

Rethinking Film Adaptation Through Directors' Discourse and Auteur Theory: Approaching Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code*

M Caleb Theodar

Department of English, Vel Tech Rangarajan Dr Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, India

Saranya P

Department of English, Vel Tech Rangarajan Dr Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, India

Abstract—This article examines the apropos of Dan Brown's novel - adaptation, *The Da Vinci Code*, to the director's discourses around the film adaptation of a literary work. Ron Howard's stance as an auteur is assessed to gauge him as an illustrator of American filmmaking in terms of auteur discourses and formulate that his work disavows significant portions of the Catholic conspiracies, sidestepping the subject of authenticity, which is at the forefront of contemporary literature adaptation discourses. Despite appearing to be more 'authentic,' the film falls short of the fidelity to source material that was an avowedly auteurist vision and is shown to have issues with authorship. This paper proposes the contemporary auteur influence, examining how the concept of directors' discourse functions in the Hollywood film industry and the director's stature as an auteur and the works' creative style in literary, screen adaptation and movie translation.

Index Terms—film adaptation, directors' discourse, Auteur Theory, Dan Brown, authenticity

I. INTRODUCTION

The raison d'être of this disquisition endeavours the concept of the auteur in modern Hollywood and pop culture by incorporating the elements into cinematic discourse. A framework for comprehending the recent speech of Ron Howard and his auteurist legacy is presented by observing the director's works coupled with the commercials and cultures preceding films and using comparative-contrastive literature and cinematographic analysis. Ron Howard has gained fame as a director who makes critically acclaimed and successful pictures stylistically and thematically consistent over genres and film industries. He received the Oscars for Best Director in 2002 and the prestigious National Medal of Arts from The United States Congress in 2003, honouring his contribution to cinema.

Ron Howard was born into an acting family in Oklahoma. When he was eighteen months old, he appeared in his first film, *The Frontier Woman* (1956). Howard's journey from child actor to adult actor was more of a transition from child actor to adult director. Although he acted in a few films, such as *Shootist* (1976), directing was his passion. He began shooting films at the age of fifteen and went on to study film at the University of Southern California. *Eat My Dust* (1976) was his first picture as a director.

Ron Howard mentions he aspired to express the emotional drama that surrounds scientific advances while also replicating the pleasure of reading the novel, which takes place over the course of a day. He has been regarded as a filmmaker who adopts a very humanistic touch to narrative and conveys as informative and simple as possible when it comes to science. Illusions, like the story's subject matter, are more persuasive than reality. The film is a reasonable adaptation of the novel that earns its place amidst a series of superhero films. Ron Howard became the finest choice to visualize the epic story of Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code*. *The Da Vinci Code* is based on Dan Brown's religious novel of the same name, which was published on May 19, 2006. The screenplay was written by Akiva Goldsman, and the film was directed by Ron Howard, a prominent filmmaker who has directed films such as *Beautiful Mind* (2001) and *Cinderella Man* (2005). The length of this adapted film of Dan Brown's religious thriller is one hundred forty-nine minutes long. Like the novel, the film discloses an alternate history of Christianity by decoding and deciphering numerous clues, particularly in and beyond Da Vinci's paintings. Although Howard's "The Da Vinci Code" touched the book's ideal peak, the marketing effort has elevated it a few more. To a great degree, Howard resolved the challenging combination of action scenes and history lectures by emphasising the former and curtailing the latter. Most lectures are visual explanations of the event, so the movie would not devolve into a schematic speech of brainiacs. Also, to slot the narrative into a two-and-a-half-hour movie, significant portions had to be sliced by the script-writer, however, nothing essential was modified.

