

# Space-temporal thinking in salinger's "Uncle wiggily in connecticut" and its film adaptation *My foolish heart*

Renata Gonçalves Gomes<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** This essay attempt to develop a study on J.D. Salinger's *Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut* (1948) in rela-tion to its adaptation to the cinema entitled *My Foo-lish Heart* (1950), regarding the review of literature of both masterpieces and an analysis of specific parts and scenes according to Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of space--temporal relations in literature and arts. The repulse of Salinger to his story's adaptation and his behavior of reclusiveness is also mentioned as a matter of con-textualization because of the difficulty of finding the film nowadays. Some other comparisons are made in the essay, putting Salinger, Edward Albee and Kathe-rine Mansfield in dialogue to each other through their literature.

**Keywords:** J.D. Salinger. Uncle Wiggily in Con-necticut.My Foolish Heart.North-American Short Story. Film Adaptation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Doctoral student at PGI, UFSC, Brazil.Contact information: Rua Tupinambá, 586, Estreito. CEP: 88095-010. Telephone: +55 (48) 9153-1481. *E-mail:* <gomex10@hotmail.com>.

## Teoria de Tempo-Espaço em “Uncle Wiggily Connecticut” e sua adaptação cinematográfica *My foolish heart*

**Resumo:** Este ensaio desenvolve um estudo sobre o conto “Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut” (1948), do escritor J.D. Salinger, e a sua adaptação cinematográfica intitulada *My Foolish Heart* (1950), com base na revisão da crítica de ambas as obras e na análise de cenas e partes específicas, de acordo com a teoria de tempo-espaco em literatura e artes. A repulsa de Salinger à adaptação de seu conto e seu comportamento recluso são também mencionados, a fim de contextualizar a dificuldade de se encontrar o filme atualmente. Algumas outras comparações são feitas neste ensaio, colocando Salinger, Edward Albee e Katherine Mansfield em diálogo através de suas literaturas.

**Palavras-chave:** J.D. Salinger. “Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut”. *My Foolish Heart*. Conto norte-americano. Adaptação cinematográfica.

*Tenho uma tia que pensa que nada acontece num relato, a menos que alguém se case ou mate outro no final. Escrevi um conto em que um vagabundo se casa com a filha idiota de uma ve-lha. Depois da cerimônia, o vagabundo leva a filha em viagem de núpcias, abandona-a num hotel de estrada e vai embora sozinho, conduzindo o auto-móvel. Bom, essa é uma história com-pleta. E no entanto não pude conven-cer minha tia de que esse era um conto completo. Ela queria saber o que acontecia com a filha da idiota depois de abandonada.*

Flannery O'Connor<sup>2</sup>

What Flannery O'Connor tried to say while telling this episode involving her text and the reading of her aunt is that modern literature, especially when focusing on short stories, does not work with finitudes, i.e., there is no purpose on finding an end; the modern short stories do not have to have a unique meaning, a unique truth. As Ernest Hemingway was used to say: "the most important thing may never be told"<sup>3</sup>, establishing his iceberg theory. This reading of modern literature, specifically talking about short-stories, is drawn by the Argentine writer Ricardo Piglia, in *Formas Breves* (2000), where he makes a well-done study about short stories' forms, from classical to modern. Piglia's thought on short story forms has many connections with Salinger's "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut", since the short story fits in the patterns of modern stories.

---

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Ricardo Piglia in his text entitled "Formas Breves". <sup>3</sup> Also quoted by Ricardo Piglia, in the same text.

J.D. Salinger's "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" was first published in the traditional magazine, already at that time<sup>4</sup>, "The New Yorker", in march 20<sup>th</sup>, year 1948. Less than two years later, the short story was already on the big screen of Radio City cinema to a special premiere public during the freezing New York Christmas of 1949, and to the general public in January 21<sup>st</sup>, 1950. By this year, Salinger had already published many short stories in magazines, including "This sandwich has no mayonnaise", in 1945, "Both parties concerned", in 1944, "I'm crazy", in 1940, and many others, all published only in magazines<sup>5</sup> and never more authorized by Salinger to be re-edited neither in magazines nor in books<sup>6</sup>. Salinger's bestseller *The Catcher in the Rye* was only published in 1951 – which means he was probably

---

4 Warren French, in his book *J.D. Salinger*, writes about Salinger signing a contract with the magazine *The New Yorker* after publishing in there the short story entitled "A Perfect Day for Bananafish", "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" and "Just Before the war with the Eskimos", and the prestige that represented: "[...] segundo Martha Foley, conquistaram-lhe um contrato com essa revista que, apesar das críticas, é considerada o máximo pela maioria dos jovens que aspiram a ser reconhecidos como escritores criadores sérios" (1963, p. 124).

5 Among these magazines Salinger used to publish his short stories and novellas were: *The New Yorker*, *Saturday Evening Post*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Mademoiselle*, *Story*, *Kansas Review*, *Colliers*, *Esquire* and *Cosmopolitan*.

6 Despite Salinger non-publication of his short stories, there is an anthology of all these never-more-published texts in a book called *The uncollected short stories of J. D. Salinger*, done by an unknown person. In 1974, Lacey Fosburgh interviewed Salinger and talked about this unauthorized book: "Some stories, my property, have been stolen [...] Someone's appropriated them. It's an illicit act. It's unfair. Suppose you had a coat you liked and somebody went into your closet and stole it. That's how I feel.", he said (FOSBURGH, Lacey. If you really want to hear about it. CRAWFORD, Catherine (ed.). **J.D. Salinger speaks about his silence**. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2006. p. 44).

in the middle to the end of it when the movie had premiered – and the book *Nine Stories*, which contains the short story here issued, only in 1953.

With just four books circulating in the market since 1955 (*The Catcher in the Rye*, *Nine Stories*, *Franny and Zooey*, *Raise High the Roof Beam, Carpenters*) and without publishing any story since “Hapworth 16, 1924”, in 1965, Salinger was a persona always hard to find.<sup>7</sup> Beyond these Salinger’s writings, there is a film adaptation of one of his stories “Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut”, authorized by him to turn into *My Foolish Heart*. It is the first and unique film adaptation of all Salinger’s stories<sup>8</sup> and also a hard piece to find nowadays: what might be a symptom of the Yankee writer’s reclusiveness and avoidance of publications.

*My Foolish Heart* is not available in the DVD format,

---

<sup>7</sup> Salinger is also known as a sort of myth because of his reclusive behavior, having lived apart from the book business in Cornish, a small city in New Hampshire, after his huge success in his professional life. Although this is a great and instigating subject on Salinger's work and life, I will not extend it due to the relevance of it to the main purpose of this essay. Further information about this may be found in the biography "Em busca de J.D. Salinger" (In Search of J.D. Salinger), by Ian Hamilton.

