

From Literary Code to Cinematic Sign: Adaptation and Visual Semiotics in The Da Vinci Code

من الشفرة الأدبية إلى العلامة السينمائية: التكيف
والسيمائيات البصرية في شيفرة دافنشي

Du code littéraire au signe cinématographique : adaptation et
sémiotique visuelle dans The Da Vinci Code

AYA HAFDALLAH

Training and Research Unit in Theories of Reading and Methodologies

Mohamed Khider University of Biskra (Algeria)

BP 145 RP, 07000 Biskra, Algérie

aya.hafdallah@univ-biskra.dz

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-7364-2967>

Date de réception	Publication numérique	Archivage ASJP
04/06/2025	18/12/2025	

Référence électronique

Aya Hafdallah, “ From Literary Code to Cinematic Sign: Adaptation and Visual Semiotics in The Da Vinci Code ”, Aleph [En ligne], Vol 13 (1) | 2026, mis en ligne le 16 avril 2026, consulté le 24 mai 2026. URL: <https://aleph.edinum.org/16280>

Référence papier (archivage (Asjp))

Aya Hafdallah, “ From Literary Code to Cinematic Sign: Adaptation and Visual Semiotics in The Da Vinci Code ”, Aleph, Vol 13 (1) | 2026, 271–289.

© Auteur(s), 2026. Les auteurs conservent leurs droits.

Article diffusé en accès ouvert sous licence Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International—CC BY 4.0, sauf mention contraire portée sur la page de publication.

Abstract

This article examines the passage from literary code to cinematic sign in Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code* and Ron Howard's film adaptation. Combining close reading with scene analysis, it studies how adaptation redistributes symbolic density through changes in temporality, framing, montage, sound, and the treatment of recurring motifs. The corpus is limited to sequences and objects central to the narrative economy of both works: Saunière's inscriptions, the Fibonacci sequence, the anagram, the Vitruvian staging of the body, Newton's tomb, the cryptex, and the Louvre pyramids. Rather than measuring the film by fidelity alone, the study analyses the transfer of meaning from discursive exposition to audiovisual concentration. It argues that the adaptation preserves the novel's broad symbolic itinerary while compressing explanation into visual thresholds, acoustic cues, and rhythmic suspense. The article finally insists on a critical distinction between diegetic efficiency, historical validity, and ideological projection, a distinction required for any rigorous scholarly reading of this controversial corpus.

Keywords

adaptation studies, film semiotics, symbolic density, narrative temporality, visual rhetoric, Dan Brown; Ron Howard

الملخص

تتناول هذه الدراسة مسألة الانتقال من النص الروائي إلى الخطاب الفيلمي من خلال تحليل رواية شيفرة دافنشي لدان براون وتمثّلاتها السينمائية. وتهدف إلى بيان الكيفية التي تتحول بها الشفرات السردية والرموز الثقافية والدينية من بنية لغوية مكتوبة إلى علامات بصرية وسمعية داخل الفيلم. وتنطلق الدراسة من فرضية مفادها أن التكييف السينمائي لا يقتصر على نقل الأحداث والشخصيات، بل يعيد بناء الدلالة وفق منطق الصورة، وحركة الكاميرا، والمونتاج، والإيقاع، وتنظيم الفضاء المشهدي. وفي هذا السياق، تبحث الدراسة في العلاقة بين الأدب والسينما بوصفها علاقة تحويل دلالي وجمالي، حيث تنتقل العلامة من مجال التخيل القرائي المفتوح إلى مجال التمثيل البصري المؤطر. كما تحلل بعض الرموز المركزية في العمل، مثل الشفرة، والجسد، واللوحة، والعلامات ذات الحمولة الدينية، من أجل إبراز دور السيميائيات البصرية في إنتاج المعنى وفي توجيه فعل التلقي. وتخلص الدراسة إلى أن الفيلم لا يكتفي

بتكثيف الرواية أو اختزالها، بل يعيد صياغة بنيتها الرمزية ضمن نظام تعبيرى خاص، يجعل من الصورة وسيطاً تأويلياً قائماً بذاته، ويمنح العمل بعداً تداولياً وجمالياً جديداً.