In a novel, the author has an absolute hold on the reader's impression, but in a film, the director, actors, cameraman, editor, and others collaborate to create the overall experience. The film becomes a radically new work of art, not separated off but possibly remote from its original story, created by completely distinct artists. As they are distinct, it is

irrational to correlate a novel to its movie adaptation. Having profuse perspectives, the movie can function on its own as a fresh and independent piece of art. Likewise, Susan Sontag's observation in her essay collection "Against Interpretation and other essays" (2009), she discovered a similarity between different art genres in terms of how they influence time and the attention of the viewer or the reader:

Like the novel, the cinema presents us with a view of the action, which is absolutely under the control of the director (writer) at every moment. Our attention cannot wander about the screen, as it does about the stage. When the camera moves, we move, when it remains still we are still. In a similar way, the novel presents a selection of the thoughts and descriptions, which are relevant to the writer's conception, and we must follow these serially, as the author leads us; they are not spread out, as a background, for us to contemplate in the order we choose, as in painting or the theatre. (pp. 243-44)

This research extends the influence of contemporary auteur influences from a predominantly textually-based approach by adding classic methods of film adaptation theory, recognising the importance of cinematic discourse in understanding the film and the director.

II. A PANORAMA OF FILM ADAPTATION

Film adaptation is regarded as a derivative work that depicts the adaptation of a play, novel, or other literary sources into the form of a film, sticking –or not- to the source material ethos or interpreting notions taken from the source text in a different way (Van Vugt, 2011). According to Belton (2003), film adaptation "offers an opportunity for filmmakers to reread a narrative from another era through the prism of their own period and to project their own understanding of the world onto that narrative" (p. 195). Film adaptation, according to Bazin (1967), is the transformation and adaptation of any "great literary concept or cliché to the film medium" (as cited in Brown & Lev, 2009, p. 2). The narrative intention of an author and the cinematic intention of a filmmaker are the parallels between novel and film. In this situation, the frequently quoted words of Joseph Conrad and D.W. Griffith are likely to be included. In a statement about his novelistic intentions, in the 1897 preface to his novel, *The Nigger of the Narcissus*, Joseph Conrad says "My task which I am trying to achieve is, by powers of written words, to make you hear, to make you feel- it is before all to make you see". Likewise, some critics and scriptwriters regard adaptation as a kind of creative art. In his book *The Adapting Art* (1963) De Witt Bodeen, a well-known screenwriter, "Adapting literary works to film, without doubt, a creative undertaking but the task requires a kind of selective interpretation, along with the ability to recreate and sustain an established mood" (p. 349).

Re-telling the same story with the convention of pictures, music, sounds, and colours with the major scheme brought life to the characters on screen. Many remarks that the author and adapter keep the story in mind, using dramatic plot twists and a strong finale to captivate the audience. The story has a 'code of narrativity,' whereas the narrative is spatially and contextually constructed and bound, according to a narrative and discourse distinction. Unless the creative or tactical objective is to adapt work as closely as possible, a reviewer cannot disregard a filmmaker's intentions. On the other hand, a comparison of a unique film adaptation to its original book should not be used to draw sweeping judgments about cinematic storytelling or the art of textual adaptation to feature films.

Dan Brown's story provides enough information to allow us to visualise the event and build our fear, while simultaneously injecting aspects of consternation that keep the readers turning pages long into the night in the hopes of saving the protagonist Langdon and the mankind. Reading novels may transport readers to a world of unthinkable dread and mystery, allowing them to imagine minute details and bringing the plot to a heart-pounding moment of surprise through dramatic moments.

When a screenwriter and director adapt a novel into a film, they attempt to take a text built inside a time framework rather than logically organised. At the same time, it does exist in spatial context as an entity but not as a narrative. They then turn it into a text organised according to spatial principles while still existing in time. Jean Mitry (1971), a renowned cinema theorist, addressed this issue in a similar way when he wrote,

Time in the novel is constructed with words. In the cinema, it is constructed with actions. The novel creates a world while the cinema puts us in the presence of a world that it organises according to a certain continuity. *The novel is a narrative that organises itself in a world; the film is a world that organises itself in a narrative.* (pp. 7-8)

The novels of Dan Brown are a unique cinematic experience and one of Hollywood's most exquisite films. The film confronts us with subjects such as the Falsified Confusion between Faith and Knowledge, History as Relativism, Overpopulation Myth, Religious Corruption, and other Conspiracy Theories. These aspects are transposed to the film as they are in the novel, as well as those that are adapted to mirror the film medium. The adaptation of the novel *The Da Vinci Code* finds that all of the characters, themes, plot, narrative approach, and setting are transmitted exactly as they are in the novel. However, because the novel and the film are intrinsically different works of art, they are converted from the novel's linguistic medium to the film's visual style.