<sup>8</sup> There are, although, some study relating the film *The Royal Tenenbaums* (2001) and the film *The Darjeeling Limited* (2007), both directed by Wes Anderson, with Salinger's stories on the Glass family. However, they are not adaptations on the stories; as André Corrêa Rollo (2006) says in his master dissertation in relation to *The Royal Tenenbaums*, and it can be referred also with *The Darjeeling Limited*, it is an (in)adaptation of Salinger's stories. On the one hand, the first film focus on the portrait of the Glass children as outsiders - the eccentric children of the Tenenbaums family. On the other hand, the story of the latest film focus on the religious and mystical issues that are around the stories and characters of the Glass family. In the film, only three brothers lead the story, which would probably be representing the Glass brothers Seymour, Buddy and Zooey.

only in the old VHS one, which means that it is out of circulation and that it has not been reedited by Samuel Goldwyn Studios for, at least, fifteen years<sup>9</sup>. Although Salinger clearly did not like the argument of Julius and Philip Epstein brother's on one of the Glass family stories<sup>10</sup>, it does not necessarily mean that Salinger had banished the reproduction of it, there is no information about it and the rights of the film were sold to Darryl Zanuck, the Samuel Goldwyn's producer. It is, although, a very interesting data that may be seen as a symptom of what Salinger did to all his despised works: to vanish them from the readers, something similar, safeguarded their different proportions, to what Franz Kafka wanted to do with his manuscripts, trying to burn all of them to be sure that nobody could ever read them.

Ian Hamilton, in his book *Em busca de J.D. Salinger*, explains Salinger's disappointment on *My Foolish Heart*: "Mas ele estava furioso - não só com Hollywood, desconfia-se" (HAMILTON, 1988, p. 110). About this disappointment, Warren French, in his book entitled *J.D. Salinger*<sup>11</sup>, goes a little further when saying the relation

9 In Brazil, the movie was exhibited by the extinct pay-tv channel "Telecine Classic", and because of this (or these) exhibition(s), there are copies of the movie circulating in non-official DVDs copies.

10 It is in "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" that there is the story of how Walt Glass died during the II World War. Walt is Eloise's boyfriend during the college period and the guy she still has good and nostalgic memories after seven years of his death. The Glass family is composed by nine characters, including the mother Bes-sie Gallagher Glass, the father Less Glass and the (grown) children Seymour, Buddy, Zooley, Franny, Walt, Waker and BooBoo. These characters are in many Salinger's stories, not necessarily with all of them in the same story, as it happens in "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut", where only Walt Glass is within the story, but as a memory.

11 In the Brazilian edition, this book figures within the collection "Clássicos do nosso tempo", where there are authors such as

between Salinger and Hollywood:

Salinger também viveu, a 21 de janeiro de 1950, finalmente, a tão adiada experiência de ver uma versão cinematográfica de uma de suas obras realizada em filme. Os estúdios Samuel Goldwyn haviam transformado 'Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut' em 'My Foolish Heart' (Meu Tolo Coração), um romance 'adulto' com a popular estre-la Susan Hayward e com Dana Andrews. O *New Yorker*, e presumivelmente o próprio Salinger, desaprovou veementemente o que Hollywood fizera da estória; e, apesar de seus antigos anseios de penetrar no cinema, Salinger desde então tem recusado sistematicamente vender os direitos de qualquer um de seus outros trabalhos para o cinema ou para a televisão. Nunca se imprimiu o roteiro de 'My Foolish Heart', mas uma das mais curiosas peças [sic] Salingeriana é um livreto de 128 páginas intitulado *Mit Dumme Hjerte*, em dinamarquês, que contém uma estória construída por Victor Skaarup a partir do filme (FRENCH, 1963, p. 25, grifos do autor).

This fragment belongs to the first chapter of French's book, entitled "Aquela lenga-lenga tipo David Copperfield", remembering one of the firsts sentences of Holden Caulfield from "*The Catcher in the Rye*", where the critic author writes a simple, but replete of first rate information, biography of Salinger and his works, yet in

---

Tennessee Williams, F. Scott Fitzgerald, John dos Passos, Ernest Hemingway, Henry James, William Faulkner, Herman Melville and many others, which positions J.D. Salinger as one of all the canonized North-American authors.

1963 when Salinger was still publishing. Very instigating information is that Salinger had always wanted to see one of his stories in a movie, especially when he was publishing in the *Saturday Evening Post*:

Na mesma carta em que ele solicitava ao Coronel Baker que apoiasse sua inscrição à Escola de Candidatos a Oficiais, Salinger confia-va que seu agente esperava que o conto do *Post* pudesse ser comprado por Hollywood. Os fabri-cantes de filmes decepcionaram Salinger, mas ele encontrou um mercado estável para suas es-tórias (FRENCH, 1963, p. 22).

So, it can be said that Salinger have never received a good response from Hollywood, since his first stories in the 40's until the adaptation of *My Foolish Heart*. Another interesting data French brings, yet in the 60's, is about the publication of *My Foolish Heart's* argument, by the Danish journalist and writer Victor Skaarup<sup>12</sup>. However, this is yet a material hard to find, since it was only writ-ten in Danish, and there isn't any translation of it. Summarizing Warren French's idea: he does not say preci-sely that Salinger was indeed disappointed about the movie adaptation of his short story, although he presu-mes it by analyzing the rejection of the Yankee author in selling more stories to Hollywood; also, by noticing the

---

12 Victor Skaarup (1906-1991) used to write for magazines and for movies subtitles. He was into the music, cinema and book's market, since he translated foreign songs and subtitles to Danish and used to be a correspondent of newspapers such as *B.T.*, in London, and then, also, in New York. This information was taken from the, written in Danish, webpage: <[http://da.wikipedia.org/wiki/Victor\\_Skaarup](http://da.wikipedia.org/wiki/Victor_Skaarup)>.



bad review of John McCarten in the column entitled “The Current Cinema” from the magazine that first published “Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut”, *The New Yorker*, about the movie adaptation. The short fragment about *My Foolish Heart* in the cinema review of McCarten, within *The New Yorker* issue of January 28<sup>th</sup>, 1950, says:

‘My Foolish Heart’ offers us Susan Hayward as a star-crossed matron given to belting the bottle and indulging in cynical chatter. The picture presents eight years of this lady’s life, beginning with her as a schoolgirl in love with spellbinding soldier (Dana Andrews) and winding up with her making life miserable for her husband (Kent Smith) and her child (Gigi Perreau). The film is full of soap-opera clichés, and it’s hard to believe that it was wrung out of a short story by J.D. Salinger that appeared in this austere magazine a couple of years ago. The scriptwriters, Julius and Philip Epstein, have certainly done Mr. Salinger wrong (1950, p. 74, grifo do autor).

The magazine, or the reviewer John McCarten, defended “Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut” and Salinger against *My Foolish Heart*. Salinger, at this point, was silent about his opinion of the movie and *The New Yorker*, in reverse, exposed the situation by disqualifying the movie in front of the short story once presented in the periodical.

Kenneth Slawenski, in the newest biography about Salinger, first published in 2010, goes deeper in the commentary about Salinger’s ideas in relation to the film adaptation and its consequences on his work and life.

