

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
INSTITUTO DE LETRAS
DEPARTAMENTO DE LÍNGUAS MODERNAS
SETOR DE INGLÊS

The Hobbit: An Expected Movie

AUTOR: GIOVANI JOSÉ DA SILVA COPPINI

ORIENTADOR: IAN ALEXANDER

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso apresentado ao Instituto de Letras da UFRGS, como requisito parcial para obtenção do grau de Licenciado em Letras pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.

Porto Alegre,

Dezembro de 2016

FICHA CATALOGRÁFICA

COPPINI, Giovani José da Silva

THE HOBBIT: AN EXPECTED MOVIE

Porto Alegre: UFRGS, Instituto de Letras, 2016. 39p.

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso (Licenciatura – Instituto de Letras)
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.

1. J. R. R. Tolkien 2. Adaptation 3. Literature 4. Cinema

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

On this unexpected journey we call life, there are many difficult moments to be overcome. University is something my family is not acquainted with; I am the first one to reach that far. Therefore, I had to face hardships due to this new step that nobody in my surroundings had taken before. Throughout the process, I had many people with me, helping me in every situation that I did not know what to do, so it seems fair to dedicate a part of this work for them. First, although she could not help me with college, my mom. She has always been by my side supporting every decision I made in my life even when she did not know what it was about. She is my mother and my father, it was hard for her to raise I and my brother by herself sometimes, but she never complained about it, I admire her so much for that and love her in a way it is not possible to measure. Unfortunately, my father did not see the things I accomplished in my life, he got sick when I was still a teenager and then died before I enter university. I wish he could see the man I became and receive a proud look and a hug from him; I will never forget him, not a single day of my life.

I had many friends who supported me through this journey and I want to thank every single one of them; I will not give names but the ones who read it will know it is for them. There are some friends that we want to have for the whole life and I made some of these throughout my graduation. I always made very clear to the ones I want to keep after graduation that I love them and they are very special for me, so, names here will not be necessary. Thank you all for encouraging me, being by my side when I needed and more important than it, being by my side when I did not need. If it were not because of you, I might not have had the strength to finish this long path. I will always remember the happy moments I had the chance to spend with you. Friendship needs good moments too and these moments are the ones that will be in my memories for the eternity. A special thank for the girl who I met in the process and made my life happier than ever (I love you). Finally yet important, I want to thank my advisor, besides being the best professor I ever had in my life, he is also an awesome person. He believed in me more than anyone has ever done, I would not have finished this work without him and his support. I want him to be part of my life even after graduation. I wish the best to all people who helped me finishing this journey.

ABSTRACT

The Hobbit, by J. R. R. Tolkien, is a literary work dated from 1937 and written aimed to the child public. In 2012, the book had its first adaptation to the cinema, altogether the novel was split in a trilogy and the other movies were released in the two successive years. This adaptation, made by Peter Jackson, brings some characteristic aspects of the cinema, as well as the novel has its own literary characteristics. These elements will be analyzed and commented from a perspective that takes literature and cinema into consideration. The purpose of this work is to analyze how the adaptation of the plot, the songs and some of the characters was made by Peter Jackson. Furthermore, explain possible reasons that could have influenced the changes made by the producer and screenwriter of the movie.

Key Words: J. R. R. Tolkien; Adaptation; Literature; Cinema.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	6
SONGS	10
THAT'S WHAT BILBO BAGGINS HATES	11
THE MISTY MOUNTAINS COLD	12
THE MAN IN THE MOON STAYED UP TOO LATE	14
DOWN DOWN DOWN IN GOBLIN TOWN	15
CHARACTERS	
AZOG, THE ORC	17
TAURIEL AND LEGOLAS	19
GOLLUM AND THE ONE RING	22
GANDALF, THE GREY	25
THORIN OAKENSHIELD	29
BILBO BAGGINS	33
CONCLUSION	37
REFERENCES	39

INTRODUCTION

Adaptation is a wide concept, which has been studied by scholars for a long time already. On this study, it consists of a literary work that was transformed into a cinematographic one. There may have much criticism about this kind of adaptation because of the fidelity it has compared to the original piece of work and also due to the public acceptance. The relationship between literature and cinema is, most of the times, prejudged because of people's not comprehending that those works are from a different media and each one of them has its own resources and specificities. Therefore, one cannot judge those two pieces of work using the same criteria because "the literature, it is believed, will never have the plastic mobility of the cinema, and this one, on the other hand, never the level of abstraction of the literature." (BRITO, 2006, p. 62). Also because "*as well as the language, the cinema is an abstraction, an object of study that fulfills itself from a code, from a grammar and from a social pact. (...) Cinema is the language seeing and listened on its happening and, thus, always present.*" (SEORSI, 2005, p.43). Therefore, the cinema has its own language as the literature has it; it is essential having those differences between the novel and the book because each language has its own characteristics.

However, the fidelity to the original work is rare, if not impossible. First of all, because one cannot represent visually verbal significances, the same way that is practically impossible to convey with words what is conveyed in lines, shapes and colors. Second of all, because the conceptual image, that the literature makes bring forth in the spirit, is fundamentally different of the filmic image, based on real data offered to us immediately to be seen, and not to imagine gradually. So, if the novel narrates the world, the movie puts us before an organized world according to a continuity and contiguity. (SEORSI, 2005, p. 40)

Then, the best way to judge it is to study the specific characteristics of each of them and interpret the quality of the adaptation respecting the particularity of each one of them. For example:

While the novelist spends speech, space and time describing, for example, some clothing, a ballroom, or a landscape, the filmmaker has technical conditions to show the totality of the object or a scenery in a minimum time, with, for example, a single centripetal or centrifugal overview, in an approximate or general view. (BRITO, 2006, p.74)

Only by reading it can you notice that it is not necessary to have fidelity with everything that is described in the book in the same way on the movie. While the writer has to spend pages describing how a place or a character is, the movie

can do it in a short amount of time. The cinema was based on many novels and it has changed aspects in order to create its own characteristics, keeping some of the literature features. The most current process when a movie is adapted from a novel is the process of reduction.

As a novel normally has an objective length (and not only diegetic) bigger than the movie, a most frequent adaptive procedure has been the reduction, in other words, elimination of elements to diminish the size of the work, that must fit in the two hours of the movie. This reduction happens in terms of cuts (exclusion of elements, excerpts, landscapes, actions, dialogues or characters) or of "raccourcis" summaries when, for example, two or more characters are transformed into only one, or when time is saved making simultaneous, in the movie, two events that are chronologically separated in the novel. (BRITO, 2006, p.72)

There are many kinds of adaptation in the world nowadays; one of them is based on a literary work in order to transform it into a cinematographic one. The cinema and the literature, besides being two distinct semiotic systems, have many characteristics in common. Not only is the cinema influenced by the literature but the inverse process can happen as well. The influence that one art performs in the other one is due to both of them having the same purpose, the public entertainment. Based on the relation between literature and cinema, some blockbuster movies are being released all around the world, *The Hobbit* is one example of it.

Before the movies of *The Hobbit*, there were many other things that influenced it. Tolkien has written other books like *The Silmarillion* and *The Lord of the Rings*, to name a few, and there are some aspects of those books that can be noticed in *The Hobbit* movies. However, most of the influence does not come from Tolkien's books but from *The Lord of the Rings* movies. The spectators of *The Lord of the Rings* do not expect less than another epic trilogy when they knew *The Hobbit* would be released after years of an evolution in the cinematographic field. If there could have been done everything that was done in *The Lord of the Rings* with the technology available at that time, imagine what the spectators were expecting from *The Hobbit* movies by the time it was released. Not only about technology but also about some features that are essential for a Middle-Earth-related movie. The battles, the characters, the creatures, the adventures, the long length of the movies and many other

characteristics are so expected by the spectators that it would not make any sense if *The Hobbit* movies were different.

Spectatorship is not only the act of watching a film, but also the ways one takes pleasure in the experience, or not; the means by which watching movies becomes a passion, or a leisure time activity like any other. Spectatorship refers to how film-going and the consumption of movies and their myths are symbolic activities, culturally significant events. (Mayne, 1993, p.1)

The spectators of *The Lord of the Rings* are the same, or should be, of *The Hobbit* movies because they take pleasure on watching this kind of movie with all the features the movie has. They know, or expect, what features the movie will have because they have watched *The Lord of the Rings* before. *The Hobbit* films are so influenced by *The Lord of the Rings* ones because the movies already have the characteristics of the cinema. If you join all Tolkien's books and compare the influence the books had to the influence the movies had on *The Hobbit* trilogy, you will notice that the films already tell you how *The Hobbit* movies would be more than the books.

