

**Adam Sumera**

University of Łódź

Going to America to See the Fens Better? Stephen Gyllenhaal's *Waterland*

ABSTRACT

Waterland (1992), directed by Stephen Gyllenhaal on the basis of the screenplay by Peter Prince, is a film adaptation of Graham Swift's novel under the same title, published in 1983. The book could be called unfilmable although the history of cinema knows examples of successful screenings of apparently unfilmable novels, e.g., *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. In the case of Swift's novel, the main potential difficulties could be seen in its wide scope, its intricate mosaic character, and its style.

The article analyzes the changes introduced in the adaptation, including the shift of the contemporary action from Greenwich, England to the American city of Pittsburgh. The way of connecting the present with the past by means of "time travel" is discussed. Consequences for possible interpretation resulting from omitting certain elements of the book and introducing new material as well as changing the order of presentation of some of the scenes are shown. Comments on the film are juxtaposed with interpretations of some aspects of the novel taken from key critical texts on Swift's book. Also specifically cinematic solutions present in Gyllenhaal's movie are taken into account.

Waterland (1992), directed by Stephen Gyllenhaal on the basis of the screenplay by Peter Prince, is a film adaptation of Graham Swift's novel under the same title, published in 1983. The book could be called an unfilmable one although the example of other apparently unfilmable novels shows that it is rather the problem of finding a proper key, the way to be taken, necessarily having much more to do with the spirit of the book than with "being faithful" to the novel. A good illustration here might be Harold Pinter's screenplay adapting John Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and the subsequent film by Karel Reisz shot on the basis of Pinter's script.

The main difficulties for a director ready to take up the task of screening Swift's novel can be seen in its wide scope, its intricate mosaic character, and its style.

Swift's *Waterland* is a family saga, encompassing eight generations over the period of more than two hundred years. It is also a regional novel, dwelling much on the history of the Fens, a marshy region in Eastern England, to some extent being reclaimed land. One can find here literary echoes of novels by George Eliot or by Thomas Hardy, or of Dickens's *Great Expectations*, signalled by one of the novel's epigraphs, "Ours was the marsh country . . ." ¹ There are very clear elements of a fairy-tale, starting almost at the very beginning of the novel: "Fairy-tale words; fairy-tale advice. But we lived in a fairy-tale place" (Swift *Waterland* 1). ² It is a novel of psychological development, but it also contains a non-fiction essay presenting the breeding cycle of eels (Malcolm 13). There are traces of the detective novel, with the narrator looking for some answers. There are also some Gothic motifs, involving Sarah Atkinson's "gift to see and shape the future" (W 72), including her influence on some events after her death (the flood, the burning down of the brewery). From this, the movie director tries only to preserve some fairy-tale references, making Tom begin his voice-over narration with "Once upon a time . . .," the phrase that so often recurs in the novel (W 6, 20, 35, 109, 110, 195, 297), and some of the suspense of the detective story.

An important element of the novel is formed by Tom's long explanations of the nature of the Fens. In order to retain at least some of them, the adaptors may have found it necessary to create a more credible narrative situation. For that reason the contemporary part of the story has been moved to a place where such explanations might seem to be more natural. In the film Tom has emigrated to the United States and is working in a secondary

¹ For more on possible literary influences, see Malcolm 11–12, 81–82.

² For brevity's sake, further bibliographical references to this source will be given as W.

school in Pittsburgh.³ His American students form an audience for whom the landscape described by him is something new.

