although Pacino opens his adaptation with the word 'now', which shows his aim to make a Shakespearean film for the present, he does not intend to make Shakespeare accessible for his peers by modifying or simplifying his language; rather, he looks for a way in order to grasp the meaning of Shakespeare lines and then transform them in a straightforward, clear narrative for the contemporary audience, hence heteroglossia underlying his quest. Pacino's movie is not simply an adaptation of Shakespeare's play "but a meditation on what Shakespeare means at the end of the twentieth century" (Sinyard, 2000, p. 58).

This postmodern adaptation of Shakespeare's history play invests on the Bard's potential to appeal to the popular culture. Shakespeare's heteroglossial texts entail elements of both popular and high cultures, revealing their "multiple (and sometimes colliding) meanings" (Henderson, 2007, p. 6). This potential for attracting people with diverse social backgrounds gives Pacino an opportunity to carry out his heteroglossial project. One crucial moment in Pacino's project is his interview with an African American beggar. The man's answer to Pacino's questions on the importance of studying Shakespeare for a late 20th century society reassures the director to pursue his heteroglossial project: "We should speak like Shakespeare ... We have no feelings. That's why it's easy for us to get a gun and shoot each other ... But if we felt what we said—we'd say less and mean more" (*Looking for Richard*). The interview "appears to confirm the filmmakers' belief that Shakespeare speaks to everyone at the precise moment that Pacino's quest is thrown into relief as luxurious" (Walker, 2006, p. 17). The man's remarks give Pacino enough confidence and motivation to make an adaptation that speaks both to Shakespeare and (post)modern individuals.

Richard III is not among Shakespeare's plays familiar for the public as he is mostly associated with *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *Macbeth*. Shakespeare's history plays are generally less known for the public. *Richard III*, in particular, is a difficult play as there are many characters and incidents which make it hard for ordinary people to follow the story. Moreover, a comprehensive understanding of *Richard III* depends to a great extent on one's familiarity with at least three other history plays as Richard's story concludes Shakespeare's first tetralogy which also entails *Henry VI* parts 1-3. The audiences' connection with the play requires their background information about an important part of English history; a period that includes Wars of Roses, House of

Lancaster, House of York, etc. More to the point, the play's "peculiar combination of archaic-sounding language and a modern-seeming protagonist" (van Elk, 2007, p. 1) further perplexes its viewers.

Pacino acts out the play's opening speech, "now is the winter of our discontent / Made glorious summer by this sun of York ..." (1.1.1-2) for a group of seemingly college students. He, then, asks them if they know what these opening words mean. None of the students knows the meaning of Shakespeare's words and, more importantly, none is interested in understanding what Shakespeare really wants to say. This unwillingness, albeit disappointing, helps Pacino realize that *Richard III* fits his project's objectives as it can highlight the gap between Shakespeare and modern New Yorkers better than plays such as *Hamlet* and *Othello*.

The director's other strategy to emphasize the need for probing into Shakespeare's text is his choice of cast members. His cast includes almost none of the actors or actresses whose names are traditionally associated with Shakespeare. As a result, most cast members are clearly uncomfortable and confused when they want to speak Shakespeare's early modern language. Their 'discoveries' of Shakespeare's language—which might be banalities for experienced Shakespeare actors such as Kenneth Branagh and Derek Jacobi—further draws attention to contemporary unfamiliarity with the Bard and his language.

The film's unusual style is itself a heteroglossial contact between stage and screen. Sarah Hatchuel maintains that "the centripetal stage gives way to a centrifugal cinematic locus as soon as the camera field participates in hiding the limits of the acting space. In other words, as soon as Pacino's camera concentrates on the actors and avoids filming the stage apparatus around them, the theatre *mise-en-scène* starts resembling a cinematic one" (2004, p. 97). This rare juxtaposition of stage and screen moments in a cinematic adaptation of Shakespeare provides a heteroglossial framework for Pacino to carry out his heteroglossial project. Even the opening title of the movie suggests that Pacino's 'Richard' project soon changes to a 'Looking for Richard' one. The movie's uneven format along with its meta-cinematic design, arranged in a dialogic way, is unprecedented in movies based on Shakespeare's plays.

This format is not without its drawbacks, though. *Looking for Richard* confuses a story that is already highly confusing for many people. With its quick crosscuts between medieval sites, crowded New York streets, offices of Shakespeare's scholars, rehearsal room, stage, Shakespeare's house, the Globe, etc., the movie "tosses around the spectator from location to location without much explanation or warning in between" (Marshall, 2009, p. 141). As a result, the spectators might lose their concentration on the storyline because they have to cope with several unexpected shifts. This puzzling style is against Pacino's purpose to show to modern audiences that Shakespeare can still be relevant and even beneficial to their lives.