To analyze the process of adaptation, I used a table found in *Literatura no cinema* by João Batista de Brito. The table describes the processes that the movie had to use in order to adapt the characteristics of the book.

Operation	Description
Removal	Features that are on the literary text (novel, tale or play) and are not on the movie.
Addition	Features that are on the movie without being on the literary text.
Displacement	Features are on both, movie and literary text, but not in the same chronological or spatial order.
Transformation	Features that, on the novel and on the movie, have equivalent meanings, but they have different configuration.
Simplification	A transformation that constituted in reducing, on the movie, the dimension of a feature that was bigger on the novel.
Expansion	A transformation that constituted in expanding, on the movie, the dimension of one or more features of the novel.

This work will be divided in two parts, each one of them having its specific points to analyze. The first part will analyze the songs since it is an important part of the novel but it does not have the same importance in the movie. Can or did it have any significant change in this work of art at all? This will be revealed during this section of the work. This part of the work will encompass both the novel and the trilogy of the movies *The Hobbit* in order to reflect about the changes that happened in the process of adaptation and it will be given theoretical considerations to better comprehension of the topic. The next section of the work will follow the same pattern; however, it will have other aspects to be discussed, the characters; not all of them, just the ones I considered important to have an analysis about. Some of the characters had huge changes during the adaptation process and these changes had completely influenced the plot of the movie, thus it seemed important to explain why Peter Jackson changed, and even created, some of the characters presented in his version of *The Hobbit*.

SONGS

Why talk about songs in this work? Music is something very important in Tolkien's works. The universe of Middle Earth and its creatures were created through music, so it seemed reasonable having this topic in this work about *The Hobbit*. Below, there is a quote of *The Silmarillion* that illustrates the origin of this world.

But when they were come into the Void, Ilúvatar said to them: 'Behold your Music!' And he showed to them a vision, giving to them sight where before was only hearing; and they saw a new World made visible before them, and it was globed amid the Void, and it was sustained therein, but was not of it. And as they looked and wondered this World began to unfold its history, and it seemed to them that it lived and grew. (TOLKIEN, 1999, p. 6)

The Hobbit novel has many songs; it is hard to say precisely how many this book has because they regularly appear during the whole plot and in every kind of situation. There is no pattern for the songs, sometimes it can be seen them being sung by the dwarves, sometimes are the many different kinds of creatures present in the book. There are happy songs, terrifying ones and other kinds of songs with different purposes. The dwarves, as you may know, are people who love singing a good song with their friends and you can notice they have a remarkable talent for playing instruments, which they always carry with them, by this comment of the author: "if it can be like their song without their music" (TOLKIEN, p. 15). Since this is a book destined to the child public, the songs become important to get the children attention and fascination.

In the trilogy of *The Hobbit* movies, it can only be seen two songs in the first movie and they are sung by the company of Oakenshield. The songs are close to each other if you consider time as a reference and they were adapted in different ways. The songs, in the book, do not have names, however, in the movie, they do; they are: *That's what Bilbo Baggins Hates* and *The Misty Mountains Cold*. After watching the movies, you may find out that all of them have extended versions, so they have added things in the version that you could have seen in the movies. That is exactly what was done and two more songs were added, for the songs lovers, that is something good. The one sung by The Great

Goblin has a different purpose than the ones sang by the dwarves; you may notice it by the lyrics. The name of this song is *Down, Down, To Goblin Town*. The other song is played when the dwarves are in Rivendell having dinner. The company of Oakenshield is bored with the songs played by the elves, so Bofur stand up on the table and starts singing a very animated song; this song was not at all mentioned in the book. Comparing to the amount of songs existed in the movies, having two in the cinema version and four in the extended one, it is clear that music does not have the same importance for the cinematographic version as it has in the novel.

THAT'S WHAT BILBO BAGGINS HATES

Now it is time to know the lyrics of the songs and analyze them. I will write about them and refer to them in the chronological order they appear in the movie. The first song, *That's what Bilbo Baggins Hates*, is sung by the dwarves after they have finished dinner at Bilbo's house.

Lyrics of the book version	Lyrics of the movie version
Chip the glasses and crack the plates! Blunt the knives and bend the forks! That's what Bilbo Baggins hates- Smash the bottles and burn the corks!	Blunt the knives, bend the forks Smash the bottles and burn the corks Chip the glasses and crack the plates That's what Bilbo Baggins hates!
Cut the cloth and tread on the fat! Pour the milk on the pantry floor! Leave the bones on the bedroom mat! Splash the wine on every door!	Cut the cloth, tread on the fat Leave the bones on the bedroom mat Pour the milk on the pantry floor Splash the wine on every door!
Dump the crocks in a boiling bawl; Pound them up with a thumping pole; And when you've finished, if any are whole, Send them down the hall to roll!	Dump the crocks in a boiling bowl Pound them up with a thumping pole When you're finished, if they are whole Send them down the hall to roll
That's what Bilbo Baggins hates! So, carefully! carefully with the plates!	That's what Bilbo Baggins hates!

This first song was adapted successfully because it conveys the same feeling it does in the novel. In the book, the dwarves are singing happily and you can see this clearly in the movie, even some instruments appear in this scene, which was described in the book. The lyrics are basically the same just in a different order, what makes the rhymes closer to each other. The scene is also very alike, Bilbo worried because the uninvited visitors could break all his things. They sang this song in order to make fun of Bilbo because he is so nervous about the whole situation that he does not know how to react very well to it.

THE MISTY MOUNTAINS COLD

The next song is sung a short time after the aforementioned one. This song had a significant change not only in the lyrics but in the message it conveys. The length of the song is first thing that can be noticed, there is a huge reduction in the lyrics, although, the meaning of the song is kept.

Lyrics of the book version	Lyrics of the movie version
Far over the misty mountains cold To dungeons deep and caverns old We must away ere break of day To seek the pale enchanted gold.	Far over the misty mountains cold. To dungeons deep, and caverns old. We must away,'ere break of day. To find our long forgotten gold.
The dwarves of yore made mighty spells, While hammers fell like ringing bells In places deep, where dark things sleep, In hollow halls beneath the fells.	
For ancient king and elvish lord There many a gloaming golden hoard They shaped and wrought, and light they caught To hide in gems on hilt of sword.	
On silver necklaces they strung The flowering stars, on crowns they hung The dragon-fire, in twisted wire They meshed the light of moon and sun.	
Far over the misty mountains cold To dungeons deep and caverns old We must away, ere break of day, To claim our long-forgotten gold.	
Goblets they carved there for themselves And harps of gold; where no man delves There lay they long, and many a song Was sung unheard by men or elves.	
The pines were roaring on the height, The winds were moaning in the night. The fire was red, it flaming spread; The trees like torches biased with light,	The pines were roaring on the height. The winds were moaning in the night. The fire was red, it flaming spread. The trees like torches blazed with light.
The bells were ringing in the dale And men looked up with faces pale; The dragon's ire more fierce than fire Laid low their towers and houses frail.	
The mountain smoked beneath the moon; The dwarves, they heard the tramp of doom. They fled their hall to dying -fall Beneath his feet, beneath the moon.	
Far over the misty mountains grim To dungeons deep and caverns dim We must away, ere break of day, To win our harps and gold from him!	

It is clear that the song suffered a big change referring to the size of it, this may be the reason of the change in the message it conveys. While the version of the book tells more about the story, culture and life of the dwarves, the movie version only tells the story of the day Smaug took their land and burned everything. The dwarves' story and culture are introduced in the prologue of the movie; this part shows everything that happened with the dwarves before and during Smaug's attack. However, in the movie, the story of the dwarves is told by Bilbo while he is writing a book of his adventures to Frodo. There is nothing that can tell us where Bilbo had found all the information he gives us about the dwarves. Bilbo's sharing the story of the dwarves is good because there are images and elements the song could not bring, like their culture and their characteristics. On the other hand, the song of the book is the thing that motivates Bilbo to go on this adventure in search for gold and a home for the dwarves because he seems not to know everything he knows about them as in the movie.