الكلمات المفتاحية

التكثيف السينمائي؛ السيميائيات البصرية؛ العلامة؛ الرمز؛ الرواية؛ السينما؛ شيفرة دافنشي.

Résumé

Cet article examine le passage du code littéraire au signe cinématographique dans *The Da Vinci Code* de Dan Brown et dans son adaptation filmique par Ron Howard. En associant lecture rapprochée et analyse de scènes, il étudie la manière dont l'adaptation redistribue la densité symbolique à travers la temporalité, le cadrage, le montage, le son et le traitement des motifs récurrents. Le corpus est centré sur des séquences et des objets décisifs dans l'économie narrative des deux œuvres : les inscriptions laissées par Saunière, la suite de Fibonacci, l'anagramme, la mise en scène vitruvienne du corps, le tombeau de Newton, le cryptex et les pyramides du Louvre. Au lieu d'évaluer le film uniquement au regard de la fidélité, l'étude analyse le transfert du sens de l'exposé discursif à la concentration audiovisuelle. Elle montre que l'adaptation conserve l'itinéraire symbolique général du roman tout en comprimant l'explication dans des seuils visuels, des indices acoustiques et un suspense rythmique. L'article insiste enfin sur la nécessité de distinguer efficacité diégétique, validité historique et projection idéologique, distinction indispensable à toute lecture scientifique rigoureuse d'un corpus aussi controversé.

Mots-clés

études de l'adaptation, sémiotique filmique, densité symbolique, temporalité narrative, rhétorique visuelle, Dan Brown, Ron Howard

Introduction

The relationship between literature and cinema has often been described either in the language of continuity or in that of loss. In the first case, film is imagined as the natural extension of narrative writing into visual form; in the second, it is judged by what it suppresses, abbreviates, or simplifies when a novel is adapted for the screen. Both approaches remain insufficient. They overlook the fact that literature and cinema organize signification through materially different economies. The novel unfolds by means of words that activate mental images, speculative inferences, and deferred visualizations. Film, by contrast, offers visible and audible forms that create a more immediate sensorium while simultaneously multiplying framing effects, acoustic cues, and montage-based relations. The issue is therefore not whether one medium is superior to the other, nor whether the film is faithful in an absolute sense, but how meaning migrates, condenses, expands, or changes status when it moves from one semiotic regime to another (Chatman, 1978; Hutcheon, 2013; Stam, 2005).

This problem becomes especially visible in symbolic thrillers. Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code* is built on the continuous conversion of cultural references into clues: names, paintings, inscriptions, numbers, architectural forms, myths, and religious controversies are folded into a narrative machine of pursuit and decipherment. The reader does not simply follow events; he or she is repeatedly positioned before signs that require decoding. The novel's suspense depends less on physical action alone than on the interpretation of traces. Ron Howard's 2006 adaptation inherits this structure, yet it cannot reproduce it by merely illustrating the novel. What prose distributes across explanatory passages, delayed revelations, and interpretive commentary, the film must reorganize through bodies in space, camera movement, editing, tonal atmosphere, and the controlled disclosure of objects. The result is not a transparent transfer from page to screen but a redistribution of symbolic labor.

Such a case is particularly instructive because *The Da Vinci Code* occupies an unstable cultural territory. It borrows from detective fiction, historical speculation, religious controversy, museum culture, conspiracy narrative, and popular semiotics. It stages symbols as if they were at once scholarly objects, theological detonators, and engines of suspense. This mixture partly explains its international circulation as both bestseller and controversial film. It also explains why scholarly commentary on the work must remain methodologically vigilant. A symbolic object in the diegesis does not become historically valid merely because the plot invests it with narrative force. The task of criticism is therefore double: first, to understand how symbols function inside the narrative economy of the novel and the film; second, to distinguish this internal function from any unexamined historical or doctrinal claim.