Why Salinger allowed himself to be put into this position is a mystery. Here was an author who became furious over the mere suggestion that his work might be altered - when magazines had changed his story titles without consultation, he had been driven to frenzy. In 1945, he had warned Ernest Hemingway against the sale of movie rights to Hollywood. And though Salinger secretly adored films, his depiction of the movie industry in his stories was consistently scathing. There can be only one explanation why Salinger forfeited "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" to Hollywood: after struggling for so many years to attain literary success, his ambition had embedded itself so deeply as to become a reflex (SLAWENSKI, 2010, p. 183, grifo do autor).

The reception of *My Foolish Heart* was controversial: despite the aversion of Salinger, the movie was a great success of public and was nominated to the Academy Award of 1950 in two categories, best actress in a leading role for Susan Hayward, for playing Eloise, and best music/original song, for "My Foolish Heart", by Victor Young and Ned Washington; earning the award for best original song. Despite these nominations and the success of audience, J.D. Salinger was not that alone in his opinion. Glauber Rocha, in his book entitled *O Século do Cinema* (2006), when writing about the post-War period of time in Hollywood, mentioning the producer Stanley Kramer as one of the most rebels in the western districts of Los Angeles, says that he revealed some directors, such as:

[...] Hugo Fregonese em *My Six Convicts* [*Meus seus criminosos*, 1952]; levou a primeira vez à tela a famosa escritora americana Carson McCullers com a novela *The Member of the Wedding* [*Cruel desengano*, 1952], sob direção de Zinnemann; reabilitou Mark Robson em *Home of the Brave* [*Clamor humano*, 1949] e *The Champion* [*O Invencível*, 1949], quando Kirk Douglas teve sua grande oportunidade (ROCHA, 2006, p. 59).

Glauber Rocha says that the producer Stanley Kramer rehabilitated *My Foolish Heart's* director, Mark Robson, by "saving" him with films that were made almost at the same period of time, but surely during the same year Salinger's adaptation was made. In this case, Glauber might be denigrating *My Foolish Heart* as a terrible movie, or simply denying the early films of Robson, some horror movies he used to make before 1949. However, Glauber is not clear to what he wanted to say, which Mark Robson's movies were ruining his career before *Home of the Brave* and *The Champion*. Then, it is also possible that Glauber Rocha would agree with J.D. Salinger's opinion about *My Foolish Heart*.

Beyond Rocha's opinion about the works of Mark Robson, there was also American critics manifestation about the movie adaptation. On the one hand, the review of the film made by *The New York Times* accomplished that the film was too sentimental and the wistfulness in it was exaggerated for a modern college girl.

Every so often there comes a picture which is obviously designed to pull the plugs out of the tear glands and cause the ducts to overflow. Such a

picture is Samuel Goldwyn's latest romance, 'My Foolish Heart', [...] Perhaps if the period of this story were, let's say, the Civil War and the desperate young lady of the romance were dressed in crinolines, the naïvely sentimental treatment which Mr. Goldwyn and his boys have given it would be entirely appropriate to the spirit and custom of that age. And maybe this corner could weep with it, along with other softly sentimental folks (CROWTHER, 2014, p. 1, grifo do autor).

On the other hand, there is a considerable empathy by the reviewer Bosley Crowther with the movie, because he tries to praise Epstein brothers' and Goldwyn's works when writing that the film has rich dialogs and great New Yorkish sets. At the same time, the review does not bring the name of Salinger when mentioning that the movie "is from a *New Yorkeryarn* which bore the demoralizing title of 'Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut'". By avoiding the name of Salinger in the review, Crowther enables the discussion on the subject of literary to film adaptation: can *My Foolish Heart* be considered a J.D. Salinger movie? Is "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" really inserted in its film adaptation? Or is the film a detached masterpiece from the short story?

For Ian Hamilton, more than think that *My Foolish Heart* was inspired by "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut", he affirms that J.D. Salinger's other stories were more affected by his idea of unsuccessfulness of the movie adaptation. About this supposed influence of the movie adaptation on Salinger's following stories, especially in the novel *The Catcher in the Rye*, Hamilton says:

A raiva que Holden Caulfield sente pelo cinema pode parecer exagerada para um rapaz de dezesseis anos, se não levarmos em consideração que *My Foolish Heart* estreou no auditório da Radio City em janeiro de 1950, quando Salinger deveria estar na metade do romance que vinha preparando há dez anos. O próprio Holden, é bom lembrar, vai ver um filme que está passando na Radio City na época do Natal, e se Salinger fez alguma pesquisa de campo, deve ter visto o cartaz anunciando *My Foolish Heart* como próxima atração -e dizendo que era um filme baseado 'num conto de J.D. Salinger'(HAMILTON, 1988, p. 110, grifo do autor).

By mentioning fragments from *The Catcher in the Rye* in order to explain how *My Foolish Heart* affected Salinger's life and works, Hamilton limits what could be a great literary discussion, simplifying it by explaining these literary pieces by life events. Hamilton was referring, especially, to these two fragments of the novel *The Catcher in the Rye*:

I mean that's all I told D.B. about, and he's my brother and all. He's in Hollywood. [...] He used to be just a regular writer, when he was home. He didn't use to. He wrote this terrific book of short stories, 'The Secret Goldfish'. It was about this little kid that wouldn't let anybody look at his goldfish because he'd bought it with his own money. It killed me. Now he's out in Hollywood, D.B., being a prostitute. If there's one thing I hate, it's the movies. Don't even mention them to me .  
[...] I had quite a bit of time to kill till ten o'clock,

so what I did, I went to the movies at Radio City. It was probably the worst thing I could've done, but it was near, and I couldn't think of anything else. [...] they had this Christmas thing they have at Radio City every year (SALINGER, 1994, p. 1, 123-124).

What Hamilton tries to do is to connect the persona Salinger to his narratives and, consequently, to his characters. The biography written by Hamilton explains, mainly, the novel *The Catcher in the Rye* by the awkward behavior of its creator. Hamilton takes the risk of being mis/understood when creating this sort of reading on Salinger's works that without the writer's experiences the stories would not exist. Life, in this case, would be merely a mean of inspiration and art a mean of reproduction. If so, life and art could be considered both dead and the author the only one alive.

In order not to fall in biographical terms, Salinger's rejection of *My Foolish Heart* is presented here not as a curiosity, gossip or to fill the anguish of blanked pages, but to raise questions that involve answers on the theory of modern short stories: Could *My Foolish Heart* evoke similar questions to "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" ones? What were those questions?