Unfortunately, the shift to America has some unexpected negative consequences. One of them is vulgarization of the language. It is not only that Price, in one of his two renderings of the sense of the statement from the novel, “The only important thing about history, I think, sir, is that it’s got to the point where it’s probably about to end” (W 6), says, “The fucking world’s gonna end.” The F-word is used again when the students refer to the sexual activities between the young Tom and Mary. When stating that Mary was curious about Dick, Tom hears giggles and realizes that for his American pupils the name has some obscene associations, especially in the context of the story of the eel inserted into a girl’s knickers and the swimming competition. Thus he has to stress that he is referring to “my brother Dick.” When Mary’s sexual curiosity arouses a negative reaction from the class, the teacher tries to justify her, saying, “Mary, my Mary was not like that. She wasn’t—.” At that moment, one of the boys ends it for him: “A slut.” None of this has any equivalent in the book.⁴

The coarseness of the language forms a part of a larger problem, not necessarily connected with the setting. Swift’s book is quite explicit in its content, it even names one of its chapters with words describing human genitals; also Tom and Mary’s love meetings are referred to in detail. In the film, the nakedness is present although it is considerably limited in comparison with what is presented in the novel. However, what matters is the manner of presentation. In the novel, the use of language is of primary importance. The title of the chapter mentioned above is in fact, “About Holes and Things” (W 36). Despite its considerable openness in presenting sexual themes, the novel remains very restrained on the verbal plane. The book does not contain a single word that could be called vulgar.

While in the film Tom and Mary’s coupling in a compartment of the commuter train is shown as a quickie, without paying much attention to any signs of their mutual love, the book goes into the following description:

³ Also the time of action has been slightly modified. In the novel, the contemporary action is set in 1980, in the film—in 1974. One can only wonder about possible reasons for the change—is it because in the novel Mary is 53 and becoming pregnant at that age (the reader still does not know about her barrenness inflicted by the crude abortion) would be really close to a miracle? Or maybe it was only to make the characters closer to the real age of the actors: Jeremy Irons (Tom) and Sinéad Cusack (Mary), both born in 1948?

⁴ In one of press film reviews, Rita Kempley complains about “Peter Prince’s decidedly eclectic screenplay, in which Swift’s elegant, descriptive phrases coexist inelegantly with classroom vulgarisms.”

Thus the Great Eastern Railway which brought these two young people into twice-daily contact—she in a rust-red uniform, he in inky black—is to be held responsible for loosening inhibitions which, without its nudging and jostling, might have stuck fast, and for a merging of destinies which might otherwise never have occurred. For while the shadow of the engine—westward-slanting in the morning, eastward-slanting in the evening—rippled over the beet fields, the unattainable was attained. Certain notions were gradually (and not unpainfully) dissolved, certain advances made and, less falteringly, encouraged, and, at last (but this was the work of two years' railway travel), an undeniable intimacy mutually—but always circumspectly—achieved. (W 41)

In the book, the contemporary plane is set in London—to be precise, at Greenwich. The loss of the original location might not be without importance. Daniel Lea stresses the choice of Greenwich, seeing in “Crick bestriding the defining point of geographical origin—longitude 0°” a sign that “*Waterland* is driven by the search for definable beginnings—points of origin that shape the histories that they initiate” (79). David Malcolm stresses a different aspect of this location:

It is noteworthy that the setting for their walks together, for Mary's revelation of her madness, and for Tom's own bleak future should be Greenwich Park and the meridian that represents Britain's imperial expansion and (literal) centrality in the world. . . . At the end of chapter 47, Crick surveys his failed life and bleak future while in the setting of Greenwich Park. . . . The national, imperial, and progressive associations of the setting are surely quite telling here. (105)

In Swift's work, the voice of the narrator is heard almost all the time, telling the story, commenting on it, asking rhetorical questions. Movies usually make do without voice-over narration. However, it is not entirely so in the case of *Waterland*. Although the film has not got a narrator for the contemporary parts, Tom Crick acts as one for some of the flashbacks. The director seems to have found it necessary to provide information about the setting as well as to supply some additional summing up of those events that would be too time-consuming to show, for example, the relationships between Ernest Atkinson and his daughter, Helen, and then between Helen and her future husband, Henry Crick, or earlier the causes of Ernest Atkinson's decision to produce the Coronation Ale, which was to have such ominous results. Thus numerous flashbacks contain a mixture

of showing (enacting) and telling (recounting)⁵. The very telling can itself be dramatic, as when Tom first tells the students that his grandfather Ernest had only a daughter, and then mentions Ernest's son. This creates suspense, strengthened by Price's question. "I thought he had a daughter." The answer to this being delayed for some time, while the action concerns other events, contributes to the growing interest on the part of the viewer when the matter is mentioned again.