The present article pursues this double aim through a comparative analysis of Brown's novel and Howard's adaptation. More precisely, it asks four related questions. How is narrative temporality transformed when a code-driven novel is compressed into a feature film? How do shot scale, montage, framing, and sound convert textual clues into cinematic signs? How are recurring objects and motifs—the Fibonacci sequence, the anagram, the Vitruvian body, the cryptex, Newton's tomb, the Louvre pyramids—redistributed between discursive explanation and visual rhetoric? And finally, what kinds of continuity and divergence can be observed between the novel and the film without reducing the analysis to a simplistic opposition between fidelity and betrayal (Brown, 2003; Howard, 2006)?

Methodologically, the study combines close reading and scene analysis. It does not seek to establish an exhaustive catalog of all symbolic references in the corpus. Instead, it selects recurrent moments where the transfer from literary sign to cinematic sign becomes especially legible. The analysis is informed by adaptation theory, particularly the view that adaptation is a process of repetition with variation rather than derivative impoverishment (Hutcheon, 2013; Stam, 2005). It also draws on film semiotics, especially the work of Christian Metz, for whom cinema functions as a language-like system whose signifying processes cannot be reduced to a stable code comparable to verbal language (Metz, 1974). Additional use is made of reflections on cinematic form, framing, and narration developed by Bazin, Mitry, Monaco, Bordwell, Thompson, Chatman, and Gaudreault and Jost (Bazin, 2005; Bordwell & Thompson, 2019; Chatman, 1978; Gaudreault & Jost, 1999; Mitry, 1997; Monaco, 2009).

The argument advanced here is that Howard's film retains the broad itinerary and symbolic architecture of Brown's thriller, but it relocates complexity from explanatory discursivity to the management of visibility, suspense, and rhythm. In the novel, clues remain embedded in exposition and commentary; in the film, they become charged visual thresholds whose force depends on framing, montage, and acoustic emphasis. This transformation does not mean that the film abolishes ambiguity. Rather, it shifts ambiguity from the space of doctrinal debate to that of perceptual guidance and interpretive timing. Put differently, the adaptation does not merely shorten a story. It reorganizes the conditions under which symbols appear, circulate, and acquire dramatic force.

For that reason, the analysis that follows proceeds in four stages. The first section examines the transformation of narrative temporality and the screenplay's role as an instrument of compression and redistribution. The second studies the semiotics of the cinematic image, with special attention to framing, montage, sound, and a set of recurrent shot scales that structure interpretation in the film. The third focuses on codes and symbols as narrative operators, distinguishing coded procedures from symbolic condensations and cautioning against historical

overstatement. The fourth returns to the comparison between the novel and the film to evaluate what the adaptation preserves, simplifies, displaces, or intensifies. The conclusion argues that the passage from literary code to cinematic sign is best understood not as a deficit but as a change in the mode of symbolic production.

1. Analytical corpus and procedure

The corpus consists of Dan Brown's novel *The Da Vinci Code* (2003) and Ron Howard's film *The Da Vinci Code* (2006), with selective attention to the screenplay's narrative logic, as it becomes legible through the finished film. The procedure is comparative and qualitative. Passages from the novel are read not as stable originals that the film must reproduce verbatim, but as discursive sites whose narrative functions are reworked in the adaptation. Likewise, film scenes are read not only for plot content but for the semiotic work performed by camera distance, angle, montage, sound, and spatial arrangement.

The method, therefore, combines three complementary operations: the identification of recurrent motifs, the comparison of their narrative distribution across both media, and the analysis of the formal means by which each medium constructs interpretive tension. This approach allows the article to move beyond impressionistic statements about fidelity and to specify where, how, and why symbolic density changes form in adaptation.

2. Adaptation and the transformation of narrative temporality

The first major transformation produced by the adaptation concerns narrative time. In Brown's novel, time is not merely the chronological support of action; it is a discursive field across which information is released unevenly. The narrative repeatedly suspends forward movement to insert explanations of Christian iconography, secret societies, historical controversies, cryptography, art history, or prior biographical details. These explanatory pauses are not detachable ornaments. They are part of the suspense mechanism itself. Brown's prose often delays action precisely by making the reader linger before names, works of art, ritual gestures, and encoded phrases. The code is therefore not simply solved within time; it generates time by imposing intervals of interpretation (Brown, 2003).