As it could be noticed, in this *My Foolish Heart's* review of literature, there aren't critical works about it. Andrew Sarris, in the magazine *Film Comment*, writes a non-academic essay about *My Foolish Heart* entitled "The Heart is a Lonely Hunter", in which the author makes a very personal critique of the film, relating its story with his own, although he insistently writes that he is not an auteurist cri-

tic. On the other hand, the text by George Cheatham and Edwin Arnaudin, entitled *Salinger's Allusions to My Foolish Heart – The Salinger Movie*, reveals a more plausible literary evidence from *The Catcher in the Rye* than the ones Hamilton attempts to show in his book. The allusion referred by Cheatham and Arnaudin in the novel is about when Holden Caulfield is in the movies, they say about it:

Later that same Sunday evening, after the movie and while in a bar waiting to meet Luce, Holden takes in the scene around him: "Then I watched the phonies for a while. Some guy next to me was snowing hell out of the babe he was with. He kept telling her she had aristocratic hands. That killed me" (142). These lines seem a clear reference to *My Foolish Heart*, in which comments about aristocratic body parts develop a motif that charts the growing relationship between film's two main characters, Walt and Eloise. Initially, Walt, like the "guy" next to Holden, employs the "aristocratic" line as part of his insincere repertoire of seduction (CHEATHAM; ARNAUDIN, 2007, p. 40-41)

Differently from Ian Hamilton's analysis of the film, these authors attempt to find textual evidences to prove the allusion in Salinger's novel about the film. Even though, in most of the critiques about *My Foolish Heart*, the movie adaptation is seen as a symptom of Salinger's short story and, because of this, is disqualified. There is only two analytical works on the cinematographic piece; however, in biographies and reviews this is a material - or data - very much presented. Although, the

commentaries are almost always the same, they do not vary that much in relation to the opinion that the movie was unsuccessful. Even sometimes, it is not hard to find wrong information about the movie, as in the text “Interview with J. D. Salinger”, by Shirlie Blaney, published in November 13, 1953, almost four years after the movie had premiered. Blaney says:

His plans for the future include going to Europe and Indonesia. He will go first to London perhaps to make a movie. One of his books, *Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut*, has been made into a movie, *My Foolish Heart* (BLANEY, 2006, p. 4).

Blaney did not pay attention that “Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut” is not a book, but actually a short story of one of Salinger’s books, *Nine Stories*. Yet, it is a bit weird that in 1953, almost four years after the “disaster” of *My Foolish Heart*, as was reported in the quoted biographies in this essay, Salinger would be thinking of making a new film, based or not in one of his stories. It was probably a mistake of the journalist, or an irony said by Salinger during the interview that Blaney probably did not understand.

Here, I assume, despite all these biographical data, that Salinger’s short story has a political discourse about suburban middle class society in the U.S. Also regarding the short story, I could say that there are literary references that dislocate the story to different space-temporal discourses. Warren French says about the short story:

O final de ‘Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut’ é ‘abrupto’, é fora de propósito, pois o assunto



da estória não é a 'salvação' de Eloise. É, mais exatamente, o reconhecimento, por parte dela, do que lhe aconteceu. Ela é como uma personagem do Inferno de Dante, que não se pode evadir, mas que acaba de descobrir aonde realmente está. Salinger faz contrastar os dois mundos e dramatiza a condição da pessoa que tem o senti-do de compreensão do mundo 'bom', estranho, os Glasses, ao mesmo tempo que tem a força su-ficiente – que geralmente falta aos Glasses – de sobreviver na depravada Connecticut(1966, p. 39, grifos do autor).

It is interesting not to forget, as French says, that "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" is part of the story of one member of the Glass family, Walt. The questions brought in the short story are about the ordinary lives in the suburb; according to Richard Rees is a reference to a short story by Katherine Mansfield. He (1965, p.103-104)says:

I would also like to have illustrated Salinger's delicate use of sentimentality (the story 'Teddy' is an example), and to have shown that when he does wobble he does it in rather the same way as that other exquisite short story writer Katherine Mansfield: 'Eloise shhok Mary Jane's arm. 'I was a nice girl' she pleaded, wasn't I?'(An alcoholic young matron remembering the past in 'Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut' a story whose title, too, recalls Katherine Mansfield not at her best.) (gri-fos do autor).

The short story Richard Rees says Salinger makes reference to is entitled "A suburban fairy tale", from 1919.

As a true fairy tale, the story is composed with many animals, and they are, basically, into the lawn of an ordinary family composed by a father - a "true" Englishman - a mother and a son, none of them are called by their names, but by their initials name's letters. The parents are very non-affective with their son and do not listen to him when he starts to see many hungry sparrows at their lawn. The short story goes in a nonsense way, as if it were an original Lewis Carroll one, when the sparrows become boys and turn into sparrows again, flying afterwards. If we think the construction of this family and Eloise's family, there are few - or none - differences between both, especially the way parents treat the kids in both stories, and how occupied they are with their own lives and disappointments. Also, Mansfield's short story is entitled a tale and also Salinger's one, if we think that Uncle Wiggily is a famous book character from children literature, having many stories entitled "Uncle Wiggily in...", for instance "Uncle Wiggily in Wonderland", by Howard R. Garis, from 1921. This little bunny, Uncle Wiggily, is always getting himself in trouble for being too naive; in these situations the narrator - or sometimes the characters of the narrative - refers to him as "Poor Uncle Wiggily" or "Poor little bunny", such as in this example from the book *Uncle Wiggily in Wonderland*:

The rats in the locked room were very busy, getting out their cheese knives and plates, and poor Uncle Wiggily hardly knew what to do with this most unpleasant adventure happening to him, when, all of a sudden, right in the middle of the room, there appeared a big, smiling mouth, with a cheerful grin spread all over it (1921, p. 28).

About "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut", in his book entitled *Fé Desesperada: um estudo de Mailer, Updike, Bellow, Baldwin, Salinger*, Howard Hasper Jr. says that Eloise regrets her feelings because she perceives how it is affecting her family:

O segundo conto, "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut", foi extensamente explorado pelos críticos. Embora uma leitura atenta revele o deliberado artesanato e o enredo elaborado da estória, "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" é na realidade uma vinheta bem simples mas estimulante. Eloise Wengler, dona de casa suburbana, embebeda--se uma tarde em companhia de uma ex-colega e chega à compreensão de que sua infelicidade está destruindo sua filha. Foi-lhe negada a entrada no mágico mundo dos Glass (seu namorado Walt Glass foi morto num acidente no Ja-pão); Eloise casa-se então com um sujeito cacete e sem valor, e vinga-se dele, de sua filha e de sua criada mulata, Grace. As palavras finais de Eloise - "Fui uma boa moça, não fui?" - são o reconhecimento de sua corrupção, é um grito desesperado de socorro a que sua limitada e perversa amiga Mary Jane jamais responderia mesmo que o compreendesse (1972, p. 49).

"Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut's" plot is based on the reunion of Eloise and Mary Jane after several years without seeing each other. They were friends in college, and after both had left it - Eloise after being caught kissing a boyfriend in the elevator and Mary Jane to get married - they stopped seeing each other for a while.