As they sang the hobbit felt the love of beautiful things made by hands and by cunning and by magic moving through him, a fierce and jealous love, the desire of the hearts of dwarves. Then something Tookish woke up inside him, and he wished to go and see the great mountains, and hear the pine-trees and the waterfalls, and explore the caves, and wear a sword instead of a walking-stick. (TOLKIEN, 2011 p. 16)

The song brought up a feeling Bilbo had never felt before, he wanted to go on an adventure. In the film, Bilbo only wants to go on this adventure after waking up and seeing the contract the Dwarves had left in his home, he looks at it and after he is already running and answering a hobbit's question about his destination, "I am going on an adventure". Having listened to the lyrics of the song, in the book, Bilbo felt interest in having his own adventure and see the things the dwarves were singing. Due to the loss the song had in comparison to the original, it would have no sense if Bilbo got motivated to go on an adventure listening to the bad things the song talks about. About the scene itself, in the book, the dwarves had instruments with them and the song seems to have a different rhythm than the one proposed by the movie, it seems more harmonious because of the many instruments described in the same scene. Bilbo's reactions to the songs can show it perfectly, the quote from the book tell us exactly how Bilbo felt about the song, while in the movie he is sat, seems to be suffering from depression because of what he was listening.

THE MAN IN THE MOON STAYED UP TOO LATE

The third song is also sung by the dwarves, Bofur is the one who starts singing it and then the other dwarves join him. They were in Rivendell searching for answers the elves could give them about the map that would guide their entrance into their home. They were having dinner and the elves were playing their songs with their flutes and harps. The dwarves were complaining about the song, it was too different from the ones their kin were used to. Therefore, Bofur said that there were just one thing they could do, he stood up on the table and started singing a song. The name of the song is *The Man in the Moon Stayed Up Too Late*.

There is an inn, a merry old inn
beneath an old grey hill,
And there they brew a beer so brown
That the Man in the Moon himself came down
one night to drink his fill.
The ostler has a tipsy cat
that plays a five-stringed fiddle;
And up and down he runs his bow,
Now squeaking high, now purring low,
now sawing in the middle.
So the cat on his fiddle played hey-diddle-diddle,
a jig that would wake the dead:
He squeaked and sawed and quickened the tune,
While the landlord shook the Man in the Moon:
"It's after three!" he said.

This is a song that cannot be found in *The Hobbit* book, so why is this song in the movie? The answer for this question is quite simple; the song was composed by Bilbo Baggins, the main character of this story, so the director of the movie may be trying to pay a tribute to the halfling. The hobbit might have taught this song to the dwarves and they sang it to get rid of the boredom the elvish song is creating on them. This composition is found in another Tolkien's book, *The Adventures of Tom Bombadil*. This book is a collection of poetry published in 1962, twenty five years after the publication of *The Hobbit*. This information has a huge importance for this work, it means that the trilogy of the

movies were not only based or influenced just by the things contained in *The Hobbit* books but it has influence of all Tolkien's works. This song is an adaptation of a very ancient nursery rhyme known as *Hey Diddle Diddle*.

DOWN DOWN DOWN IN GOBLIN TOWN

The fourth song is not sung by the dwarves but by The Great Goblin. When the dwarves are captured and taken to the goblins' cave, this song is their welcome when they face The Great Goblin. This song is meant to make the dwarves feel afraid. The lyrics are very terrifying and it gets worse because it is sung by a dreadful creature. The lyrics of the song in the book are in the following table, the movie version of the movie has similar lyrics. The movie made the lyrics more complex, with longer sentences, while the book's version is basically compound by horrifying threatening words.

Lyrics of the book version	Lyrics of the movie version
Clap! Snap! the black crack! Grip, grab! Pinch, nab! And down down to Goblin-town You go, my lad!	Clap snap the black crack! Grip grab pinch and nab! Batter and beat! Make them stammer and squeak! Pound pound far underground Down down down in Goblin Town
Clash, crash! Crush, smash! Hammer and tongs! Knocker and gongs! Pound, pound, far underground! Ho, ho! my lad!	With a swish and a smack and a whip and a crack! Everybody talks when they're on my rack! Pound pound far underground Down down down to Goblin Town
Swish, smack! Whip crack! Batter and beat! Yammer and bleat! Work, work! Nor dare to shirk, While Goblins quaff, and Goblins laugh, Round and round far underground Below, my lad!	Hammer and torch! You won't last long on the end of my prong! Clash crash crush and smash! Bang break shiver and shake! You can yell it and yelp but there aint no help! Pound pound far under ground Down down down in Goblin Town!

The song is indeed terrifying, but only in the book. If you read the book and the description of the scene, you will be terrified by it. In the movie, this will not happen, unless you close your eyes because The Great Goblin makes the song funny with his performance. He dances as if he was performing to a TV program that selects people by their talents. In the end of his performance, he spins and it finishes ruining the terrifying aspect it could have. After the song in the book it is said, "It sounded truly terrifying" (TOLKIEN, 2011) and in the movie one of the

dwarves says, “this is not a song it’s an abomination” (THE HOBBIT, 2012). It can be seen that the song of the movie is treated badly even by the characters of it. The adaptation of this song could have been successful if The Great Goblin had not made a funny performance, the lyrics and the scenario were appropriated for a terrifying moment in the movie as good as the same moment in the book but it did not happen as well as expected.

In the cinematographic trilogy, the presence of the songs is not as important as it is in the book due to some reasons that will be discussed next. First of all, the public of the movies was completely different from the public of the book. The people who wanted to watch *The Hobbit* film were, in general, people who wanted to watch a movie as good as *The Lord of the Rings*. Having this in mind, the songs that are present in the book would not have the same acceptance that it had by the children. The movies inspired in Tolkien’s works are famous for having long hours of duration, so if the director of the movie decided to put all the songs the book had, the trilogy would get even longer than its extended version and this would not be watched. “*The translation of a literary work to the screen needs, as far as possible, to touch on the points of origin of the book, to perform its narration within the temporal compression the cinema demands.*” (SEORSI, 2005, p. 42).

Analyzing the process of adaptation of the songs according to Brito (2006), it can be observed different processes that the songs went through. The first one is the *Simplification*. Many of the songs present in the book are not in the movie so this is characterized as a simplification because there was a process in the adaptation that simplified the way the songs are present in the movie, not having too much of them. Talking specifically about the song *The Misty Mountains Cold*, which also went through the process of simplification, it has gone through the process of *Transformation* because, although it has changed a bit, the idea or the purpose of the song has a similar configuration in both movie and book. Amazing as it might seem, there has been a process called *Addition* in the songs. *The Man in the Moon Stayed Up Too Late* is the responsible for this process because it is a song that was not present in the book but it has been added in the cinematographic version.

The importance of music in the two different medias is clearly not the same. While in the book there are many of them and many of the characters and creatures of the story sing them, the film brings only four of these songs being three of them sung by the dwarves, one of them was not in *The Hobbit* book, and one sung by the goblins. The book and the movie have different target audiences, so having more or having less songs may be due to this. The book is aimed to children, having songs is something that can make them interact more with the reading and enjoy it better. The movie has its own tools to attract its spectators, so the songs are not so essential. Another reason for not having a big amount of songs in the movie might be the difficulty of conveying the sound of the songs presented in the book. While you can imagine the song, in the book, the way you want it to be, the movie has to invent a rhythm and a melody to that song; I wonder it would be extreme difficult to do this with every song of the book. You can have epic battles with hundreds of creatures, a beautiful landscape, special effects and many other things better than a song in a movie. Those are other reasons that make the movie distant to the book in the aspect of songs presence.

CHARACTERS

AZOG, THE ORC

“The Pale Orc” or “Azog, the Defiler”, this is how Azog is called in the movie. The first thing that can be noticed is that he is a different creature comparing book and movie; in the book, he is a Goblin but in the movie, he is an Orc. *Silmarillion* bring us the Orcs being creatures created like this:

(...) all those of the Quendi who came into the hands of Melkor, ere Utumno was broken, were put there in prison, and by slow arts of cruelty were corrupted and enslaved; and thus did Melkor breed the hideous race of the Orcs in envy and mockery of the Elves, of whom they were afterwards the bitterest foes. For the Orcs had life and multiplied after the manner of the Children of Ilúvatar; and naught that had life of its own, nor the semblance of life, could ever Melkor make since his rebellion in the Ainulindalë before the Beginning: so say the wise. And deep in their dark hearts the Orcs loathed the Master whom they served in fear, the maker only of their misery. This it may be was the vilest deed of Melkor, and the most hateful to Ilúvatar. (TOLKIEN, 1999, p. 47)

In *The Hobbit* book, the word Orc is mentioned once or twice, so Azog being a Goblin would make it easier the process of creating his image in our

imagination since it is not known what an Orc is. The movies of *The Hobbit* is completely influenced by the movies of *The Lord of the Rings* and Orcs there are stronger and more terrifying than a Goblin. Azog is the main antagonist of the movies, so it would not be accepted by the audience that a Goblin would play this role. The Goblins in *The Hobbit's* scene when they are captured by them are many in number but they do not seem to be as strong as an Orc is; you can notice it by their size and physical strength. Therefore, Azog could not be a Goblin in the movie because he would not be an acceptable rival for the king under the mountain, Thorin.