The adaptors have also tried to avoid having too much of the narration provided by a voice-over. Their solution to this problem has been via some trick that could well fit a book written in the convention of magic realism. At some point Tom Crick takes his American students on a ride in a strange vehicle. In fact, it is a charabanc, an early motor coach used for sightseeing in the early years of the twentieth century that became obsolete in the 1920s. To a modern viewer, however, it has the look of a product of the filmmakers' imagination. This is a trip in time and space—from Pittsburgh in 1974 they go to the English region of the Fens in 1911. Thus the curious car may bring associations with a time machine, the concept introduced by H. G. Wells and then used by dozens of science-fiction writers. The visitors from the 1970s not only can see the events in the past but they can even get in contact and in conversation with some of the people from the past, as proved by the scene when Tom and Price enter a pub demolished by victims of the Coronation Ale, and its owner, on seeing them, grasps a cudgel and asks them, "You drank any of the bloody Coronation Ale?" Then even the pretext of the "time machine" is discarded, and Tom and Price just walk around on the Fens of the past, witnessing events featuring in Tom's story. In several scenes the old Tom can observe himself as an adolescent, and what is more, the viewers can see both of them at a time.

Tom as the narrator of the novel is not omniscient. What is more, at some points he becomes unsure whether he is really able to discover things as they really are:

Now tread carefully, history teacher. Maybe this isn't your province. Maybe this is where history dissolves, chronology goes backwards. That's your wife over there; you know, Mary, the one you thought you knew. But maybe this is unknown country. (W 229)

Sometimes he is only able to ask questions to which he cannot give any answers. It is so, for example, in the case of Sarah Atkinson at the time of erecting the New Atkinson Brewery:

⁵ Those terms are generally used in reference to narration in a written text, for example by Chatman (32–33), but they clearly can be also employed in relation to a film.

Sarah hears, in her room, the sounds of work in progress. . . . Does she notice? Does she care? Is she pleased, is she proud? No record notes that she is present among the guests of honour on that day in June, 1849. . . . But was she there in spirit? Was she cheering with the rest of them? Or was she still, in her upper room, keeping her watch over Nothing? (*W* 78)

Unfortunately, the movie adaptation has no place for such subtleties. Tom Crick is our exclusive source of knowledge, and he cannot hesitate in his narration.

From the tightly-knit web of the novel, the filmmakers have picked out the part of the plot presenting the relationship between Tom and Mary—their early sexual encounters, Mary’s sexually tinged curiosity about Dick, Tom and Mary’s reaction to the news of her pregnancy, Mary’s telling Dick that the child is not his but Freddie Parr’s, the abortion at Martha Clay’s witch house, and, after years, Mary’s mad ideas about God giving her a child, resulting in her kidnapping a baby from a shopping centre. Although Tom represents the sane approach, convincing Mary that they should return the stolen baby to its mother, he does not remain untouched by the preoccupation with the child that was never born, the foetus he had to discard into the Ouse. In a significant scene, when inebriated and so not fully controlling himself, he—as if unconsciously—assures the bartender that he knows that Price is of age because “he’s my son.”

The choice of the remaining elements of the plot seems to have depended on their connection with the relationship between Tom and Mary. Thus the long history of the Cricks and the Atkinsons has been abridged to several items: the story of the Coronation Ale (explaining the origin of the bottle used by Dick to kill Freddie Parr), the incestuous relationship between Tom’s mother and his grandfather (revealing Dick’s origin), Tom’s mother taking care of Henry Crick, her future husband, in the Atkinsons’ mansion turned into a hospital for soldiers mentally maimed in the First World War.

