

https://dspace.org/

Adaptation in the Lowveld : a comparative case study of the live-action to 3D animation filmic adaptation of Duncan MacNeillie's Jock of the Bushveld

Higgins, Lucy

2013-05-10
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/12719

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Lucy Higgins

0507792K

Adaptation in the Lowveld

A comparative case study of the live-action to 3D animation filmic adaptation of Duncan MacNeillie's Jock of the Bushveld

A research report submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts by coursework in Digital Animation

University of the Witwatersrand

Wits School of Arts – Digital Arts

15 November 2012

Supervisor: Hanli Geyser

Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation is my own work. It is submitted for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been previously submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.

_____

Lucy Higgins

15th day of November, 2012

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Hanli Geyser for her unwavering support throughout the course of this research project, her guidance has proved invaluable. I would also like to thank Christo Doherty for assisting me during the early stages of my proposal preparation.

I would like to thank Duncan MacNeillie for taking time out of his busy schedule to grant me an interview and provide the basis upon which this entire report is built.

Thank you to my parents, Michael and Rebecca, and my sister Charlotte for their support, encouragement and understanding, as well as financial support.

Lastly, thank you to Aidan, Sandy and Greg for all the belief and encouragement you have shown me during this process.

Contents

Introduction: 4
Chapter One: The Original *Jock of the Bushveld* 10
1.1 Sir Percy FitzPatrick: a brief introduction 10
1.2 A Synopsis of *Jock of the Bushveld* the book 10
1.3 Contextualising Racism and Violence in *Jock of the Bushveld* 13
Chapter Two: *Jock* in Live Action 17
2.1 The Evolution of Cinema in South Africa 17
2.2 Jock of the Bushveld: The Live-Action Film 19
2.3 A Synopsis of the Live-Action Film 21
Chapter Three: *Jock* gets Animated 26
3.1 Contextualising the Animation of Jock 26
3.2 A Synopsis of the Animated Film 29
3.3 Critical Responses 33
4.1 An Introduction to Adapting *Jock* 35
4.1.1 Setting out the Theorists 35
4.1.2 Introducing Adaptation in South Africa 39
4.1.3 Introducing Animation and Anthropomorphism 40
4.2 Contextualising Adaptation Theory 40
4.2.1 Development of the Field 40
4.2.2 The 'Fidelity' Debate 43
4.2.3 Moving from 'Fidelity' to 'Intertextuality': A Way Forward 47
4.2.4 The Remake and the Adaptation 5352
4.3 Unpacking Jock 57
4.3.1 Adapting to the Audience 57
4.3.2 Character Analysis 61
4.3.3 Anthropomorphism 65
Works Cited 76
Appendix – Interview with Duncan MacNeillie 78

Introduction:

Jock of the Bushveld, written by Sir Percy FitzPatrick[1] is arguably one of the greatest pieces of literature to emerge from South Africa. For over a hundred years it has never been out of print, with countless publication re-runs, abridgements and adaptations. In 1986, Jock[2] was immortalised on celluloid in the form of a live-action filmic rendition and more recently, in the years between late 2007 and mid-2011, he was animated in stereoscopic 3D. The fascinating thing about this little dog is his unbelievable endurance (in every sense of the word). His virtually unabated presence in a world that has evolved socially, culturally and politically raises one question: What is it about this story that ever-changing audiences can relate to? The first answer that may come to mind is: It's a story about a dog and his master in the bush. Almost everybody loves a dog story. Fair enough, but we need to dig deeper as there is more to Jock than what meets the eye. As Stephen Gray so aptly stated:

> A century is a long time to remember a brindled bull-terrier, no matter how intelligent and devoted. With cocked crooked ear, sharpened diamond-black eyes, listening faithfully to His Master's Voice, wagging his stumpy tail, Jock clearly stands for more than he could possibly know. (Gray 4)

On the tail of Jock's longevity one also has to remember the story itself is not immune to societal shifts in thinking. While the *concept* of Jock and the story about him has not changed, the *representation* has. With that in mind one has to explore the notion that Jock may well function as an independent cultural phenomenon, rather than a hero of a bygone colonial era. In order for this assessment to make sense one has to detach the dog from the story, and assess him in terms of sociological, political and ideological representations through adaptation. Jock is part of a story that has transcended generations, and is the subject of several adaptations, whereas the concept of his character has changed little.

---

[1] FitzPatrick was born James Peter, but later changed his name to Percy, '...emblematic of his allegiance to his mother's Anglo-Irish origins and identity.' (Wessels 7)

[2] In order to disperse confusion I shall be referring to Jock the dog (as a character) in normal font, and *Jock* the film(s), in italics throughout the report

Searching for the Spirit of the Great Heart:

Jock's enduring legacy has piqued my interest and sparked my imagination. How has his story survived so many years, especially in South Africa, a country notorious for numerous drastic societal changes in a relatively short space of time? The story of *Jock of the Bushveld* has been adapted, modified, altered or changed to accommodate newer modes of thinking, and critical engagement.

In order to narrow down the scope of interest, I have decided to analyse two locally produced filmic versions of the story. This allows for the opportunity to use *Jock of the Bushveld* as a case study within the realm of adaptation studies. The main contributory factors in this decision are the common elements of: story, certain characters and director/screenplay author. Interestingly, another commonality is that the same man, Duncan MacNeillie, was highly involved in both filmic adaptations of the story, with one critical difference being that one is live-action and the other is animation. He was the screenplay writer for the 1986[3] live-action film, and the screenplay writer/director for the 2011 animated film.

This study will operate under the umbrella of adaptation studies theory. There is a distinct evolution within the school of thought; the older theory of 'fidelity discourse'[4], and the more recent 'intertextual'[5] approach. Both will be discussed at length later on in this research report. There are

[3] The film was originally produced in 1986, but due to unforeseen interference by the apartheid government the film was only to be re-released in 1992. However, for the purpose of this research project I shall refer to the live-action film, as the '1986 version'

[4] 'Fidelity discourse' has its place as one of the older adaptation studies theories, centred on the idea that a [filmic] adaptation needs to scrupulously follow its literary sourcetext, and that the film is beholden to its literary origins. Without such attention to detail, the adaptation would betray its sourcetext and therefore, its 'fidelity' to the original.

[5] '[i]ntertextuality is the recognition of a frame, a context that allows the reader to make sense out of what he or she might otherwise perceive as senseless...Interpretation is shaped by a complex of relations between the text, the reader, reading, writing, printing, publishing and history: the history that is inscribed in the language

additional problems that appear when trying to analyse [con] textual adaptation as South Africa's historical representations (political, social and cultural) are different from that of North America or Europe. The current theories, present in adaptation studies, hinge on the criterion of 'fidelity', which, for numerous reasons, would be undesirable to analyse in a South African context. I wish to expand the notions of 'hypertextuality', 'metatextuality' (Dovey 166) and 'intertextuality' (Stam 4). The definitions of which will be dissected and applied to various aspects of the two *Jock of the Bushveld* films, thereby creating and/or expanding South African adaptation theory discourse.

In order to investigate the shifts that have occurred from the time the apartheid live-action version was produced, to the post-apartheid animated version, I will be looking at three specific characters, and they are: Percy FitzPatrick, Jim Makokel and Jock, and the ways they are represented in each film. By using a character-to-character analysis I hope to tease out the changes that have been made to each of them, therefore identifying the shifts that have occurred due to changes in South Africa's socio-political and cultural history. The type of 'shifts' that I shall be analysing within this report will involve a brief encounter with post-modernist theories of meta-narrative within the South African agenda and the ways in which these meta-narratives have changed over the last twenty five years.

The first three chapters will be dedicated to the synopses of the three variations of *Jock of the Bushveld.* The first will look at the book version, published in 1907 in order to provide the reader with a greater understanding of the original narrative as well as contextualising issues such as racism and violence within the scope of the colonial era. The second chapter is devoted to the live-action filmic version of the story, produced in 1986. I shall provide a brief history of the South African film industry, and explore the problems faced during apartheid, such as censorship and racial tensions, and the impact this had on the 'reading' of the story with a brief description of the narrative. The third chapter will be on the 3D stereoscopic animated filmic version of *Jock.* This will include a brief

---

of the text and in the history that is carried in the reader's reading. Such a history has been given a name: intertextuality' (Plottel qtd. in Orr 11).

history of production, synopsis of the story, commentary from the public, and the views of film critics in online forums/websites. I shall also be discussing the commercial aspect of the film, which will tie up with Linda Hutcheon's and Thomas Leitch's theories later on in the research report.

Due to the fact that the scope of this study could very easily reach unmanageable proportions, this research report will focus on very specific aspects of adaptation studies, that is steering away from 'fidelity' discourse and moving into discourse on 'intertextuality', by honing in on problems held by adaptation studies within a South African context. In order to delimit the scope of such an analysis, I shall be focussing primarily on the adaptation and evolution of Jock as a cultural phenomenon, which has weathered the tides of change in South Africa's somewhat hostile and vastly varied cultural and societal shifts. Therefore, in order to prevent a severe diversion into post-modernist and post-colonial theory, I shall be steering my research into the realm of postmodern adaptation studies theory. Thomas Leitch narrows down the definition of adaptation in fifteen core questions. Whilst all of these questions remain relevant to this study, there are several that I find particularly pertinent. The questions that Leitch posts, address the core issues of how *Jock of the Bushveld* has been adapted. They are the following:

- Does the film depart from its literary source because of new cultural or historical contexts it addresses?
- Is the movie as well as its source subject to cultural and historical contextualization? (Leitch 66)

In its totality the final chapter of this report shall address the problems faced when using traditional adaptation theory when comparing the two separate film versions of *Jock*, as the notion of 'fidelity' is disproved in this instance. The reason for this is located in the fact that the traditional canon of adaptation studies focuses on predominantly on book-to-film adaptation. I seek not only to disengage from this concept, but to re-engage with differing theories of intertextuality when using the slightly less common analysis of film-to-film adaptation.

What is unusual about this case study is that the animation came *after* the live action and both films had the same producer/writer Duncan MacNeillie. This will lead me to scrutinise both *Jock of the Bushveld* films, and categorise what could be construed as elements of a 'remake' using Thomas Leitch's theories, what has been adapted, and how it has been adapted. By categorising and isolating out specific elements of the films by using character analyses, I hope to create a platform upon which to engage in certain theories of adaptation studies, within a South African context.

A large portion of this paper will be dedicated to addressing the socio-political shifts that have occurred from the time the live-action version of the film was released to the advent of the animated feature using the theoretical concept of meta-narrative as a (rough) guide. By no means will I dive into the vast pool of meta-narrative theory. I shall rather give a brief outline and use it in context within the greater framework of this study, without expanding it beyond comprehensible boundaries.

Leading from this concept of meta-narrative I shall be looking at Lindiwe Dovey's theories on South African historical representations within film (and other forms of adaptations) and how they become highly problematic, in part, due to our turbulent cultural history. As South Africans we face a whole host of differing obstacles when analysing the evolution of adaptation studies, as not only have we had to deal with incredible socio-political upheaval and change, but we have also had to create a creative film identity from scratch. Until this new 'identity' can be researched and analysed, it remains convoluted and marred by (unfavourable) historical references of colonial suppression and racial tension. In order to conduct such analyses, I shall be comparing the two characters of Jim Makokel and Percy FitzPatrick from their live action to animated representations, concentrating on hierarchies, race representation and dialogical interaction in order to demonstrate the socio-political shift that has occurred during the last twenty five years or so.

With the socio-political orientation of *Jock of the Bushveld* in place I shall then discuss a very different aspect of the filmic adaptation theory already mentioned. This will be a distinct departure

from previous discussions. However, as Jock is the central character in both films, it is very important to acknowledge the theory around anthropomorphism in the animated feature. Anthropomorphism is a phenomenon that is synonymous with animated films, and plays a crucial role in unpacking the *Jock of the Bushveld* narrative as a whole.

I shall be looking at the various divides present in the two narratives, by assessing Jock in the differing environments between the films. In the live-action film, Jock functions as the hunter and servant to the lead character of FitzPatrick. In the animated film, Jock is the lead character and is the focus of the film. I will also be mentioning the cross-communicating character of Baba, and how he bridged the gap between the human world and animal world through mysticism, as discussed by animation studies theorist, Paul Wells in *The Animated Bestiary: Animals, Cartoons, and Culture.*

Chapter One: The Original *Jock of the Bushveld*

1.1 Sir Percy FitzPatrick: a brief introduction

Sir Percy FitzPatrick, the author of *Jock of the Bushveld,* was born to James Peter and Jenny FitzPatrick on the 24th of July 1862. Both parents were of Irish descent but Percy was born in King William's town situated within the Cape Colony (Wessels 5). FitzPatrick lead a colourful life and career, which included transport riding in his earlier years as well as taking part in the *Jameson Raid*[6] during 1897. As a result of the failed raid, FitzPatrick was arrested and sentenced to two years' imprisonment (of which he served three months) and had to pay a fine of two thousand pounds (Wessels 8). He was later knighted for his involvement in the raid. It is not necessary, however, to go into great depth about FitzPatrick's political career in this instance.

For those who are not familiar with the *Jock of the Bushveld* narrative, I shall provide a brief synopsis of, arguably, FitzPatrick's most famous work and one of South Africa's most beloved stories.

> ...*Jock* is about a short period in his life when he took to the lonely trail, and during which his truest companion was a dauntless dog. It is a narrative about solitude, distress and disaster, not at all what one would expect of a future jingo Randlord, Jameson Raid conspirator and multimillionaire. (Gray 5)

1.2 A Synopsis of *Jock of the Bushveld* the book

After failing to find his fortune on the gold-fields, FitzPatrick opted to become a transport rider. Transport riding in the 1880s on the lowveld was a treacherous job. With many dangers, such as the threat of attack from wild animals, pestilence, drought, starvation and the dreaded 'tsetse

[6] '...a group of imperialist enthusiasts at the behest of Cecil John Rhodes and under the command of his friend, Dr Jameson, invaded the Transvaal...the Raid was supported by a group of prominent men, functioning as a 'Reform Committee' (Wessels 8).

fly'[7], it was not for the faint-hearted. FitzPatrick craved the adventure of the bush despite being warned:

> 'Here is safe: yonder is all chance, where many indeed are called, but few - so few – are chosen. Many have gone forth; some to return, beaten, hopeless and despised...so few are free and well...Be wise and do not venture. Here it is safe: there is no fortune there!' (FitzPatrick 7)

Fate would have him cross paths with a very unlikely hero, in the shape of a small dog, the runt of the litter, whom he named Jock. A plucky Staffordshire Terrier cross, Jock was part of a litter of six puppies. His mother's name was Jess, who was '...the only dog on our camp; and she was not an attractive one...bad tempered and most unsociable; but she was as faithful and as brave a dog ever lived' (FitzPatrick 40). His father was 'imported' and was the best dog of the breed in the country (FitzPatrick 43). All the other pups in the litter were strong and handsome, but Jock was not. He was small, had a large head and a thin neck. When FitzPatrick started feeding him he gorged himself until he looked like a 'toy balloon', but by no means was he the strongest. FitzPatrick grew attached to him, and when given the opportunity to have the pick of the litter he turned the offer down, and chose Jock instead.

What follows is a variable collection of anecdotes, and events that stood out for FitzPatrick during his years with Jock. As he worked as a transport rider, hunting was par for the course, as this was part of keeping 'the perpetual stew' also known as the 'hunting pot', full. Killing was a way of life. The book is full of gruesome stories of lionesses, buffalo, kudu, a baboon and a vast number of other animals who were shot or 'disembowelled'. Hardly fare for a young reader by today's standards, however, violence of this nature was accepted and necessary for survival in an unforgiving environment.

Jock is by no means immune to the harshness of the bush. A memorable example of this is located in the story in which, while out hunting one day, he and FitzPatrick come across a Kudu cow.

[7] Sleeping sickness was a very prolific killer of people and live-stock

FitzPatrick attempts to shoot it (and fails dismally as he usually does), while Jock, however, chases on. Heedless and fearless Jock begins to snap at the Kudu's feet. A little too ambitious, the poor dog is kicked in the head. FitzPatrick races up to find Jock extremely dazed and disoriented, but otherwise alive. It is only a while later in the book that FitzPatrick finds out that Jock is stone deaf as a result of this accident. This disability makes Jock that little bit more vulnerable to the harshness of the African bush.

There is, however, no happy ending to this tale. Jock does not live out his days and die a peaceful death of old age; he is mistakenly shot by FitzPatrick's friend Tom Barnett. Jock is left at Barnett's farm as FitzPatrick doubts the dog's ability to cope in the bustling noise and danger of city life. At Barnett's farm there is a problem with 'kaffir' dogs eating his chickens. One dark dawn the farmer sees movement in his chicken coop. He shouts out at the 'intruder', and after no response from the dog, he fetches his shotgun and shoots Jock unintentionally. He goes back to bed and emerges later when dawn breaks only to find Jock:

> The morning sun slanting across the yard shone in Tom's eyes as he pushed the reed gate open and made his way towards the fowl-house. Under the porch where the sunlight touched it, something shone like burnished gold. He was stretched on his side – it might have been in sleep; but on the snow-white chest there was one red spot. And inside the fowl-house lay the kaffir-dog – dead. Jock had done his duty. (FitzPatrick 348)

The recollections are not chronological, nor do they follow any particular story line. The book was written many years after the fact and so many of the anecdotes are subject to the haze of recollection and the faults of the human memory. Stephen Gray, however, interprets the story as a 'scrupulously factual one' (Gray 4) in terms of the geographical recount of the lowveld at the time. Since this is the case, one could argue that from an archival geographic perspective, the book can be seen as 'non-fiction'. However, Jock and his exploits remain subject to the accuracy of FitzPatrick's recollection. As he mentions:

> It is not a diary: incidents have been grouped and moved to get over the difficulty of blank days and bad spells, but there is no incident of importance or of credit to Jock which is not absolutely true. (FitzPatrick qtd. in Gray 3)

This makes *Jock* stand out as somewhat unusual in its execution as it is subject not only to errors in FitzPatrick's recollections, but also does not follow the typical structure of a novel. In essence the story consists of a beginning and an end, signified by Jock's birth and death. Everything that happens in between is haphazard and erratic - one would say true to life - except that only the 'exciting' bits are included, while the periods of day to day humdrum are excluded.