It's noteworthy to mention that Pacino's semi-documentary belongs to the category of interactive documentary; a type which, according to Warren Buckland, "makes the film maker's presence prominent, as he or she interacts with the people or events being filmed. In other words, all interactive documentaries by definition draw the filmed people and events into direct contact with the film maker. The content of the interactive documentary is based primarily on interviews, which draw out specific comments and responses from those who are filmed" (1998, p. 111). This multiplicity of voices leads to the adaptation's unique discursive diversity because "as soon as you allow a variety of discourses into a textual space—vulgar discourses as well as polite ones, vernacular as well as literary, oral as well as written—you establish a resistance (to use Davis's work) to the dominance of any one discourse" (Lodge, 1990, p. 22). As a result, despite what some critics slam as Pacino's extremely high-profile presence in the movie, the structure of *Looking for Richard* prevents the role of the lead characters to hold back other voices and discourses.

Pacino's project to fill the gap between Shakespeare and New Yorkers is dialogic because it engages him in a process to mull over the unstable conditions that can give an utterance a meaning different from what it would mean in other times and places. The adaptation even implies dialogic ties between *Looking for Richard* and Pacino's earlier cinematic roles. The council meeting where Lord Hastings is arrested and sentenced to death is described as "a gathering of dons" (*Looking for Richard*). This scene cleverly alludes to Pacino's part in Francis Ford Coppola's *Godfather* films.

The heteroglossial feature of the adaptation influences its ending as well. Regarding stage productions of Shakespeare's plays, Alan C. Dessen argues that "often final scene changes are designed to change or reinforce a particular sense of an ending. Such alterations are widespread and are to be found in comedies, histories, tragedies, and romances" (2004, p. 111). This can also explain Pacino's decision for the ending of *Looking for Richard*. Given the contemporary setting of the film, Pacino seems unable to end his adaptation in a tragic way as Shakespeare did. In a condition of explicit heteroglossia, the movie shows Richard's death, but immediately shifts to contemporary Pacino who acts out the death scene in a comic and quasi-buffoonery way. The idea originates from the fact that the director cannot find a suitable context for Richard's death in modern New York where 'grand' tragedies appear out of place.

Pacino's version of *Richard III* is mainly an inquiry on Shakespeare's position in the popular culture. As a result, many lines and scenes of the play are removed in the film. However, the quest cannot be discarded as incomplete: "Pacino stages only some ten scenes from one play-though with great cumulative power and clarity-and in this incompleteness, with all it must suggest and encompass, provides the most complete of recent Shakespeare film experiences" (Combs and Durgnat, 2001, p. 61). The sense of completeness that we feel at the end of the adaptation is heavily dependent on its heteroglossial aspect which allows all constituents of the process to be involved in a dialogic network of relations. When the movie comes to its end, Pacino seems to have accomplished his goal to prove that it is feasible to live in the postmodern New York City and still comprehend and enjoy Shakespeare and his characters.

Richard Loncraine and Looking for Chronotope

Loncraine's adaptation demands to be interpreted in relation to its contemporary social and political contexts. The film sets the play in late 1930s England, transforming Richard to a tyrant who is conspiring to usurp the British throne. Loncraine has recontextualized the play to present "a parable of twentieth-century fascism which resonates with the rising popularity of the British National Party during the 1990s" (Walker, 2006, p. 19).

Although the movie lacks the documentary aspect of Pacino's *Looking for Richard*, it is similarly eclectic, mixing elements of multiple genres including science

fiction, slasher film and western movies. *Richard III*, in particular, alludes to two main cinematic genres: British heritage film (referring to movies that depict England of the decades before World War II in a nostalgic way) and American gangster film (a genre that focuses on gangs and organized crime). This generic combination is further supported by using American actors for some key roles in this British adaptation of Shakespeare. Not only do Annette Bening (Queen Elizabeth) and Robert Downey Jr. (Queen Elizabeth's brother) guarantee the movie's box office, their high profile presence in Loncraine's film as opposed to Shakespeare's text is another aspect of the director's response to his contemporary spectators. Moreover, the casting of American actors "gives the new 'interloping' Woodvilles a social identity so distinctively different from the traditional British aristocratic York family we are shown, that the audience will immediately discern the cultural contrast from their accents and performances" (Hindle, 2007, p. 160). Loncraine's adaptation, thus, forms a network for various literary and cinematic genres to interact with Shakespeare's history play.