This character is not important for the book, it can only be heard about him when Gandalf is explaining Thorin where he got the map.

“I did not ‘get hold of it,’ I was given it,” said the wizard.

“Your grandfather Thror was killed, you remember, in the mines of Moria by Azog the Goblin.” (TOLKIEN, 2011)

If you search the whole book trying to find Azog's name, this is the only time that he appears. On the other hand, in the cinematographic version of *The Hobbit*, Azog is the main antagonist of the movie. This villain appears throughout the three movies and he has a very important role for the plot of the movie. In the movie, the orc hunts Thorin Oakenshield during the entire trilogy in search for revenge. In the battle of the mines of Moria Thorin had almost killed Azog, cutting one of his hands off. At the end of the third movie, Azog and Thorin are finally facing each other for the final battle; Azog wants revenge because of his injury caused by Thorin long ago and the Dwarf wants to avenge every one of his kind that Azog had killed, mainly his grandfather Thror, and take back his mountain to be the king. The battle has a tragic ending for both of them; Azog dies after hurting Thorin, receiving a deadly rage attack and Thorin does not resist the injury caused by the orc. Not before speaking his last words did Thorin die, he apologizes with Bilbo and give the audience a moral lesson, typical of good characters deaths in movies.

It can be found in many movies, the conflict between “the bad guy” and “the good/chosen one”, and in *The Hobbit* that is no different, Azog and Thorin fit in those roles so represented in the cinema. Although Thorin is not always a good person, he does whatever it takes to have his home back, he leads the dwarves

to achieve it, and these reasons turn him to be good at the end. The battle between the villain and the hero is iconic in many movies and, in cases of trilogy; this battle is expected to happen just in the last movie. It makes the battle the most epic it can be because the public is waiting for this battle to happen since the first movie and the expectation, joined with great stunts performance, is what makes it so epic in a movie.

Based on the terminology used by João Batista de Brito, in his work *Literatura no Cinema*, the process that the character Azog suffered in this adaptation receives the name of *Expansion*. This process is characterized by a transformation that expand, on the movie, the dimension of one or more features of the novel. In this case, Azog had a huge transformation if compared to his participation on the book, in which he is just mentioned, to his role in the plot of the movie, in which he is the main antagonist. His role in the movie had such a transformation that his participation became essential to the movie's story. All in all, Azog was expanded to become one of the most important characters of the movie, seeing that he was before, in the book, just mentioned by Gandalf, it can be said that this change might have been the most important considering his importance to the plot in the trilogy. Azog's participation was so remarkable that he was the one who killed The King under the Mountain, Thorin Oakenshield. Having a main antagonist in the movie, the focus of the story changes a little. While in the movie one of the focus seems to be Azog getting avenged towards Thorin and vice versa; in the book, since Azog does not exist, the focus is the mission they have to accomplish and not the battle against Orcs to achieve it, even though there is a big battle at the end of the plot in the book.

TAURIEL AND LEGOLAS

Some characters have an important role in the movie, but are not even mentioned in the book. Legolas, a remarkable character from *The Lord of the Rings*, the story happens chronologically after the events in *The Hobbit*, is brought back to the movies. The Elf has no participation in the book; however, he appears frequently from the second *The Hobbit* movie on. The target audience of the book is children, but the movie does not have the same target, so Peter Jackson added some action and fight to the movie bringing one of the most iconic characters from *The Lord of the Rings*, Legolas. He is acclaimed for his ability in

archery, he can kill almost any enemy with his bow and arrow and his acute aiming but when he is out of arrows, he uses his swords with a flawless dexterity and can kill many enemies in a blink of an eye. These abilities and his fame may have been the reasons that brought him to the plot of the cinematographic version of *The Hobbit*. Another reason that can be related with his appearance in the movie is that he brings with him another character, who also appears only in the movie. Tauriel, a female Elf who is his adventures partner in the movie. As Tauriel does not exist in Tolkien's works, her acceptance would be a lot better if she were accompanied by one the most acclaimed characters of another of Tolkien's works, *The Lord of the Rings*.

Tauriel is a Woodland Elf who had her parents murdered by Orcs when she was just a baby, so Thranduil, the King of the Dark Forest, raised her among the royal members. Tauriel is a valuable warrior and she is the head of the Mirkwood Elven guard; her name, in the Elven language, means Daughter of the Forest. She demonstrates being more tolerant to the relationship between Elves and Dwarves, this becomes known, strongly, when she starts demonstrating a kind of interest for one of the dwarves from Thorin's Company, Kili. The manifestation of a female character in the movie causes a big impact because neither the book nor the movie had important roles, or even simple ones, to women until the arrival of Tauriel, who has an important role for the cinematographic genre since she brings romance into it.

It would be difficult to have a movie like *The Hobbit* with no presence of female characters for the contemporary audience. On these days, the women have more space in the world if compared to the past, so it would not be advisable for the filmmaker not to put a female character in the movie. She is a strong warrior, which can be related to the many battles women have to face to have their rights on the society, so, Tauriel is more than a female elf warrior, she is the representation of the woman nowadays. Another thing that Tauriel brings is the different relationship she has with Legolas and Fili. Even though Legolas shows interest by her and is the same race Tauriel is, she does not follow the patterns and falls in love with a dwarf. The romance in the movie would be expected to happen between the two elves, since they are always together and since Legolas stands for her against his father, the king. However, the unexpected happens and

the plot has a twist regarding to the romance. Having a romance in a movie like this might be an strategy to attract the teenage audience.

The arrival of this new character brings something very frequent characteristic in movies, a romance between two different races that should not happen because of the differences imposed by their origins. A dwarf and an elf in love is a situation that the public was not expecting because these two races in general hate each other and would relate just in extreme cases, like a war against armies of Orcs for example. It is the relation expected from Shakespeare in *Romeo and Juliet*, not in a Peter Jackson's film. The relation between the two characters begins in the moment that the dwarf sees her for the first time and tries to win her heart with awkward speech, as a womanizer would do. As the movie goes on, so does their feeling for each other, Kili is not afraid of demonstrating his love for the elf and increasingly, his feelings are expressed in a totally different way comparing to the way he treated her before. Tauriel tries to fight against her feelings and negate the love she was feeling because an elf could not have a relationship with a dwarf under no condition, she avoids even more the feeling when Legolas is close to her.

At the end of the third movie, this relation has a tragic ending. A great and powerful Orc from Azog's army fights Tauriel and almost kills her, when he is about to kill her, her lover arrives to rescue her. He fights bravely with the huge Orc, the lovers join forces to beat the enemy, but the Orc is too powerful and kills Kili stabbing his chest with his sharp weapon. Kili and Tauriel change the last gaze of love and Kili dies on the hands of the Orc. Tauriel finally surrenders to her feelings and, seeing that she would not be able to kill the enemy by herself, grab him and jump off the tower they are in hoping she could avenge the death of her lover. This last scene is another common characteristic of movies, when you see the person you love die, you forget everything and try to do whatever it takes to avenge the death, sometimes causing the other person death so that they can be together in the afterlife.

Bringing Brito's (2016) terminology again, Legolas and Tauriel can be classified in the same category. When features that are not present in the novel appear in the movie, the process of adaptation they suffer can be called *Addition*.

(...) an addition may consist in the mere addition of new elements (images, actions, characters, sceneries, dialogues, etc), or the expansion of the ones already existing. Thereby, a small detail, physical or psychic, that there were not in the novel may appear in the movie as an important semantic trigger, in substitution or not to elements of the novelistic structure (...) (BRITO, 2006, p.72)

None of these two characters is present in the book; however, they have essential roles for the plot of the movie. Tauriel becomes important in several scenes, for example, when the elf heals Kili because he was severely injured, almost dying, only her could save his life due to her healing domain. She is completely relevant to the plot when she is attacked by the Orc that kills Kili, if she did not exist Kili would not need to sacrifice his life and maybe could have survived the war. Legolas, as he is an extreme powerful warrior, helped the dwarves on the battlefield many times when the Orcs attacked them, he even saved Thorin's life when many enemies surrounded the dwarf. He was also the one who imprison the dwarves and took them to Thranduil's domain when they first met. Considering only *The Hobbit* book it is possible to classify both of them in the same category, but if it is considered *The Lord of the Rings* movies and films as well, then, Legolas will fit in a different one. In this case, Legolas would suffer the same process Azog went through, an *Expansion*. Since Legolas already existed in *The Lord of the Rings*, his participation was just extended to another part of the story and since he is an elf, it does not seem to be unreal, because elves are immortals and he could have already existed by the time the story of *The Hobbit* happened.