Characters present in the story vary greatly. Most pass casually in and out, offering some sort of insight into living in the bush. The most contentious issue comes from relations between the black and white characters of the story. As an imperialist, FitzPatrick had certain viewpoints on race relations within the 'frontier' environment. One of the main black characters within the story is the Zulu, Jim Makokel. He is portrayed as strong willed and feisty. He also has a drinking problem. FitzPatrick describes him as 'A Man' and the only other character to earn this title was the old American prospector Rocky, (Gray 6) who essentially taught FitzPatrick how to survive in the bush. Makokel is seen as invaluable in the riding industry due to his tenacity and strength. However, his fighting nature and drinking problem pose huge problems to his employers, often landing him on the wrong side of a whip. Makokel develops a very close bond with Jock, and he is extremely fond of the little dog. This is evident in the chapter describing Jock's disappearance from 'Cigarette Koppie'. FitzPatrick had made a blundered shot at a buck that ran off wounded. Jock, sensing the animal's vulnerability chased after. It was after several hours that the pair of men became worried; they spent ages looking for Jock calling his name into the quickly approaching dusk, but to no avail. Luckily Jock returned the next morning to much jubilation from FitzPatrick and Makokel.

1.3 Contextualising Racism and Violence in *Jock of the Bushveld*

The bond between Makokel and Jock does little to disperse the racial tension in the book, as very early on Jock is described as being '...virulently racist – "hates kaffirs" is FitzPatrick's blunt way of putting it' (Gray 10). In one particularly distressing scene, Jock is spurred by Makokel to attack a group of Shangaans who were peacefully returning to their homes in Swaziland after knocking off from the mines. [FitzPatrick] '...condones this wanton destruction, even inviting us to laugh at it' (Gray 10). However, the behaviour and language present within the book were largely accepted as the norm. Imperialist attitudes present at the time were self-righteous and racist. Anyone who did not fit the description of 'white settler' in this book were at best ignored, and at worst abused. This included the Afrikaner. The blacks present in the narrative are often described as lesser human beings, subservient to the whites. There are precious few moments in which Jim Makokel's skills are openly praised. As Gray states:

> ' ...Jock, the unflinching loyal servant, is frequently compared to Jim Makokel', FitzPatrick's other servant whom he can never totally subdue- and not for lack of trying. As regards master-servant relations FitzPatrick's views are as one would expect of the period- unacceptable.' (Gray 10)

Imperialists used their 'cultural superiority' as a weapon against 'the natives'. They felt it was their God-given right to turn the 'natives' into 'civilised' and functioning members of a Western/British Imperialist empire. These concepts which were so widely accepted and believed, lauded and understood, are highly inflammatory. When referring to another great work by FitzPatrick entitled *The Outspan,* Andries Wessels mentions:

> '...the thrust of FitzPatrick's story appears to be that it is the 'white man's burden' to go and spread civilisation and light the "the lesser breeds without the law" and that civilisation will exact a terrible vengeance upon those white men who betray this destiny and identify themselves with the norms and values of "the dark places of the earth." (Wessels 15)

Throughout the book there is very little mention of the Afrikaner, apart from the evil *Veld Kornet*. South Africa was inhabited and developed by many differing races and it was odd to portray

the '...opening up of the Bushveld...' as '...an almost exclusively British endeavour' (Gray 7). Perhaps this was commonplace for imperialists, to portray themselves as strong, steadfast and reliable 'frontier men'. Where a sense of personal achievement came from conquering the otherwise 'uninhabited' wild, and where readers of such novels would be none the wiser. It is the age-old tall story as was commonplace for writers at the turn of the 20th century. FitzPatrick arguably fits into the writing category of what adaptation studies theorist Robert Stam calls 'sensationalist travel literature' (Stam 65). As I mentioned above, FitzPatrick was at the mercy of his recollection. The story was altered, and [semi] fabricated, thus eliminating it from the 'non-fiction' genre. However, this chapter seeks to position FitzPatrick and his belief systems within the fabric of this report.

Violence and hunting were a natural aspect of living in the bushveld. Jock was trained as a hunting dog. Hunting was deemed a [necessary] sport by the colonialists/imperialists. To understand the Victorian attitude toward hunting at the turn of the century, Robert MacDonald writes about it as if it were 'a game', in *The Language of Empire*. It is important to understand that *Jock of the Bushveld* is essentially a hunting tale. Grizzly and brutal and never ending are FitzPatrick's quests for fresh meat in the Bushveld, partly out of the need to survive, and partly out of glorified trophy hunting. MacDonald has an interesting take on the Victorian attitude towards hunting, and that is, not of murder but rather as sport. The transformation from brutality to game may serve its purpose in watering down the problem associated with animal slaughter and converting it to frivolous fun, as MacDonald states:

> Even *game* animals knew the rules, and as the targets of big-game hunting - itself and image of Victorian war, with the superior armaments in the hands of the fittest - like the martial races, they enjoyed the sport. (MacDonald 23)

He then goes on to quote FitzPatrick, 'The kudu 'were simply playing with me...It was all part of the game' (MacDonald 23). So from a literary background of development to a 'style' of writing synonymous with South African fiction, to an understanding of racial prejudices and interactions

within those of differing ethnicity within the narrative, to a greater understanding of the 'hunting' mentality of the Victorians, we can begin to garner specific nuances of a South African literary identity present in the book.

However, Andries Wessels discusses FitzPatrick's identity as a bit of an enigma. Fitzpatrick appears to be full of contradictory ideals, projecting a colonial British identity while being of Irish decent, and being born and raised in South Africa. What's more is that he seems to project his personality onto Jock in the book. This ambiguity can certainly be confusing when trying to understand the relationship the pair share in the book, as Gray explains:

> ...the real man stays so shadowy behind his conventional mask in *Jock;* much of FitzPatrick's real intention becomes clear if you study the dog. In truth, he garbles human and canine characteristics throughout the work that one tends only too often to reflect on the other. (Gray 9)

Gray's argument goes a long way in this instance as he states that it was a strongly upheld conviction that animal heroes in stories of this type should *not* be anthropomorphised (Gray 9). However, by treating Jock as an extension of himself, subconsciously or not, FitzPatrick is ultimately anthropomorphising Jock. This is the Golden Thread that links up with the animated version, the very core of my question as to the origin of Jock's personality as a conscious, talking, responsive animated character. 'Jock is no dog in his own right; he is merely part of FitzPatrick's own personality' (Gray 9).

Chapter Two: *Jock* in Live Action

2.1 The Evolution of Cinema in South Africa

> In order to understand the state of cinema in South Africa after 1994, one needs to contextualise the recent developments in our film industry within a brief history of filmmaking during the apartheid years. (Botha 20)

South Africa has had its own film industry since the inception of the medium. According to Martin Botha, the 'kinetoscope... reached Johannesburg by 1895, only six years after its introduction in New York' (Botha 20). Mainly British and American films were shown during the period spanning 1895 to 1909 and the public were able to view them by means of mobile bioscopes (Botha 20). A company called Electric Theatres Limited, based in Durban opened the first permanent cinema in 1909. 'Over the next five years several film distribution companies built cinemas across the country, which led to serious competition' (Botha 20).

The film industry in South Africa has had its fair share of upheaval. Government controls, censorship and the withholding of funding prevented many scripts from seeing the light of day. Due to our highly complicated and convoluted political history, where the apartheid regime reigned for the better part of 50 years, our filmic development was delayed while freedom of speech was hampered. The live-action version of *Jock of the Bushveld* was made during a very volatile time in South Africa's history, 1986. In the mid-eighties a state of emergency was in place, and political unrest reached its pinnacle. Martin Botha comments that most films faced censorship problems during this time and many were banned by the state (Botha 30).

Comment [KP1]: This is the section you would need to change on your own, according to the report. The report states that the inclusion of theory relevant to SA film would better support your argument regarding freedom of speech. You could, of course, simply change the sentence to read: "…filmic development was delayed WHILE freedom of speech was hampered…" (or similar)

In the midst of the turmoil, *Jock* was produced, at the helm of what was called 'The liberal and progressive generation of the 1980s' (Botha 30). 1986 and 1987 were '...regarded as the turning point in the South African film industry.' (Botha 31) It was during this time when new types of films were produced that questioned the long-standing idealistic representations of the Afrikaner in film. These engendered a much more critical approach, examining '...the South African milieu as well as

apartheid and colonial history' (Botha 31). Keyan Tomaselli discusses the role of 'film movements' in *The South African Film Industry* (1979), and manages to narrow down six factors which '...assist in an identification of a film movement in any particular society' (Tomaselli 5). *Jock of the Bushveld* falls into the alternative 'film movement' that emerged during the mid-eighties. Tomaselli references anthropologist Antony Wallace, who managed to narrow this 'movement' down to six key factors, four of which are relevant to this study:

1. A movement originates in a specific society
2. The society usually, though not always, experiences some form of socio-cultural trauma immediately prior to the rise of the movement
3. A film movement represents a sub-culture, the members of which are conscious of their position or goals
4. The artifacts [sic] rendered by a film movement are respected as art, that is, the articulation of important themes by intellectuals (Wallace qtd. in Tomaselli 5)

With the abovementioned points in mind it is important to assess *Jock*'s validity as part of South Africa's '...liberal and progressive generation of the 1980s' (Botha 30). This movement appeared as part of a segregated and marginalised South African society.

The socio-cultural trauma that Wallace mentions is highly evidential as South Africa was in the throes of a nation-wide 'state of emergency' in the mid-eighties. *Jock,* as a referential representative of a 'sub-culture', may be stretching that notion somewhat as in modern terms *Jock* is not seen as a particularly offensive film. However, at the time the government felt the need to ban it as such. This very act of censorship puts *Jock* into the region of 'against the grain' films.

Whether *Jock* stands as 'art' remains somewhat problematic. The film was not entirely free of its literary chains from the colonial period, but it did, however, start to challenge the established mode of filmic representation by including a black actor in a lead role, as well as subtle social commentary in the form of disgust at the treatment of the blacks within the film by certain whites. Technologically speaking it was a strong example of its generation, as the film was produced on quite a small budget. Keyan Tomaselli called it a '...fine example of cinematic, technical, musical and

performative skill, special effects and animal handling.' He then goes on to state: 'This kind of all-round cinematic sophistication is rarely seen in earlier South African cinema' (Tomaselli 40).

2.2 Jock of the Bushveld: The Live-Action Film

Jock of the Bushveld was adapted to the screen by John Cundill and produced by Duncan MacNeillie. The executive producer was Edgar Bold, who had been appointed as the head of the newly reorganised *Satbel Films* by Sol Kerzner (Tomaselli 40). According to Keyan Tomaselli, 'The script passed through the hands of no less than five producers over a twenty-year period before it was made' (Tomaselli 40). Without Bold at the helm this film may have never existed as he used his authority to push the story through, regardless of reluctant financiers (Tomaselli 40).

The film itself was shot almost exclusively in the South African lowveld where the original book is mainly set. No aspect of the set design was too trivial; the attention to detail was highly commendable. The film was given a gritty, dirty edge, fully exposing the harshness of the African bush. It appears that the wagons and supplies, namely the whips and clothing were all faithful to the originals. Pilgrim's Rest was made to look like the 1880s gold rush town that it was; the area holds less significance within the actual book, but in the film it is where most of the action is centred.

Jock is played by a stocky Staffordshire Terrier named Umfubu. He was handled so well that one could easily forget that one was not watching Jock himself. He is plucky, courageous, filled with boundless energy and is instantly likeable, whilst remembering he was a trained killer. Jock is unassuming and realistic and there is very little 'sugar-coating'. He is what he is: a traditional colonial hunting dog.

Percy FitzPatrick (played by Jonathan Rands) is a young man, out to seek his fortune. When he arrives at Pilgrim's Rest as a speculator he is dismayed to find that all the gold patches had been claimed. He turns his attention to doing what he can to make ends meet; which eventually leads him to transport riding. FitzPatrick is portrayed as hard working and eager to please, without being afraid

to stand up for what he believes in. This character representation is very close to the book, and although the narrator of the story is ambiguous, it eventually emerges to be FitzPatrick himself. He, like Jock, is also unassuming and gets on with the job at hand.

Jim Makokel (played by Olivier Ngwenya) is arguably the strongest and most contentious character of the entire film. He is FitzPatrick's lead driver, and is in charge of the wagon, its contents and the oxen. In the film the pair shares a bond, even a friendship; that was almost unheard of in the time of apartheid. Botha termed it '...an alternative film revival, a cinema that gave a voice to those who were previously marginalised by apartheid' in what he refers to as '...issues of black-white conflict and friendship' (Botha 31). This concept was not completely unheard of however, as this film was aimed for mass consumption by large audiences. The sensitive stage of race relations at the time could have negatively affected the reception of such a bond, hence the banning by the apartheid government as it was deemed unacceptable for [white] audiences.

There are several differences between the book and film in terms of character representation with some aspects excluded and some included. The original book made almost no reference to females apart from Jock's mother, Jess. This patriarchal chauvinism was broken in the screenplay adaptation by the addition of 'Lilian' (played by Jocelyn Broderick), a teacher from Pilgrim's Rest who catches FitzPatrick's eye. Ultimately the 'love-interest' is created and the story is fleshed out for broader audiences and a more substantial story-line.

Many subsidiary characters featured in the film were also in the book. Surprisingly enough, one of the characters who were not featured in the film was an old American prospector named Rocky. This is disappointing as he was the man who essentially taught FitzPatrick how to survive in the African bush, and added a new dimension to the story with his eccentricity. The only character who offered this sort of paternal guidance in the film was Tom Barnett (played by Gordon Mulholland), whom FitzPatrick worked alongside within the wagon riding business.

The villain of the story is a man called Seedling (played by Michael Brunner), a tax collector and magistrate, who is posted at the crossing at the Crocodile River. Here he earns a living by charging the locals a fee to cross the river safely as it is inhabited by an enormous crocodile. This and a few other irregular sources of income make Seedling a very unsavoury character indeed. Possibly his worst money-making endeavour had to do with his pet baboon. The baboon was kept on a chain outside his office and Seedling would place bets with other owners of dogs that if their dog could kill his baboon, he would pay them ten pounds. It never worked out that way, and ultimately, as part of the deal the owner of the deceased dog would have to pay *him* a princely sum of five pounds.

2.3 A Synopsis of the Live-Action Film

With the main characters in place one can begin to write a synopsis of the film. The film's opening credits begin with a wide-angle shot of a wagon lead by a team of oxen laden with goods. The wagon itself is on a dirt road and there are drivers alongside it. The scenery is typical of the South African lowveld*,* with bristling acacias and swathes of brown bush. The air is dusty, the heat intense. The opening song for the film entitled 'Dust of Africa' was performed by Edi Nederlander[8]. There is a brief altercation between Tom Barnett and FitzPatrick as we are introduced to the main characters. Jess, who is Jock's mother, is seen riding on the wagon with the rest of the party. Barnett goes to uncover her, and out pops Jock. This very endearing image is followed by the appearance of the title of the film.

The next scene sets the viewer up for what life in 1886 must have looked like. Amongst dusty, corrugated houses, set atop the road at Pilgrim's Rest, we see our protagonist FitzPatrick drinking in a local bar. All sense of time flows freely throughout the story and days may pass between scenes. Set in this quaint town amidst Victorian-laced porches and ox wagons we see FitzPatrick involved in a scuffle whilst attempting to prevent a runt puppy from being drowned. The

[8] The score for the film was put together by Keith Hutchinson, who was also temporarily involved in the scoring for the animated *Jock of the Bushveld* (MacNeillie)

unknown perpetrator was sent by Tom Barnett to drown the runt as he felt the puppy would not survive. FitzPatrick convinces Barnett not to drown the runt. He wins this fight, proclaims the runt as his own, and names him Jock (even if he did resemble a rat).

In the next scene the viewer is given a small glimpse into FitzPatrick's early life. Speaking to a local barmaid he divulges that his father was a judge and that FitzPatrick himself was born in King William's town. He had come to Pilgrim's Rest to seek his fortune as he had heard that that was where all the gold was. This romantic notion was turned on its head as he searches for work for two whole days, but to no avail. Broken and despondent, whilst sitting on the side of the road, Lilian walks past and drops a coin in his upturned hat.

Tom Barnett, sensing FitzPatrick's desperation offers him a job in transport riding. They meet with Barnett's boss, George Barnard, who agrees to hire FitzPatrick. Much to Barnett's dismay, FitzPatrick is forced to join him in order to learn the ropes. The viewer is then exposed to an enormous night time thunderstorm, on what was their first transport ride together. This contextualises the harshness of the lifestyle they had to endure. During the trip from Pilgrim's Rest to Delagoa Bay, Barnett proceeds to teach FitzPatrick about hunting. He mentions '...out here you're only as good as your dog' (Hofmeyr 12). FitzPatrick takes his advice to heart. At Delagoa Bay we are introduced to Jim Makokel, a Zulu driver. He is proud, tall and strong, but full of vices. He was initially employed by Seedling, but he was a harsh man, often ignoring Makokel's pleas for '...meat, drink and women...' (Hofmeyr 15). One night he could not take the badgering anymore and flogged Makokel. FitzPatrick is appalled by this treatment, although Barnett warns him '...not to interfere with a man and his driver' (Hofmeyr 16). FitzPatrick vocalises his horror at having '... to experience man's inhumanity to man and not do something about it, went against the grain' (Hofmeyr 16). Later that evening FitzPatrick helps Makokel with a little water. The next morning Makokel approaches FitzPatrick requesting a job as a driver and FitzPatrick obliges.

What follows is a montage of Jock and FitzPatrick's adventures over the course of a year, to the music of Johnny Clegg's 'Spirit of the Great Heart.' In the book this period is known as Jock's 'school days', where he learns to become a prized hunter. FitzPatrick's character uses the 'school days' metaphor in the live action film. It is during this montage where one will recognise certain stills and cinematography set-ups also present in the animated film, which will be discussed later.

The entire movie is set between three locations: Pilgrim's Rest, Seedling's outpost and Delagoa Bay. In the scene where the party arrives at the *Veld Kornet*'s [9]office, we meet Seedling himself. He runs shady operations in the area, including an illegal ferry crossing where he charges locals to cross the river inhabited by a large crocodile, and illegal betting in the form of a baboon tied by chain to a wooden post with a box atop. A poor hapless traveller is present as FitzPatrick and his team pull up. This man, holding an Alsatian dog is approached by Seedling who offers the baboon bet he holds. What follows is a harrowing scene where the dog is killed by the baboon, much to the horror of his/her owner.