Mary Jane, then, in a very snowy afternoon comes visiting her old friend Eloise at her house in Connecticut after living some letters to her ill boss at his house. Eloise offers drinks to Mary Jane and they start chatting, as if they were not apart from each other for several years. Among many drinks and cigarettes, Eloise and Mary Jane talk, mainly about remembrances about their college period of time. During their conversation, Ramona, Eloise's daughter, goes outside with her imaginary beau, and Mary Jane sees her after this long period of time, now much grown. Eloise treats her daughter as rudely as her husband Lew, who calls her asking for a ride, but she mocks at him and do not go catch him up. Eloise and Mary Jane talk mainly about remembrances of the college time and Eloise especially remembers how Walt Glass, her boyfriend at that time, was so great, the only man that had made her really laugh in her entire life; she also remembers that he once said to her, when she twisted her ankle, "Poor uncle Wiggily", and how funny he used to be before he had died during the War. When Ramona is back from outside, Eloise notice she is a bit feverish and without her invisible friend who had died, Ramona says. The two friends are a bit high of many drinks and cigarettes they had and Eloise feels a bit concerned about Ramona. Eloise then goes to Ramona bedroom to see if she is better, sits beside her and says "Poor uncle Wiggily". After that, she goes downstairs to the living room, where Mary Jane is taking a nap on the couch, and asks her "I was a nice girl, wasn't I?"

The film *My Foolish Heart* has some important changes in relation to the short story plot. Mary Jane, in a rainy day, visits her friend from college, Eloise, who

is married to Lew and has a daughter called Ramona. They start talking and drinking when Lew calls Eloise to ask her for a ride, but she denies sarcastically. Ramona goes to play with her invisible friend outside and after this, she comes inside a bit sick. When Lew arrives he starts to have a discussion with Eloise and both decide, rudely with each other, it is time to break up the relationship, but Lew wants to stay with Ramona and Eloise does not agree with it, saying that she will keep Ramona with her. Mary Jane tries to calm down Eloise, putting aside Lew from the bedroom. Eloise while packing her clothes to run away from home with Ramona finds an old dress she wore in the day she met Walt, her boyfriend from college time. Then, starts a flashback where Eloise and Mary Jane were in college. Eloise was dating Lew when met Walt and fell in love with him. After that she starts dating Walt, who Eloise thought he was a funny and charming guy, and Mary Jane starts dating Lew. However, Walt was serving the army and barely could see Eloise. Some time after, Eloise is caught in the elevator of the college dependences kissing Walt, and she gets expelled from it. To get worse, Eloise finds out she is pregnant from a Walt's baby, but do not tell anybody about it but her friend Mary Jane. Walt goes to the war and there, in a plane accident, pass away. Eloise, then, marry to Lew after a party where he declares himself to be in love with her yet. After remember all these episodes Eloise says to Lew and Mary Jane – who assume that are back together – to keep Ramona with them. Then, she goes to Ramona's bedroom to check if she is better and she says "Poor uncle Wiggily" to her. Mary Jane sees Eloise talking this to Ramona and

says to her to stay with the girl. Mary Jane and Lew left home and the film ends.

Although the narratives of short story and film have many differences, the intention here is not to compare both in order to dis/qualify one or other, but to think how some elements were used (or not used) in order to build a discourse in each one. For this, I will focus on fragments of both literary and film pieces due to think how space-temporal elements are used to construct these discourses. The importance here is not in relation to the difference/similarity between cinema and literary means to reproduce these similar stories. Respecting the film adaptation theories, the importance here is how both discourses are built with the space-temporal elements and how they contribute to the final products, i.e., short story and film.

Linda Seger, in her book entitled *A Arte da Adaptação: como transformar fatos em ficção* focus the first chapter on the difficulty of adapting books to cinema. Seger re-reflects on the experiences of reading a book – or I can say a narrative – and watching a film, and raises the differences of both to the reader/spectator in relation to time spent for them to conclude each one of the pieces. She (2007, p. 31) says:

E é exatamente esta diferença que causa dificuldades para a transformação do livro em filme. Ao lermos um livro, o tempo está a nosso favor. Não se trata de uma experiência puramente cronológica, em que outra pessoa determina o nosso ritmo, mas sim de uma experiência reflexiva.

And she continues reflecting on the difficulties of adaptation from books into films through a perspecti-

ve of time, when saying that a book needs many pages to describe or define a scene when a film need no more than few minutes to reproduce it. However, it seems that Seger has few examples in mind when writing it, because this is not a standard regarding many different literary writing' styles and also different film styles that her argument does not support. If thinking on Salinger' short story to its film adaptation it is possible to perceive that this short narrative, with only twenty pages of a pocket book, replete with dialogs and almost no movement, could better fit in a short film than in a long one. Or better, in a play because of its form, as Kenneth Slawenski had already said:

The sale of 'Uncle Wiggily' paid handsomely and assured Salinger increased exposure for his work. Potentially, it was a tremendous advance for his career. Though 'Uncle Wiggily' might have fitted neatly onto the stage of a play, the story consisted almost entirely of dialogue and was simply too short for a film (2010, p. 182).

In this case, Slawenski would probably agree that "Uncle Wiggily" is very much similar with its contemporary play *Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf*, written by the American writer Edward Albee and first published in 1961, thirteen years after Salinger' short story publication in *The New Yorker*. It is not only the form of both writings: the dialogs, the use of italics emphasizing the tone of voice of the character's words, the lack of movement and actions during the scenes and the use of few different locations/spaces in each stories. But also the main characters Eloise, in "Uncle Wiggily", and Martha, in *Who's afraid*,

because both of them are frustrated middle class women who overuse the drinking of alcohol and opt for a hostile behavior with their family, especially with their husbands, Lew and George, respectively. In the book *Existencialismo e Alienação na Literatura Norteamericana*, Sidney Finkelstein opens the dialog between the works of Salinger and Albee, in the subtext entitled “Guerra Fria, Revigoroamento Religioso e Alienação Familiar: William Styron, J. D. Salinger e Edward Albee”; he says about them:

Muito do valor de Salinger está no fato de ter e demonstrar um sentimento de simpatia e ter tornado explícito, de maneira a nos fazer refletir, um aspecto social significativo que vem emergindo da realidade. Escreve sobre a alienação sem ser escritor alienado. [...] A motivação da peça e razão de seu título é uma paródia de “Quem tem medo do lobo mau?”. No final, quando George, ternamente, cantarola para Martha ‘Quem tem medo de Virginia Woolf...’, ela responde: ‘Eu...tenho...George...eu...tenho...’. A verdade que daí podemos deduzir não é que a vida seja absurda ou sem sentido, mas que as pessoas cujas vidas, alienadas de parte de si mesmas, tornaram-se vazias e imotivadas. O ‘nada’ da morte é o reflexo do nada de suas vidas (STYRON, 1965, p. 221, 223, grifos do autor).

The difference between both pieces is that when adapted to cinema, into the homonymous *Who’s afraid of Virginia Woolf* (1966), the structure of Albee’s play was maintained, probably because the play has a long leng-



th, what facilitates the argument in order not to have many changes in it. This did not happen with *My Foolish Heart*, which had in its argument a composition of flashback, regarding Eloise's memories about her college time. The problematic issue is not that the brothers Epstein's argument had creation on Salinger's short story when piercing it to film, but that the argument changed its structure characteristics - the ones that re-veal a connection with theater and also the characteristics of Eloise, by putting her as a melancholic college girl. It is important to remember what Walter Benjamin was thinking in the beginning of the twentieth century about the authenticity of work of art in its reproduction:

Mesmo na reprodução mais perfeita, um elemento está ausente: o aqui e agora da obra de arte, sua existência única, no lugar em que ela se encontra. É nessa existência única, e somente nela, que se desdobra a história da obra. [...] O aqui e agora do original constitui o conteúdo da sua autenticidade, e nela se enraíza uma tradição que identifica esse objeto, até os nossos dias, como sendo *aquele* objeto, sempre igual e idêntico a si mesmo. *A esfera da autenticidade, como num todo escapa à reproduzibilidade técnica, e naturalmente não apenas à técnica* (1986, p. 167, grifo do autor).