Film time is materially more constrained. A feature film, even a long one, cannot indefinitely suspend narrative progression without jeopardizing rhythm and audience investment. Adaptation thus requires a redistribution of temporal value. Passages that function in the novel as expository plateaus must be condensed, displaced, or transformed into brief dialogic exchanges, visual insertions, or acoustic markers. This is one of the screenplay's most decisive tasks. It does not merely shorten prose. It translates descriptive and explanatory mass into performable actions, scenic blocks, and moments of heightened legibility. In that

respect, the screenplay should be understood as a matrix of redistribution rather than as a summary (Chatman, 1978; Gaudreault & Jost, 1999).

This redistribution changes the ontology of suspense. In the novel, suspense often arises from the coexistence of action and commentary. A chase sequence may be interrupted by a symbolic explanation; a revelation may trigger a brief historical lesson; a conversation may open into a speculative excursion. The reader's curiosity is stretched across discursive length. In the film, suspense is more tightly bound to immediate progression. Objects appear, are framed, and quickly become operative. The clue must not only signify; it must move the scene forward. This is why the film often compresses or externalizes knowledge. It prefers visible relay points—a painting, a key, a cryptex, a line on a floor, a body posed like a diagram—to more extended speculative development.

To say this is not to accuse the film of superficiality. It is rather to identify a shift in narrative economy. The novel can establish long intervals during which the event becomes temporarily secondary to its interpretation. The film, by contrast, must keep interpretation under the pressure of movement. Viewers are rarely allowed the same expository dwell time as readers. The consequence is that decipherment becomes more kinetic. Knowledge is acquired while moving, looking, escaping, comparing, and reacting. The adaptation thus brings the hermeneutic act closer to bodily action.

This bodily activation is especially visible in the early Louvre sequences. In the novel, Saunière's final inscriptions open a chain of explanatory interpretations that can unfold over pages. In the film, the same clues must be made immediately graspable as visual provocations. The camera singles out writing, positions bodies, isolates the pentagram, and turns the ultraviolet message into a perceptual event. The spectator must feel that the reading itself has become dramatic. What is textual in the novel becomes scenographic in the film. Temporality is no longer governed by paragraphs and chapters alone, but by the speed of disclosure and the pacing of cuts.

A similar logic structures the film's treatment of geographical movement. Brown's novel can spend significant time elaborating the symbolic aura of the Louvre, the Depository Bank of Zurich, Westminster Abbey, or Rosslyn Chapel. The film must establish these spaces more economically. It does so through selective visual cues, orienting shots, and swift transitions that preserve narrative momentum while still attaching cultural resonance to the settings. Here again, the reduction of verbal exposition is compensated by an intensification of framed visibility. Space becomes semantically legible through architectural surfaces, lighting, scale, and sound design.

The adaptation consequently alters the balance between explanation and progression. Brown's prose repeatedly slows down in order to turn the reader into an apprentice interpreter. Howard's film grants less time to doctrinal digression and

instead increases the pressure of pursuit, secrecy, and imminent discovery. This does not eliminate symbolic density; it relocates it. The symbol is no longer primarily developed through discursive extension but through visual concentration. A sign must be readable at a glance while still suggesting hidden depth. Hence the recurrent reliance on close shots of inscriptions, objects, paintings, and coded fragments, each one functioning as a hinge between cognition and movement.

The question of temporality is inseparable from that of hierarchy. In the novel, not all information has the same status, but Brown can distribute that inequality through a layered narrative texture. A minor clue may later become central; a historical digression may retrospectively reframe an earlier scene. The film handles hierarchy differently. Through framing, montage, and sound emphasis, it tells the spectator more directly where to look and what to retain. Adaptation therefore transforms not only the quantity of time devoted to a clue but the mode by which that clue is ranked within the spectator's attention.