Despite the necessary cuts one could say that as far as the main plot is concerned, the film has preserved most of the important elements of the novel. However, the order of the presentation of some of them has been changed. As the film has moved the focus to the motif of the child, Mary’s stealing a baby from a supermarket has been given much more attention. The film opens with the cry of a baby, and this sets the main theme for the viewers.

Paradoxically, though the theme of Tom and Mary is the one most carefully preserved from the elements of the plot, it is also the one into which several serious changes have been introduced. Unlike in the novel,

where both Tom and Mary acknowledge her guilt of stealing the baby, and Mary is put in an asylum, the couple are let go after Tom has assured the investigating policeman that Mary and he found the child outside his school. The fact that Tom is alone in the later stages of the story results not from Mary being isolated in a mental institution but from her leaving him. And then the film offers something entirely new: after their separation Tom and Mary get reunited. In the final sequences we can see Tom Crick arriving on the Fens and there meeting Mary, who has also made a long journey to England. This happy ending considerably changes the impact of the story and forms a sharp contrast to the book, on which Tamás Bényei comments in the following way: “*Waterland* is perhaps the most negative in tone among Swift’s novels, at least as far as the possibility of overcoming trauma, of spiritual reconciliation and regeneration is concerned” (52).

The changes in the order of presentation, resulting from foregrounding the story of Tom and Mary, have destroyed the structure built by Swift. In the book, Tom quite clearly tries to postpone the presentation of the most painful memories as much as possible. Dominic Head explains the structure of the novel by pointing out that Tom Crick’s “quest is conducted through the uncovering of layers of personal guilt . . .” (205). The last item to be described to the readers is the suicidal death of Tom’s brother, Dick. Apart from expressing the psychological attitude of Tom, this positioning might be also said to correspond to the circular character of the book. As Alison Lee observes, *Waterland* “is so cleverly structured that the end of the novel is only mid way through the story” (42).

An important element of the novel is the use of references to the Fens as symbols of human life. This especially applies to the motif of land reclamation. For example, Tom and Mary’s marriage is compared to a fenland (*W* 102); Tom speaks also about “the tenuous, reclaimed land of our marriage” (*W* 111). At some point, this motif is used to refer to our activities in general:

There’s this thing called progress. But it doesn’t progress. It doesn’t go anywhere. Because as progress progresses the world can slip away. It’s progress if you can stop the world slipping away. My humble model for progress is the reclamation of land. Which is repeatedly, never-endingly retrieving what is lost. A dogged and vigilant business. A dull yet valuable business. A hard, inglorious business. But you shouldn’t go mistaking the reclamation of land for the building of empires. (*W* 291)

Unfortunately, nothing of it could be rendered in the film.

Another important symbol in the structure of the book is the eel. It is no accident that a whole chapter (Chapter 26) has been devoted to

discussing its particularities. The breeding pattern of the eel can be seen to represent the circular character of nature. As Tom says,

[w]e believe we are going forward, towards the oasis of Utopia. But how do we know—only some imaginary figure looking down from the sky (let's call him God) can know—that we are not moving in a great circle? (W 117)

And the same image is applied more precisely to history: “How it repeats itself, how it goes back on itself, no matter how we try to straighten it out. How it twists, turns. How it goes in circles and brings us back to the same place” (W 123). In the screen version, the role of eels is practically limited to two scenes: when Freddie Parr puts an eel into Mary's knickers,⁶ and when an eel for dinner forms a pretext for Mary to meet Dick at the river bank.

The screening includes a number of changes which may not be too important but still influence how the action is perceived. They could perhaps be referred to summarily by mentioning Freddie Parr's vehicle. In the novel, he makes his shady business trips (incidentally, not on his own initiative but for his father) on foot or on his bicycle. As this might look too unattractive, in the movie he drives around in a jeep.

The original time of the main events in the past—that of World War II—has been preserved but the war, unlike in the novel where it is given a symbolic role, remains quite marginal and can be guessed at only by some details, e.g., the presence of American soldiers with whom Freddie conducts his illegal trade.