III. THE TENETS OF NOVEL-FILM VICISSITUDE

“Everyone loves a conspiracy,” writes Dan Brown, and his novel proves the point. The novel has something for everyone, and perhaps too much for some of us: a fast-paced murder mystery; puzzles, paradoxes, and anagrams; art historical secrets; and myriad conspiracy theories, including the secret identity of the Holy Grail, the secret society of the Priory of Sion (Prieur de Sion), and the vicious Vatican and Opus Dei plots. *The Da Vinci Code* (2003) surged to the summit of the New York Times bestseller list in its first week, selling 6,000 copies on the first day alone; to present, the book has sold over 80 million copies in 45 languages. Brown’s profits from *The Da Vinci Code* are predicted to be around 250 million dollars, and Hollywood cannot really help but be captivated by Robert Langdon’s adventures: Columbia Pictures produced a film adaptation of the novel in 2006, titled *The Da Vinci Code*, which grossed 750 million dollars despite scathing reviews (Crow, 2021).

The rapid interest in our hermeneutic schemata and empathetic response characterises the reading and watching experience of each plot pattern in Dan Brown’s novels and films. In his narrative, however, rapidity is blended with immersion. Each micro-sequence skilfully surprises the reader with the plot’s cryptologic and cognitive complexities: the author deceives the reader about the text’s intricacy and the director visually enchants the audience to the edge of the seat.

The most researched stance regarding authorship in this domain is the auteur theory, where the director is the author of the movie and the fundamental meaning and innovation of the movie emerge from the director. It is necessary to investigate the influence of the auteur concept in modern Hollywood with the idea of the director being the author since the film discourse keeps reappearing in all levels of widespread, critical, and academic strata. A distinct central aspect of Ron Howard’s auteurism in modern Hollywood is his handling of the unifying force over each movie, uniting a seemingly diverse series of movies and books into a definite filmography. “It’s intriguing on a lot of levels. It’s the kind of fiction that provokes thought, conversation and debate” – was Howard’s impression of the novel *The Da Vinci Code*. (Ron Howard in *The Da Vinci Code Interview*, 2016).

By utilising the concept of the director’s intertextual framework concept, we may better understand Ron Howard’s role as an individual artist and a commercial model – advertising his films and style. The review of tactics employed to establish Howard’s auteur persona during his film’s official run signifies the auteur focus’s continuous effect in all parts of cinematic discourse and film studies over the burgeoning literature on the interconnection between auteur and directors’ discourse. The director’s auteur touch aids him in acting as a unifying and conceptualizing medium that has been developed from an extensive network of texts and varied layers of discourse.

It has been documented that there are three phases associated with implementing protracted auteur impact. First of all, the auteur’s influence must enrich the cinematic interaction. Themes in Howard’s works, such as questions of individuality and authorship, have been linked to his auteur impact. Howard has produced unique artistic patterns in addition to theme consistency. Howard’s approach is evident in his films, which have elaborated or non-linear plot frameworks with focal centring on the characters to immerse the audience in the mind of the said character. He reinforces the film’s potential interpretations, which are present throughout his filmography and the components that give him control over the writings (Naremore, 1994).

Secondly, the auteur influence compiles a collection of movies, genres, or an experience by using the director’s identity as a reference for a specific feature. Ron Howard broadcast a certain presumption for a film with an intense spotlight on a character, a penchant for turns, and a unique storyline sequence.

Lastly, the auteur’s impact on cinematography should have a particular niche that distinguishes one’s auteur and movies from other filmmakers in the competition (Cook, 1998). Howard has chiselled a position by recycling genre clichés for novel outcomes. This signature’s interpretation impacts Howard’s involvement as a director and optical modulator, articulating in official and critical discourse and highlighting his influence over the pattern of his films.

In the novel and its film adaptation of *The Da Vinci Code*, cinematic discourse and Howard’s auteurism permeate all text levels formed by verbal and visual codes. Metaphorically, they can be separated into image, audio, and word but are mostly interconnected and complementary. The director’s discourse parts play the most crucial function in capturing the range of narrative ideas. According to Howard, these little adjustments were made legitimately to spare time and to establish a ‘standalone movie.’ When it comes to modifying the original material, Howard explains, “You don’t take any kind of structural changes lightly”. “But, Dan Brown’s books — and he’d be the first to tell — if you adapted them literally, they’d be five [or] six hours long” (Ron Howard in *The Da Vinci Code Interview*, 2016).