Loncraine's change of chronotope is significant in the overall effect and success of his movie. In cinematic adaptations such as Loncraine's *Richard III*, the audiences experience a triangular chronotopic relation. The first part of this triangular is the temporo-spatial framework of the dramatic text. Then, we face the time and space of the adaptation's plotline. Finally, the chronotopic triangle is formed when these two frameworks interact with the time and space in which the movie is received by the audience. The way a director handles the dialogic relation between these three parts determines the overall reception of their adaptation as "chronotopes influence a text's potential reception" (Collington and Collington, 2014, p. 793).

Loncraine's emphasis on the tripartite chronotopic structure of his adaptation process is evident in his efforts to convince his viewers that they are watching a version of *Richard III* which takes place in the 1930s. Unlike Shakespeare's play which begins with Richard, Loncraine's version postpones the lead character's first appearance to the 4th minute when he shoots dead a senior army officer. This deferment allows the director to familiarize his audience with a chronotope which is neither Shakespearean nor contemporary. Furthermore, in the first ten minutes of this adaptation, no single word of Shakespeare is used. The director decides to introduce the setting, background, and all major characters and their relations and then move to Shakespeare's text.

As “the ‘individuality’ of the speaker and ‘originality’ of the utterance arise from their exclusive positioning in time and space” (Morgan, 1996, p. 37), the camera throughout the movie photographs items belonging to the 1930s London: cars, newspapers, clothing, authentic Abdulla cigarettes and recognizable architectural elements. The movie’s exclusive chronotopic positioning helps the director to create an original utterance in the form of an alternative reality which constantly interacts with Shakespeare’s utterance. Moreover, a probe into the movie’s four tag lines shows that preserving this dialogic interaction has been of paramount importance for Loncraine. Two are quotations from Shakespeare: “I can smile, and murder whiles I smile” (*Henry VI Part 3*) and “I am determined to prove a villain, and hate the idle pleasures of these days” (*Richard III*). The other two are non-Shakespearean, albeit with Shakespearean aura: “power conquers all” and “what is worth dying for ... is worth killing for” (*Richard III*).

Although the movie is set in the 1930s, “there is no conflict with a known historical outcome like that of the Second World War to undermine the film’s effect. It avoids specific reference to the region’s civil war of the 1980s, but inevitably the film’s action is haunted by those events, and the images of street-to-street fighting are all too familiar from reports of war zones across the world” (Jackson, 2014, p. 32). It is how Loncraine defines the intricate relation between his three chronotopes. He uses Shakespeare to express his contemporary political and social concerns in the context of a relatively distant past. Despite the acclaims that Loncraine’s method has received, some argue that it fails to address the potential of Shakespeare’s play by reducing it to a condemnation of fascism and “displacing it to a comfortably distant past” (Aune, 2006, p. 43).

But the ‘distant-past’ chronotope allows Loncraine to carry out what Pacino was essentially seeking to do in his heteroglossial project: minimizing the gap created through years between Shakespeare and popular culture. Instead of highlighting Shakespeare’s timelessness, Loncraine “assigns Shakespeare to a specific, though anachronistic, time period” (Johnson, 2004, p. 49). Therefore, the chronotopic tie between historical past and contemporary society is a crucial feature of Loncraine’s adaptation. As the chronotope is a phenomenon that “crystallizes action and the meaning of action” (van der Liet, 1999, p. 208) and “one of the principal generators of artistic meanings” (Best, 1994, p. 291), the chronotopic schema in Loncraine’s film creates meaning by providing “a screen for contemporary anxieties and dilemmas”, thus

enabling the adaptation to be both “the bearer of its own histories and a bridge to wider societal analysis” (Eley, 2001, pp. 837-8).

Frequent direct addresses to the camera by the lead character (acted out by Ian McKellen) indicate the most intimate moments not only between Richard and the movie viewers, but, more significantly, between Shakespeare and modern audiences. These meta-cinematic moments suggest Shakespeare is looking directly into the eyes of the film’s viewers, revealing Richard’s plots to them. Despite its attempt to appeal to the audience at the end of the twentieth century through a pre-World War II story, the movie is not, as it may seem, a radical departure from its Shakespearean source. Loncraine’s movie preserves “the original language, the relationships among characters, the principal events, most of the basic political themes - in short, it is decidedly in keeping with the dramatic demands of the play text and is ultimately conservative” (Fedderson and Richardson, 2009, p. 8).