GOLLUM AND THE ONE RING

There is not much about Gollum in *The Hobbit* book or movies; however, he is a very important character to the universe of Middle Earth. It is impossible talking about this creature without mentioning *The One Ring*. The story of *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings* would be nothing without "one ring to rule them all". In *The Hobbit*, there is just one scene that Gollum is present and his story is not mentioned neither in the book nor in the movies. He is described as "a *small slimy creature. I don't know where he came from, nor who or what he was. He was Gollum . As dark as darkness, except for two big round pale eyes in his thin face.*" (TOLKIEN, 2011, p.54). Nevertheless, why is he so important for *The Hobbit*? He is the creature who "gives" the ring of power to Bilbo, this ring was

the most important event in *The Hobbit*, I dare say. The ring made Bilbo become more important in the story, but Bilbo has his own section in this work; this part here will talk about other creature.

The riddles game disputed between Gollum and Bilbo in *The Hobbit* is the only part that it can be seen this “*slimy creature*”. In the book and in the movie this is the only participation Gollum has in the plot. Even having this small participation, I decided to talk about him because of The One Ring, he is the one who has it and “passes” it to Bilbo. It is at least interesting to see what this little golden object can do to a living being and this is not clearly shown in *The Hobbit*. Nevertheless, another of Tolkien’s work brings us more about this creature, the saga of *The Lord of the Rings*. Only by watching *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King* movie, will you be able to find the origin of Gollum, even *The Silmarillion*, which gives us many of the creatures origins, does not mention Gollum. Therefore, it seems advisable to introduce this creature.

Gollum was not always this “*slimy creature*” as you may think. He was once, surprisingly, a Hobbit. His real name was Sméagol, now this name is used when he talks to himself. In *The Hobbit*, he talks to the golden ring but when he loses it, he keeps on talking to it, calling it as “*my precious*”; even it is not with him anymore, which is one of his remarkable feature. Sméagol and his friend Deagol go fishing for Sméagol’s birthday. Deagol is pulled by a fish - I imagine how strong a fish can be - to the bottom of a lake and he finds the ring. He returns to the shore and when Sméagol sees the ring, he asks Deagol to give it to him as a birthday present. Deagol refuses and they start fighting, at the end of the fight, Sméagol kills his friend and keeps the ring with him. Moreover, this is how the *Silmarillion* describes the finding of the ring, it does not mention Sméagol, but if you compare the movie scene to the book’s one, it is clear that this was the inspiration for the film plot.

(..)the One Ring was indeed found again, by a chance more strange than even Mithrandir had foreseen; and it was hidden from Curunír and from Sauron. For it had been taken from Anduin long ere they sought for it, being found by one of the small fisherfolk that dwelt by the River, ere the Kings failed in Condor; and by its finder it was brought beyond search into dark hiding under the roots of the mountains. (TOLKIEN, 1999, p. 363)

After Sméagol wear The One Ring by the first time, the ring started driving him crazy and, after years of loneliness, eating raw fish, or Orc, he became the creature he is nowadays. How can a simple golden ring transform a hobbit into a creature like Gollum? You shall see its origin and powers to solve this mystery.

Now the Elves made many rings; but secretly Sauron made One Ring to rule all the others, and their power was bound up with it, to be subject wholly to it and to last only so long as it too should last. And much of the strength and will of Sauron passed into that One Ring; for the power of the Elven-rings was very great, and that which should govern them must be a thing of surpassing potency; and Sauron forged it in the Mountain of Fire in the Land of Shadow. And while he wore the One Ring he could perceive all the things that were done by means of the lesser rings, and he could see and govern the very thoughts of those that wore them. (TOLKIEN, 1999, p. 344)

As you can see, the powers of the ring go far above invisibility, which is the explored power in *The Hobbit*. The ring is the most powerful one among many others. Sauron forged the ring in order to control all kinds of creatures using its mind control power. The One Ring would control everyone who was wearing one of the other rings and so, Sauron would be the governor of the world of Middle Earth. If you are curious to know how evil Sauron is, *Silmarillion* brings his story and you may check a little of it here:

Among those of his servants that have names the greatest was that spirit whom the Eldar called Sauron, or Gorthaur the Cruel. In his beginning he was of the Maiar of Aulë, and he remained mighty in the lore of that people. In all the deeds of Melkor the Morgoth upon Arda, in his vast works and in the deceits of his cunning, Sauron had a part, and was only less evil than his master in that for long he served another and not himself. But in after years he rose like a shadow of Morgoth and a ghost of his malice, and walked behind him on the same ruinous path down into the Void. (TOLKIEN, 1999, p. 23,24)

Sauron is one of the most evil creatures and he forged a ring of power, now you have an idea about what could have caused Sméagol's transformation. The ring has the power to control minds so it may have controlled Sméagol's mind and turned him into being an evil thing as well.

If this ring is so powerful, how could Bilbo manage to control it and use as he wished? There may have a few reasons for this to happen. First of all, he found the ring and put inside his pocket, he does not have to kill a friend to keep it, this can be very what triggered the evil in Sméagol, the ring asked him to kill his friend. Bilbo only used the ring to get rid of danger, he never used it to other things but his survival or the accomplishment of his mission, Sméagol takes it

and wears as fast as he can, so, the time you wear the ring can be another fact that influenced in Sméagol's transformation. Sméagol stayed alone for long years, but Bilbo had all his companions with him almost all the time and he used to ring sometimes to impress them and gain their confidence and respect; being among friends also helped him not being controlled by the evil power of The One Ring.

Gollum is first found in *The Hobbit* then in *The Lord of the Rings* if you consider the books, but if you consider the movies, the opposite happened. This fact has a huge influence on how the spectators of the movie expect Gollum to be because *spectatorship is not just the relationship that occurs between the viewer and the screen, but also and especially how that relationship lives on once the spectator leaves the theater.* (Mayne, 1993, p. 2, 3). Gollum is expected, by the movie audience, to be exactly as he was in *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy because of this process of having appeared before in the same universe. In conclusion, not only because Gollum appears in *The Hobbit* book is he present in the movie, but also because of the expectation of the audience to see this so remarkable character of Tolkien's Middle Earth in the cinema's screen one more time.

GANDALF, THE GREY

Before talking about Gandalf's participation in *The Hobbit*, it is good to know what a wizard in Tolkien's universe is. In many other stories, wizards are human beings that learned magic through books or other ways, but, in general, being a wizard is something that you learn. In Tolkien's universe, wizards is just the name given by Middle Earth men, their real name is Istari. The Istari are creatures created by Eru Iluvatar that were sent to Middle Earth to help the three peoples (men, dwarves and elves) stand against the evil. These powerful creatures have their powers because of supernatural reasons; they were born with their powers, in other words.

Even as the first shadows were felt in Mirkwood there appeared in the west of Middle-earth the Istari, whom Men called the Wizards. None knew at that time whence they were, save Círdan of the Havens, and only to Elrond and to Galadriel did he reveal that they came over the Sea. But afterwards it was said among the Elves that they were messengers sent by the Lords of the West to contest the power of Sauron, if he should arise again, and to move Elves and Men and all

living things of good will to valiant deeds. In the likeness of Men they appeared, old but vigorous, and they changed little with the years, and aged but slowly, though great cares lay on them; great wisdom they had, and many powers of mind and hand. Long they journeyed far and wide among Elves and Men, and held converse also with beasts and with birds; and the peoples of Middle-earth gave to them many names, for their true names they did not reveal. (TOLKIEN, 1999, p. 359, 360)

In the universe of Middle Earth, there are five wizards. In *The Hobbit* book, only Gandalf is part of the story, Radagast, the brown, is just mentioned and Saruman, the white has no participation in the book; the other two, the blue wizards, do not take part in the movie nor in the book. Radagast appears in the movies and helps Gandalf in some parts of the film. Saruman has two participations, one in the council they make to discuss the increasing of the dark power; and other when Gandalf is trapped in Dol Guldur and Saruman, Galadriel Radagast and Elrond go there to rescue him. There is a fight against the power of Sauron and he is defeated for that moment. These two scenes are not in *The Hobbit* book, but you can find its inspiration in the *Silmarillion* - Mithrandir and Curunír are the real names of Gandalf and Saruman, respectively.