One might expect that facing the task of screening a long and complex novel, the filmmakers would be anxious to preserve as much as possible and thus would be wary of introducing new material. However, this is not the case. The decision of moving the place of action to the United States has caused the necessity of explaining some matters. Another factor responsible for the additions may have been the decision to signal more clearly the presence of the pupils. In Swift's work, the class is present only as mostly impersonal listeners to Tom Crick's elaborate yarns. The only student truly individualized is Price. Only once are two pupils named. Characteristically, however, no other student besides Price voices any objections to Tom Crick's narratives:

⁶ Deprived of any comment, this remains only a rude joke. In the novel, a long time before Chapter 24, in which the swimming contest takes place, the reader is given a piece of folk wisdom: “a live fish in a woman's lap will make her barren” (W 16). This will be referred to later, in Chapter 28: “Mary, in navy blue knickers which she has shared briefly with an eel; a live fish in a woman's lap . . .” (180).

Prurient mutterings around the class. Exchanges of leers. Judy Dobson and Gita Khan in the front row cross their legs, feminine-defensive, experiencing, no doubt, inside their knickers, navy blue or otherwise, uncomfortable sensations; but, up top, are all eager and pricked ears. (W 168)

Gyllenhaal presents a different situation. The pupils seem to be more willing to participate, and sometimes to voice their objections to the explicit content of the stories. However, this results in adding details irrelevant for the action and also contributing to the viewers' impression that Tom Crick is rather helpless in his attempts at making his pupils realize the true meaning of his stories. The film wastes its time by going into such exchanges as "Why did you have to do it on a train?"—"We didn't have a car." What is worse, this does not end the matter. Another question follows: "Why didn't you go to a motel? That's what I'd do." A similar objection could be formulated in the case of a dialogue between the teacher and his pupils, added in the movie. When Tom says, "The First World War . . . Who gives the dates?", the kids' answer is, "1917–18"; he has to remind them, "We're in England," and only then does he receive the correct answer.

The situation in the classroom seems to have changed also in another respect. The reason for Price's opposition to the history teacher seems to be different. In the novel, the difference between the attitudes of the two characters could be summed up as a contrast between useless history and dangerous future. In the film, this contrast seems to be between useless history and useful mathematics.

After Tom has been notified that he is going to be "retired," he meets Price. In the movie, Price comes from extra maths. In the novel, he is coming from a meeting of the Holocaust Club, the organization expressing the youths' preoccupation with the possibility of a nuclear disaster. Similarly, the pupils' cry "Fear is here" (W 288, 289) during Crick's final speech is never heard in the film. While the nuclear threat forms a vital element of the novel (Lewis Scott's fallout shelter and the activity of the Holocaust Club, with Price as its head), nothing of it has made its way into the movie. When Tom asks Price to be more specific why history is to come to an end, the student answers in a way that is both vague and rude: "Take your choice." This is as close to mentioning the possibility of a nuclear disaster as Gyllenhaal chooses to come. Crick, played by Irons, voices his concern that children are scared but there seems to be little support for this conviction of the teacher.

David Leon Higdon observes that "*Waterland* is . . . a profound meditation on the uses of the past and the necessity of history" (189). As opposed to this, the movie could be said to be a requiem for history, which

seems to be relegated to retirement together with the history teacher made redundant.

The film suggests also—without any connection with what can be found in the novel—that in telling his tales about sexual initiation from the past Tom becomes sexually attracted to some of his female pupils. At some point we share his subjective vision of one the girls sitting naked in the classroom, which might make Tom a kind of Humbert Humbert.⁷ Another new element, which might seem to be an unnecessary addition, is the subplot of a blind pupil whom Tom meets in the schoolyard; she is not even in his class, and there seems to be no particular justification for her inclusion unless this has been done for reasons of political correctness.