Back at Pilgrim's Rest FitzPatrick meets Lilian at the local shop and he pays her back the coin she dropped in his hat a year earlier. This is when the two officially meet. Later he goes to her house with a bunch of flowers. She invites him in, and in a chair sits FitzPatrick's boss George Barnard. Barnard has an interest in Lilian and an immediate feud is sparked.

What follows is a collection of anecdotes surrounding life in the bush, where Jock takes down his first kill, and some comic relief (albeit somewhat racist) whereby Makokel sets Jock upon a group of peaceful Shangaans at Delagoa Bay. Back in the bush, FitzPatrick shoots a Kudu, and Jock takes chase. The result is that FitzPatrick loses Jock, much to the dismay of himself and Makokel. They both wait anxiously all night for his return, surmising his survival potential in the night against

[9] An employee of the South African government, posted in remote locations. In the live-action film he is referenced as the '...magistrate and tax collector...' by Tom Barnett (Hofmeyr 15)

predators such as leopards and lions. Joyfully Jock returns in the early morning, to the jubilation of the pair. Jock then leads them to a fallen Kudu bull.

The party end up in Pilgrim's Rest once again, except this time FitzPatrick approaches the bank in order to secure a loan. He wishes to open his own transport riding company. FitzPatrick takes out a substantial loan and buys a wagon and span of oxen. Later, during a bar scene, George Barnard approaches FitzPatrick with the proposition of partnership. FitzPatrick declines and Barnard is incensed. Lilian is present in the bar and FitzPatrick dances with her, only to find out after that she is engaged to Barnard. Regardless of this fact, FitzPatrick proclaims his love to Lilian. Barnard then attempts to turn Lilian against FitzPatrick by accusing him of seeing a local girl named Maggie. This plan succeeds and FitzPatrick is unable to see Lilian before he leaves for his great trek.

In the next scene FitzPatrick and his men approach the Crocodile River, where Seedling's post is located. A huge ruckus erupts and everyone (including the locals) runs down to the river. The crocodile is dangerously close to the people on the ferry. FitzPatrick attempts to shoot the beast several times, Jock jumps in as does Makokel. Makokel ends up killing the crocodile with his spear and Seedling is unhappy with this sudden intervention. Retaliation comes in the form of Seedling throwing Jock to his baboon without the others looking. Makokel rushes to see what is happening and a fight ensues between the two. Jock kills the baboon. Later, Makokel is sitting outside his home, a broken man. Seedling had had all his livestock taken from him for 'outstanding fines'.

This sparks a new mission; to find a new, quicker pathway through the trade route lowveld, and to find Seedling who is purported to own a farm just outside the 'fly belt'. This journey is extremely hazardous and the group travel at night in the hopes of avoiding the dreaded Tsetse Fly, carrier of sleeping sickness. Unfortunately Barnard succumbs after a brief fever induced psychosis. FitzPatrick is also forced to kill most of his oxen as one by one they are stricken with the disease. During these 'few unfortunate weeks' Jock also gets kicked in the head by a Kudu, resulting in his deafness.

The party eventually finds Seedling's farm, and in an attempt to recover Makokel's livestock, they enter the property. A gun fight ensues between FitzPatrick and Seedling, but it is Makokel who ultimately gets his revenge by stabbing Seedling, who dies. FitzPatrick gives the remainder of his oxen to Makokel and heads back to Pilgrim's Rest.

He is forced to deliver the sad news to Lilian, about her deceased fiancé. She temporarily leaves town with her mother. FitzPatrick assumes the job as a bank clerk in order to repay his debts. Lilian returns and they become engaged. He gives Jock to Tom Barnett who has retired to raise chickens on his farm. FitzPatrick felt that Jock was no longer suited to life in the town as it had become too dangerous as a result of his deafness. Sadly, one morning, Barnett mistakes Jock for one of the thieving mongrels who were killing his chickens and shoots him. In the morning, to his horror he finds Jock in the coop, with the perpetrator next to him, also dead. Barnett breaks the bad news to FitzPatrick and Lilian on their return to tell him about their engagement. Jock is buried by Tom Barnett's trading post (where he is today).

On the whole the film is well written, the characters are believable and it has a distinctly South African flavour to it. Many attempts had been made to resist 'Hollywoodising' it and '...John Cundill's script injected a subtle social criticism into the narrative' (Tomaselli 40). While one may argue that the story does not follow the book exactly, it was expanded by the film. The core integrity of the story is not lost, and to a certain degree the issues brought about by modern interpretations of the story were handled tactfully. No race was belittled or glorified *per se*, rather an equal injunction of characters made this movie stand out as one of the more forward thinking models of its generation.

Chapter Three: *Jock* gets Animated

3.1 Contextualising the Animation of Jock

Jock of the Bushveld, the stereoscopic 3D animated version, was released on the 29th of July 2011 to audiences in South Africa. It garnered different reactions from various sections of the media, from enthusiastic sponsorship deals to critical derision. From a market-related perspective *Jock* did very well, securing deals with Woolworths clothing for children, an advertising deal with Suzuki motors South Africa, Bobtail dogs foods and Nestle Smarties. Many different avenues were explored in the marketing department, headed by Andy Rice.

> Big hopes centre on licensed merchandising, which will include clothing, toys, quick-service restaurants, fuel, stationery, greetings cards, DVDs, dog food, outdoor activities (such as camping) and even banking. A range of pet shop products include a Jock leash, jokingly called a Jock strap. Penguin Books has already signed up for several special editions of the book geared to different age groups. (Koenderman 60)

All the bases were covered in terms of media exposure and merchandising opportunities. Although *Jock* was a commercial success, the question remains whether it was an accurate representation of the original *Jock* narrative. Further, a comparison must be drawn with the live-action version produced by Duncan MacNeillie in 1986.

Production on *Jock* began late 2007 in Nelspruit, Mpumalanga, South Africa. Spear headed by producer, director and screenplay writer Duncan MacNeillie and marketing guru Andy Rice (brother of lyricist Sir Tim Rice of *The Lion King* fame). MacNeillie sourced local animation professionals to make up his production team, which was headed by production supervisor Kerry Liss. As production wore on however, MacNeillie and his team found it increasingly difficult to source local talent and technical specialists able to run and maintain the expensive imported equipment. The technology required to produce such a large scale project was not available in South

Africa and computers, render machines and other equipment were sourced and imported from Canada.

In order to fill this void and progress with production MacNeillie decided to move the entire team to Johannesburg, and situated the offices in Hyde Park for the remainder of the four years of production. From there a team of approximately twenty-five animators were assembled, with experience from all different sectors in the South African animation industry.

This project was a monumental undertaking and cost approximately R50 million to fund. Private investors were involved, and the scale of such a production had never been seen in South Africa before. The fact *that Jock of the Bushveld* is the first feature length 3D animated film to be produced in South Africa marks it as a cornerstone in animated film development within the country. Interestingly enough a film entitled *Zambezia* was being produced at roughly the same time by a studio based in Cape Town named Triggerfish. This film was a competitor in the running for first feature film in South Africa. It will be interesting to see what the public think of it, once it is eventually released. As of the beginning of 2012 the film is still in production, which leaves *Jock* comfortably at the head of animation firsts in South Africa.

Music was another big draw card for *Jock.* Artists who contributed to the film include Canadian pop singer Bryan Adams, whose experience is wide and varied from pop singles and chart toppers to film scores. Bryan Adams wrote the musical score for the 2D animated feature film *Spirit: Stallion of the Cimarron* released in 2002 to critical and commercial acclaim. Incidentally, it was also decided that Adams would provide the voice for the main character Jock in the film. This appointment was met with mixed responses. From the perspective of the production team, using Adams would be a 'big international draw card' but for local audiences to have Jock represented by a foreigner went against all local sentiments and would affect the representation of the story. Johnny Clegg, the artist who created the hit 'Spirit of the Great Heart' for the original film also contributed a few songs to the animated version. His efforts add a comforting local flavour to the film. Other local

artists include Craig Hinds of *Watershed* fame and independent Afrikaans artist *Nianell,* who co-produced two songs for the film score. Music was compiled by Ian Honeyman and Klaus Badelt and added a rich dimension to the film, providing the quality associated with a feature length film.

The story itself comprises of various characters, from both the original story and live-action film as well as some new ones. From the original stable we see Jock himself, 'Fitz' or Percy FitzPatrick, Jim Makokel and an altered characterisation of the *Veld Kornet,* Seedling. Lilian, the 'love-interest' from Pilgrim's Rest, created in the live-action film and was retained in the animated film. It can be argued that she 'rounded-off' the story, as in the original book there are no female characters apart from Jess, Jock's mother. Characters that are completely excluded from the animated version were Tom Barnett the wagon rider turned tradesman, George Barnard the owner of the wagon riding company and Lilian's mother.

There is one aspect of the animated feature that takes complete liberties with characterisations in the form of the anthropomorphisation of leading animal characters. All the animals speak, and therefore new personalities are created to fill the gap created by non-speaking animals in the live-action version. The animals present include Pezulu (voiced by Ted Danson) the rooster who was named and present in the original story, and George (voiced by Anthony Bishop) the baboon, named for the purpose of the animated film. Although the baboon was unnamed in the original story, he was owned by Seedling, which is accurately represented in the animated film. Snarly, the dog (who is owned by one of Seedling's friends Claude) is present in the original book and animated film, but is not present in the live-action film.

Completely new animal characters include Polly the poodle owned by Lilian and Basil the monkey, an accomplice/minion for George the baboon. Additional human characters include Baba the spiritual leader who acts as the bridge between the human and animal worlds as he is able to converse with every character in the story. This relationship and phenomenon will be discussed at length later on in the chapter when I touch on the role of anthropomorphism within the animated

feature. Mr. Morris (Lilian's father) and Claude (a friend of Seedling's) also make an appearance as completely new characters.

3.2 A Synopsis of the Animated Film

For those who have not seen the animated feature I shall be giving a brief synopsis of the film. This will highlight the discrepancies and alterations made when comparing it to the live-action version.

The opening shot of the film is comprised of an eagle in flight over the expanses of lowveld bush. We see a recognisable landmark in the form of 'The Three Sisters', a formation of mountains synonymous with Mpumalanga scenery. The scene then focuses on the rolling hills where the viewer then gets a taste of the various animals present in the lowveld, such as birds and elephants and antelope. This is teamed with an epic opening musical sequence, which was also present in the final trailer used to market the film. This leads into a song by Johnny Clegg, called 'Golden Country'. A team of oxen is then displayed, very similarly to the live-action version, to set the scene for transport riding. As soon as this opening scene finishes the viewer is directly transported to a cave, where we are introduced to Jock and his siblings, playing a tug of war on a rope. This is an endearing scene, of rough and tumble play-fighting. Jock grabs on to a rope and tumbles backward, whilst upside down he is met by Baba, the spiritual leader who is also Jock's first owner. Jock is picked up and affectionately plays with Baba.

What follows is an emotional scene in which the audience is introduced to Jess, Jock's mother. In this scene she explains that Jock is to be taken away by Fitz as part of his 'rite of passage' into adulthood. Here Jock grapples with the dilemma of leaving his mother as well as being the runt of the litter. She offers him words of kindness and wisdom, and he sets out to join Fitz at the wagon. Before he is able to get there he is intercepted by a large eagle, who takes Jock off into the sky, possibly to kill him. This happens in the book too, although in the animation, it is used as an example

of Jock's resilience as a survivor. This is not entirely evident in the film, as the immediate danger is not felt during this scene and he merely falls to the ground from atop a tree after biting his aggressor's leg. A large bird's nest falls on him, whilst the eagle attempts to peck at him. He then runs for the cover of a nearby warthog den, where the occupant runs out and chases the eagle away. So ends the initial conflict, however, Jock comes across a character who is affiliated with Seedling named Claude, a hunter. His wagon is covered in a variety of unsavoury dead things, and once he picks Jock up he attempts to drown him as he is 'the runt'. After much chasing, Jess appears and saves Jock from being drowned in a barrel. She is aggressive and holds Claude off until Jim Makokel and FitzPatrick arrive. A brief introduction is made by all and Fitz proceeds to take Jock back, Claude says, '...is this your dog?' to which he replies, '...yes, he's my dog' (MacNeillie 11). Any dispute as to the ownership of Jock is now resolved and Fitz has proclaimed him as his own.

Similar to the original live-action version of *Jock,* a montage scene of him 'growing up' and learning the intricacies of bush living appears next. The song is sung by Bryan Adams and shows Jock in a variety of situations, ending with him jumping out of the bush a fully grown dog. By now he had been on the road for a few months.

Fitz, Jock and Jim approach Seedling's outpost with their wagon in tow. The audience is introduced to this location as being a mid-way outpost between Pilgrim's Rest and Delagoa Bay. Used as a supply store it is largely true to fact and a variety of supplies are loaded and transported to Pilgrim's Rest. Fitz, as a prospector asks for a pan, a shovel and a bag of salt for his trip to Pilgrim's Rest where he is hoping to find his fortune. Seedling is introduced as a callous and unrefined man, his accent is British and he is represented as a 'yob' or brute. Broadly set and imposing he threatens Fitz and Jock. It should be noted that foreign accents are often used in Disney films to differentiate the protagonists from the villains. In *Jock* all the villainous characters have a distinctly British accent; Seedling, George, Claude and Snarly. In the same scene, we are introduced to George the baboon who is owned by Seedling. He takes no real notice of Jock except when Jock attempts to intervene

between George and a crate of monkeys that had been brought into the pub. Jock asks why George does not pick on someone his own size and an immediate feud is ignited.

After all of the confrontation and the introduction of the antagonists, Lilian and her father, Mr. Morris, walk into the pub. Lilian had come to collect a shipment of books she was expecting. Fitz is immediately enamoured with her, as is Seedling, who uses this as an opportunity to downplay Fitz's role as a potential suitor. Lilian's father approaches Seedling with an offer of a bet, as he was holding a race for warthogs, an entirely fictional and somewhat silly sport. Fitz uses this opportunity to place a bet of his own with little money that he has.

The next scene introduces Basil the performing monkey accomplice of George the baboon, rounding up the warthogs and their jockeys (other monkeys) for the expected race. Seedling, knowing that Fitz and Mr. Morris bet on the blue warthog, sticks a thorn into the correlating warthog's foot. As a result thereof, the warthog is unable to run. Jock arrives and offers to take the warthogs place. This distresses Basil but he is left with no choice as Claude (Seedling's accomplice) arrives to begin the race. Basil asks Jock not to win, but as the race ensues, the first warthog loses its 'jockey' (a monkey) and is therefore disqualified. Jock wins by default much to Basil's horror.

Later there is a race 'after party' where George the baboon makes a violent entry by flinging the original injured warthog down the stairs. George then goes on to enquire why Seedling had lost all his money in this bet, when he had deliberately sabotaged the competition. When Basil is not able to answer he proceeds to threaten the injured warthog with death. George then confronts Jock but Basil strikes George with an empty bottle. George slumps to the floor unconscious.

The wagon party leaves the next morning on a ferry over a crocodile-infested river, (which is true to the original story as well as the live-action film) to head back to Jock's home. As soon as they arrive Jock sees his mother and an emotional reunion ensues. Drums are sounding from the local

village that Baba oversees. Jess informs Jock that a little girl from the village was killed by a Leopard by 'the water hole'. Later that night the team decides to embark on a hunt for the killer Leopard.

In the next scene the audience is taken back to Seedling's outpost, where George the baboon has regained consciousness and all animals are present in the abandoned mine shaft. George interrogates Basil, questioning him on the origins of his enormous bump on his head. Basil proceeds to lie to George by saying that a beam fell on his head. George does not initially believe this excuse, but accepts the version of events tentatively.

Back at Baba's Kraal, the group, comprised of Fitz, Jock, Makokel and Jess embark on their Leopard hunting expedition. It is a night time endeavour, and the group nervously edges into the bush. They approach a cave and travel through it, crossing the bathing place where the little girl was killed. Suddenly as they approach the ravine the Leopard attacks the group, Jess leaps in and knocks the Leopard off course. A fight ensues and Jess is badly wounded. Jock jumps in to help. He fights the Leopard off which loses its footing and falls off the cliff face. As the leopard was responsible for its own demise Jock is excused from any 'wrong doing'. This is a common strategy used in animated films to express conflict and heroism to children without the protagonist committing a 'bad deed'. A similar scenario can be seen in Disney's *The Lion King* (1994) in which the hero Simba knocks his evil uncle Scar off the edge of a rock-face without actually killing him. What ensues is a scene of evil retribution, in which a group of hyenas who were originally under Scar's leadership turn against him. Simba was exempt from killing Scar, just as Jock is exempt from killing the Leopard, and later on, George the baboon. Jock immediately rushes back to Jess, who is in a poor condition. The next morning, an emotional scene is a precursor to Jess's death. A song sung by Nianell and Craig Hinds closes the scene, with Jess dying.

A few months later Jock, Fitz and Jim arrive back at Pilgrim's Rest. Jock is still crestfallen and mourning the death of his mother. Fitz attempts to look for gold, but all the available spaces on the gold fields were taken. Dejected, Fitz slumps down at the side of the road. At that moment, Lilian

walks down and greets him. He is invited to dinner, much to Mr. Morris's apprehension. From there Fitz is offered a job as a transport rider, and is instructed to collect Lilian's piano from Seedling's trade post.

Back at Seedling's, George the baboon kidnaps Basil and threatens to throw him to the crocodiles. Basil manages to escape and hide in the crate containing the piano. The group returns to Pilgrim's Rest with the piano in tow. Later that evening, George knocks Jim out and sets his wagon on fire and Jock is kidnapped and taken back to Seedling's outpost. The next morning Seedling sets up a bet between George and Jock, whom he has dubbed 'the Leopard slayer'. Jock manages to escape his box, but his disappearance puts Snarly (Claude's dog) in jeopardy as Snarly is used as a replacement in the fight with George. Jock arrives just in the nick of time to save Snarly from George. After a short fight scene he convinces George to gain his freedom from Seedling instead of a continued life of violence and fighting. George realises this and runs away from Seedling, who, also sensing defeat, took all the betting money and disappears with Jock yelling 'Run Seedling! Get out of town!' (MacNeillie 73). Order is restored and Jock has saved the day.