Mitchell and Snyder argue that the director’s concern to stress the affinities between Richard and Hitler as larger-than-life tyrants reflects “each era’s need to condense evil into a manageable singular figure outfitted in the readily identifiable physical ‘costume’ of disability” (2000, p. 116). Loncraine’s chronotope helps him make sure that his viewers will easily recognize Richard’s evilness as the movie’s time-space framework frequently reminds them of the Hitler-Richard analogy.

The chronotope of the final scene, which happens in an industrial London monstrosity, is not only an update of Shakespeare’s Battle of Bosworth, but a final reminder—or warning—that a modern tyrant like Richard can wreak havoc on an entire nation. Richard’s rise to the top of a huge metal structure and his final fall into burning flames signify symbolically what Lily Alexander describes as “the *chronotope of rise and fall*” (2007, p. 29; emphasis original). The ascent and descent illustrate the end of Richard’s efforts to transcend the chronotopic framework in which he is situated. This is exactly how a chronotope works: allowing the individual to preserve his ethical authority but at the same time imposing some constraints on his decisions.

Loncraine has selected a classic text to make a postmodern film set in modern Britain. He joins disparate temporal and spatial elements in an integrated cinematic

structure. A chronotopic reading of Loncraine's adaptation underscores how the British director creates a modern context for a classical text to respond to some of his contemporary social, cultural and political concerns.

Conclusion

The present study investigated two late twentieth century adaptations of Shakespeare's *Richard III*. Each adaptation approaches the source text in its unique way. The research argues that Bakhtinian heteroglossia and chronotope can highlight the relation that Al Pacino and Richard Loncraine seek to establish with Shakespeare's play respectively.

Pacino's project is explicitly heteroglot as it seeks to find a way for modern audience to retain their language but simultaneously comprehend and enjoy Shakespeare's language. The postmodern intercuts in the movie further show that the movie is in fact a quest to establish a relation of heteroglossia, or as Robert E. Kohn calls it, "the assortment of socio-ideological languages" (2005, p. 210) between Shakespeare fictional characters and American audience.

Loncraine's adaptation, on the other hand, establishes a chronotopic relation to Shakespeare's play. Loncraine's Richard is a 1930 Nazi-like tyrant who shares features of both a Shakespearean villain and a dictator at the end of the twentieth century. This representation of Richard is supported by other visual elements in the tripartite chronotopic relation in the movie.

To sum up, the endeavor in both movies is to retain Shakespearean climate in their contemporary contexts. Pacino's purpose, in particular, is to find a way for the co-existence of Shakespeare's language and modern American English while Loncraine pursues certain political and social purposes by creating a new chronotopic context in his adaptation. Despite their different approaches, both movies suggest that Shakespeare's *Richard III* is capable of being imaginatively and innovatively adapted long after its birth.

References

- Alexander, L. (2007). Storytelling in Time and Space: Studies in the Chronotope and Narrative Logic on Screen. *Journal of Narrative Theory*, 37(1), 27-64.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/jnt.2007.0014>
- Aronowitz, S. (1995). Literature as Social Knowledge: Mikhail Bakhtin and the Reemergence of the Human Sciences. In A. Mandelker (Ed.), *Bakhtin in Contexts: Across the Disciplines* (pp. 119-137). Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- Aune, M. G. (2006). The Uses of "Richard III": From Robert Cecil to Richard Nixon. *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 24 (3), 23-47. <https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2006.0045>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. (M. Holquist and C. Emerson, Trans.) Texas: University of Texas Press (Original work published 1975).
- Best, J. (1994). The Chronotope and the Generation of Meaning in Novels and Paintings. *Criticism*, 36(2), 291-316.
- Boozer, J. (2008). Introduction: The Screenplay and Authorship in Adaptation. In J. Boozer (Ed.), *Authorship in Film Adaptation* (pp. 1-31). Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Buckland, W. (1998). *Film Studies*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Cartelli, T. (2003). Shakespeare and the Street: Pacino's *Looking for Richard*, Bedford's *Street King*, and the common understanding. In R. Burt and L. E. Boose (Eds.), *Shakespeare, the Movie, II: Popularizing the Plays on Film, TV, Video, and DVD* (pp. 186-200). New York and London: Routledge.
- Collington, T. & Collington P. (2014). "The Time When ... The Place Where": Chronotopes and Chronologies in "Love's Labour's Lost". *Studies in Philology*, 111(4), 786-820.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/sip.2014.0027>
- Combs, R. & Durgnat, R. (2001). Shakespeare: A Chaos Theory. *Film Comment*, 37(4), 56-59.
- Dessen, A. C. (2004). *Rescripting Shakespeare: The Text, the Director, and Modern Productions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eley, G. (2001). Finding the People's War: Film, British Collective Memory, and World War II. *The American Historical Review*, 106(3), 818-838.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2692326>
- Fedderson, K. and Richardson J. M. (2009). Shakespeare's Multiple Metamorphoses: Authenticity Agonistes. *College Literature*, 36(1), 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/lit.0.0040>
- Flanagan, M. (2009). *Bakhtin and the Movies: New Ways of Understanding Hollywood Film*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230252042>