Benjamin, then, states that with the technique and the reproducibility of art there is an impossibility to achieve the authenticity of the masterpiece. And still, Benjamin says that the dramatic art is the one which has more difficulties in reproducing it, because of its acting that originates from the actor. Benjamin says:

A arte contemporânea será tanto mais eficaz quanto mais se orientar em função da reproduzibilidade e, portanto, quanto menos colocar em seu centro a obra original. É óbvio, à luz dessas reflexões, porque a arte dramática é de todas a que enfrenta a crise mais manifesta. Pois nada contrasta mais radicalmente com a obra de arte sujeita ao processo de reprodução técnica, e por ele engendrada, a exemplo do cinema, que a obra teatral, caracterizada pela atuação sempre nova e originária do ator (1986, p. 180, 181).

Here, Benjamin points out that drama is not as reproducible as cinema, because of its dependency, in a different way, on the actor. It is not a matter of reproducing a masterpiece by using technology, but permitting the actor to go on stage and perform the text, reproduce it. Another important thing that differs drama and cinema is the editing, which in cinema enables the actor to perform illusionary images made by techniques, in order that in drama the actor has to perform the character in its interior, in a unitary form.

*My Foolish Heart* brings the technique of editing to delimit time and space in the narrative - probably this would not be possible in "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" if thinking on what Salinger presented to the public, a short story very concentrated on drama elements. This editing is presented exactly in the frame which clashes the narrative from what the short story presents: the scene where Eloise and Lew discuss and she goes after to her bedroom to pack her clothes in her luggage to get out of home. Eloise, when getting her clothes off the closet, grabs her old dress from college time in

a very melancholic way - here, there is a close-up into Eloise's thoughtful expression while holding the dress and Mary Jane stops talking to her, feeling that Eloise was away from the conversation.

While going out of her closet, going slowly in the di-rection of her bed, Eloise says to Mary Jane "Look what I found" (00:12:41), and Mary Jane comes closely to Eloise and answers, "What is it, El?" (00:12:44). Then, in an American plane - where the frame shows Eloise and Mary Jane, both trimmed by their knees, approximate-ly - Eloise seats down on her bed, still holding her old dress and says to Mary Jane:

Eloise: Listen, Mary Jane, please. You remember when we were in college and I had this brown-and-white dress I bought in the Boise? And Miriam Ball told me nobody wore those kind of dresses in New York, and I cried all night? I was a nice girl, wasn't I?

Mary Jane: Yes. Yes, Eloise, you were.

Eloise: I was a nice girl, wasn't I? (00:12:45 - 00:13:19)

Then, the camera closes up into Eloise and follows her lying down on the bed, leaning her head on the headboard of it. Eloise fixes her eyes to nowhere, as if she could look at inside her memories, while the song "My Foolish Heart", by Victor Young, starts to play outside the time and space of the narrative, that is, not in a representation of the diegesis form. While the theme song is playing and the frame is focused on Eloise's face, she says one more time, "I was a nice girl, wasn't I", but it does not seem that she is still talking to Mary Jane, but

actually, she seems to be talking to herself by this time, profoundly into her feelings and memories.

Then, Eloise starts to remember her college days; the space and the time of the narrative goes years back, using the film resource of fading out - in Eloise's face close-up - as a flashback, and another narrative begins. The connection point that links one narrative to the other is Eloise's close-up fading out the frame into the college party actions, where Eloise is wearing her brown-and-white dress.

The second narrative, the flashback, has little to do with the short story one, not only in terms of over creation on the story - which was probably very much necessary because of the difference of length of both short story and film - but also in terms of structure and form, the narrative is completely different from the beginning of the film, it is a typical Hollywood film narrative, with many actions and movement, which does not follow the original form from the short story, that is, with many dialogs and replete of drama elements. Anyway, in the beginning of *My Foolish Heart* it seems that the movie will bring the structure of a play, as "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" suggests during all its short story, but it stops at this point, according to Slawenski:

The opening scenes of *My Foolish Heart* hold closely to Salinger's original version, and some of the initial dialogue is verbatim. Quoted repeatedly is the line 'Poor Uncle Wiggily', which, in the film, is an expression of sympathy that falls flat and is overused. But the plot soon deviates into a tale that has little to do with the original. To say that Hollywood took liberties with 'Uncle Wiggily' when devising *My Foolish Heart* would be an understatement (SLAWENSKI, 2010, p. 183, grifos do autor).

Bella Josef, in her book entitled *A Máscara e o Enigma* when discoursing about the differences between literature and cinema in relation to space and time says:

No romance, o espaço é abstrato (significado por palavras) e o tempo é intensamente marcado na sequencialidade da obra e na duração da leitura. No filme, que é também uma cadeia nar-rativa, as marcações temporais são difíceis, en-quanto que o espaço, perceptível, concretizado, vem antes do tempo e determina (JOSEF, 1986, p. 369).

As can be noticed in this passage by Josef, there are important differences in how a film and a written narrative<sup>13</sup> regarding the issues of time and space. Later on, she continues developing this issue by saying:

O tempo do cinema, como o da vida, é sempre relativo a um espaço (exemplo: o movimento), e o que é levado no tempo, é a imagem que modifica sem cessar seu espaço diante de nossos olhos. No entanto, o espaço preenche o tempo com sua presença obrigatória, e o tempo torna-se menos manejável do que no romance, pois o cineasta é obrigado, quando quer deslocar o tempo, de deslocar o espaço (ex.: *flash-back*). Assim, pois, o romance, que tem o tempo de saída, projeta-se para o espaço, enquanto que o filme, que tem de saída o espaço, projeta-se no tempo (JOSEF, 1986, p. 378).

---

<sup>13</sup>I will read written narratives instead of novels in Bella Josef writings in order not to focus on only one literary genre, since this essay is dealing with written and filmic productions.

What Bella Josef tries to say when explaining the use of time and space in the cinema is that in films time is presented by movements and changes of space, that is, in order to dislocate time, it is necessary to also dislocate space, something that is not mandatory in written narratives. This is very much perceptible in the examples of "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" in comparison to *My Foolish Heart*. In the short story there is no need of a resource such as flashback, because the narrator is already narrating the story from a past perspective, as can be exemplified here:

"Let it freeze. Go phone. Say you're dead," said Eloise. "Gimme that."

"Well...Where's the phone?"