The film has some strong points. First of all, thanks to the cinematography of Robert Elswit, it impressively presents the fenlands and makes them “as eerie and singular as the characters who inhabit” them (Maslin). There are several scenes in which the film makes full use of its visual possibilities. One of them is connected with Tom’s lesson on the French Revolution. He shows the pupils a slide showing a scene from the time of the Revolution—to be precise, it is a picture presenting the guillotine—and then he moves to stand in front of the screen; thus the slide is superimposed on his face. This seems to be a perfect, symbolic visualization of the narrator’s comment in the novel: “And then it dawned on you [Tom’s pupils]: old Cricky was trying to put himself into history; old Cricky was trying to show you that he himself was only a piece of the stuff he taught” (W 5).

One should also mention the three scenes connected with Dick’s swimming. The first one follows the events of the kids’ swimming contest containing sexual undertones. After having rescued Freddie Parr, so willing to take part in the contest as to ignore the fact of his not being able to swim, Dick asks Mary, “Me swim too?” and then makes a dive. He stays under water for quite a long time. Only after everybody (including the viewer) has become afraid whether he has drowned does he surface. A similar scene is repeated when Dick swims across the river in order to deliver an eel to Mary waiting for him on the other bank. After such preparation it is only natural that when Dick takes his final plunge from the deck of the *Rosa II*, and the camera dwells on the flow of the river for a considerable time,⁸ we expect his head to appear somewhere downstream. The image is

⁷ Incidentally, Jeremy Irons did play Humbert Humbert in Adrian Lyne’s film adaptation of *Lolita*, but it was only in 1997, five years after *Waterland* was released.

⁸ The camera remains stationary, fixed on the river, for close to twenty seconds, which is very long in a film; to this one should add several more seconds before this, when the camera pans the water.

accompanied by Tom's answering his father's question, "He's gone?" Tom says, "No. . . . He can swim so far." This is probably as close as the film could get in rendering the comment given in the novel:

Because he [Tom] knows (though he doesn't say; he'll never say: a secret he and Mary will share for ever): there'll be no bobbing top-knot. There'll come no answering gurgling, rescue-me cry. He's on his way. Obeying instinct. Returning. The Ouse flows to the sea . . . (W 310)

In the book, those words were meant to remind the reader of the breeding cycle of the eel (this is the meaning of "obeying instinct") but also of the narrator's earlier comment on the Ouse:

As we all know, the sun and the wind suck up the water from the sea and disperse it on the land, perpetually refeeding the rivers. So that while the Ouse flows to the sea, it flows, in reality, like all rivers, only back to itself, to its own source; and that impression that a river moves only one way is an illusion. And it is also an illusion that what you throw (or push) into a river will be carried away, swallowed for ever, and never return. Because it will return. (W 127)

Although the film does not voice such thoughts, the camera lingering on the water of the river flowing into a sea may evoke a similar reflection in the viewer's mind.

Another scene that should be pointed out for its impact on the viewers is the presentation of the fatal abortion. Basing more on the atmosphere and what is only implied rather than on what is really shown, Gyllenhaal manages to render the painful experiences of Mary undergoing the crude abortion performed by witchlike Martha Clay.

Stephen Gyllenhaal summed up his approach to the movie in an interview given at the Toronto Film Festival in 1992: "More than anything else, this is a love story. . . . It doesn't matter where it is set because the appeal is universal. It's about marriage, but it's also about fathers and sons" (qtd. in Ryan). The problem is that this renders only a part of what can be found in the novel, and even in this very limited scope the movie introduces a number of changes that significantly modify the impact of the original story.

Those few film reviews that make more than a passing reference to Swift's novel are mostly critical of the film as a whole though usually they praise some of its elements. Desmond Ryan states that

Peter Prince's script doesn't solve all the problems—especially when he resorts to having the students time-travel back to Crick's youth—and it often betrays the film's literary origins. But it does catch an eerie resonance between a painful past and an unresolved present.