- French, E. (2006). *Selling Shakespeare to Hollywood: The Marketing of Filmed Shakespeare Adaptations from 1989 into the New Millennium*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Hatchuel, S. (2004). *Shakespeare, from Stage to Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511483615>
- Henderson, D. E. (2007). From popular entertainment to literature. In R. Shaughnessy (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture* (pp. 6-26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521844291.002>
- Hindle, M. (2007). *Studying Shakespeare on Film*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hitchcock, P. (1998). The Grotesque of the Body Electric. In M. M. Bell & M. Gardiner (Eds.), *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences* (pp. 78-95). California: SAGE Publications.
- Holquist, M. (2002). *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his World*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203425855>
- Hoy, M. (1992). Bakhtin and Popular Culture. *New Literary History*, 23(3), 765-782. <https://doi.org/10.2307/469229>
- Hudelet, A. (2012). Austen and Sterne: Beyond Heritage. In D. Cartmell (Ed.), *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation* (pp. 256-272). New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118312032.ch14>
- Jackson, R. (2014). *Shakespeare and the English-speaking Cinema*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, J. S. (2004). The Propaganda Imperative: Challenging Mass Media Representations in McKellen's Richard III. *College Literature*, 31(4), 44-59. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lit.2004.0059>
- Kohn, R. E. (2005). Parody, Heteroglossia, and Chronotope in Don DeLillo's *Great Jones Street*. *Style*, 39(2), 206-215.
- Lanier, D. (2007). Shakespeare TM: Myth and Biographical Fiction. In R. Shaughnessy (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture* (pp. 93-114). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521844291.006>
- Lodge, D. (1990). *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. New York: Routledge.
- Marowitz, C. (2004). Cinematizing Shakespeare. *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 22(2), 67-78.
- Marshall, K. (2009). The Creative Process and the Power of Art in "Shakespeare Behind Bars", or So This Is What "Looking for Richard" Meant to Do?" *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 37(2), 140-150.

- Mitchell, D. T. and Snyder S. L. (2000). *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.11523>
- Morgan, D. (1996). Andrew Suknaski's "Wood Mountain Time" and the Chronotope of Multiculturalism. *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal*, 29(3), 35-51.
- Sandywell, B. (1998). The Shock of the Old: Mikhail Bakhtin's Contributions to the Theory of Time and Alterity. In M. M. Bell & M. Gardiner (Eds.), *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences* (pp. 196-214). California: SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446278949.n13>
- Sinyard, N. (2000). Shakespeare Meets The Godfather: The Postmodern Populism of Al Pacino's *Looking for Richard*. In M. T. Burnett & R. Wray (Eds.), *Shakespeare, Film, Fin de Siècle* (pp. 58-73). New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Steinby, L. (2013). Bakhtin's Concept of the Chronotope: The Viewpoint of an Acting Subject. In L. Steinby & T. Klapuri (Eds.), *Bakhtin and his Others: (Inter)subjectivity, Chronotope, Dialogism* (pp. 105-127). London and New York: Anthem Press. <https://doi.org/10.7135/9780857283108.009>
- Stone, J. (2008). Polyphony and the Atomic Age: Bakhtin's Assimilation of an Einsteinian Universe. *PMLA*, 123(2), 405-421. <https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2008.123.2.405>
- Van der Liet, H. (1999). "Haven't You Heard . . .": Speech and Chronotope in Peer Hultberg's Novel "Byen og Verden". *Scandinavian Studies*, 71(2), 207-220.
- van Elk, M. (2007). "Determined to Prove a Villain": Criticism, Pedagogy, and "Richard III". *College Literature*, 34(4), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lit.2007.0050>
- Walker, E. (2006). Getting Back to Shakespeare: Whose Film is it Anyway? In D. E. Henderson (Ed.), *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare on Screen* (pp. 8-31). New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757659.ch1>

Reviewers:

1. Magdalena Grabias, PhD, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Poland
2. Irene Ranzato, PhD, Sapienza University of Roma, Italy

Handling Editor:

Stan Bogdanov, PhD,
New Bulgarian University