Several critics have criticised the novel, including those Catholics who felt offended at the claims levelled about the opus Dei and suspected Brown of being a member of a pro-masonic society in retaliation. Dan Brown’s multi-layered story begins with an inversion of Leonardo’s masterpiece inferences, advances via consciousness of the aesthetic and religious world’s system of symbols and concludes with a defined, thought-provoking denouement. Unlike conventional detective fiction, the clues in this book are so obscure and incomprehensible that the reader is left marvelling at the protagonists’ remarkable intellect and sharp thinking amidst solving the puzzles. In the narrative of *The Da Vinci Code*: Langdon follows a secret record laid out centuries before to expose history’s biggest artifice. It turns out that Jesus Christ did not die on the cross, but rather escaped as the husband of Mary Magdalene and fathered a royal bloodline that lives on to this day. The Catholic Church denies Jesus’ mortality and the egalitarian notion of the “sacred feminine,” and tries to keep the truth from being revealed. Langdon’s mission is to discover this massive conspiracy that has been going on for over two millennia. As a film, Ron Howard’s concept is to adapt a fiction and create a thriller with a Papal

conclave. Dan took cues from Vatican history, and Howard developed a fascinating movie out of it. Because of its zesty assertions, the novelist's claim to certainty, the novel's powerful plot, and its exhilarating ambience, the work becomes highly popular as well as controversial. The film *The Da Vinci Code* sparked outrage and protests around the world. The novel became more popular and well-known as a result of the film. After the film's debut, the novel received a slew of criticisms. In 2006, Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, co-authors of *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail* (1982), sued Dan Brown allegedly for the supposed plagiarism of *The Da Vinci Code* (a novel based on a fictional historical reliance); they asserted he had abused the central hypothesis of their book: the supposed marriage between Jesus and Mary Magdalene, the latter's pregnancy and escape to France after the crucifixion, and the birth of the Sarah, who gave birth to the Merovingian dynasty, and the Templars and the Priory of Sion guarded the bloodline's secret for two thousand years.

IV. THE HERMENEUTICS OF THE DIRECTOR'S DISCOURSE

In the film, the viewpoint is less rigid than in literature, allowing the director to move his camera at a whim. More like a vision, the camera performs in a certain fashion for a specific objective: to observe what a viewer would see if he were physically there in the scenario. As a result, an author who aims for the illusion of fairness is indeed endeavouring to approximate the viewpoint of the camera. Furthermore, the filmmaker can point his camera at peculiar elements while ignoring the unnecessary. This cinematic approach of the director altering the views has significant resemblances with the way various viewpoints are handled in literature, placing the novel adjacent to the movie. Ron Howard pertains a unique style and tone to the content, as well as an obvious sense of mystery. It all starts at the top, with Hans Zimmer's music sounding both ecclesiastical and frightening as the Columbia Pictures logo fades into shadow. The murder scene within Louvre is eerie in a cultic way, and Langdon's ability to visually rearrange letters, numerals, and symbols to reveal their secrets is brilliant.

The correspondence of adaptation is pertinent to the basis of translation. Similar to a translator, the director who adapts must maintain some authenticity to the original story while simultaneously developing new artwork in a new projection, in this context, languages in the movie. The novel's film adaptation features some flashback scenes depicting Sophie's memories of her past, particularly her life and relationship with Jacques Sauniere. Sophie recalls her parent's and younger brother's deaths in French linguistics based on the concept of bilingual episodic memory (referring to the lapsed time in *The Da Vinci Code* film). Since it is divulged in the character's mind and presented to the audience retrospectively, this framework of memory recall in another language can be identified as an intrinsic discourse. The film's depiction of such recollections indulges recurring flashbacks at times, mirroring the author's objective of memory.