"It went," said Eloise, carrying the empty glasses and walking toward the dining room, "this-a-way." She stopped short on the floor board between the living room and the dining room and executed a grind and a bump. Mary Jane giggled.

"I mean you didn't really *know* Walt," said Eloise at a quarter of five, lying on her small-breasted chest. "He was the only boy I ever knew that could make me laugh. I mean *really* laugh." She looked over at Mary Jane. "You remember that night – our last year – when that crazy Lou-ise Hermanson busted in the room wearing that black brassière she bought in Chicago?" (JOSEF, 1991, p. 28)

Differently from *My Foolish Heart*, the short story presents a space-temporal relationship through elements that represent chronotopes. For Mikhail Bakhtin,

chronotope (from Greek: *kronos* = time; *topos* = space) is “the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature” (1981, p. 84). Bakhtin thinks time as a fourth dimension of space and brings this idea when analyzing literary elements in narratives that have a metaphorical and symbolical chronotope, which means that it happens in a moment of crisis. Explaining the chronotope of the threshold, Bakhtin (1981, p. 48) says:

We will mention one more chronotope of *threshold*; it can be combined with the motif of encounter, but its most fundamental instance is as the chronotope of *crisis* and *break* in a life. The word ‘threshold’ itself already has a metaphorical meaning in everyday usage (together with its literal meaning), and is connected with the breaking point of a life, the moment of crisis, the decision that changes a life (or indecisiveness that fails to change a life, the fear to step over the threshold) (*grifos do autor*).

In both *My Foolish Heart* and “Uncle Wiggily”, the epiphany - and at the same time the crisis - of the main character, Eloise, happens when she is asking to herself “I was a nice girl, wasn’t I?”, although film and short story put this episode in different times in the narratives - the film in the middle and the short story in the very end of it. As Bakhtin says, the chronotope of “threshold” is the turning point of the narrative, what means that “time is essentially instantaneous; it is as if it has no duration and falls out of the normal course of biographical time” (BAKHTIN, 1981, p. 248).

In *My Foolish Heart* sequence plane during the discussion between Eloise and Lew – when Mary Jane is called by Eloise to go upstairs to stay around them – they are placed in an upstairs corridor of the house, in between the bedroom and the stairs. As Bakhtin affirms, these moments of break or crisis are mainly in places of passage and movement, and so it is in the film *My Foolish Heart*, even when Eloise is in her bedroom packing her clothes, she is passing from her closet to her bedroom all the time while talking to Mary Jane, implying a movement and a change in her life, and also in the narrative, caused by her crisis. The sequence plane does not bring any ellipse, and it can be noticed when Mary Jane goes upstairs due to Eloise called her (00:11:06), there is no interruption in it she goes step-by-step (00:11:18). Although there is some editing/cuts in it, the exact moment when Eloise calls Mary Jane, the camera is no more placed downstairs showing Eloise and Lew upstairs, in the frame from down to up, but the camera is placed upstairs behind Eloise's shoulder, in first plane, and Mary Jane walking up the stairs (00:11:12).

Then, there is another editing (00:11:20), when Mary Jane is saying to Eloise that she had already talked to Lew about him willing to stay with Ramona: the camera now is placed behind Mary Jane's shoulder, showing Eloise in second plane and Lew in the back, looking at them talking. Still in the corridor, in the third frame of the sequence plane, the camera is placed in front of the stairs, showing Mary Jane and Lew – one in front of the other – and Eloise in between them, with her body turned front to the camera (00:11:31); Eloise gets mad at both, feeling betrayed by them and walk away in the direction of her bedroom. In the fourth frame, the came-



ra shows Eloise walking to her bedroom in almost the same position as the one before, but a little more behind it, in an American plane, showing almost the characters whole body, trimmed by their knees (00:11:40). The American plane continues in the fifth frame, when Eloise turns right to enter in her bedroom and Lew follows her – and the camera follows Lew, showing his back at the door, in the first plane, and Eloise entering in the bedroom, trimmed by her knees (00:11:44), when Mary Jane comes from behind the camera and stays in front of Lew, asking him to leave them alone to talk (00:11:49).

The camera, then, follows Eloise acts, which is to open the closet door (00:11:58), and here there is the sixth frame, where the camera is placed inside the closet, showing Eloise opening the door and entering in it (00:12:00). While Eloise gets her luggage, Lew goes out of the bedroom and Mary Jane closes the door (00:12:04). The camera, then, inside the closet, follows Eloise packing her clothes in a sequence that lasts one minute, while she is talking to Mary Jane when finds her brown-and-yellow dress. When Eloise seats down on her bed, there is the sixth frame of this sequence plane, where the camera is closed up by Eloise's breast, holding her dress against it (00:13:00); in the seventh frame where it shows Eloise's back and shoulders and Mary Jane's body up to her knees, crouching herself into Eloise's height, to sit down on the bed (00:13:12). Then, in the last frame, the camera starts to close up Eloise's face even more (00:13:27), where the non-diegetic song "My Foolish Heart" is played and Eloise starts to remember her old days of college (00:13:32) and the closed-up frame of Eloise's face fades out into Eloise's memories of the college party.

In the short story, although, there is a lack of movement because of its drama elements, but before Eloise wakes up Mary Jane, in order to ask her if she was indeed a nice girl, she leaves her daughter's bedroom and walks down the stairs to *encounter* Mary Jane:

Eloise kissed her wetly on the mouth and wiped the hair out of her eyes and then left the room. She went downstairs, staggering now very badly, and wakened Mary Jane. "Wuzzat? Who? Huh?" said Mary Jane, sitting bolt upright on the couch. (SALINGER, 1991, p. 37-38)

Another element that can be seen as a chronotope is the use of telephone in both film and short story. The telephone, as can be noticed during the conversation between Eloise and Mary Jane exemplified before (1991), is a connection to another space-temporal connection: characters in different places can only be connected in the narratives by the use of telephones. The connection between characters is broken when Eloise does not accept to share the same space with Lew, in both film and short story. Eloise avoids sharing spaces with her relatives and Grace – her maid – and her husband and she uses the communication to achieve these separations – and telephone is a mean to achieve that.

The positions of the camera in the frames of the sequence plane analyzed here are interesting because in the short story the narrator – that in the film can be seen as the camera – does not move that much, it stays similar to what the camera in *My Foolish Heart* does, being behind the back of the characters. As it can be noticed in this part, Eloise and Mary Jane are talking to each

other in the living room when Eloise goes to the kitchen to prepare one more drink to each of them. The narra-tor, though, stays in the living room narrating the ac-tions of Mary Jane; it is interesting because the narra-tor is so attached to Mary Jane actions, that the reader is also distracted and caught by surprise when Eloise is in the living room with the drinks. Mary Jane was distrac-ted with her actions and did not perceive Eloise coming, and consequently, neither the narrator.