3.3 Critical Responses

Expectations of this movie were exceedingly high, mainly due to the rigorous touting undertaken by the Jock Studios and their representatives. As I mentioned before, merchandising and sponsorship deals were present in many different segments of the market. In addition to this general public exposure, a trailer for the film was regularly screened on television. Magazines, newspapers and even radio stations promoted the film as excitement for *Jock* grew. The studio was in production from late 2007 to late 2010. The initial scheduled release was December 2010, but delays in post-production pushed this date to mid-2011. While most of the animation was developed in South Africa, in its raw form, the film was sent to the United States of America to score, edit, and add after effects. In the last six months of production it was decided to complete the film in stereoscopic 3D, a

technology that would allow the audience to experience a whole new level of depth by donning 3D glasses in the cinema and watching the characters “pop out” of the screen.

Upon release the film was met with varying responses. Veteran film critic Barry Ronge slated the film by saying ‘...it is a South African animated film that takes serious liberties with the story and fills the screen with songs and 3D animation that are barely up to scratch. It has been made on a shoestring budget and it shows’ (Ronge). He then goes on to mention the shift that has occurred within the narrative; from the focus being on the human characters, to the focus being on the animal characters.

Commercially the film did very well, raking in R2.4 million in its opening weekend. Backed by sponsors and merchandising deals, it is expected that much of the R50 million will be recouped. From a marketing and commercial aspect the film was a success, but was it in terms of adaptation theory? What were the main problems faced when adapting *Jock* to animation? What role does anthropomorphism play when adapting animal characters? This will all be discussed at length in the following chapter.

Chapter Four: Adapting *Jock*

4.1 An Introduction to Adapting *Jock*

There is much to be said about 'adapting' a work. Whether it be from a novel or other literary source, the outcome is the same: a shift from the original work to the new, and it is how this shift is defined that is of great interest to me. South Africa, with its tumultuous past has had vast historical, socio-political and cultural changes that have occurred over a relatively short space of time. One hundred years passed from when *Jock of the Bushveld* was written, in 1907, to when it was animated in 2007. Many things have happened during this century in South Africa, and I wish to uncover the effect these social changes have had on the text focusing on the timeframe between 1986 and 2007. I wish to explore the attitudes towards the representation of race, violence, the definition of forming a filmic identity from a troubled past, as well as the role anthropomorphism plays when adapting *Jock* from live-action film to animation. By doing so I hope to garner a greater understanding of the cultural shifts that have occurred over the last twenty five years in the South African film industry.

4.1.1 Setting out the Theorists

I shall be streamlining and condensing the vast number of theories of adaptation by focussing on select adaptation studies theorists. These will include Aragay, Leitch, Hutcheon, Stam and Dovey amongst others, as well as animation studies theorist Paul Wells. As adaptation studies theory is so vast I shall be investigating some of the older theories on textual 'fidelity' as well as its function within this report. For this I shall be using Robert Stam's theories on 'fidelity' and 'intertextuality'. As neither of the films closely follow the book (for reasons I shall be discussing later) this 'fidelity' argument will be disproved within the context of this study in order to set the groundwork for 'intertextuality' theory.

Robert Stam has taken all the traditional notions and definitions of adaptation studies and steered them away from 'fidelity' and toward 'multicultural dialogism' and Bakhtinian 'intertextual dialogism'. Detailed definitions of these terms will follow in the body of this chapter. Stam also focuses on colonialism, and although his focus remains primarily on Daniel Defoe's novel *Robinson Crusoe,* many of his theories are applicable to the original *Jock of the Bushveld* narrative.

This will then lead to a discussion of Stam's definition of 'Genre', in which he explores the link between filmic genre and literary genre. These pre-defined codes are very much a part of film study, as genre defines a film. In the case of *Jock* the live-action film was a drama, with extremely subtle undertones of social/political commentary or 'critique', whereas the animated film fits under the guise of 'animated cartoon'. How do these labels affect the reading of each film, and how are characters, places and social/power/race hierarchies examined in each film? In order to transpose these theories onto *Jock of the Bushveld* I shall be looking at the characters of Percy FitzPatrick and Jim Makokel specifically. I shall consider FitzPatrick as the definition of the colonialist and Makokel as the victim of racial hierarchies brought about by the prejudices implicated in the colonial era, and subsequently transcribed into the book. The subsequent critique will consider the role apartheid played when adapting the work in the 1986 version, all the way up to the 'equalising' of the two in the animated feature.

This will lead to a discussion of Linda Hutcheon's theories on 'intertextuality' and her viewpoints on a new interpretation of adaptation studies. Her argument is that an adaptation need not follow a rigid and specified trajectory, and that an adaptation could consist of any number of combinations, not just book-to-film. She also discusses the merits of commercial success when creating an adaptation, which brings the discussion to Thomas Leitch's theories on the difference between an adaptation and a remake. As *Jock of the Bushveld* has aspects in it which places the animated film in both categories I shall be isolating the changes made to the text to accommodate a

new social environment; one that is punctuated by an aversion to racism and violence and well as subscribing to a distinctly 'American' model when producing the animated feature.

From that point onward I deem it necessary to bring the aspect of anthropomorphism in animation to the fore. As Jock is anthropomorphised in the animated feature it is important to highlight the changes made to his character. While the glaringly obvious trait is a newly acquired voice and humanoid persona, there are many other aspects of the animated feature which tie up with the problematic notion of a South African filmic identity. Anthropomorphism is predominantly used in animation. It has its roots in America and, according to Paul Wells:

> ...*animated* films can sustain the suspension of disbelief in despite of their apparent inconsistencies because of its illusionist and phenomenological status as a text. Audiences are not watching a wildlife documentary; they are viewing an animated fairytale that can play with generic orthodoxies and real world expectations. (Wells 49)

Comment [KP2]: This sentence makes no sense and because it's a quote I'd much rather not change anything until you check the original text. I suspect it may just be missing a word.

This applies to the anthropomorphic component of the portrayal of Jock in the animated film, as well as the cultural representations of Makokel and FitzPatrick. The animated *Jock of the Bushveld* has attempted to synchronise the contributory factors between international and commercial success by subscribing to a tried and tested model of film making. It is important to ask, however, if during this process the film has forsaken its literary roots and left its live-action counterpart behind. Has this alienated South African audiences, and was this avoidable? All of these questions will be discussed later in this chapter.

I shall look at the role 'intertextuality' plays when assessing our specific filmic history and the problems faced when transposing Western adaptation theory into a South African context, through identifying the stylistic and informed exclusions made in each of the films, thereby isolating each aspect synonymous with adaptation studies, This would examine how the changes affected the reading of each of the films by using Leitch and Dovey's theories on creating an 'African Identity'

(Dovey 164) through 're-historicising' (Dovey 163) literature, however, in this case study the focus will be on two films functioning as independent texts.

By identifying which branch of adaptation theory this analysis of *Jock of the Bushveld* will fall under, as a film-to-film adaptation and assessing the two texts, I hope to draw out culturally specific nuances seen in South African filmic theory. By engaging with the notion of 'intertextuality' and a broader sociological and cultural effect on the reading of the texts, I hope to explore the changes made to society to accommodate our ever shifting power relations using this case study of *Jock of the Bushveld* as a starting point. It is in doing so that a broader understanding of problems faced by South African adaptation theorists can be reached, particularly in a situation when defining a 'good' or 'bad' adaptation does not depend on the 'fidelity' of the text to the original, as the text is at the mercy of the time in which it was written.

The external cultural influences synonymous with this country are vastly different to any problems faced in Western adaptation theory. To investigate these problems in South African identity using anthropomorphism in terms of animation studies, I hope to underline the ways in which South Africa is beholden to a Western model in [animated] filmmaking, where the chasm between proud national heritage and a commercial compromise, subscribing to a distinctly American flavour is the current definition of our filmic identity. This is an uneasy, perhaps impossible, balance to find.

As South Africa has such a distinctive historical path, where extreme demographical, social and political changes have occurred, I wish to explore the repercussions these changes have had on film study and adaptation study in South Africa as a whole. By highlighting relevant arguments raised in adaptation studies discourse, and unpacking the uncomfortable 'secrets' of our cinematic past, I hope to bring to the fore a clearer definition of our filmic identity, using *Jock of the Bushveld* as my case study. I shall be discussing each theorist's contribution, and juxtaposing their theories with *Jock* in order to position South African adaptation theory within a greater framework.

By scrutinising each theory, I hope to place *Jock* within the context of South African adaptations studies, thereby creating and/or expanding the discourse in a relatively new field of academia, with special reference to *South African* cultural and socio-political development.

4.1.2 Introducing Adaptation in South Africa

Ideas and convictions varied greatly over the passage of the last twenty five years and it is important to inspect the shift from 1986 to 2007; from when the first live-action filmic adaptation of the story was filmed to the animated feature from a socio-political perspective. During the mid-eighties South Africa's political and racial landscape was in crisis. A state of emergency had been called due to growing unrest from the oppressed coloured community. Apartheid itself had had a stronghold in the country for the better part of fifty years, and the cracks (which showed themselves in 1976 during the Sharpeville massacre) became huge chasms which threatened to swallow every semblance of order and security as public unrest reached breaking point. Political stability was compromised and the apartheid government had to make a decision, they eventually agreed to the release of Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, the party that is still in power to this day, in early 1990[10]. This set off a chain of events that would change the face of South Africa forever, politically, socially and demographically.

Approximately twenty years into the 'New South Africa', international sanctions had been lifted and foreign investment increased. In addition, races were allowed to mix however they chose, and people who were previously disadvantaged now had a voice.

The changes that occurred during that timeframe reached far beyond political endeavours; technologically, filming practices had come a long way in a short space of time. Developments in 3D animation opened up doors for South African production houses, and subsequently two major films went into production at roughly the same time: *Jock of the Bushveld* and its competitor *Zambezia.*

[10] Nelson Mandela was released from prison on the 11th of February 1990

This is no coincidence as South African production, which had been lagging behind other countries in the filmic arts due to restrictions in the apartheid years, was finally able to get off the ground. However, this was not without snags, as funding was extremely hard to come by. Investors wanted something that would guarantee an income, even a substantial profit margin. This film was hoped to be *Jock of the Bushveld.*

4.1.3 Introducing Animation and Anthropomorphism

There are aspects of animated film that cannot be replicated by live-action and the most important for this report is the phenomenon of anthropomorphism. Jock as a character is the central element in the discussion of anthropomorphism in the animated feature as he is a completely new entity. He functions as a speaking, interacting and feeling humanoid character although he is an animal. As Jock was played by a real dog in the live-action version there are natural restrictions. He is limited by his surroundings and defined by his interactions with the human characters, FitzPatrick and Makokel, whereas in the animated feature a whole new dynamic is created. The animals develop their own 'community'.

As anthropomorphism is primarily used in animation, how does this intertwine in the study of adaptation, creating a complex reading of a very old, very well known story? Famed animation studies scholar, Paul Wells discusses the phenomenon of anthropomorphism at length in *The Animated Bestiary: Animals, Cartoons, and Culture.* I shall be looking at some of his theories, such as the 'natural/cultural divide' and 'the Madagascar problem' at length later on in this chapter.

4.2 Contextualising Adaptation Theory

4.2.1 Development of the Field

In order to position the investigation in a greater understanding I shall now briefly delve into adaptation studies' older theoretical background. Mireia Aragay discusses the shifts that have occurred in adaptation theory in her essay entitled *Reflection to Refraction: Adaptation Studies Then and Now*, and highlights newer ways of dealing with a plethora of issues, previously ignored by traditional theorists. According to Aragay, the field of adaptation studies is relatively new. She states that the United States and the United Kingdom were the first to identify 'the importance of the institutional history of film studies for an understanding of the different shapes adaptation theory has taken since its inception', all of which emerged during the 1960s and 1970s (Aragay 11). She goes on to discuss the notion of the 'Author-God' where adaptations of popular literature were essentially frowned upon, and seen as the 'downgrading' of the written word (Aragay 11). She even references Virginia Woolf who called cinema '...a rapacious animal of prey or parasite devouring 'its unfortunate victim' (Aragay 12).

As film was seen as a '...low brow, popular form of entertainment...' (Aragay 12), the automatic response was that literature upon which such films were based was automatically seen as superior. According to Aragay this:

> ...resulted in a binary, hierarchical view of the relationship between literature and film, where the literary work was conceived of as the valued original, while the film adaptation was merely a copy, and where fidelity emerged as the central category of adaptation studies. (Aragay 12)

She references George Bluestone, one of the first adaptation studies theorists, on his views that there is '...a categorical distinction between novel and film, according to which the two media are essentially different, in that the novel is linguistic, conceptual and discursive, while film is primarily visual' (Aragay 12-13). His theories, although challenging the traditionalist notion of 'fidelity' are still '...underpinned by a continued belief in the intrinsic superiority of literature' (Aragay 13). This evolution from fidelity discourse to intertextuality sparked in the 1950s and resulted in film receiving a higher status than before, but adaptation studies still battled to move

away from the discourse of fidelity (Aragay 14-16). In 1975, Geoffrey Wagner '...draws a distinction between three modes of adaptation, which he labels transposition, commentary and analogy':

> ...*transposition* 'a novel is directly given on the screen, with the minimum of apparent interference...
>
> ...*commentary* is 'where an original is taken and...altered in some respect'... revealing 'a different intention on the part of the film-maker, rather than an infidelity or outright violation.'...
>
> ...*analogy* takes 'a fiction as a point of departure...and therefore 'cannot be indicted as a violation of a literary original since the director has not attempted (or has only minimally attempted) to reproduce the original'... (Wagner qtd. in Aragay 16 [my emphasis])

Whilst this may be seen as moving away from fidelity discourse onto a newer and broader definition, this is indeed not the case, as Aragay stated:

> ...his tripartite classification to specific adaptations have the perverse effect of foregrounding the severely limited theoretical and practical validity of any model that relies on the centrality of the literary source 'original'. (Aragay 16)

During the 1980s however, theorist Christopher Orr opened up the playing field for a '...critique of the discourse of fidelity...by pointing to ways in which adaptation studies could seek to transcend it' (Aragay 19). Similarly, Dudley Andrew was of the opinion that

> Adaptation...is a cultural practice; specific adaptations need to be approached as acts of discourse partaking of a particular era's cultural and aesthetic needs and pressures, and such an approach requires both 'historical labour and critical acumen'. (Aragay 19)

It is from this point on that we can begin to make the shift away from traditionalist theory and onto a more universally contextualising theory that takes a whole range of factors into account when discussing the merits of film-to film-adaptation. Whether the film follows the book or not, it still exists as an independent entity, a marker or historical device of the time in which it was made, and the only things that are adapted are those elements which have changed drastically.

4.2.2 The 'Fidelity' Debate

The first theorist I shall be looking at in relation to fidelity is Robert Stam. Stam condensed all prior theories of adaptation into a three volume series on literature-to-film adaptation. Thomas Leitch discusses Stam in his essay entitled *Adaptation Studies at a Crossroads.* In it he states that Stam's three volumes on adaptation studies had culminated from a decade's worth of 'pioneering work' conducted by Brian Mc Farlane, Deborah Cartmell, Imelda Whelehan, James Naremore and Sarah Cardwell (Leitch 63). Their work, however, focuses on the '...relation between film adaptations and their literary antecedents' (Leitch 63). Whilst I am not conducting a novel-to-film comparison, it is important to understand the rhetoric that makes up adaptation studies discourse. I am hoping to transplant some of the relevant theories onto film-to-film adaptation studies. The dialogue between the texts is important as it will highlight the cultural shifts that have occurred in South African production and/or storytelling.

Stam discusses the role of traditional adaptation studies discourse as well as colonialism extensively in *Literature through Film,* using Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* as a case study, which was written at roughly the same time as *Jock of the Bushveld* and in the same 'method', namely that which Stam calls '...an oxymoronic genre: the realistic fictional autobiography.' 'Fidelity' or 'loyalty to the original' is problematic from the outset. As fidelity is one of the defining terms used in adaptation studies, coined by theorists such as George Bluestone as early as the 1950s, it is important to discuss it within the realms of adaptation discourse. In *Jock,* the evolution of the story, from personal physical experience, to mental comprehension, to writing (all done on FitzPatrick's part), to re-interpretation by differing parties in differing socio-cultural environments in different times, stirs up a plethora of potential issues.

Stam has several opinions pertaining to the traditional canon of adaptation studies in academia. Similarly to Aragay, Stam used George Bluestone's theories as the starting point of his argument. Bluestone focussed primarily on the notion of 'fidelity', and how well the film captures

the essence of the novel. The intrinsic argument was that literature was somehow 'superior' to its filmic counterparts. However, as Thomas Leitch states in his essay *Adaptation Studies at a Crossroads*:

> The monumental project of Stam and Raengo sought to reorient adaptation studies decisively from the fidelity discourse universally attacked by theorists as far back as George Bluestone to a focus on Bakhtinian[11] intertextuality – with each text, avowed adaptation or not, afloat upon a sea of countless earlier texts from which it could not help borrowing – and this attempt was largely successful. (Leitch 63)

This quote drives home a very dominant theme apparent in adaptation studies discourse. There is no such thing as an independent text; all text is drawn from its surroundings. *Jock of the Bushveld* was written in a vastly differing socio-cultural and political climate, and this is evident in FitzPatrick's writing. In order to adapt *Jock* to film, one must disassociate from the less 'desirable' traits found in older texts. *Jock* has had to evolve but at the same time, stay the same. A text merely reflects society back to itself. Intertextuality functions as a mirror, as well as a residual remembrance embodied in cultural production that society can never completely disengage with. That is what makes South African adaptation studies so tricky: the urge is to completely forget about our past, as it is too uncomfortable to deal with and the impossibility of doing so. The atrocities faced are a bitter pill to swallow, but what does 'white-washing' do to our filmic and literary identity? It is part of who we are, yet it is unfavourable. By creating a new identity we wash away the dust of the past, but we will never be completely free from intertextual shackles. No current text is completely free from its precursory 'sourcetext'.

It is also important to keep in mind that whilst a filmic adaptation may follow a certain trajectory, or recognised storyline, it is not entirely beholden to its sourcetext. It is the archetypal

[11] Stam references Bakhtin's '...proto-poststructuralist conception of the author as the orchestrator of pre-existing discourses, along with Foucault's downgrading of the author in favour of a "pervasive anonymity of discourse," which opened the way to a "discursive" and non-originary approach to all arts.' (Leitch 4) Bakhtin essentially said that no text could exist as an independent entity, and was beholden to all previous texts, whether written or spoken - all was part of the collective consciousness.