In specific contexts, portions of French appear in the film adaptation that does not exist in the novel, such as the conversation between Bezu Fache and Sophie Neveu during their first briefing, when she supposedly prompted Professor Robert Langdon to phone the US Embassy while she was distracting the police chief. However, there are a few phrases in the film that are reiterated from the novel: "Ce n'est pas le moment!", - As well as the following expressions with slight changes: the phrase "Excusez-moi, commissaire" in the book is referred to as "Excusez-moi messieurs," in the film; and also, the movie includes only the introductory statement of the phrase, "Bonjour, vous êtes bien chez Sophie Neveu. ...Je suis absente pour le moment, mais..." of the book. This constriction can be regarded as the director's discourse being turned into a room in the film. The director's discourse is based on the writer's interest, here keeping Silas and Aringarosa closer. Howard's contribution is the creation of the so-called framework structure for portraying the monk's fate: before meeting Aringarosa, he envisioned himself as a lonely ghost; after meeting Aringarosa, he imagined himself as a servant of God, now dying; and after coming to God, he imagines himself as a ghost yet again.

In the film, three phone conversations with 'the teacher' were seen, one with Silas and two with Manuel Aringarosa. In the first scenario, the director's auteur influence could be attributed to the strange language of the phone call to give the character a distinct role. Silas considers 'the teacher' as his messenger because he finds life's meaning in serving God. Silas has never seen "the teacher," but he trusts in his integrity as if it were divine.

Brown did not engage Latin in conversations; only specific linguistic phrases are used in the book to accomplish the attributes. Unlike the novel, Howard's movie characters have extensive dialogues and conversations in Latin. Because of the film's fluency, the soundtrack is as sophisticated as the symbolic and visual representation of the text on the screen. This emphasis on audience understanding in literary and cinematic works, within the text, and across the entire artistic realm of the director's discourse, it demonstrates the auteur's dynamic influence.

Flashbacks in the film adaptation can be directly traced to a Latin phrase that precisely replicates the content from the book: "Castigo corpus meum". In this approach, Ron Howard accentuates the incorporation of the Latin language to portray Silas' desire to join the sacred community. Even though the film, like the novel, features Silas as a servant of God, his involvement in the church can only be outlined as nominal due to his misconception of the profound meaning of devotion and the church's mission. Manuel Aringarosa is yet another character who is expressive in Latin. He speaks Latin for the first time in the film when he receives a phone call from "the teacher" while in the presence of a journalist. To limit the dissemination of information not meant for ordinary people, the bishop replied in Latin to his interlocutor,

constructing a communication barrier separating those who have been initiated into the secret and others who are regarded as unreliable of knowing it.

As an auteur of his film, Howard made a few adjustments to the story's narrative. In the Novel, after unlocking the cryptex with the word 'SOFIA,' Langdon and Sophie happened to find another small cryptex inside it, which they later opened using the word 'APPLE.' Bearing in mind the time-bounded construction for a movie, this scenario was modified with only one cryptex that opens with the word 'APPLE.' Concerning the death of Sophie's family in a car accident, the novel portrays that Sophie was not with her family during the accident and only her parents were dead in the accident leaving her brother alive, whom she later reunites in the Roslyn Church at the end. However, Howard spiced the movie with the drama of Sophie being with her family in the car and surviving the accident while both her parents and brother died.

V. AUTEUR INFLUENCE

The auteur theory's influence is succinctly stated by the fact that it indeed urges audiences to interpret films differently than they did before their inception. According to John Caughie (1981),

The attention to *mise-en-scène*, even to the extent of a specific historically necessary formalism, is probably the most crucial positive contribution of auteurism to the development of specific and detailed film criticism, engaging with the specific mechanisms of visual discourse, freeing it from literary models, and from the liberal commitments which were prepared to validate films based on their themes alone. (p. 128)

The 'only the author' syndrome attached to screenwriters is undergoing something of a sea change, thanks to the success of Andrew Davies, who has achieved 'fame' in his capacity as an adaptor, possibly because Davies 'sums up' what audiences look for in a good adaptation: this can be defined simply as what is added to the hypertext (to borrow Gérard Genette's term for the source) rather than what is left out.