Ever most vigilant was Mithrandir, and he it was that most doubted the darkness in Mirkwood, for though many deemed that it was wrought by the Ringwraiths, he feared that it was indeed the first shadow of Sauron returning; and he went to Dol Guldur, and the Sorcerer fled from him, and there was a watchful peace for a long while. But at length the Shadow returned and its power increased; and in that time was first made the Council of the Wise that is called the White Council, and therein were Elrond and Galadriel and Círdan, and other lords of the Eldar, and with them were Mithrandir and Curunír. (TOLKIEN, 1999, p. 360, 361)

Therefore on a time Mithrandir at great peril went again to Dol Guldur and the pits of the Sorcerer, and he discovered the truth of his fears, and escaped. And returning to Elrond he said: 'True, alas, is our guess. This is not one of the Úlairi, as many have long supposed. It is Sauron himself who has taken shape again and now grows apace; and he is gathering again all the Rings to his hand; and he seeks ever for news of the One, and of the Heirs of Isildur, if they live still on earth.' (TOLKIEN, 1999, p. 361)

Gandalf did not change much in the movies version if you compare *The Hobbit* to *The Lord of the Rings*. His participation in the two trilogies is basically

the same; he has a hobbit friend who he needs to protect from evil and they go on an adventure they know it is very dangerous. Having this in mind, it can be assured that *The Lord of the Rings* movies have an impact in the way Gandalf is built in *The Hobbit* films. The relationship Gandalf has with hobbits in the two works is very similar. In *The Lord of the Rings*, Gandalf asks Frodo to carry the ring to Rivendell while he goes to other place to deal with another issue. There is a council in Rivendell and Frodo decides to take the ring of power to Mordor to be destroyed, so Gandalf promises to protect him on his journey. In *The Hobbit*, either in the movie or in the book, Gandalf has a strong bond with the hobbit; the difference is that, in this piece of work, the wizard is the one who chooses Bilbo to go on an adventure.

Gandalf has a very unforgettable characteristic, he guides the adventure and when big problems come to happen, the wizard has other businesses to deal with and then, he leaves his companions by themselves. He always appears when they are almost dying and save them, but this piece of information will not relate with the aspect that I want to talk about in Gandalf's characteristics. In Role Playing Games, or RPG, there is a character that has this same characteristic of describing the adventure, then leaving the battle to the other characters, the Dungeon Master.

A term, created for the Dungeons & Dragons game, that describes the player who fulfills two important functions during a roleplaying game: referee and storyteller. As the rules for Dungeons & Dragons are vast and complex, it's the job of the Dungeon Master to facilitate gameplay and to determine the outcome of contested events by deciding how to interpret a given rule or dice roll. It's also the job of a Dungeon Master to provide the setting for the players' fictional characters, create goals for the characters to accomplish, and to fill any supporting roles needed for the adventure (kings, princes, dragons, innkeepers, barmaids, villains, etc.). The ultimate goal of a Dungeon Master is provide a fun and satisfying challenge for the players to overcome, through acting, exploration, puzzle-solving, and scenario-based decision-making. (www.urbandictionary.com)

Comparing it to Gandalf's behavior, it can be said that the wizard would be the Dungeon Master if *The Hobbit* were an RPG game. He is the one who brings the adventure in *The Hobbit* and in *The Lord of the Rings*; he decides the path they have to follow, he does not enter battle – which is also a Dungeon Master characteristic – and he brings the goals to be accomplished by the “players”, the characters of the story, in this case. The wizard has many similar characteristics

with the concept of a Dungeon Master; the thing that differs him to the RPG ruler is that although he leaves his companions to decide what they have to do by themselves, when they are in danger, he always appears bringing help to them.

In *The Hobbit* book, there is a scene Gandalf meets Beorn, a creature that can transform himself into a giant bear. Beorn is fierce and do not like visitors, mainly if they are dwarves. However, Gandalf has to find a place for the Oakenshield Company to rest and get supplies. In this scene, the wizard shows us his cunningness by tricking the wild creature and bring the dwarves to Beorn's home. Gandalf knew the skin-changer reputation so he planned to trick him; he asked the dwarves to come in pairs with a time gap between their arrivals while he talked to Beorn. Then, Gandalf started telling Beorn their adventure so far, and as he talked, the number of people in his story would increase and the dwarves would arrive at Beorn's place. The skin-changer was so connected to the story that he did not care too much about thirteen dwarves arriving in his place. Gandalf used the story telling to save his life and his companions'.

This can be related to an ancient story called *The Thousands Nights and One Night* in which the main character, Sherazade, tricks the king in order not to be killed. The king was famous for killing his wife the night after he sleeps with them, so Sherazade wanted to end this "curse" and save her life. The first night, Sherazade started telling a story to the king and she did not finish because it was morning already and she said she would finish it at night. The king was so curious about the end of the story that he kept her alive just to listen to the story end. The night arrived and Sherazade finished the story, however she started another one and left the end to the other night. Therefore, the king was so fond of the stories that he did not kill Sherazade. That was exactly what Gandalf did with Beorn, he told him a story and made him get so allured to it that he did not appeared to care about his many visitors. In the second *The Hobbit* movie, in which this scene takes place, this story-telling characteristic does not appear; this part of the movie happens in not more than three minutes and it is completely different. Gandalf pretends to be a fool to Beorn, laughing and stuttering, and the dwarves show up in Bofur's command. Beorn gets angry but after seeing Thorin, they are all allowed to enter his home, rest and get supplies.

You may think that this difference in the scene, between the movie and the book, ruins the meaning of its original source, but this is not completely right.

About the problem of adaptation itself, Bazin, presuming that style defines itself by the fusion of form and background, it is concluded that every fidelity is illusory, and even desirable. What the filmmaker should do is finding the cinematographic equivalent to the original, since the movie is a “esthetic translation of the novel to another language”, founded in a fundamental sympathy from the filmmaker to the novelist, it deals with respecting the spirit of the adapted novel, the fidelity to the author consisting only in inventing and articulate the audio-visual elements that would not disallow. (BRITO, 2006, p. 71)

There is no need of complete fidelity between the movie and the book in this scene, since goal of this part of the plot was getting help. Both in the movie and in the book they get this help from Beorn in two different ways, as there are two different languages, the difference is expected already. Since the meaning is kept, there must not be a scene identical to the original one, the book has its own features that allow this scene to be as if it were and the cinema has other features that decided how this scene would be.

THORIN OAKENSHIELD

The king under the mountain, son of Thrain, son of Thrór, this is the most important dwarf of *The Hobbit*. Much has changed in this character when you compare him in the movie and in the book. From the very beginning of the film, it can be noticed this difference. The arrival of the dwarves is a memorable scene; the dwarves arriving at Bilbo’s house and the little hobbit not knowing what to do. In the book, Thorin arrives with the rest of the dwarves but he “*was very haughty, and said nothing about service*” like the others did. In the movie, Thorin arrives after the song *That’s what Bilbo Baggins Hates* with a strong knocking on the door, then everything get quiet and Gandalf says “he is here”. Thorin seems to be feared by the other dwarves by this scene. After arriving, he speaks with Bilbo and after a short conversation; he makes fun of him and goes with his kind to have a meeting.

The appearance of the dwarf is the first thing one can notice. Dwarves are known for having long beards, and Thorin had this characteristic in the book “*Must we go any further?*” asked Bilbo, when it was so dark that he could only just see Thorin’s beard wagging beside him(...) (TOLKIEN 2011, P. 72). If you look at *The Hobbit’s* movie Thorin, you will notice his beard cannot wag because it is too

short. There is a dwarf, the one who finds The Arkenstone, who seems very dwarflike; so let us compare him to Thorin. In addition, there is Bard, from Lake Town, who is a man and has more in common with Thorin than the other dwarf. Little, or nothing, is known about the beauty of dwarves, so the dwarf who found The Arkenstone may be very handsome for the dwarves. The man, Bard, is a handsome man and a role model for the people of Lake Town. It is difficult to see dwarfish characteristics in Thorin other than the height; he seems to be a short handsome man, with a regular man beard and a face that would delight many women. So, is Thorin a handsome dwarf or a short handsome man? This question is impossible to be solved surely. It can be known he is a dwarf because he is son of dwarves and he is presented to us as being one, but his appearance in the movie tells us other thing. It seems to be that the filmmaker appealed to appearance to have more women watching the movie to see the dwarf king handsome face. Here, there are the three images of the characters described in this paragraph; look at them and you will see that Thorin seems more like a man than a dwarf.