'victim of circumstance': interpretations of the story change as socio-cultural and political situations change. The film is at the mercy of its surroundings. In the case of *Jock of the Bushveld* using the traditional notion of 'fidelity' to discern whether the film is a success or not is not only futile, it is very well near impossible as social attitudes have changed so much from when *Jock of the Bushveld* was written to the 1986 version and onwards to the present day. Both films do not follow the story exactly as it was written, but does this lead to disappointment when comparing the two, or do they function as completely separate, individual entities? As Stam originally stated:

> When we say an adaptation has been "unfaithful" to the original, the very violence of the term gives expression to the intense disappointment we feel when a film adaptation fails to capture what we see as the fundamental narrative, thematic and aesthetic features of its literary source. (Stam 3)

Whilst every effort could be put into detaching from its literary origins, a film is still beholden to audience expectation. There are large numbers of people at any given time who have 'read the book'. Imelda Whelehan discusses this notion in *Adaptations: from text to screen, screen to text*:

> The question of the audience's historical relationship to the literary/filmic text is an interesting one...film adaptations of nineteenth century novels... [and] the growing dominance of the novel as a respectable and morally responsible literary form during this period. (Whelehan 13)

In order to escape the binding nature of 'fidelity' discourse it is important to look upon a film as an *evolutionary* entity, in that it is *constantly* changing and adapting to the world around it. 'An adaptation is thus less a resuscitation of an originary word than a turn in an ongoing dialogical process' (Stam 4). In film-to-film adaptation there is no monumental shift, essentially they are both displayed the same way: with moving pictures, sound and music. By detaching from this notion of fidelity it frees us up to explore each piece as an individual artwork:

> An adaptation is **automatically** different and original due to the change of medium. The shift from single-track verbal medium such as the novel to a multi-track medium like film, which can play not only with words (written and spoken) but also with music, sound effects, and moving

> photographic images, explains the unlikelihood, and I would suggest even the *undesirability* (my emphasis) of literal fidelity. (Stam 3-4)

Stam focuses on the value of the relationship between the original text and the subsequent remake. However, although his focus remains on the role of colonialism in literary history, his adaptation analogies are limited to novel-to-film adaptations.

> ...the history of literature , like that of film, must be seen in the light of large-scale historical events like colonialism, the process by which the European powers reached positions of economic, military, political and cultural hegemony in much of Asia, Africa, and the Americas. (Stam 16)

The 'essence' of the novel *Jock of the Bushveld* has its roots firmly entrenched in colonial ideals, practices and representations. All things within the book are accurate and acceptable from the vantage point of the nineteenth century English speaking, white settler. While racism is severely frowned upon by society today, at the time the book was written racism (of this calibre) was widely accepted as the norm. It was deemed acceptable to flog your 'servant' and treat him as if he were of a significantly lower social standing. This attitude did not appear overnight, as it was a long standing imperialist belief system that the 'natives' were of a lower status to the white man. It was the British, among others, who came to South Africa to 'spread civilisation' amongst the poor, uncouth savages. Most representations in film or book have been from the European's perspective, as English is the dominating language. Naturally film would follow a similar trajectory: that of [mis]representation of all other races other than the white.

> The cinema combined narrative and spectacle to tell the story of colonialism from the colonizer's perspective. Of all the celebrated "coincidences"- of the beginnings of cinema with the beginnings of psychoanalysis, with the rise of nationalism, with the emergence of consumerism – it is this coincidence with imperialism that has least been studied. (Stam 17)

4.2.3 Moving from 'Fidelity' to 'Intertextuality': A Way Forward

> The concept of intertextuality reminds us that each text exists in relation to others. In fact, texts owe more to other texts than to their own makers. (Chandler)

The term 'intertextuality' was first coined by French theorist Julia Kristeva in the mid 1960s. Theorists such as Bakhtin and Barthes have long discussed the merits of intertextuality in ways of use within an adaptation studies framework. The notion is that no text functions as an entirely autonomous entity, but rather as '...afloat upon a sea of countless earlier texts from which it could not help borrowing...' (Leitch 63). In this case, *Jock of the Bushveld* is part of a far greater meta-narrative shift in South African history. The intertextuality present here could be defined not only in relation to other texts, but by changes in language (the book was written over a century ago), changes in political power and demographical shifts, changes in racial representation as well as the overarching theme of the change to animation (which encompasses a whole range of predispositions synonymous with animated films created by Disney).

> ...texts are said to be mosaics of citations that are visible and invisible, heard and silent; they are always already written and read. So, too, are adaptations, but with the added proviso that they are also acknowledged as adaptations *of specific texts.* (Hutcheon 21)

'Intertextual dialogism' '...helps us transcend the aporias of "fidelity" (Stam 4). Where '...an adaptation is thus less a resuscitation of an originary word than a turn in an ongoing dialogical process' (Stam 4). For the purposes of this research report I shall be using Stam's 'intertextual dialogism' when referring to the *Jock of the Bushveld* films within the realm of intertextual readings. In order to clarify the term 'intertextuality', I shall be using Gerard Genette's theory of five sub-types of 'transtextuality' which '...he deemed to be a more inclusive term' (Chandler). This list was obtained from Daniel Chandler's essay, *Semiotics for Beginners:*

- *intertextuality*: quotation, plagiarism, allusion

- *paratextuality*: the relation between a text and its 'paratext' - that which surrounds the main body of the text - such as titles, headings, prefaces, epigraphs, dedications, acknowledgements, footnotes, illustrations, dust jackets, etc.
- *architextuality*: designation of a text as part of a genre or genres (Genette refers to designation by the text itself, but this could also be applied to its framing by readers)
- *metatextuality*: explicit or implicit critical commentary of one text on another text (metatextuality can be hard to distinguish from the following category)
- *hypotextuality* (Genette's term was *hypertextuality*) (qtd. in Chandler)

Stam deems Genette's fifth category, namely 'hypertextuality' as most '...productive in terms of adaptation (Stam 5). He goes on to discuss the merits of Genette's notions of 'hypotext' and 'hypertext'. 'Hypotext' refers to the originary text which the ancillary 'hypertext' is based upon, '...which...transforms, modifies, elaborates, or extends' (Stam 5). The 'hypotext' in this instance would be the original *Jock of the Bushveld* book, upon which 'hypertexts' of the two films were created. To state that the original book functions as a staid and unchanging entity would throw me back into the realm of 'fidelity' discourse; from an intertextual perspective the reading of the book changes as the passage of time does. As does the reading of the films, which is most significant here. The live-action film 'read' the original text in a certain way, thus creating a new identity for *Jock.* This interpretation had taken into account the societal shifts that had occurred from the time of writing, to that of filming. This process was repeated in the animated version, where the film not only becomes another 'hypertext' of the original *Jock* narrative, but it becomes 'hyperreal' by stepping into the world of animation (this will be discussed in the section of this chapter on anthropomorphism). The main thread running through all analyses of the *Jock* narrative is the dominance of the English language as the prevailing mode for representation. This aligns our literary/cultural history with that of a Eurocentric perspective, leaving very little room for the formation of a South African identity as, at a very fundamental level, the English language predates everything to do with South Africa since *Jock of the Bushveld* was written.

Language, representation of race and culture from a Eurocentric perspective, as well as definitions of violence all change as time wears on. *Jock of the Bushveld* has not been immune to the march of time. Many things that featured in the book are, by today's standards, highly unacceptable. As I mentioned earlier, violence and racism form the core values to which the colonialist/imperialist adhere to. With this in mind, the notion of 'fidelity' in *Jock* is not only very nearly impossible to adhere to, it is *undesirable.* If the live-action or animated film stayed true to the entire narrative we would not have a commercially viable project. So in this instance neither film is an adaptation by traditional, fidelity based, adaptation studies standards. This leaves us defining the story through cultural representation and audience responsiveness.

The filmic representations of *Jock of the Bushveld* are aimed at two distinct sets of audiences, and this gap is not only generational it is also culturally significant. The live-action film was made to appeal to an English speaking adult audience in the middle of the 1980s, whereas the animated version was made primarily for small children in a vastly differing socio-political climate compared to that of its live-action counterpart. There are those who know the original story, and those who do not. This gap is what Linda Hutcheon terms the 'knowing and unknowing audience' (Hutcheon 120). She states that 'Different knowing audiences bring different information to their interpretations of adaptations' (Hutcheon 125). It is very important to understand the role 'intertextuality' plays when referring to an audience. Each person will have a differing opinion of the adaptations, but that is due to the differing ways in which a text is 'read' and the ways in which 'intertextuality' is recognised.

Intertextuality is a highly complex concept and can be split into many differing terms (metatextuality, hypertextuality). However, it is *how* the adaptation functions within the realm of intertextuality that gives it greater meaning. Audience response is critical to an adaptation's success, and certain 'readings' of the text have a dramatic effect on the meaning of the text as a whole.

When a text is a far departure from its original, one needs to distinguish between certain aspects of intertextuality, in order to make it clearer to the audience, as Daniel Chandler states:

- *reflexivity*: how reflexive (or self-conscious) the use of intertextuality seems to be (if reflexivity is important to what it means to be intertextual, then presumably an indistinguishable copy goes beyond being intertextual)
- *alteration*: the alteration of sources (more *noticeable* alteration presumably making it more reflexively intertextual)
- *explicitness*: the specificity and explicitness of reference(s) to other text(s) (e.g. direct quotation, attributed quotation) (is *assuming* recognition more reflexively intertextual?)
- *criticality to comprehension*: how important it would be for the reader to *recognize* the intertextuality involved
- *scale of adoption*: the overall scale of allusion/incorporation within the text
- *structural unboundedness*: to what extent the text is presented (or understood) as part of or tied to a larger structure (e.g. as part of a genre, of a series, of a serial, of a magazine, of an exhibition etc.) - factors which are often not under the control of the author of the text. (Chandler)

By using each of the above terms to assess the intertextuality of any given text, one can begin to define the varying degrees in which the live-action *Jock of the Bushveld* adopts such changes. In the case of *Jock* the film is reflexive, in that it subtly critiques racial behaviour, frowning upon the traditionalist notion of the 'black as servant'. This leads into a *noticeable alteration* that is assuming the audience had read the original book, from racist to less so, although not eradicating it completely. Explicitness in terms of 'direct quotes' where certain parts of the film are narrated as from the original book, this leads onto 'criticality to comprehension' which would allow audiences involved to recognise the contextual changes made to *Jock* in order to make it more 'appropriate' for mass consumption, and note the societal changes made since the book's inception. Finally, 'structural unboundedness' applies to *Jock* in a much grander sociological sense. Jock, as a character,

has become part of South African collective consciousness through years of scholastic referral; it would seem that almost everyone in this country knows who Jock is and what he is about.

In the animated version however, these concepts change as we go from book-to-film analysis to film-to-film analysis. The film not only 'remakes' *Jock* but transposes him to an entirely new medium and realm. By realm I mean a talking, thinking anthropomorphic character. Jock as a character becomes humanoid. In this case the 'noticeable alteration' is extremely vast due to the shift in representation mediums. This film is reflexive to a certain degree as it references certain scenes and/or screenshots from the live-action version. This, for those who know the original film, will be a signifier and link. The 'criticality to comprehension' is all but lost in the animated feature for young audiences, but does, to a certain degree, apply to older audiences. Due to the shift in mediums, *Jock's* 'structural unboundedness' is almost a given, as he has been moved from the 'real' world to that of animation. By becoming an animated character, Jock is transported to the realm of disbelief and fantastical notions of talking animals, a far cry from the original film. Whilst intertextual recognition is not essential to the success of a film, it is when trying to understand *why* certain changes were made and to whom the producers were appealing, and in order to understand this one needs to delve deeper into how and why a film is adapted to appeal to certain audiences.

Leitch posits that whilst many advances have been made towards a broader understanding of what an adaptation could accurately be described as, or rather what a 'good' adaptation could be, traditional notions of adaptation studies remain pointed towards a literary/sourcetext comparison because '...the field is still haunted by the notion that adaptations ought to be faithful to their ostensible sourcetexts' (Leitch 64). Leitch set out to disprove this notion to a point, and devised a set of questions that would open up a whole host of other areas of critique within the realm of adaptation studies. Leitch drafted fifteen core questions, and whilst all are relevant to the expansion of adaptation studies discourse, there were only a few that I deemed relevant to this particular

study. The questions posed by Leitch that relate to distinctly South African problems pertaining to adaptations are the following:

> 4. If the movie transcends its original literary source, does that source, however fairly eclipsed by the movie, deserve closer consideration as interesting in its own right?
>
> 5. Is it possible for a film to recreate what could be assumed to be specifically literary aspects of its source that challenge medium-specific models of adaptation by indicating unexpected resources the cinema brings to matters once thought the exclusive province of literature (almost always, in this case, the novel)?
>
> 6. Is the movie as well as its source subject to cultural and historical contextualization?...contextual forces, from biographical circumstance to ideological assumptions, are assumed to play a pivotal role in shaping the sourcetext as well as its adaptations, undermining its claims to stability and centrality in any debate about adaptations and their sources...for many African filmmakers, the challenge of adaptation is 'not only...how to transfer literature to cinema', but also 'how to represent a colonial past in a postcolonial present, thereby creating history and identity'. (Leitch 66)

The very nature of the adaptation is to change and/or mould an 'up-to-date' reading of a text for a newer audience. In this case the live-action version of *Jock of the Bushveld* was made for a *knowing audience.* People who knew the story, and could recognise the intertextual dialogism that had occurred, alongside the subtle social commentary, without losing the essence of the story. The animated version however, was produced to cater to a vastly differing social demographic. A newer generation of viewers who had very little reference to the live-action film, and much less the original story. One could construe this as a completely new and independent adaptation, but these lines are blurred by the fact that Duncan MacNeillie was heavily involved in both films. He has knowingly and unknowingly referenced his original live-action film in the animation by copying certain characters (that were not in the book) and screenshots. This leads onto another question, namely, which parts of the animated *Jock* were adapted, and which were remade. By whittling these characteristics down

we can begin to categorise and clarify these drastic changes by differentiating between certain aspects of each of the films.

4.2.4 The Remake and the Adaptation

In the essay *Twice-told Tales: the Rhetoric of the Remake,* Leitch articulates the very essence of the problem arising from the two filmic incarnations of *Jock*. When is a film an *adaptation* and when is it a *remake?*

> ...remakes differ from other adaptations to a new medium because of the *triangular* relationship they establish among themselves, the original film they remake, and the property on which both films are based. [My emphasis] (Leitch 138)

Leitch defines a film remake as '...a movie based on another movie, or competing with another movie based on the same property...' in addition to the fact that '...remakes necessarily entail adaptation to a *new medium,* for a remake in the same medium would risk charges of plagiarism' [my emphasis] (Leitch 138). Therefore, in this instance the term 'remake' denotes a distinctive differentiation from the 'adaptation' because of the medium of film they both occupy. An adaptation therefore, would be construed as a text removed from another text, (in this case the *Jock of the Bushveld* novel) whereas the film-to-film 'adaptation' could accurately be described as a remake. Not only because of the films' subject matter, but also due to the fact that Duncan MacNeillie was so heavily involved in *both* films. Purely from a production and distribution viewpoint the animated *Jock of the Bushveld* would be best described as a *remake.* The shift from book to film was an adaptation; the film-to-film transition was a remake across mediums. *Jock* was remade from live-action to animation. What differs here however, is the relationship between past and present representations of *Jock.* As I shall discuss, the new version of *Jock* has not forsaken its roots. In many ways it *has* been adapted due to the fact that many unfavourable aspects were removed in the re-writing of the script. However from a practical movie-production viewpoint, I shall be discussing the merits of describing *Jock* as a remake.

While, as articulated in Bakhtin's discussion of intertextuality, no text is completely free from its sourcetext, the producer, writer or director, is however, free to *interpret* that text whichever way he or she chooses. This is what Duncan MacNeillie has done. He has not adapted the animated *Jock* from the original text; this was made clear during our interview in October 2010, when he stated that he made very little reference to the book. Instead, what he had done was take the live-action version, to which he owned the rights, and remake it into a different medium. The medium he chose was animation and his target audience was small children, who in all likelihood had very little reference to the original story.

> The problem of making its story intelligible to a new audience without making it boring to an audience familiar with the original film is therefore closely linked to the second, more general rhetorical problem characteristic of the remake: the problem of intertextuality, of establishing a normative relation to its original film. The exposition of a remake determines the way its audience defines their initial attitude toward the film; its intertextual stance, the general attitude it adopts towards its original, helps define the way the audience makes sense of their experience of the film as a whole. (Leitch 138)

The recollection of a story's accuracy from the public perspective is directly proportional to the amount of time that has passed between the remakes. As the live-action version of *Jock* was made in a vastly differing social climate and for a completely different audience, links to the original are limited and the plot is virtually unrecognisable. However, this disassociation is not as clear cut as one would think as there are many signs, symbols and screen shots which directly correlate to the original live-action version.




Figure 1a.



Figure 1b.



Figure 2a.



Figure 2b.



Figure 3a.



Figure 3b.



Figure 4a. Figure 4b.

Fig. 1a- Fig. 4a stills from MacNeillie's animated *Jock of the Bushveld*. Fig. 1b- 4b stills from Hofmeyr's live-action *Jock of the Bushveld*

Figures 1a-4a all represent screenshots from the animated version of *Jock of the Bushveld*, the second set of figures (1b-4b) represent those taken from the live-action film. It is uncanny to observe the references made as they are virtually impossible to miss, especially in the case of figures 1a and 1b. These images are purely representational and no descriptions of this calibre are given in the original book. The colours used, the scene set up and character positioning make a definitive hark back to the original live-action film.

The argument in general criticism of the animation is that if the story was to be cherry-picked like this, it should have been directly remade to honour the original film. There are problems with this though, as the story presented in the live-action film was not suitable for young audiences and does not fit in with the traditional canon of animation.