The *mise-en-scène* and film technique relies on the director's depth perception and craftsmanship instead of inferring a diverse audience-generated film intellect intertextuality in modern culture. In other words, the impact of the auteur in the film adaptation will have substantially influenced the primary and secondary text correlation for the cinephile. And for its undisputed position at the centre of the Literary canon, the proposition will be no different for the intended or film-literate audience as to whether the director's auteur in recreating *The Da Vinci Code* has more radical potential than certain. Since many articles on "Novel and film" have conflated the influence of auteur films, artsy films, Hollywood films, etcetera, it seems relevant to scrutinise what Film studies scholars may benefit from a more conscious analysis of director's auteur and source material. The screenplay appeared to spend the effort on what author Dan Brown of *The Da Vinci Code* rightly handled as a minimalist aesthetic. Rather than showing more of Neveu's life and allowing her constructive comments to recognise her, Howard seemed to focus on the Opus Dei rites in favour of making the viewer gasp. It skips over a lot of Neveu's progression as an intellectual woman entangled in a web of encrypted intrigue, making her seem much more like one of Langdon's admiring disciples.

According to George Bluestone (1957) in *Novels into Film*, a competent scriptwriter in an adaptation should know the boundaries of the cinema and ensure sustainable modifications to a series of diverse and sometimes contradictory chapters, which have historical literature differentiated from the independents. Bluestone posits that an adaptation is a form of resource that reinterprets contextual essence. Cast members, pivotal scenes, and thematic key moments from the film's primordial elements. Bluestone finishes by stating that the adaptor is now a creative author, rather than merely a translator of anyone's work.

Several instances have been revealed about the situation of *The Da Vinci Code's* director and writer making incredible modifications to the storylines of novels and plays and source material before the final version is released to the public. The charge levelled against filmmakers that the Film adaptations of Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code* are frequently mutilated by well-intentioned but ineptly qualified experts who have not understood that the transition from print to movie and imposes certain constraints that make it virtually impossible to sustain all of a narrative's characters and situations. Finally, the auteur theory may be significant for a greater understanding of the implications and ramifications of the film. Still, its efficacy will be amplified if the societal, commercial, and cultural aspects of adaptation are emphasised. *The Da Vinci Code* is a fictional work. And, as everyone has read this book, the only thing left to divulge is that the film faithfully follows the book. Despite the fact that the novel is a pastiche written with some elegance and flamboyance, it does have a compelling narrative. Fortunately, Ron Howard is a greater filmmaker than Dan Brown is a novelist; he takes Brown's formula (foreign location, intriguing revelations, intense pursuit sequence, repeat as required) and transforms it into a remarkable entertainment.

Buscombe attempts with an auteurist sensibility by asserting that, the film's authenticity is still determined primarily by the director, as the combination of genre conventions and an artistic directorial style, exemplifies the correlation between the creator and the material on the contrary, and the content and the audience over the other. The desire to understand the technical and intellectual processes that contribute to filmmaking is frequently stated in the director interviews to know the choices made in the film or the effort that went into producing it. This indicates that the director, who is typically positioned as the primary theme maker, influences the audience's knowledge and understanding of the film (Buscombe, 1981).

VI. CONCLUSION

Bluestone says that “Changes are inevitable the moment one abandons the linguistic for the visual medium,” (1956, p. 174) - highly perceived as the foundation text in adaptation study. Adaptation study delegates both unique adaptations to their canonical source material and film as a channel to literature and medium. It intends either faithful or not, but adaptations are studied under the sign of literature, which creates a summative touchstone for film adaptations. As an exemplar, Matthew Arnold (1880) reveals the programme of critical analysis of a medium for adaptation through his “The Study of Poetry.” Presenting poetry as a replacement for besieged religious tradition, Arnold implored:

We should conceive of poetry worthily, and more highly than it has been the custom to conceive of it. We should conceive of it as capable of higher uses, and called to higher destinies, than those which in general men have assigned to it hitherto. More and more mankind will discover that we have to turn to poetry to interpret life for us, to console us, to sustain us. Without poetry, our science will appear incomplete; and most of what now passes with us for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry. (p. 8)

If the responsibility Arnold places on poetry seems peculiarly implausible, the passage can easily be revised by modifying the word with literature, novels, or even cinema. The careers of three undisputed auteurs—Alfred Hitchcock, Stanley Kubrick, and Walt Disney—whose bodies of work were almost entirely adaptations indicate that a director’s auteur significance is based at least as much on their demeanour and work choices, as their victories over other aspiring authors, and their achievements in branding themselves as brand names as it is on their artistic pretensions or any textual attributes of their films.

