

Young-Moon Jung (South Korea)

Either in literature like novels and poetry, or in movies or plays, the foremost common ground is verbal language, because verbal language is the basis of thinking itself. Even the feelings or senses need to be processed and interpreted in their final stages by the thought. Of course, verbal language and visual or oral language are quite or sometimes diametrically different in that they appeal to different consciousnesses or senses and therefore induce different reactions from readers or audiences. In a sense visual or oral languages are more primary and the reaction could be more immediate than verbal language. A movie or a play precipitates our emotional reaction, but a novel induces reflections. They both have their own grammars, laws and mechanisms. But they share common ground in that they require a rumination to fully understand the meaning or beauty of a work. And they need some form of narrative as their integral part, although some of them ignore that need intentionally, as could be seen in Samuel Beckett.

Personally, I am very interested in multiple dimensions of writing because I not only write novels, but also want to make a film in the future myself. And I wrote a play which was staged in Korea a couple of years ago, so I had a good opportunity to delve into the similarity or difference, and vicinity or chasm, between the two genres. My play, whose title is *Donkies*, is a play of absurdity. It's my first play, and when it was staged it was very different from what I thought it would be like. The director put much emphasis on what was being seen whereas I put an emphasis on the dialogue. I wanted a minimalist setting, but the outcome was an over-decorated stage. The director wanted to dramatize the play with the tools of theatrical language, while I wanted the literary element to be retained as much as possible. In a movie or a play you have to take account of the sound, the smell and even the unexpected. You need to consider the scenes, in the case of a movie, and a stage, in the case of a drama, first. In a movie, something that is captured by camera but unspeakable in verbal language can be very effective or critical. For example, in some of Michelangelo Antonioni's films, especially in *L'Avventura* and *Blowup*, the actors' gaze or the barren landscape says so much about the suffocating void or a person's agony, which is hard express in verbal language. Sometimes the limits of verbal language can be overcome by images. In a movie, things themselves put in certain spaces in certain situations can play great roles.

It is true that in the last decades movies encroached on literature profoundly and subjugated it as its sub-genre. In the last century there were rumors, which were a little bit exaggerated, about the death of literature, and concern and fear prevailed for a while. Actually, literature is in a crisis everywhere in the world. Surely it's because literature could not create its own new form, for nearly every conceivable experiment was performed in the past. The history of the novel is more than three centuries long and so many stories were told in the forms of the novel, so there is scarcely any space left in the zone of absolutely new tales to be told or explored. All the stories of the future will be either revised or modified stories of the past. I personally think nearly every conceivable experiment was performed for the last time with the French Nouveau or Nouveau-Nouveau Roman by writers like Alain Robbe-Grillet, Marguerite Duras, Natalie Chailotte, and Samuel Beckett who have sought a way to express the unspeakable. They pursued this to the extremity, I think. After them, any conspicuous literary experiment either has not appeared or is still to come. And that's the one reason that

literature today is a little bit in decline, and will be more so in the future, if it does not get invigorated by something yet unknown.

Movies have prospered greatly in the last century and become a kind of core of the contemporary culture. Surely it's due to the amazing developments of technology. But in my opinion film itself is stagnant in creating its new form or grammar now too. I see that the new movies show the new technology of cinematography, but I don't see an entirely new film either in its content or form. I think the movie has fallen into its own trap these days. It tends to be heavily dependent on its own possibilities of technical development and lacks much self-doubt and self-questioning and a self-reflective system.

I presume even movies will not prosper or survive without the ongoing supply of materials from literature. Actually, most of the really good movies are adapted ones whose origins are good literature. Such cases are so common that it's hard to enumerate them all, among which John Fowls' *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and Harold Pinter's *Betrayal* are good examples. And without exception, good movies contain literary qualities, like Ingmar Bergman's or Michelangelo Antonioni's.

Verbal language and visual or oral language are interactive, and therefore they can provide affluent soils to each other and make themselves more rich. In fact, I get a lot of inspiration from movies or plays in creating a story. Even a piece of a photograph inspires me enormously. Often when I see an impressive scene in a movie or play I visualize a setting for my story, from which the story flows out and I catch it.

Literature and other artistic forms do not exclude each other. More properly put, they are compatible in every aspect. Literature can expand its own domain by absorbing the elements of other genres all the more, and vice versa.