As an alternative, in order to compensate for the new audience, the story should have been *entirely* made anew. One example of where this has been done would be that of Hans Christian Anderson's *Little Mermaid.* Assuming that not many people would actually have read the original story, Disney created a film that functioned as an entirely independent entity. What has happened in *Jock* is that certain aspects of the story are 'referenced' to the live-action, in the form of episodes in the original book as well as screen shots and cinematographic set-ups from the original live-action film. In essence the film uneasily straddles a chasm between the adaptation and the remake and eventually it seems to be a half-baked attempt at pleasing everyone. By aiming to please both sets of audiences, the knowing and the unknowing, the story has become a Frankenstein of old and new signifiers thus alienating adult audiences who have a point of reference and confusing younger audiences who most likely do not. As a film is at the mercy of audience receptiveness, Leitch highlighted the following theory:

> The triangular relationship among the remake, its original film, and the source for both films defines two leading problems in the rhetoric of the remake, the relation it establishes with an audience that allows it to be understood and enjoyed on the terms it prescribes. The first of these problems concerns the rhetoric of exposition- the way a remake arouses the audience's pleasurable anticipation by the way it sets forth its premises. The audience for a given remake is several audiences, each one of which the remake sets out to please even though their expectations are different and often apparently contradictory. (Leitch 138)

This differentiation between the adaptation and the remake is important when we begin to dissect the *adapted* aspects of *Jock of the Bushveld.* As mentioned above, the animated film was technically remade by those who were involved in the original live-action version. This is purely from

an audience representational viewpoint and does not take into account the phenomenon of anthropomorphism and changes made to the script in order to accommodate younger audiences. If the film was a clear-cut remake then the issues of violence, racism and talking animals would not have been a problem. The film however would have been vastly the same. However, this is *not* the case. The film was *animated,* and in order to produce an animated film certain procedures are applied, which hark back to the earliest Disney days. There are a set of rules and conventions that apply exclusively to the realm of the animated feature. The most pertinent of these rules is the use of anthropomorphism in the animated feature. Jock is anthropomorphised. This, in addition to the characterisations of Makokel and FitzPatrick lead to the conclusion that certain aspects of the live-action film have been remade (narrative, artistic direction), but the characters have been adapted. It is these adaptations of characters which are most important to this study.

4.3 Unpacking Jock

4.3.1 Adapting to the Audience

Linda Hutcheon in *A Theory of Adaptation* highlights the narrow-mindedness of the traditional adaptation studies canon by stating that an adaptation need not follow its 'sourcetext' with scrupulous accuracy as, with many types of adaptation, following this method of production is not only impractical, it is also very nearly impossible. The novel and the author have a far greater amount of 'freedom' in terms of time/space continuum, where the passage of time is easily demonstrated or tactically left out. The narrator functions as the omnipresent guide for the reader. The written word has power to both guide the reader as well as provide him/her the opportunity to fill in the metaphorical gaps, or to use their imagination. By describing a scene, the author can *suggest* something to the reader and then the reader makes up his or her own mind on the actual visionary outcome of what is being said.

> ...to tell a story, as in novels, short stories, and even historical accounts, is to describe, explain, summarize, expand; the narrator has a point of view and great power to leap through time and space and sometimes to venture inside the minds of characters. To show a story, as in movies, ballets, radio and stage plays, musicals and operas, involves a direct aural and usually visual performance experienced in real time. (Hutcheon 13)

Differing audiences all have an opinion of what a character should *look* like, and act like, but the *representation* of these characters in film is entirely up to the discretion of the film producer or director. Each facet of the filming production has to align with the common denominator of characterisation otherwise film producers run the risk of alienating their audiences. When this predisposition is violated, the association with the story becomes convoluted, and, at a very basic level the adaptation fails due to 'unrecognisability'.

There is a flip side to this however. What happens when a story was written so long ago, in such vastly varying socio-political times, that the essence of the original story is lost to younger audiences? This is what may have happened to the animated version of *Jock.* Although the book was originally intended for younger readers back in 1907, it can be assumed that not many parents would read such a racist and violent tale to their children in the present day, and as the live-action version was made so long ago many people may have missed seeing that too. Whilst there are many who know both, there are also many who do not. In the years of the latter part of the 20th century, the novel of *Jock of the Bushveld* was taught in schools. However, in post-apartheid South Africa, the need to teach this story fell away. What we are left with is a *residual* remembrance of the original story. I would hazard to say that most people get the basic gist of the story; parents know it is about a courageous and plucky *Staffy*[12] and his adventures in the South African bush with his owner, but in many cases that is where the association ends. Therefore it could be argued that the animated feature of *Jock* has more artistic freedom as audiences are not stringently scrutinising the film's

[12] A colloquial term used for Staffordshire Terrier

contextual accuracy. However, for those who *do* know the story, the liberties taken in the animated feature may just be too much to handle. As the famed film buff/critic Barry Ronge stated:

> For me the real cop-out is that Jock does not die. The film stops after he has won a battle with a rival and at that point the film abruptly leaves these characters to continue whichever unbearably kitschy story line they are stringing out. I don't think you ought to chop and change story-lines and structure with foolish abandon. Literary classics have become literary classics because that structure was solid and moved with logic and grace to the best possible ending – the death of Jock. (Ronge)

An intrinsic part of the animated feature has woven itself into the collective subconscious mind of the animated film watcher: the hero does not die. Disney has created an expectation, a model by which most animated films are based upon. This is at the core, the hero or protagonist, succeeds and triumphs over evil in the end. Almost every single animated film (produced for mass western consumption) has a very specific structure; the animated *Jock of the Bushveld* is no different. Paul Wells states:

> ...Disney effectively established the genre of the cinematic animal story...This is usually characterized by an initial establishing context of spring or a time of new birth or community ritual, which is normally followed by a rupture in this apparent calm and continuity: a lead character is orphaned, literally or symbolically, prompting a journey or quest that in turn operates as a rites of passage tale or avenging story. The character then finds new friends or an alternative community, and through adventures informed by trial, suffering, and overcoming major challenges, resolves any schisms in the response to a common plight and overcomes adversarial elements. Community is normally restored, and the main character in completing the journey is advanced spiritually and practically. (Wells 124)

Death of the protagonist is too upsetting for younger viewers and is not conducive to a happy Disney-esque ending. This is a strange phenomenon common to most animated films. The inception of this 'animated film prerequisite' in which there is a fear to create a true-to-life ending

was instigated by Disney, the forefather of the animated feature. This provides a severe disjuncture when most South Africans know that Jock does indeed die at the end of the narrative, regardless of them having read the book or seen the original live-action film.

> Most theories of adaptation assume...that the story is the common denominator, the core of what is transposed across different media and genres, each of which deals with that story in formally different ways and, I would add, through different modes of engagement- narrating, performing, or interacting. (Hutcheon 10)

The 'mistake' of keeping him alive was first made in 2000 when an international production of *Jock of the Bushveld* was made for American audiences, entitled *Jock: A Tale of True Friendship.* The film was a failure, as South African audiences could not relate to the overly sanitised version of their beloved tale, and the Americans had very little historical reference to the original story. It is a tragic truth that this little dog has remained in the front of popular consciousness in this country, due, in part, to his tragic ending. Everybody remembers how sad it was, and to not pay homage to this in many ways defeats the purpose of this story. In essence he died a hero, and that is how South African society wants to remember him. The traditional animation canon does not however, allow for such terrible things.

In this model the very essence of the *Jock* story is compromised as it does not fit this mould. It had to be drastically changed in order to accommodate the shift from 'real' to 'animated'. The structure of the live-action version does not mesh very easily with its animated adaptation for one; there is lots of violence and human brutality against nature and man in the live-action film. Under the watchful eye of independent film regulation boards, a film that is destined for consumption by small children is closely scrutinised. Stepping away from the tried-and-tested Disney formula involves not only losing a large portion of your audience due to age restrictions, but also represents a huge loss in revenue due to age restrictions imposed by the Film and Publications Board.

4.3.2 Character Analysis

Not only has *Jock* crossed the boundaries of time, he has crossed into the fantastical world of *animation*. In order to delimit the vast number of academic theories already mentioned, I shall be using a character-to-character analysis between the three main characters in *Jock* (FitzPatrick, Makokel and Jock), in order to categorise and contextualise the aforementioned academic theories in adaptation studies. Jock, the dog, will be the central focus, where anthropomorphism and adaptation studies collide, and the other two will function as ancillary back-ups for various 'meta-narrative' and dialogical theories that I shall be investigating.

4.3.2.1 Percy FitzPatrick

The first character in question shall be Percy FitzPatrick. Represented as the archetypal imperialist in the book this would not work for a revised edition made in the 1980s, much less one made in 2007. How was FitzPatrick's character changed to accommodate the shift between British, colonial, imperialist din, to a much more neutral, (some would say bland) character designed for mass consumption in an animated feature? One must emphasise however, that the character portrayed in the live-action film was already distinctly white-washed where the attitude of superiority present in the book had been significantly reduced. I wish to highlight the changes that both forced and accommodated this shift, specifically what Stam calls 'multicultural dialogism' and the ever shifting meta-narrative of South African discourse.

In the live-action film, FitzPatrick is portrayed as a young and inexperienced man seeking his fortune. He has a distinctive Irish accent, and tells the story as the omnipresent narrator. However, in the film we recognise that the narrator is FitzPatrick himself from the start, whereas in the book this is not immediately apparent. His clothing and appearance seem to adhere to that of the time, which creates an aura of believability. This attention to detail is seen throughout the film, to its benefit. (See figure 5a) As a non-assuming and non-offensive character, the live-action

representation of FitzPatrick is endearing. Jonathan Rands successfully recreates the (almost) naive charm one would expect FitzPatrick to possess.

FitzPatrick's dialogue throughout the film is politically neutral, and there is hardly any reference to the racism present in the book. Rands portrays FitzPatrick as a compassionate person, both to Jock and his fellow human beings. There is absolutely no indication of racism on his part, which is in stark contrast to the original, where words like 'kaffir' were thrown about freely. Apart from his slight accent there are very few references to FitzPatrick's heritage. He is not portrayed as the typical imperialist, but rather as politically neutral, only standing up to occurrences which he deemed wrong. One of which included the unfair flogging of Jim Makokel by Seedling.

As the film was made during a very difficult time in South Africa's history, FitzPatrick's character is carefully 'neutralised' and apolitical. He is very subtle in vocalizing his disagreement in the way Makokel's character is treated in the film, backing a human rights perspective as opposed to a racial stance. It seems the filmmakers attempts to steer the narrative away from any racial tensions, without losing the essence of the story. White on black violence is portrayed by Seedling whipping Makokel; and whilst this was widely accepted as the norm within the original book, in this film FitzPatrick's character criticises it.




Fig. 5a still from Hofmeyr's live-action *Jock of the Bushveld's* 'Percy FitzPatrick' (Jonathan Rands). Fig. 5b still from MacNeillie's animated *Jock of the Bushveld* 'Fitz' (voiced by Theo Landey)

In the animated film, FitzPatrick is portrayed as weedy and bumbling. His character is somewhat pathetic and this disappoints. He is tall and lean with a South African accent, spectacles and a wide-brimmed hat (Figure 5b). His movements are awkward, due in part to his characterisation and the fact that he is poorly animated. His facial expressions are wooden and unflinching; he fails to capture the essence of the brave and fearless FitzPatrick from the novel and live-action film.

His character is totally eclipsed by all others in the film, especially Jock, whereas in the live-action version the pair is seen as a team. In the animated film however, this is not the case, as FitzPatrick is seen as more of a hindrance or accessory to Jock which fails to portray the special bond these two shared. In addition to his pathetic appearance, his dialogue does little to impress, and there are precious few memorable lines for FitzPatrick in the animation. All semblances of identity have been stripped from him; he has been neutralized to a point where he just fades into the background. Perhaps this evolution from book to live-action to animation could be seen as the systematic removal of colonial ideals and convictions through the passage of time. The identity of FitzPatrick as the colonial, imperialist white settler has been discounted in its entirety, which is extremely telling in our ever evolving quest in finding our filmic identity. The colonialist (in this instance) has been made into a bumbling fool, plain sighted and no longer worthy of respect or consideration.

4.3.2.2 Jim Makokel

On the other side of the coin from FitzPatrick we get Jim Makokel, subjugated to white supremacy and power in the book, and to a lesser extent in the live-action film. There is a shift in representation that occurred from when the book was written to when the two films were made.

In the book FitzPatrick describes Makokel as belonging to a different period and different conditions, other than wagon riding he was better suited to '...leading some murderous fight ...' as

one of '...Shaka's fighting guard' (FitzPatrick 144). However, he is part of FitzPatrick's team and is described as:

> ...a great fighting savage and, instead of wearing the cast-off clothing of the white man and peacefully driving bullock wagons along a transport road, should have been decked in his savage finery of leopard skin and black ostrich feathers, showing off the powerful bronzed limbs and body all alive with muscle and sharing in some wild war dance; or, equipped with shield and assegais, leading in some murderous fight. (FitzPatrick 144)

In the live-action film, his character is portrayed as a strong willed and highly physical being. If you put his drinking vice aside, he is an asset to FitzPatrick's driving team. Olivier Ngwenya plays Makokel as a feisty mischievous man who holds an intense dislike for the Shangaan people. He is (accurately) portrayed as a non English-speaking Zulu man, whilst his 'crude' use of language, such as '...me come work for you, me Jim Makokel, me catch live lion, Makokel me...' (Hofmeyr 17), could be construed as racist as it is not inaccurate for the time. The words FitzPatrick uses to describe Makokel, such as 'kaffir' and 'savage' have been omitted from the script in their entirety and for good reason. The use of language has been carefully balanced, the essence of communications in the book have not been 'bastardised' but derogative words, not suitable for modern day consumption have been noticeably left out.





Fig. 6a still from Hofmeyr's live-action *Jock of the Bushveld's* 'Jim Makokel' (Olivier Ngwenya). Fig. 6b still from MacNeillie's animated *Jock of the Bushveld* 'Jim' (voiced by Bongani Nxumalo)

In the animated feature he is voiced by popular radio personality Bongani Nxumalo, a very well spoken and educated man. He comes to represent the changes in racial representation as Jim (Makokel is referred to as 'Jim' throughout the animated feature) is a vibrant, charismatic and compassionate character. Jim shines as the 'leader' and his interactions with other characters in the film, both human and animal are testament to how far we have come in terms of racial representation in films. He outshines FitzPatrick in terms of confidence and character. There is a solid representation of friendship and equality throughout the animation and a 'local flavour' is added with the inclusion of a few jubilant expressions in Zulu.

4.3.3 Anthropomorphism

The character of Jock himself will be investigated using Paul Wells' notion of anthropomorphism and its application within the animated feature. Wells mentions a vast array of applications of anthropomorphism within the animated film, but I shall be focussing exclusively on his 'wild systems' argument in additional to what he calls *The Madagascar Problem* in examining how Jock was shifted from the realm of the non-speaking domestic animal to the fully anthropomorphic 'lead character'. There is a definite uneasiness that surrounds this familiar dog; in his original incarnations he is not a 'cute-and-fluffy' dog, he is a violent hunter and ruthless killer. How was this transferred to animation? How was this film made suitable for its target market: children? In an already overly sanitised world, we South Africans have to grapple with an added dilemma; a traumatic national history of major socio-political and cultural change and the representation of that history, as well as violent behaviour to fellow humans as well as animals for survival. Is it represented at all, or simply white-washed?

> One of the intrinsic qualities of animation is its illusionism and its resistance to modes of realism, especially those bound up with notions of documentary truth or social actuality. Critical readings of Disney chastise him and/or the studio for producing stories that endlessly reprise oppressive acts of sexism, racism, cultural ignorance, and environmental insensitivity, and, perhaps

> worst of all, for propagating endemically old-fashioned American values. Supposedly, the natural world and the animals that inhabit it are wholly domesticated and service these perspectives. (Wells 48)

The animated *Jock of the Bushveld* is subject not only to a narrative structure beholden to a Disney mode of production, but also to an added problem of representing a naturally aggressive hunting dog as a wholesome and non-violent character, where the very notion of Jock has come to represent a resilient survivor of the African bush. The reason he was able to survive was due to his tenacity and skill when it came to hunting and killing prey. By turning Jock into a 'humanoid' character it becomes important to question how these issues are addressed, particularly in light of the fact that '...anthropomorphism [is] attributing human emotions to the non-human' (Jacobson qtd. in Wells 96). Jock is a phenomenal character who has endured change beyond comprehension; he has come through a myriad of change, in a cultural, political and sociological perspective. His legacy has endured, but at what cost? How much remains of 'the original' Jock, and how much personality was there to begin with? Such questions raise a mountain of possible answers, but all can be addressed through Well's investigation of 'Wild Systems'.

'...Disney ethos promotes escapism from the indeterminacy of 'wild systems' through the denial of process and difference' (Murphy qtd. in Wells 47). In the original narrative by FitzPatrick, Jock is placed in the wild at the mercy of the elements. He is a domesticated dog, who learns how to survive by killing, and therefore helps FitzPatrick survive. This is an intrinsically primal relationship, where one cannot survive without the other.

Wells also discusses a concept which he calls *The Madagascar Problem* where:

> The core paradigm in many narratives engaging with nature and culture – seemingly the key contextual grounding of the human/animal discourse - is largely based upon a construction of the natural world as wild and the recognition of culture as a model of apparently civilized social order. (Wells 19)

Jock functions in both the 'natural world' as well as part of 'civilized social order' in the live-action film, and this is an uneasy balance given that the representation of Jock in the film could be seen as simple and straightforward. When adapting Jock to anthropomorphic animated character this relationship between the wild and culture is brought into sharp contrast, due in part to his precarious allegiance to 'traditional' notions of what Jock *did* as a dog to current 'humanoid' characterisation. In the live action film Jock is a domesticated pet, and an 'extension' of FitzPatrick's personality. He is an animal, but functions separately and 'against' the wild (animals and people included). That is a given, and is generally accepted as the norm when contextualising older literature into film. The wild was dangerous and it was FitzPatrick and Jock against it all.

> It is important to understand the problem from a number of perspectives, from the point of view of both those who make animated films and those who seek to understand, enjoy, and analyze them. The key discourses, then, are how animals are represented from the point of view of animators (scriptwriters, directors, filmmakers, and so on), that is, *as a practice phenomena and a creative paradigm,* and how animals are represented from the point of view of critical and cultural interpretation, that is, *as a created phenomena and a paradigm to evaluate in the eyes of "the audience."* (Wells *23)*

Jock functions within two separate realms, the first being of the animals, the second, humans. The only difference is that there is no cross communication between the two. However, to understand this anthropomorphism conundrum one must go back to the beginning of this research report, where I mentioned Percy FitzPatrick's strange affiliation with Jock in the book. He almost projects his own personality onto Jock, whilst vehemently denying any link to anthropomorphism. The irony lies in the fact that one hundred years on this is exactly what has happened to Jock. He has become a very active part of current consciousness due to the fact that he has been revived in animated format.