DWARF¹



THORIN²



MAN³



Thorin, in the book, seems to share a dwarf common spirit; he sings with his companions and plays the harp among them. In the movie, he is full of himself, he claims to be the most important dwarf and sometimes he does not care about his companions, mostly Bilbo. The book brings Thorin being more goal oriented

¹ http://vignette2.wikia.nocookie.net/peter-jacksons-the-hobbit/images/0/0e/Dwarf_Miner.jpg/revision/latest?cb=20140323224422

²

<http://vignette4.wikia.nocookie.net/lotr/images/3/39/ThorinOakenshieldOfTheHobbit.jpeg/revision/latest?cb=20120714161359>

³ <https://s-media-cache-ak0.pinimg.com/736x/fe/39/79/fe3979f39c40b9cab1b595cbbedf177b.jpg>

while the film he seems to be focused only in reclaim his land and his gold in no matter what circumstances or who is still with him. The dwarf is a leader who is followed by his company in the story narrated in the book, however, in the movie he is someone to be afraid of and not be thwarted. Throughout the movie, it can be seen that Thorin is a different character compared to the book. There are some changes in his behavior in the plot of the movie that you may think Thorin suffers from split personality. He is always saying bad things to Bilbo, for example, and after he was saved by him from Azog, he yells at Bilbo and the hobbit feels like this is a regular Thorin's behavior, but at a blink of an eye, Thorin is hugging the hobbit and thanking him. This kind of situation happens in the book, but in a different moment. When they get to leave the goblin's cave, Bilbo is not with them and Thorin wants to leave him behind; but Thorin had already befriended with Bilbo and then, out of nowhere, he wants to get rid of the hobbit.

Elves and dwarves are not very good friends, but this rivalry is much stronger in the movie than in the book. When Gandalf wants to take them to Rivendell in the book, Thorin knows where they are going and does not complain about getting help from the elves. This part of the movie has a totally different approach; Gandalf tells Thorin they need the elves assistance but Thorin refuses it, so Gandalf leave the Oakenshield company for a moment because he is tired of Thorin's pride and stubbornness. The hate Thorin has towards the elves in the movie can be explained because of the prologue scene, that the book does not bring. In this scene, Smaug devastates Erebor and the dwarves have to run away of their homeland. When they are running, Thorin sees the Elvenking and his army standing in the mountain, he asks them for help but they simply turn their back on them; this is something that would make Thorin, and all the dwarves, hate the elves for the eternity. The book does not tell us the reason of the rivalry between the two peoples, but the hate Thorin has in the movie is also not mentioned. Therefore, the prologue scene of *The Hobbit: An Unexpected Journey* is the responsible for this behavior in Thorin. It is also important to mention that there is this rivalry in *The Lord of the Rings* movies as well. Gimli and Legolas seem not to get along very well by the first time, however, after the adventures they pass together, they become very good friends. This fact is already in the spectator's mind; elves and dwarves can get along and help one

another. The strong bond the elf and the dwarf create in *The Lord of the Rings* is due to their working together to reach a common goal; in *The Hobbit*, the mission is Thorin and his companion's not the elves'. The hate Thorin has towards the elves is stronger than Gimli's because Thorin witnessed the elves turning their backs when the dwarves most needed help and because Gimli fights along Legolas throughout *The Lord of the Rings* films. They both help each other because they want to accomplish a same goal, destroy *The One Ring*, not reclaim a land, like Thorin's goal.

When the story is ending, Thorin from the book and from the movie are very similar, I would say that in some parts, their behavior is exactly the same. When Thorin finally reclaims his home, he does not want to give any part of his gold to anyone, neither the ones who helped him to arrive there; he just wants to split his gold with his dwarf companions.

To the treasure of my people no man has a claim, because Smaug who stole it from us also robbed him of life or home. The treasure was not his that his evil deeds should be amended with a share of it. The price of the goods and the assistance that we received of the Lake-men we will fairly pay-in due time. But nothing will we give, not even a loaf.s worth, under threat of force. While an armed host lies before our doors, we look on you as foes and thieves. (TOLKIEN, 2011, p.179)

On this part of the movie and of the book, Thorin seems to be suffering from a sickness that controls his mind and makes him go crazy. He just wants to find the Arkenstone and he does not want to give any coin or jewel to anyone, the treasure is his and his only.

When The Battle of the Five Armies is begun, there comes another change in Thorin. In the book, when the battle gets intense, Thorin and his company join the fight. In the movie, Thorin is sit on his throne and Dwalin talks to him asking that they join the battle. The king under the mountain is clearly very tormented and suggests that they hide the gold and fortify parts of Erebor to stay safe from the war. Dwalin and Thorin argue because Thorin says that the gold is more valuable than all the blood spent in battle. Dwalin does not agree with his king but he goes away after Thorin treating to kill him. After this, Thorin goes to a great hall with a golden floor and starts thinking of everything everyone had said to him after the gold of the mountain took control of his actions. He has an epiphany and then he apologizes with his company and joins the battle.

According to Brito's (2016) terminology, the process of adaptation that Thorin went through is called *Transformation*. This process is consisted by characteristics that are on the movie and on the book having equivalent meanings but in a different configuration. The characteristics that are different lead Thorin to the same destiny and do not have interference in the plot. Although there may have been made many changes between the novel and the film, these changes were made because of the two different languages encountered in this kind of adaptation; one is the language of literature and the other, the language of the cinema. If one wants to have a good adaptation, the changes are essential because each of piece of work has its own characteristics; therefore, it might be recommended that Thorin in the movie and in the book shall have different characteristics.

BILBO BAGGINS

Bilbo, the hobbit, the protagonist of this story, the adventurer, the one who makes this novel be possible. Tolkien created the concept of a hobbit long ago, but what is known about this creature? The author questions the reader about it, so, you shall see what a hobbit is according to Tolkien.

They are (or were) a little people, about half our height, and smaller than the bearded Dwarves. Hobbits have no beards. There is little or no magic about them, except the ordinary everyday sort which helps them to disappear quietly and quickly when large stupid folk like you and me come blundering along, making a noise like elephants which they can hear a mile off. They are inclined to be at in the stomach; they dress in bright colours (chiefly green and yellow); wear no shoes, because their feet grow natural leathery soles and thick warm brown hair like the stuff on their heads (which is curly); have long clever brown fingers, good-natured faces, and laugh deep fruity laughs (especially after dinner, which they have twice a day when they can get it). (TOLKIEN, 2011 p. 7,8)

Our little adventurer is Gandalf's choice to be a burglar. In the beginning of the movie, they meet each other but Bilbo seems not to agree with Gandalf when he offers him an adventure. It is not hobbitlike going on an adventure because they are very strict with their meals; they have a specific time for each one of them and they do not like to get late to any of them. Bilbo, in the movie, seems impolite while in the book he just do not want to go on any adventures, like almost every hobbit. His impoliteness is shown also in the dwarves' arrival in the film. He treats them very rudely, he answers the door mad, he does not

prepare food for them, just for the first one and this is something not hobbitlike. In the book, even though he was not expecting visitors, he keeps his characteristics of a hobbit; he serves the dwarves and after all night, before going to bed, he takes notes of the dishes the dwarves want for breakfast.

There is more about this hobbit than the regular characteristics of an ordinary hobbit. Bilbo Baggins is Belladonna Took's son, she is the daughter of the Old Took, and this would explain why Gandalf chose Bilbo to go on this adventure.

It was often said (in other families) that long ago one of the Took ancestors must have taken a fairy wife. That was, of course, absurd, but certainly there was still something not entirely hobbit-like about them, - and once in a while members of the Took-clan would go and have adventures. They discreetly disappeared, and the family hushed it up; but the fact remained that the Tookes were not as respectable as the Bagginses, though they were undoubtedly richer. (TOLKIEN, 2011 p. 8)

Gandalf says to Bilbo, when he is thinking whether he goes on this adventure or not, that he has the Took's inheritance for adventures, he is not just a Baggins. Having the spirit of adventures, Bilbo was chosen by Gandalf because *he got something a bit queer in his makeup from the Took side, something that only waited for a chance to come out.* (TOLKIEN, 2011). This chance would be now, the dwarves wanted a burglar and, although Bilbo had never stolen before, he had the required abilities to do so. Hobbits can be very quiet and unnoticeable if they want, what more Thorin and his company could ask about a burglar than this.

Bilbo Baggins is the most important character for the plot, but he suffered huge transformations in the adaptation of the novel. One of them was bringing the halfling as the narrator of the story. Bilbo, in the movie, is old and is writing a book to Frodo in order to tell him all the adventures he had in the past. This has a huge influence in how the story is told, how much it is true and, most importantly, it can be unreal in many occasions because Bilbo would have to narrate things that he was not taking part on.