Mary Jane threw back her head and roared again, but Eloise had already gone into the ki-tchen. With little or no wherewithal for being left alone in a room, Mary Jane stood up and walked over the window. She drew aside the curtain and leaned her wrist on one of the crosspieces between panes, but, feeling grit, she removed it, rubbed it clean with her other hand, and stood up more erectly. Outside, the filthy slush was visibly turning to ice. Mary Jane let go the curtain and wandered back to the blue chair, passing two heavily stocked bookcases without glancing at any of the ti-tles. Seated, she opened her handbag and used the mirror to look at her teeth. She closed her lips and ran her tongue hard over her upper front teeth, then took another look. 'It's get-ting so *icy* out', she said, turning. 'God, that was quick. Didn't you put any soda in them?' Eloise, with a fresh drink in each hand, sto-pped short. She extended both index fingers, gun-muzzle style, and said, 'Don't nobody move. I got the whole damn place surroun-ded' (SALINGER, 1991, p. 22, grifos do autor).

Another interesting point in each masterpiece is the use – or overuse – of some expressions. As Slawenski emphasizes, in relation to the movie, there is an overuse of the expression “poor uncle Wiggily”. It is also possible to think that the expression/question Eloise says, in the scene already mentioned, to Mary Jane “I was a nice girl, wasn’t I?” is overused as well. And when one expression, pretty meaningful as these ones, is overused, they lose their power; language and meaning are trivialized by the repetition of it during the narrative of the film. In the short story the expression “I was a nice girl, wasn’t I?” is only said by Eloise once, in the last sentence of it:

Mary Jane. Listen. Please,” Eloise said, sobbing. “You remember our freshman year, and I had that brown-and-yellow dress I bought in Boi-se, and Miriam Ball told me nobody wore tho-se kind of dresses in New York, and I cried all night?” Eloise shook Mary Jane’s arm. “I was a nice girl,” she pleaded, “wasn’t I? (SALINGER, 1991, p. 38, grifos do autor).

This way, the choice to put Eloise’s memories of her college years and of Walt Glass, that in the movie is Walt Dreiser<sup>14</sup>, making a transposition of space to mean time, when fading out Eloise’s present frame into another from

---

<sup>14</sup>The change of the last name of the only Glass character of "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" in *My Foolish Heart* is pretty symptomatic, because by avoiding the use of the last name Glass, the film does not attach itself with any other stories by Salinger that present the Glass family characters. This shows that the film was not suppose to be closed into Salinger's creation, because taking away the Glass from the narrative, it dislocate the story away from the whole context in which the family Glass stories are put in, ena-bling for the screenwriters a more free adaptation.

the past, was made maybe in order to facilitate better the understanding of this narrative on the screen. Another option would be make a movie based on the dialogs, like *Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf*, but then, it would be lose in actions - and the choice of how to put the narrative on screen is not only based on the cinema techniques, but also on how it is going to be affected on the target public.

With the aim of comparing pieces of "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut" and a scene of *My Foolish Heart* regarding the space-temporal using literary, film and adaptation theories, I may say that both short story and movie have ample connection with Bakhtin theory on chronotopes and configure masterpieces replete of elements that characterize both in very space-temporal concerned forms. The intention here was not to qualify/disqualify any of both works, but to think about how they make the use of space-temporal elements in their narratives, being aware that they have their own differences due to the possibilities of the mean of each one. Despite of the analyzes of the parts of the narratives, I had the intention to make a review of literature of both film and short story, collecting many different texts about them that were published in magazines, newspapers, books, anthologies and others. Yet, daring to manage biographical issues and critical ones, I come here once more to say that at any time it was my intention to make a biographical reading of any of these two masterpieces. Although, the biographical issues are indeed important as data which permitted myself to problematize many symptomatic questions on J.D. Salinger and *My Foolish Heart* relationship. Among these issues brought in this essay, I hope this may be a beginning of the study on this very hard piece to find the movie *My Foolish Heart* is.

## References

ALBEE, E. **Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?** London: Jonathan Cape, 1964.

ARNAUDIN, E.; CHEATHAM, G. Salinger's allusions to my foolish heart– the Salinger movie. **Greensboro College**, Greensboro, v. 20, no. 2, p. 39-43, Spring 2007.

BAKHTIN, M. **The Dialogic Imagination**. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

BENJAMIN, W. **Obras escolhidas: magia e técnica, arte e política**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986.

CROWTHER, B. **My Foolish Heart (1949)**. The screen in review; 'May Foolish Heart,' with Dana Andrews, Susan Hayward, New Bill at Music Hall. New York: The New York Times, May 15, 2014. (Movies. The New York Times Review). Published: January 20, 1950.

CROWFORD, C. **If you really want to hear about it: writers on J.D. Salinger and his work**. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2006.

FINKELSTEIN, S. **Existencialismo e alienação na literatura norte-americana**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1965.

FRENCH, W. **Clássicos do nosso tempo: J.D. Salinger**. Rio de Janeiro: Lidador, 1966.

GARIS, H. R. **Uncle wiggily in wonderland**. New York: A. L. Burt Company, 1921.

HAMILTON, I. **Em busca de J.D. Salinger**. Rio de Janeiro: Casa Maria Editorial, 1988.

HARPER JR., H. M. **Fé desesperada**: um estudo de Bellow, Salinger, Mailer, Baldwin e Updike. Rio de Janeiro: Lido, 1972.

JOSEF, B. **A máscara e o enigma, a modernidade**: da representação à transgressão. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 2006.

MY FOOLISH heart. Direção de Mark Robson.  
[Hollywood?]: Samuel Goldwyn Home Entertainment, 1949. 1DVD (98'), widescreen, color., legendado.

PIGLIA, R. **Formas breves**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000.

REES, R. **The Salinger situation**. Contemporary American novelists. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.

ROCHA, G. **O século do cinema**. São Paulo: CosacNaify, 2006.

ROLLO, A. C. **Duas representações de família**: os Glass, de J. D. Salinger, e os Tenenbaum, de Wes Anderson & Owen Wilson. 2006. Dissertação (Mestrado em Literatura Comparada)– Instituto de Letras, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2006. Disponível em: <<http://www.lume.ufrgs.br/bitstream/handle/10183/17525/000716354.pdf?sequence=1>>. Acesso em: mar. 2013.

SALINGER, J.D. **Nine stories**. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. **The Catcher in the Rye**. London: Penguin Books, 2008.

SARRIS, Andrew. The Heart is a Lonely Hunter. In:**Film Comment**;Jan 1991; 27, 1; Research Library.

SEGER, L. **A arte da adaptação**: como transformar fatos e ficção em filme.São Paulo: Bossa Nova, 2007.

SLAWENSKI, K. **Salinger**:a life.New York: Random House, 2010.

THE DARJEELING Limited.Direção de Wes Anderson. Los Angeles (USA): 20th Century Fox, 2007. 1 DVD (91'), widescreen, color., subtitled.

THE ROYAL Tenenbaums.Direção de Wes Anderson. Burbank: Touchstone Pictures;[S.I.]: American Empirical Pictures, 2001.1 DVD (110'), widescreen, color., subtitled.

WHO'S afraid of Virginia Woolf?Direção de MikeNichols. New York: Warner Bros. Pictures, 1966, 1 DVD (131'), widescreen, color., subtitled.