Todd McCarthy remarks that

[d]espite a tight and cleverly constructed time-jumping structure, it can't be said that scenarist Peter Prince has really solved the problem, since what's on-screen unfortunately creates the constant impression of a story that would be much more effectively told on the printed page.

216

He also complains that

[w]hen Tom's most insolent student, Matthew Price (Ethan Hawke), challenges him to defend the teaching of history, one awaits the elaboration of the teacher's justification with reasonable expectation.

Instead, we get superficial, borderline-laughable scenes of the students riding through moments of British history in an open-air tour bus, and a summing-up by Tom that, in its fumbling sentimentality, seems like a portrait of the deterioration of teacher-student relations since the days of Mr. Chips.

His conclusion seems to sum up the problem quite succinctly: "Stephen Gyllenhaal . . . handles the often delicate subject matter with integrity on a scene-by-scene basis but can't transform what may simply be intractable material." Rita Kempley's objection has already been quoted (see note 4).

Swift's own remarks on this film adaptation can be found in his essay "Filming the Fens" in his collection *Making an Elephant*. Reflecting on his not getting involved in the work on adapting *Waterland*, he writes:

So ungodlike was my role that I knew very little about what was happening—I assumed nothing would happen—until about a fortnight before the filming began. But suddenly everything was happening. A script had been written, a director had been found and a cast and crew had been assembled on location in Norfolk, where the cameras were starting to roll. Would I like to come and take a look?

It was only when I did go and look and talk to some key people that I discovered certain things that might have made a more wrathfully god-like author throw a fit. For example, that large chunks of the novel which are set in Greenwich (London, England) were to be transposed in the film to—Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. And that while Jeremy Irons as Tom Crick would retain his Fenland childhood (hence we were in Norfolk),

he would mysteriously become in later life a teacher in a mid-American school. ("Filming" 189–90)

Trying to be as kind as possible and dwelling on his friendly relations with Stephen Gyllenhaal, Swift cannot but state: "I wish a better film had finally emerged—a film that hadn't distorted basic elements of the book and a film that, as film, had lived up in all parts to the real strengths and sensitivity it had only in some . . . ("Filming" 191–92). This seems to confirm at least some of the observations made in this article.

WORKS CITED

- Bényei, Tamás. "The Novels of Graham Swift: Family Photos." *Contemporary British Fiction*. Ed. Richard J. Lane, Rod Mengham and Philip Tew. Cambridge: Polity, 2003. 40–55. Print.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978. Print.
- Head, Dominic. *The Cambridge Introduction to Modern British Fiction, 1950–2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.
- Higdon, David Leon. "'Unconfessed Confessions': The Narrators of Julian Barnes and Graham Swift." *The British and Irish Novel since 1960*. Ed. James Acheson. New York: St. Martin's, 1991. 174–91. Print.
- Kempley, Rita. Film review of *Waterland*. *Washington Post*. Washington Post 7 Nov. 1992. Web. 3 Feb. 2015.
- Lea, Daniel. *Graham Swift*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2005. Print.
- Lee, Alison. *Realism and Power: Postmodern British Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.
- Malcolm, David. *Understanding Graham Swift*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 2003. Print.
- Maslin, Janet. "Memories of Madness and Love." *New York Times*. New York Times 30 Oct. 1992. Web. 30 Jan. 2015.
- McCarthy, Todd. "Review: *Waterland*." *Variety*. Variety 24 Aug. 1992. Web. 30 Jan. 2015.
- Ryan, Desmond. "A Teacher who Brings History to Life." *Philly.com*. Interstate General Media, Philadelphia, 13 Nov. 1992. Web. 3 Feb. 2015.
- Swift, Graham. "Filming the Fens." *Making an Elephant*. London: Picador, 2010. 185–96. *Google Books*. Web. 2 Feb. 2015.
- . *Waterland*. London: Picador, 1983. Print.
- Waterland*. Dir. Stephen Gyllenhaal. Perf. Jeremy Irons, Ethan Hawke, Si-néad Cusack. 1992. Optimum, 2006. DVD.