In literature, a character who tells the story is flatly forbidden of relating facts that he has no knowledge about. (...) The cinema that, in contrast, is not read, it is more shown it is "lived", never took it seriously, if we may say it, the limitation of the point of view. (BRITO, 2006, p. 78,79)

Being the narrator of the movie, Bilbo can tell us the story the way he wants. In literature, when the main character being the narrator of the story, this character cannot tell events that he was not present; in the cinema this does not happen, one can see it by *The Hobbit* trilogy. During the whole trilogy, there are several parts that it would be impossible for the hobbit to know what happened in that situation, but cinema seems not to take this into consideration and keeps Bilbo being the narrator of the story, or it should be said, the writer of *The Hobbit* book. Therefore, in the movie, there is Bilbo being the writer of the book; this may be the reason for so many changes in his personality in the movie since he is more courageous, for example. This also could explain why Bilbo saves the dwarves more times than he actually does in the book's plot. This small change has a huge impact for the plot of the whole trilogy of the movies. The spectator has nothing to do but believing in Bilbo's version of his own adventure; I bet if any person would narrate an adventure, it would not be the exact telling of what happened but a way of emphasizing that the adventurer is the hero of the story, the best of the best. Keeping in mind that Bilbo is the narrator of the movie, every comparison one makes between his character in the movie and in the book will be related to it.

In the Troll's scene, in the book, Gandalf is the one who tricks them and save the dwarves while in the movie, Bilbo does it. Bilbo saves Thorin from Azog's attack and motivates the other dwarves to enter the battle. These are some of the facts that changed from the book to the cinema that can be related to the change of the narrator. Bilbo narrating the book would try to tell Frodo, on his book, how courageous a hobbit could be and how he confronted all the difficulties, he had on his adventure. The question is; can anyone trust Bilbo narrating his own adventure or should one believe the author of the original book, Tolkien? Events that happen in the book and in the movie pass through a *Transformation*, Brito (2006), and this process is guided by Bilbo, who narrates the new story. Therefore, I should say Bilbo is not trustworthy because he can make whatever he wants with the plot of the original adventure he had. Bilbo narrates some facts that he did not see, so, it makes stronger the possibility of him telling the story the way he wants, creating and changing some of the facts. He made himself a lot more important than he was in the book. While in the book Bilbo is not so

helpful until the giant spider's scene, in the movie, he already has his importance saving the dwarves and being braver than in the book. The hobbit himself used a process Brito (2006) calls *Expansion*, in which the dimension of one or more features of the novel are bigger in the movie than in the book. All those changes are related to Bilbo's narrating the movie, so, he cannot be fully trusted. One may not know what really happened if one consider it, so, *The Hobbit* trilogy of movies can be an exaggerated version of what really happened to him and what his role on this adventure was.

If Bilbo is the narrator of the whole story, all the other changes related to it would be caused by him and all previous information you have in this work of mine would not make sense anymore. It is reasonable to be said that, the book Bilbo writes narrates his own adventures and no one has access to it. Therefore, one can say that *The Hobbit* trilogy is not entirely in Bilbo's book, only the parts he was present. That would explain why he changes his own personality and characteristics, he wants to impress Frodo with his adventures. *The Hobbit* films tell the story the book written by Tolkien tells, that is the reason why there are events not witnessed by Bilbo Baggins in it. The old hobbit, while is writing his book, tells Frodo how Erebor was and it is certain it is him because you hear his old voice narrating it.

CONCLUSION

Throughout this work, adaptation is been described and analyzed; the focus was *The Hobbit*, by J. R. R. Tolkien, which have lead the discussion to different aspects of the process one has to deal when adapting a novel to a film. This kind of adaptation is very complex; it takes the filmmaker knowledge about cinema and literature characteristics and specificities. This work presented some of these features and had shown the reasons why the decisions made in order to adapt *The Hobbit* to the cinema were relevant or not to the whole meaning of the story.

In film criticism, it has always been easy to recognize how a poor film "destroys" a superior novel. What has not been sufficiently recognized is that such destruction is inevitable. In the fullest sense of the word, the filmist becomes not a translator for an established author, but a new author in his own right. (BLUESTONE, 1973, p.62)

It can be found everywhere, people that complain about adaptations that have ruined the beauty of the novel, however, according to Bluestone, the filmmaker does not spoil the novel, he gives it another meaning, since it is now another kind of work. It is sometimes hard to accept that your favorite book had been transformed into a movie that may not have the same aspects the book had, but this has to happen because of many variables. A movie is certainly shorter than a book, so reductions are necessary for the film to have the duration it usually has. Therefore, not all the things the novelist had put in the story will appear in this new version off the work.

The Hobbit may be considered one exception of this reduction process sometimes. It was made three movies from one book, so, reductions would be less necessary since each of these movies were three hours long. The long length of the movies is already expected for the spectators because of the trilogy of *The Lord of the Rings*, the story that would chronologically happen after *The Hobbit*. I would say that, except for the songs, everything that Tolkien had told in his book is somehow present in Peter Jackson's version of *The Hobbit*. You may have noticed whether by reading this paper or by watching the movies after reading the book that many things have been added in the story of one the Middle Earth's favorite halfling, Bilbo Baggins. Adaptation is sophisticated and versatile, there are many procedures involved in it and one can use many of them in the

same work without losing its attributes; that is why in *The Hobbit* there are several changes and each one of them have its reasons and specificities. Working with adaptation is a difficult thing by itself; moreover, the adaptor has to fulfill the public expectation as well. The spectators of *The Hobbit* are the ones that had watched *The Lord of the Rings* before; therefore, the filmmaker had to add remarkable features of *The Lord of the Rings* in *The Hobbit* besides attending the spectators of the novel. Considering all these pieces of information, it is completely acceptable that *The Hobbit* movies had to be different from the book in many aspects since “*the mission of the cinema was never literary, and even when novel and films share themes, the big cinema arise, not from adapted novels, but from original screenplays*” (BRITO, 2006, p.76).

As this is a work made by a student who is also an English teacher, it might help other people to work with different kinds of languages, in this case, the written and the audiovisual. English teachers can have this work as a starting point to teach the students the processes of adaptation as well as they can teach the language using two different tools, a novel and a film. Teaching English using this material can be extremely interesting; there can be made many things using this work as basis. For instance, students can also analyze the adaptation and discuss it, they can talk about the variation of the language used in a novel and the one used in the cinema. Hoping that it will be useful or relevant for someone, this work is concluded with a Tolkien’s quotation.

*The Road goes ever on and on
Down from the door where it began.
Now far ahead the Road has gone,
And I must follow, if I can,
Pursuing it with eager feet,
Until it joins some larger way
Where many paths and errands meet.
And whither then? I cannot say.
(TOLKIEN, 2001 p. 96)*

REFERENCES

BRITO, João Batista de. *Literatura no cinema*. 2006.

BLUESTONE, George. *Novels into films*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

DITHER. Dungeon Master. 2008. Disponível em: <[http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Dungeon Master](http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Dungeon+Master)>. Acesso em: 20 nov. 2016.

MAYNE, Judith. *Cinema and spectatorship*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

PEREIRA, Olga Arantes. Cinema e Literatura: dois sistemas semióticos distintos. *Kalíope*, São Paulo, v. 5, n. 10, p.42-69, 2009.

SEORSI, Rosalia de Angelo. Cinema na Literatura. *Pro-posições*, São Paulo, v. 16, n. 2, p.37-54, 2005. Quadrimestral.

SHIPPEY, Tom. *The Road to Middle Earth*. London: Harper Collins, 2005.

THE Hobbit: An Unexpected Journey. Production by Peter Jackson. New Line Cinema, 2012

THE Hobbit: The Battle of the Five Armies. Production by Peter Jackson. New Line Cinema, 2014

THE Hobbit: The Desolation of Smaug. Production by Peter Jackson. New Line Cinema, 2013

THE Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring. Production by Peter Jackson. New Zealand: Wingnut Films The Saul Zaentz Company, 2001

THE Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King. Production by Peter Jackson. New Zealand: Wingnut Films The Saul Zaentz Company, 2003.

THE Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers. Production by Peter Jackson. New Zealand: Wingnut Films The Saul Zaentz Company, 2002.

TOLKIEN, J. R. R. *The Hobbit*. London: Harper Collins, 2011.

_____. *The Lord of the Rings*. London: Harper Collins, 2007.

_____. *The Silmarillion*. (Edited by Christopher Tolkien). London: Harper Collins, 1999.

_____. *Unfinished Tales*. (Edited by Christopher Tolkien). London: Harper Collins, 1998.