> It is important to address some of the tensions between perceptions and definitions of animal and human. At its most extreme, on the one hand, this acknowledges the seemingly

> irreconcilable difference of animals, while on the other, its opposite, the sociocultural assimilation of animals as pets, man's best friends, and *quasi-humans*. [My emphasis] (Wells 27)

The divide between the human characters and the animal characters is evident in the most straightforward notion of speech. The humans talk to the animals, and they understand. The animals talk amongst themselves, separate from the humans. Baba, the spiritual leader, is the bridge between the two worlds. He is mystical and magical and perpetuates the suspension of disbelief. He is allowed to talk to the animals and understand them because he is both separate from, and yet remaining within both worlds. His spiritual mysticism is the defining factor in his ability to communicate with the animals of the story. He is separate from all the characters, and he does not fit into any specific group. He can be seen as a luminal signifier of transition.

4.3.3.1 Jock

> From the perspective of the development of the animated film, it is clear that the animal is the embodiment not merely of motion itself as the core characteristics of animation practice, but the carrier of notions of movement as the signifier of social change. Animated animals very quickly became an alternative iconography that challenged orthodox modes of representation within the confused unfolding of modern cultural life. (Wells 65)

With this in mind we have to start the dissection of Jock from what he originally represented to what he represents now. In the original book Jock was seen as the runt of the litter, but soon proved to be an invaluable companion to FitzPatrick. He was short set, stocky and had a formidable set of teeth. He was a working dog, whose main job was to bring in kills for the 'hunting pot' so that the wagon riders did not go hungry. In the live-action film he was a killer, a hunter. He had no qualms about bringing an adult Kudu down, or about disembowelling a variety of other creatures. This was accepted as he was a dog; he was in no way connected to humanity. In the newest rendition, the animated feature, Jock's name has not changed, nor has his appearance. What has however happened is that through a shift from animal to human, all that Jock represented before is

no longer acceptable. He is no longer a killer; he is no longer a dog, although he may have four legs and a wet nose. He represents an anthropomorphised animal animation model that was created by Disney.

Jock's character in the animated version is lovable and cuddly little dog, with big brown eyes, a belly and big paws. There is nothing vicious about him and there is no reference to his grizzly textual origins. As Jock is voiced by Bryan Adams one could say that the production studio was looking to create an 'international flavour' by making *Jock of the Bushveld* marketable to overseas buyers by using big ticket actors/singers to gather respect. This said, Jock, who was a non-speaking character in the live-action film, now has a voice and a Canadian voice at that. This opens up a whole plethora of potential issues around cultural representation and audience expectation. Jock is South African, and naturally he should have a South African voice. Once this was announced there was a public outcry, and the *knowing audiences* were disappointed.

In the live-action film Jock is a strong and tenacious animal (as he is represented in the book); his characterisation in the animated film is vastly different. He is portrayed as the pinnacle of innocence, with big eyes and big feet. Many liberties are taken when representing him and he is different in every aspect of his personality. The only thing that remains is appearance, and that reference is transmuted.



Fig. 6a still from Hofmeyr's live-action *Jock of the Bushveld's* 'Jock' (Umfubu). Fig. 6b still from MacNeillie's animated *Jock of the Bushveld* 'Jock' (voiced by Bryan Adams)

The changes made to Jock's character are most noticeable when comparing two images of him. In figures 6a and 6b above we see a distinctive alteration in Jock's physical appearance. In the live-action he is a broad-set and muscular dog and he is also very strong. His jaw is enormous but he is a fine example of what 'the real' Jock from FitzPatrick's book may have looked like. Figure 6b features Jock as the animated character. He is less menacing in the sense that he is less muscular than his live-action counterpart. He has a large nose, and eyes, and his paws helps balance out this oversized exaggeration. Jock's 'cuteness' has increased substantially. He no longer appears to be a ruthless hunter, and killer. He looks more like a cuddly toy.

Much can be said about this characterisation, as 'cuteness' is often a big factor when adapting animals to animation. These changes are what Wells calls 'design idioms' (Wells 60) or changes that are made for the purpose of animation. It is *how* these changes are executed that is of great interest to me. Jock's character in the live-action film is subject to the 'animators interpretation' (Wells 67) where the focus is on engaging with '...the nature of the animal within the flux of meaning, as well as using the core traits and tropes of gendered performance and identity' (Wells 67). The original characterisation of Jock within the live-action feature was very similar to the portrayal of him in the book; he was essentially a masculine character. He shared all the attributes associated with a 'bush dog' and this formed his identity.

This masculinity was diluted to a certain extent, when Jock was made to be 'cute' in the animated version. Since Jock functioned as a masculine entity throughout the live-action film (and the original book) this identity now becomes convoluted and eschewed. The violence and masculinity have been removed and replaced by a characterisation that is vastly different from the original representation of Jock. Whilst this is not necessarily a bad thing it is very important to acknowledge within the greater framework of cultural representations within both *Jock* films.

Conclusion

Whilst *Jock of the Bushveld* may have been written over a century ago, the tale still holds a firm place in the realm of South African collective consciousness. The tale has maintained its standing in the literary world and can be seen as one of the greatest literary classics in this country. Sir Percy FitzPatrick has contributed much to the cultural development of South Africa, even long after his death, in creating a story that would be read and re-read over the span of more than a century. By forming the foundation of the two filmic versions of *Jock of the Bushveld,* FitzPatrick has transcended not only decades of change, but he has also helped create a South African identity. The story's adaptability is testament to this. Through cultural and political change Jock, as a character has overcome the boundaries of our torrid and troubled past.

The very essence of *Jock of the Bushveld* is what one would call transcendental, in that the *idea* of him is so endearing that he is not lost through the passage of time. Modern audiences still relate to the little dog, many decades after his death. Through analysing the 'fidelity debate' we learn that an adaptation need not be tied to its literary sourcetext. If this were the case, *Jock* certainly would not have been around for this amount of time as cultural attitudes have changed so vastly. If *Jock* was adapted *verbatim* it would not only upset audiences, but it would also not fit the typical structure from either a live-action nor animated feature. The structure of the literary story was far too erratic and patriarchal to be successfully transferred to the screen. Therefore what happened was a necessary interjection of new characters, in order to expand the repertoire and balance out the story. The most notable of the characters was the creation of Lilian, the previously non-existent female love interest. If the adaptation studies fidelity discourse were to be applied here the story would be remain an 'outpost' adventure story and would alienate a large portion of the audience, both in the live-action and animated versions.

Apart from the addition of characters, certain aspects of the narrative were left out of the film. These aspects were the exclusion of racist terms and undesirable representations of other races

present at the time the book was written and scenes of gratuitous violence, whilst these may have been deemed suitable and acceptable at the time the novel was written they are no longer applicable. Fidelity discourse severely limits the freedom in which a filmic narrative can critique previously undesirable traits of a society from a bygone era. By critiquing and omitting certain features from a sourcetext we are able to *recreate* our identity. By recreating an identity we are able to move beyond the errors of the past and bypass and/or evolve a metanarrative that is more in tune with the needs and grievances of more people within a social demographic. In this case, by omitting the racism and violence in *Jock,* the filmmakers are able to reach a greater audience, which benefits the original story, not by following it exactly but by manipulating it to suit the tastes of a 'modern' audience. By proving that a story such as *Jock of the Bushveld* remains 'mouldable' opens it up to another century of fond remembrance, not as the original tale, but rather as an ever-shifting element and phenomenon of our cultural identity.

Aligning *Jock of the Bushveld* with the theoretical concept of 'intertextuality' allows us to engage critically with the changes that have occurred in South African society. The very fact that the original live-action film was made in a critical juncture of South African history makes this story an invaluable case study as we are able to analyse the changes made to the story, not only to accommodate the shift from live-action to animation but also the shift from apartheid to post-apartheid society. Showing a colonial story, in animated form to a generation that is very unlikely to know the full extent of the atrocities of the apartheid system and colonial oppression is a risk, and large sacrifices had to be made (in terms of storyline and characterisation. However, if younger audiences know of *Jock of the Bushveld,* then the story has transcended generational gaps.

Each version of *Jock of the Bushveld* can be seen as a product of its time. The 1986 version was banned due to the fact that it was subtly critiquing the racism of the apartheid government; it was only to be rereleased in 1992 when society was 'ready' to see it. This convoluted constraint helped *Jock* in the end as it was deemed a '...fine example of cinematic, technical, musical and

performative skill, special effects and animal handling...' by famed South African film scholar Keyan Tomaselli (*Encountering Modernity* 40), both on a subtle socially critical level, but also a technologically fine 'specimen'. The live-action film was very well made.

Approximately twenty years later, the animated *Jock of the Bushveld* aimed to fill a gap in the South African film industry by being the forerunner in 3D animated feature length films. A project of this calibre had never been attempted in this country before. Technological and financial constraints had made production of this film impossible previously, but Duncan MacNeillie saw a gap and a 'need' to fill. Whilst many critics deemed this a 'bastardisation' of the story and a technological disappointment, they failed to recognise the significance such a story has in our society as a whole. As it is one of the most famous of locally written stories, making an animated film seemed like the next logical step. Although the story itself was frought with difficulties, particularly surrounding representations of racism and violence, the fact of the matter remains that the movie producer, Duncan MacNeillie had enough gumption to attempt such a monumental production at such a high financial cost.

The animated version attempted to follow the Disney structure of animated films, which seems like the logical step to take as Disney was the forerunner in feature length animated features. However, due to the high calibre of animated films currently being produced in Hollywood the animated *Jock of the Bushveld* was unfairly compared to these films. Critics fail to recognise the fact that the technology used to produce such films go into the hundreds of millions of dollars. This local production was produced at a fraction of the cost. However, the poor quality of the animated film was not addressed during this research report, as the focus was predominantly on narrative, although it is important to note here.

Technological failures of the animated film aside, the elements that were omitted from the narrative were intentionally left out to cater for a much younger audience. The film was not created as an in-depth critique of the original narrative, nor was it recreating the live-action version. It

referenced certain aspects of the live-action version, whilst attempting to create a fresh identity using the essence of the original 'positive' aspects of the original *Jock* narrative; only in this case the emphasis was taken away from the human characters and placed on the animal characters. This has positive and negative consequences. By referencing the original film expectation was placed on the animated version, and those who had seen the live-action version went into the cinema with a critical predisposition.

This concept was highlighted by Linda Hutcheon's theories of 'Knowing and Unknowing Audiences' (Hutcheon 120). The film was made for an unknowing audience of small children. This may seem like a sweeping assumption, but apart from parents who have actually read their children the original *Jock* story or shown them the original live-action film, one can assume that the majority of the population for whom this film was made did not know the specific nuances of the story, as *Jock of the Bushveld* as a literary classic had been removed from the school syllabus many years ago. However, the parents who took their children to see the animated film could be construed as the 'knowing audience' as being older, and most likely having experienced the apartheid government and lived through the massive changes experienced in this country and are therefore more informed as to what has been omitted from the original story. Therefore critics such as Barry Ronge were more 'informed' as to the original narrative, but were not as open minded regarding the intended target audience.

Barry Ronge was of the impression that the animation quality was not up to scratch. From a technological perspective the actual character design could have done with a lot more consideration. I found the villain of the story George the Baboon dominated the storyline, in both execution and in design and animation quality. Jock as a character is, to a certain degree, eclipsed by George. However, it is important to understand that professionals in the South African animation industry are inexperienced in the productions of feature length films as the majority of the

(approximately) twenty five animators were sourced from an advertising background[13]. Whilst there are many aspects of the overall production quality one must not forget the financial, experiential and time constraints of producing *Jock.* From a marketing perspective it was a noble attempt of a brave and unflinching production house to turn out the first feature length 3D animated film in South Africa at great risk to themselves.

In essence, *Jock of the Bushveld* has weathered the cultural changes that have occurred over the last twenty-five years, due to the fact that fidelity was not taken into consideration. To be absolutely faithful to the original live-action film (or even the story) would pose huge problems in terms of representation. In order to forge a new filmic identity, South Africans will need to embrace a more reflexive approach to our turbulent past. Strict adherence to contextual correctness will merely keep us in the past and in a cultural 'no-man's land'. We need not be beholden to our literary or cultural past; we merely need to learn how to appropriate it. That being said, certain elements of our history are unsuitable for translation into animation, and since this is the case then an entirely new identity needs to be forged.

If the animation industry can continue to aspire to a higher level of understanding in technical proficiency and storytelling then we will be able to move beyond the realm of the Disney model of filmmaking. By acknowledging the vast and varied cultural influences we have in South Africa we can begin to create our own methods of filmmaking, *Jock of the Bushveld* with all its flaws has merely set up a framework upon which other animations could build. This is merely the beginning of a bright future in the South African animation industry.

[13] The supervising animator Kerry Liss had experience from an animation background. She was a former employee of Luma Johannesburg, a large company specialising in animation for advertisements.

Works Cited

Aragay, Mireia. "Reflection to Refraction: Adaptation Studies Then and Now". *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship.* Ed. Mireia Aragay. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005. *Questia.* Web. 16 February 2012.

Botha, Martin. "Post-Apartheid Cinema: Policy, Structures, Themes and New Aesthetics." *Marginal Lives & Painful Pasts.* Ed. Martin Botha. LIPCO Chambers: Genugtig! Publishers, 2007. Print.

Bloom, Kevin. "Analysis: The Jock of the Bushveld Dilemma". *The Daily Maverick*: The Daily Maverick, 2009. Web. 13 September 2010.

Bosman, Natalie. "The Art of Animation". *The Citizen.* 24 May 2010: 3. *Sabinet.* Web. 1 August 2010.

Cartmell, Deborah and Imelda Whelehan. *Adaptations: from text to screen, screen to text.* London: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Cartmell, Deborah and Whelehan, Imelda. "Harry Potter and the Fidelity Debate". *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship.* Ed. Mireia Aragay. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005. *Questia.* Web. 16 February 2012.

Chandler, Daniel. *Semiotics for Beginners.* www.aber.ac.uk. Web. 14 February 2012.

Dovey, Lindiwe. "Politicising Adaptation: Re-historicising South African Literature through *Fools*". *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship.* Ed. Mireia Aragay. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005. *Questia.* Web. 25 June 2011.

FitzPatrick, J. Percy. *Jock of the Bushveld.* Johannesburg: Penguin Books Ltd, 2007. Print.

Furniss, Maureen. *Art in Motion: Animation Aesthetics*. John Libber & Company Pty Ltd, 1998. Print.

Gray, Stephen. "Domesticating the Wilds: J. Percy FitzPatrick's "Jock of the Bushveld" as a Historical Record for Children." *English in Africa.* 14.2 (1987): 1-14. *Jstor.* Web. 25 June 2010.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation.* New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Jock of the Bushveld. Dir. Gray Hofmeyr. Perf. Jonathan Rands and Gordan Mulholland, 1986. Next Entertainment, 2009. DVD.

Jock of the Bushveld. Dir. Duncan MacNeillie, 2011. Ster Kinekor Entertainment, 2011. DVD.

Koenderman, Tony. "'Jock' could be a landmark: South Africa ready to enter the big time." *Finweek* 22 April 2010, p. 60. Web. 25 June 2010.

Leitch, Thomas. "Adaptation Studies at a Crossroads." *Adaptation* 1.1 (2008): 63-77. *Oxford Journals Online.* Web. 31 August 2011.

---. "Twice-told Tales: The Rhetoric of the Remake." *Literature/Film Quarterly.* 18.3. (1990): 138+. *Questia* Web. 16 February 2012.

MacDonald, Robert. *The Language of Empire: Myths and Metaphors of Popular Imperialism, 1880-1918.* Manchester: Manchester University Publishing, 1994. Print.

MacNeillie, Duncan. Personal Interview. 27 October 2010.

McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Print.

Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts.* Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003. Print.

Renders, Luc. "Redemption Movies." *Marginal Lives & Painful Pasts.* Ed. Martin Botha. LIPCO Chambers: Genugtig! Publishers, 2007. Print.

Stam, Robert. *Literature through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaptation.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2005. Print.

Tomaselli, Keyan. *Encountering Modernity: Twentieth Century South African Cinemas.* Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers, 2006. Print.

---. *The Cinema of Apartheid: Race and Class in South African Film.* London: Routledge, 1989. Print.

---. *The South African Film Industry.* Johannesburg: African Studies Institute, 1979. Print.

Wells, Paul. *The Animated Bestiary, Animals, Cartoons, and Culture.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2009. Print.

---. *Understanding Animation.* London: Routledge, 1998. Print

Wessels, Andries. "An Irish Gentleman in Africa: The Ambiguous Political and Cultural Identity of Sir Percy FitzPatrick." *English in Africa*. 3.1 (2004): 5-22. *Jstor.* Web. 25 June 2010.

Appendix – Interview with Duncan MacNeillie

Interviewer: Lucy Higgins

Interviewee: Duncan MacNeillie

Place: Northcliff Hill

Date: 27 October 2010

HIGGINS: What were your original inspirations to create the animated film?

MACNEILLIE: If we went way back to the first film that I made when I was in the early stages of planning, the chairman of the FitzPatrick trust said to me this would be easier to animate. At the time I didn't consider it and I didn't even want to consider it. But it was always at the back of my mind to one day look at an animated version because it does what film worldwide needs and that is your merchandise, marketing backup. You know, film's success relies on a marketing strategy and campaign, and the Americans are masters at that and the rest of the world are always trying to kind of match the Americans, but unless you spend the money on marketing at the right levels, particularly in America, you are not going to make it. So that was, well, I mean that's the long way of going about it, but, ja. That was the first thought, and then a good friend of mine who's a 2D animator, one of the top 2D animators, had been over to work with Disney on Lion King came back, we studied together, um, and he kept saying to me you should animate this film. It got to a point where CGI was at a level where it was pretty easy to do from anywhere. You know, you didn't have to be in the main centres. The biggest challenge was the technical challenges.

HIGGINS: And the technology was imported from Canada?

MACNEILLIE: Correct

HIGGINS: Did you closely follow the original text and/or your live-action movie?

MACNEILLIE: Live-action movie. The original text, I didn't even look at it. I knew the story pretty well and I didn't want to be influenced in any way. I knew the basis of the story, the core of the story, it's a classic after all and I think that was special and it is your, using the word again, classic antagonist and hero are perfect, you know the baboon is not the most loved animal. It'ss ugly, it's vicious, it's got all the attributes for a great evil character. And, Jock, a dog is man's best friend, so there really was a great setup between those two, and that pretty much is the core of the story. The sidekicks are some of which I've made up, and add a lot to bringing out the hero because the hero is often made in a film by the character of the sidekicks.

HIGGINS: So the hero in this case is Jock?

MACNEILLIE: It is Jock.

HIGGINS: So it's not like a mutual relationship between Fitz and Jock?

MACNEILLIE: No, Jock is the hero, very clearly.