Initial research on adaptation studies has focused upon just one dimension of the film adaptation, or on the films and techniques rather than the director, but this paper has stressed the essential factors contributing to auteur understandings, as each level of discourse development in the context of possible interpretations. The auteur influence creates a framework for a narrative, enabling them to structure their knowledge of the text and more cohesive retrieval. The intertextual attribute of the director’s discourse can be emphasised by implying it as a notion of authenticity. The auteur’s impact and the director’s influence result from various parameters to determine the film’s composition. All aspects must be present and work together to incorporate the auteur image. The confluence of these influences suggests that accounting for Ron Howard’s director’s discourse and the auteur influence helps to understand the dimension of the adaptation in film culture.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arnold, M. (1880). “The Study of Poetry.” In *T.H. Ward’s anthology The English Poets*.
- [2] Belton, E. (2003). Reimagining Jane Austen: the 1940 and 1995 Film Versions of *Pride and Prejudice*. In G. Macdonald & A. Macdonald (eds.), *Jane Austen on Screen*, 175–196. Cambridge.
- [3] Bluestones, G. (1957). *Novels into Film*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- [4] Bluestone, G. (1956). Word to Image: The Problem of the Filmed Novel. *The Quarterly of Film Radio and Television*, 11(2), 171-180. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1209838>
- [5] Bodeen, D. (1963). The Adapting Art. *Film in Review*, 14(6), 349-356.
- [6] Brown, D. (2003). *The Da Vinci Code*. Doubleday.
- [7] Brown, K., & Lev, P. (2009). *Teaching Literary Theories Using Film Adaptations*, 2-4. McFarland & Company Inc.
- [8] Buscombe, E. (1981). Ideas of Authorship. In J. Caughie (Ed.), *Theories of Authorship: A Reader*, 22–34. Routledge.
- [9] Conrad, J. (1897). *The Nigger of the Narcissus*.
- [10] Cook, D. A. (1998). Auteur Cinema and the ‘Film Generation’ in 1970s Hollywood. In J. Lewis (Ed.), *The New American Cinema*, 11–37. Duke University Press.
- [11] Crow, D. (2021, February 25). *The Da Vinci Code: A Better, Smarter Blockbuster Than You Remember | Den of Geek*. Den of Geek. <https://www.denofgeek.com/movies/the-da-vinci-code-better-smarter-blockbuster-rewatch/>. Accessed on 28/03/2022.
- [12] Mitry, J. (1971). Remarks on the Problem of Cinematic Adaptation. *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, 1, 1. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1314966>
- [13] Naremore, J. (1994). Authorship. In T. Miller & R. Stam (Eds.), *A Companion to Film Theory*, 9–24. Wiley Blackwell.
- [14] Sontag, S. (2009). *Against Interpretation and other essays*, 243-244. Penguin Classics.
- [15] *The Da Vinci Code*. (2006). Directed by Ron Howard (Film). Columbia Pictures.
- [16] *The Da Vinci Code Interview*. (2016, January 14). Hollywood Archives. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sADDdhYHJOU>
- [17] *The Shootlist* (1976). Directed by Don Siegel (Film). Paramount Pictures.
- [18] Van, V. N. (2011). *Film Adaptation, Alternative Cinema and Lynchian Moments of Transposition*. (Master’s Thesis). McMaster University.

Caleb Theodar is a Research Scholar of the Department of English in the School of Science and Humanities at Vel Tech Rangarajan Dr Sagunthala R&D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. He is a graduate of MA, and MPhil in English and has qualified UGC-NET. His research area is focused on the theory of Film Adaptation and expounding the significance of narrative functions in interpreting text and applying film *modus operandi* extensively in Dan Brown’s adapted films.

Saranya P is an Assistant Professor of the Department of English in the School of Science and Humanities at Vel Tech Rangarajan Dr Sagunthala R&D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Her area of research interest focuses on Indian Literature, Diaspora Literature and ELT.