This is why fidelity remains an insufficient criterion. A film may retain the novel's major plot while profoundly altering the temporal experience of interpretation. To ask whether Howard remains faithful to Brown is less illuminating than to ask how the adaptation converts narrative duration into perceptual rhythm. The film remains recognizably attached to Brown's symbolic architecture—the murder, the codes, the cryptological relay, the trail through art and architecture, the final displacement toward Rosslyn and back to the Louvre—yet it reorganizes their order of phenomenological impact. The spectator experiences clues as thresholds of visibility before integrating them into extended argument (Brown, 2003; Howard, 2006; Hutcheon, 2013).

Seen from this angle, adaptation is not a fall from plenitude into lack. It is a transformation of semiotic pacing. Literature can make time dense through discursive branching; cinema can make time tense through visible concentration. In *The Da Vinci Code*, the novel's expansiveness and the film's compression do not cancel one another. They reveal two distinct ways of dramatizing interpretation: one through explanatory unfolding, the other through rhythmic condensation (Hutcheon, 2013; Stam, 2005).

3. The semiotics of the cinematic image

If adaptation transforms narrative time, it also transforms the signifying status of the clue. In a literary work, the signifier reaches the reader through language, and its sensory body remains relatively indeterminate until the reader imagines it. In cinema, the signifier is given in visible and audible form from the outset; this apparent concreteness does not abolish interpretation. On the contrary, it multiplies the layers through which meaning can be guided: framing, lighting, camera movement, actor positioning, editing, music, silence, and spatial contrast. The cinematic sign is not simply an image. It is an image organized in time and under perspective (Metz, 1974; Monaco, 2009).

The *Da Vinci Code* is exemplary in this respect because its narrative depends on signs that oscillate between legibility and opacity. Paintings, tombs, numbers, letters, bodies, keys, and architectural alignments are never neutral props. They are visual propositions waiting to be activated. The film must therefore persuade the spectator that looking is itself a dramatic act. It achieves this through a constant articulation between object visibility and narrative urgency. Montage, shot scale, and spatial framing do not merely embellish the story; they construct the very conditions of decipherment.

Sound contributes decisively to this economy. In a symbolic thriller, music and acoustic texture do not only accompany action; they regulate interpretive tension. Howard's film repeatedly uses suspense-laden scoring, reverberation, and moments of acoustic narrowing to transform spaces such as the Louvre, the bank, Westminster Abbey, and Rosslyn Chapel into resonant chambers of meaning. The clue is thus rarely isolated as a purely visual item. It arrives within an audiovisual envelope that announces its importance before it is fully interpreted (Bordwell & Thompson, 2019; Howard, 2006).

The semiotics of the cinematic image in this film can be further clarified by examining recurring shot scales and framing procedures. The following subsections revisit a set of recurrent framing categories in order to describe more precisely how the film organizes spectator attention. The aim is not to reduce the work to a mechanical taxonomy of shots. It is to show how recurring framing choices structure symbolic interpretation and guide perception (Bordwell & Thompson, 2019; Mitry, 1997).

3.1. Cutaways and the authority of artworks

Among the most effective devices in the film are cutaways to paintings, inscriptions, architectural fragments, and coded objects. A cutaway interrupts a sequence in order to isolate a visual element whose significance exceeds its immediate descriptive role. In *The Da Vinci Code*, this device is crucial because symbolic information is often concentrated in objects rather than in speech. The Louvre scenes are particularly revealing. Paintings do not function as inert décor; once isolated by the camera, they become active participants in the narrative. Their temporary extraction from the flow of action elevates them to the status of signs.

This operation is especially important in a film that relies on canonical artworks. A cutaway to Leonardo's *The Last Supper*, to the *Mona Lisa*, or to a written fragment does not simply help the spectator identify what the characters are discussing. It confers authority on the object by allowing it to occupy the screen alone for a brief moment. The artwork becomes both evidence and enigma. Such shots also condense time. What the novel can describe over several lines or pages, the film can intensify by isolating the object and surrounding it with suspense. The cutaway thus serves not only to clarify but also to symbolically magnify.