HIGGINS: And is he portrayed as the child in the story or is it like a progression?

MACNEILLIE: Yes it is like a progression, we take Jock as a puppy at the age where he's weaned and he's ready to be given away and at that stage he belongs to our spiritual leader, or Jess does, who's played by Archbishop Tutu and you know, so it's time Jess recognises it and it's tough for a parent sending a kid to boarding school, or sending a kid away that you might never see again.

We go through that stage where Fitz and Jim take Jock and he goes off on the ox wagon and that's the starting point of Jock's growing stages because we then go into montage sequence which I did in the first film as well with Johnny Clegg's *Spirit of the Great Heart.*

HIGGINS: He's learning all he needs to know.

MACNEILLIE: Ja, so it's his school days and I've used that passage in the film kind of towards the end of the first act, in a way, for him to go through this running sequence where he morphs from puppy to middle size, to final size where he jumps out.

HIGGINS: It sounds almost like the sequence in *The Lion King?*

MACNEILLIE: I've done everything I can to avoid a relationship with *The Lion King* or link, apart from having Tim Rice.

HIGGINS: The nice thing about animated movies is, in this sense, is that, what I've learnt is that most of them follow a specific structure and that structure is what I am going to try uncover. There's an animation academic, his name is Paul Wells and he talks of narrative strategies, and I'm just using *Jock* as a case study to position that within a South African context. Like, what makes an animated movie 'South African', how do we create that identity? That's just one part of it because like you said Jock was being schooled, you know, that's in the book as well you know and that's very interesting.

MACNEILLIE: Yes, that's his school days and that very much comes from that thought. It isn't portrayed as such apart from the fact that you can see there's a time where they bond, there's a time where they're learning, they're getting to understand each other, they see each other's weaknesses and strengths and

it is just the bond that develops because I've structured it that Fitz didn't want him, because he was a runt and it's Jim Makokel who says, and Jim has a very special relationship with the dog in the film, which I believe in real life would've happened. You know, the Zulus admire courage and strength and that's why Jim loved him, Jock. Jim has a very close relationship with him.

HIGGINS: I mean I remember in the book when Jock went missing it was Jim who wouldn't give up, he was the most upset I think and because the book was written a hundred years ago they didn't exactly portray the Zulu in a favourable light, I mean I hate to draw the race card but it's present.

MACNEILLIE: Well I've shown Jim in a very favourable light and the interesting thing is, this is a little bit of a deviation but my editor came in the other day, who was editing the film pretty much as you go is that you have to be so disciplined in the animation, but I brought in an editor who I've worked with a few days and she ran a little test with her son and a couple of his friends over the weekend who didn't know the story as most young kids don't. I'm talking about new generation kids, like age fifteen and below probably, and their first comments were when Megan said who were your favourite characters? It was Jock and Jim, and I like that because that is special because that, Jim was a more earthy, rough and tumble, like to play you know, and I think that that's great that that relationship must've kind of come across to those seven year olds who were seeing it 'blind'.

HIGGINS: Where the other characters created to round the story, to give it more cohesion suitable for scriptwriting/screenplay writing? Naturally you had to add characters into it like the poodle and the lady.

MACNELLIE: You know the poodle; it's just nice to have love-interest with your hero and I mean they obviously in all our lives there is some attraction and I think for Jock he's in those days mongrels weren't, you know, you boasted if you had a pedigree. So it was quite nice in a similar level to draw that comparison between the kind of, not that there were aristocrats in those days but if you compare a pedigree with the mongrels, kind of so to say then , Polly comes in as this French Poodle and looks down her nose at the riff-raff. So there's a nice sort of comparison between her and the people she lives with who are well-to-do, they're not digging, running around looking for gold. They're not, they've made it. Morris is a wealthy person and he's a, his daughter Lilian who's Polly's owner is a school teacher. So they're quite a different breed to the miners and the guys that are transport riding. Not to say that they're better, but I mean that's quite a nice comparison.

HIGGINS: So like separate sort of lives? So I assume you took that from the live-action, was Lilian present in the live-action?

MACNEILLIE: Yes, she was

HIGGINS: And Polly was created as an extra?

MACNEILLIE: Yes. Funnily enough we did have an odd looking dog that belonged to our production manager in the film who would like you said, but yes it was there was a Lilian had a dog in the film as well. But like you said they're not featured strongly because in live-action it is pretty difficult, the animals can't talk, they can't represent themselves and what we've done with the animals sort of, and we brought about, funnily enough what developed with Bryan Adams was recording his role as Jock was every time Fitz pulls out the pan to

search for gold Jock associates that with food because it looks like his bowl to eat from and he's thinking food and FitzPatrick's thinking money and gold and it's just the different values which I've tried to portray in a kind of a low-key manner. You don't want to push these things but I mean it's there, the message is there.

HIGGINS: So it's sort of like social commentary?

MACNEILLIE: Yeah exactly. I mean, for animals it's love and food and water and that's what they live on.

HIGGINS: Ultimately that message is what comes out in the end, that love triumphs over everything. I also saw that you've got Pezulu the rooster and Basil the monkey. What I want to know is that how did you grapple with the divide between (this is another part of it) the domestic and the wild? How does Jock relate to the wild animals that he's surrounded by?

MACNEILLIE: OK, I have an old friend called Ian Ployer who I think I learned particularly from his friend Mak'lu Ntombena in Zululand, I made a few documentaries with him and when I started this film. You know it's the big thing in animation, the animals and the humans mustn't understand or been seen to be talking to each other because that's off-putting. So, in the treatment I've had Tata, who's the spiritual leader as the only person in the film who can understand and communicate with animals. It's not overplayed, it's very subtle, but he is. In the animal kingdom they were, well before, I'm not saying this goes back in time, there's always been this form of segregation, there's always been the Zebras in their little herds and the Wildebeest. They

don't necessarily interact, but I've always treated the domestic, so-called domestic animals in the film as the same, on a par with the wild animals.

HIGGINS: It's very, very important because what you said about Tata being the link between the humans and the animals. The problem I've noticed with some animated films is that you've either got the animals who talk amongst themselves and the humans are completely separate, like in *Ratatouille*, Remy can't talk to his human counterpart in the movie but he talks amongst the rats. That's why it's very interesting to see how you addressed it in the movie because they obviously need to have that connection in the story because they're so closely connected, Fitz and Jock.

MACNEILLIE: Absolutely, and I mean we've shown Fitz...

HIGGINS: Because I mean it's the same with, like you mentioned, *The Lion King* except there's no humans in that.

MACNEILLIE: Ja, it's in fact one of the things that I've just had quite a senior ex-Disney official, you know a guy who had been with them for twenty years and very, very experienced in the marketing and distribution game, and the one thing he really liked was that human interaction. It enables us as humans, the viewers to kind of maybe, you know kind of learn something on this, if it was purely animal driven I don't think the message that, even if it's a subtle message...

HIGGINS: It would be more towards live-action then?

MACNEILLIE: Ja, exactly

HIGGINS: That's the joy of animation, that you can afford to do that. Where did you get the inspiration for Jock's personality, was he completely made up or was he influenced?

MACNEILLIE: He was completely made up and you know, I mean it's a funny thing even in the character styling and development your key character being a dog you would think it being straightforward and simple but it took WAY longer than doing your writing for a kind of, a character or a villain is a lot easier than writing for, in many respects for a hero role. You might live that hero role, you might try and create it, but that person is helped so much by what goes on around him, the sidekicks and Basil and Pezulu are really, are good sidekicks you know coming from very different backgrounds; Basil was almost a slave entertainer for George, the antagonist, but he escapes and finally ends up as a friend of Jock's. But throughout he is a nice person, whereas Pezulu is just this over-the-top rooster and cocky, and the mannerisms are taken from what you would see, the rooster walking around with all the hens, the arrogance and the cockiness, so I portrayed Pezulu in that manner. He regards himself as a kind of protector and I mean toward Jock and he kind of plays that role

HIGGINS: It's like that in the book. I laughed when I read about Pezulu; I was like 'Ha! Now I know where they got the character design from!' Because I could directly correlate the characteristics match the characteristics in the film which is why it's so interesting

MACNEILLIE: Ja, and in fact the other character that comes from the book directly is Snarly, who's this sort of thieving dog who would blames Jock for everything if he can, he's an opportunist.

HIGGINS: How did you deal with aspects of violence in terms of George the baboon and his owner, like, we know in the book that the baboon used to kill all these dogs...

MACNEILLIE: Yes it's extreme...

HIGGINS: How does the relationship work between them in the animated movie?

MACNEILLIE: One thing that I thought of upfront is that I'd try and be honest, as honest as possible to the time and in terms of showing some of the aggression and violence as it would be. I mean, a baboon is a frightening animal and as described, I mean they have four hands to hold you with and they rip your stomach out with their teeth that are bigger than lions, they're not a good thing to go up against. Seedling and George who are seen as sort of sidekicks or partners in the film. One difference between George and the other characters was that George was beginning to grasp money; he's beginning to understand 'Hey, with money comes certain luxuries.' You know it's like, lie on the bar, have a few swigs of the leftover beer or whatever and this is all, this is good stuff and I understand my human sidekick Seedling has the means to make money so we can have these little luxuries. You know so he's kind of in tune with the gambler, in tune with corruption, whereas the other animals are very different. So he's taken on a little bit of a human trait which is good because they both, you can see in a way how George is influenced by Seedling but also on the other hand how he's controlled by Seedling as almost like a slave and a pet for his own financial gain.

HIGGINS: And that's exactly how it was like in the book. So you took the human aspect of greed and gambling and the quest for money as opposed to the basics: food, water, love and use that as a balance between the two characters?

MACNEILLIE: Yes, correct. And I think you're picking up so much Lucy in terms of, yes it all originates from the book, my original film is referenced from the book but, there are a lot of things that are true to the book, but obviously the story you wouldn't recognise from the book because it's made up from Jock's point of view.

HIGGINS: Well I mean the story is just a bunch of hunting tales; they just go out, kill a Wildebeest, come back...

MACNEILLIE: Yeah, it's not something you would animate...

HIGGINS: And it's also interesting from a child's perspective because what my reader picked up on was children today wouldn't be able to read *Jock of the Bushveld* as it would have been read a hundred years ago, so adaptation is important to keep the story alive.

MACNEILLIE: Penguin books have done exactly that, they've adapted books from the screenplay, from the film and I read them the other day and I was actually pleasantly surprised by the way they've adapted it for kids today, and understanding my research and running it in parallel at times and other directions, but they've really captured what I was after in a great way, and I think they've done, they're printing twelve books; some in English, Afrikaans and Zulu but all in all twelve.

HIGGINS: Are they like picture books?

MACNEILLIE: Some are, some are sticker books, some are very basic things, but then the main ones are more of an adaptation of the screenplay in a story form.

HIGGINS: Stephen Gray was saying that one hundred years is a long time to remember a brindled terrier, no matter how special. So my reader Craig also said Jock is a phenomenon. It's a South African phenomenon and that's what I'm going to approach it as because we've had the live-action, we've had the animation and now we've had the musical as well. You know this sudden surge in interest in this old story, it's just, I just find it very interesting that South Africa is grappling with this identity but everybody knows the story.

MACNEILLIE: Well I think the nicest thing is that, I mean, Bryan Adams has said it and this ex-Disney, I say he's ex because he's independent now, a really smart man, has stated that it's a universal story. It's no different to the gold rush in America, or Australia or whatever, and it's having a dog, we're just in a wild country so dogs were more sought after for protection than anything else, and a companion.

HIGGINS: Did you have anything to say about the 2000 version that was made in America?

MACNEILLIE: No it wasn't, it was made by me and even when I was interviewed by Ster Kinekor they said that they thought it was American. The less said about it the better because it's like doing a painting twice, this is so different. The first one I had my heart and soul in it, the second one, came about I decided to stay in the country during the apartheid years thinking that maybe in the long term I can contribute, plus I love the country. I love the bush

particularly, and when I was offered a wonderful job in Los Angeles, you know that was the reason I declined it. So it was a long wait before we could actually get back into the marketplace and that was in a way, you know one of those things where I hadn't gotten involved in the tax circus where I thought 'Well, now it's political change', Disney had the following thoughts about it and it was Americanized in the sense that, you know, but I don't want to go down that road and explain it.

HIGGINS: It's like one of those little footnotes, as a progression of a story, because that's what it is basically, it's the progression. Why was the 1986 version banned?

MACNEILLIE: Apartheid. It was a cultural boycott in every sense and I expected it, I mean I went over knowing Disney because of the success here, asked me to come over and present it and they gave it serious consideration while shooting in Kenya, to cut a long story short nothing happened, and we released six months after the ban on South African product. Johnny Clegg called me at the time and the film also helped market Johnny and he wrote *Spirit of the Great Heart* for me and did the soundtrack with Keith [Hutchinson]. Keith played the main role in fact of the soundtrack of that version. He's involved now just because Marius my present guy has fallen ill, anyway.

HIGGINS: So it was probably because it was, was it portraying the Afrikaners in an unfavourable light? Or was it just commercial reasons, it was banned?

MACNEILLIE: Oh no it was just purely apartheid I mean we ran Disney at a test market in L.A. and people said to me, they stood up and there were tears, you know it was all the right emotions but they just said outright, they will not finance

apartheid. Which is, you know, you can't argue with that, so that was the end of it and then the decision for me to stay in this country was family and love of the country and that was it, but it didn't do my career much good as you went into kind of slow-motion really, I mean you have to just really wait and do the odd thing and this tax circus the film industry was in a mess because just greed dominated.

HIGGINS: I imagine you probably get, I mean how do the film industries work overseas? Do they get funding from the government, or is it also independent financiers?

MACNEILLIE: You know what I think the biggest weakness we have in this country is our film commissions are not properly structured and they are divided. I think we should focus on a model that works. It is also quite a difficult thing because when filmmakers get involved in how the industry should progress. It's often greed that gets in the way, they're not thinking of the industry but themselves.

HIGGINS: So it's better to be independent?

MACNEILLIE: Ja, no you have to be.

HIGGINS: So, going back to the beginning, you just started in 2007 once you managed to acquire the technology?

MACNEILLIE: Ja and I mean getting the technology you would think 'Ok if we run into snags we'll just call the suppliers' and, you know, and learn a bit from the Canadians and the Americans, and it's not so easy apart from operating at a different time of day if there are issues, technical issues we have to send them across and these are big files, and there's confidentiality and all sorts

of things and I ended up finally moving up here because there was a greater pool of talent in Joburg. I tried initially to set up in the lowveld, but the good thing about that phase is that it was great reference time. I live in an area where there's wild animals all around sp we went out. It was the environment, the trees, the textures, writing the story so that all took place there. I'm pleased I did it that way and really we moved up here to get into the production side of things. We ended up with a really great team of people, who were all, and that's the biggest challenge in any form of film, or anything in life is having a team that believes in what they are doing, and that is quite a thing because you have to convince people in this country because we haven't done enough that we can be proud of. Its unchartered territory, and you're starting from scratch and people always think 'Oh well, this is just a local film', but I approached this from the outset as competing with the best in the world and if you don't, then why are we actually doing it? You know? It's a lot of time and effort.

HIGGINS: So you say the role of Fitz is more downplayed, is he just sort of a peripheral character?

MACNEILLIE: Ja, I mean Fitz plays a meaningful role in Jock's life, he's pretty much dictated to in terms of where he [Jock] is going geographically. Now Fitz, he heads off on the journey as a novice and as a naive person. He's not at home in the bush. But by circumstance, failure and his search for gold he ends up transport riding, and we don't go through that whole circus, but we cover it. But it takes Jock back, and Fitz to Seedling and George which, and as Jock's reputation has grown as a hero, I mean he didn't ask for fame but he became well known in the leopard hunt and you know, all those little things

are, in part, I guess covered in the book. What made Jock famous was his courage ending up defeating George but Seedling and George finally find a dog worth fighting against and that is what drives Seedling and ultimately George because all the previous dog fights haven't been much of a challenge. He's become a bit like a retired boxer, kind of lazing around and losing shape. As soon as they find Jock they become determined again. That here's something worthy of a fight.

HIGGINS: Does the film focus in one area or do they also travel?

MACNEILLIE: Yes they travel; we focused primarily on the entry, going through the beautiful lowveld into arrival at Crook's Corner. Crook's corner is really where the bulk happens, the excitement, the danger and the bad guys hang out. So that's where everything happens. Pilgrim's Rest becomes more of a love-interest because the girls are there, and from a transport point of view he was headed there to search for gold. He fails, he comes back as transport rider to Crook's Corner and that's where the real clash/animosity begins between the antagonists and the heroes.

HIGGINS: So it's almost like two separate areas in which the action occurs?

MACNEILLIE: The showdown happens at Crook's Corner and Crook's Corner I took from; again from that area where it wasn't geographically I've just put it there for convenience with the Crocodile River, and in terms of the journey from the coast to Pilgrim's, it is more or less on the old transport route, so I've just created this island where which we've called Crook's Corner. It was up in the north where all these sort of guys were avoiding the law would go there so that if the Mozambican authorities wanted them they could duck into

South Africa or vice versa. You so there were three countries that met at that point.

HIGGINS: You say you went to the lowveld for artistic inspiration. Did you follow realism or is it more stylised?

MACNEILLIE: That's such a good question because when you start off developing something it is stylised, but it is fairly realistic. So, it would be in a more sort of classical style, but it is also quite different; you have to simplify. Whereas we've gone fairly detailed in terms of hair because the technology has allowed for it and I mean it does push your render time and make it more challenging. But ja, you have to stylise. If you're going for super real stuff it makes it a little difficult. But when you look at it you will see it has got a strong realistic look.

HIGGINS: Have any artists influenced the art direction?

MACNEILLIE: You know I originally started with influence from African art which is quite angular, you go with that carved look because I think African art is so underrated and if we talk about our own South African style it's a lot less refined than Zimbabwe, northern countries; Kenya which is more polished and rounder whereas ours, I've always related to it as being more angular. So kind of a bit like a Picasso, you would also look at the environment. I also tried to bring in a Pierneef sort of feel who played with those things, and it just became quite difficult with angular objects in animation so we ended up softening the angles and ending up in a more traditional manner.

HIGGINS: And the architecture? Cape Dutch or corrugated iron?

MACNEILLIE: Corrugated iron, Pilgrim's Rest ja. So like the main street in Pilgrim's Rest.

HIGGINS: I think that's pretty much covered everything. It's fantastic, thank you.

MACNEILLIE: It's a pleasure Lucy.