It is worth noting that the cutaway also serves a disciplinary function. By interrupting the sequence, it briefly imposes an interpretive hierarchy. The spectator is told that this detail matters. In a narrative crowded with visual information, such guidance is indispensable. The cutaway keeps the film from dissolving into scenic abundance by momentarily freezing attention around a sign-bearing fragment.

3.2. Panning shots and guided perception

Horizontal pans frequently accompany moments of search, transition, or guided perception. When the camera moves laterally across a space, it does more than display the décor. It reproduces the act of scanning. In an investigation narrative, this has a clear semiotic value: the spectator is invited to inspect space as if meaning might emerge from its surfaces. Pans across museum interiors, corridors, or rooms help transform architecture into a field of possible clues.

This device is especially effective because it creates a moving relation between concealment and discovery. The clue is not always revealed at once; it may enter the frame progressively as the camera glides. Such movement mimics the work of decipherment itself. Rather than presenting a symbol as a static datum, the pan dramatizes the process by which attention is organized. In that sense, it turns looking into a temporal event.

3.3. Medium framing, dialogue, and shared decipherment

Medium framing and the so-called American shot are central to the dialogic scenes between Langdon and Sophie. These framings preserve enough bodily presence to sustain dramatic relation while remaining close enough to register shifts in interpretation. They are particularly apt for scenes of shared decipherment, where meaning is not produced by solitary contemplation but by exchange, correction, hesitation, and mutual testing.

The recurrent pairing of Langdon and Sophie in such framings also carries a narrative function. It visually stabilizes their alliance in a world structured by institutional suspicion and ideological conflict. Their co-presence in the frame often signals a temporary pocket of interpretive cooperation against surrounding forces such as the police, Opus Dei, or Teabing's manipulations. The shot scale therefore supports both cognition and relational structure.

3.4. Close-ups and the materiality of the clue

Close-ups are among the most important rhetorical instruments in the film. They isolate faces, inscriptions, textures, and coded surfaces, thereby converting local detail into dramatic evidence. A close-up on a face captures not only emotion but thought under pressure; it renders the instant when interpretation begins to modify a character's relation to the situation. In a mystery-thriller, such moments are essential because discovery is often interior before it is verbalized.

At the same time, close-ups on objects give material weight to what the novel can describe verbally. An inscription becomes legible as an inscription; a key becomes heavy with promise; a cryptex becomes something tactile, fragile, and dangerous. The close-up, in other words, prevents the symbol from remaining a purely abstract category. It anchors meaning in a visible surface. This is crucial in *The Da Vinci Code*, where the entire plot depends on the conversion of learned references into manipulable objects.

The close-up also controls intensity. By narrowing the field, it excludes contextual distraction and imposes seriousness on the fragment it selects. In an adaptation where explanatory discursivity must often be shortened, the close-up compensates by increasing the pressure exerted by the object or face under scrutiny. It is one of the chief means by which the film condenses symbolic density.

3.5. Extreme close-ups and the pressure of detail

Extreme close-ups go one step further by isolating not the face as a whole but a part, a texture, a written sign, or a minute visual trace. In practical terms, they are especially useful for ciphers, engraved surfaces, blood writing, or mechanical details of the cryptex. Their value lies in making the clue almost invasive. The spectator does not merely see it; the spectator is brought too near to ignore it.

This proximity has a double effect. It intensifies suspense because any tiny mark may prove decisive, and it materializes secrecy because meaning appears lodged in minute detail. The extreme close-up therefore translates the novel's fine-grained descriptive attention into visual insistence. What prose accomplishes through lexical precision, the film accomplishes here through optical narrowing.

3.6. Vertical angles and symbolic asymmetry

High-angle and low-angle shots introduce relations of force, fragility, and symbolic asymmetry. A high-angle view can diminish a body, exposing it to institutional power, surveillance, or helplessness. A low-angle view, by contrast, can magnify a character or object, lending it authority, menace, or revelatory weight. In *The Da Vinci Code*, such vertical framings frequently accompany moments when bodies are subordinated to structures larger than themselves: the Church, the police, the secret society, the museum, history, or the quest itself.

Their importance should not be reduced to psychology alone. These angles also organize the spectator's relation to knowledge. A figure looked down upon may appear deprived of mastery; a figure seen from below may seem temporarily elevated by possession of a clue or by ideological conviction. Vertical framing thus contributes to the film's symbolic politics. It distributes dignity, vulnerability, and obsession across bodies.

3.7. Long shots, aerial views, and monumental space

Long shots and aerial views situate the symbolic quest within a larger geography. They are indispensable in a narrative that moves from Paris to London to Scotland and repeatedly connects individual pursuit with monumental architecture. A long shot restores the body to space; an aerial view subordinates space to a larger design. Both scales counterbalance the film's reliance on close-ups and inserts by reminding the spectator that the code is never purely local. It extends through institutions, cities, and transnational routes.

This broader framing is not merely decorative. It establishes the contrast between intimate decipherment and the vast cultural surfaces through which the characters move. The symbol is at once tiny and monumental: a line of text, a letter, a key, but also a chapel, a museum, a tomb, a pyramid. By alternating between narrow and expansive scales, the film makes this oscillation perceptible. Symbolic interpretation is shown to occur within spaces already saturated with authority and historical prestige.

4. Codes, symbols, and visual rhetoric

The symbolic system of *The Da Vinci Code* revolves around the transformation of objects into clues and clues into narrative relays. For analytical clarity, it is useful to distinguish between code and symbol. A code presupposes a rule of decipherment: numbers must be reordered, letters rearranged, a word guessed, an object opened, a message read in a mirror, a line followed. A symbol, by contrast, exceeds procedure. It condenses values, associations, myths, and cultural memories that cannot be captured by a single operational rule. Some narrative elements in Brown's novel and Howard's film function primarily as codes; others function primarily as symbols; many operate as relays between the two (Brown, 2003; Howard, 2006).

The out-of-order Fibonacci sequence is a good example of coded procedure. Its immediate role is not metaphysical but tactical. It marks the message as intentionally scrambled and signals that order must be reconstructed. In the novel, the reader can linger over the sequence and enjoy the gradual realization that disorder is itself the clue. In the film, the same sequence must be made quickly legible as both enigma and challenge. Its value lies less in the mathematics of Fibonacci per se than in the narrative function of disorder that calls for reordering. The spectator needs only enough recognition to understand that apparent randomness conceals intention.

The accompanying anagram performs a similar operation. A string such as "O, Draconian devil! Oh, lame saint!" is not meaningful at the surface level in the ordinary sense; its significance lies in its potential for rearrangement. The narrative pleasure here comes from the passage from nonsense to overdetermined sense. In both novel and film, the anagram dramatizes the instability of the sig-

nifier: letters are the same, but order changes meaning. What differs is the medium-specific handling of this instability. The novel can dwell on the typographic puzzle itself; the film must rely on visual presentation, dialogue, and reaction shots to externalize the interpretive process.

The cryptex occupies a more complex position because it is at once a code, an object, a container, and a symbol of deferred knowledge. It cannot be reduced to a plot device. Its cylindrical form, fragile mechanism, and progressive unlocking turn interpretation into a material risk. One does not merely understand the cryptex; one handles it under the threat of destruction. This materialization of hermeneutics is central to the adaptation. The film uses the cryptex to embody the principle that truth in this narrative is not simply hidden; it is enclosed, transportable, and vulnerable.

Saunière's body, staged as a Vitruvian figure, belongs more squarely to the domain of symbolic condensation. Here the body becomes diagram, artwork, message, and scandal all at once. The scene fuses mortality, inscription, and cultural quotation. It also exemplifies the adaptation's reliance on visual condensation. A great deal of the narrative's symbolic ambition is compressed into one memorable image: the dying curator's body transformed into a coded tableau. The force of the scene does not depend only on what it means conceptually. It depends on the immediate shock of seeing a body turned into an interpretive surface.

Newton's tomb provides another revealing example. In the novel, the sequence allows Brown to expand on symbolic associations, historical references, and linguistic clues. In the film, the tomb becomes a charged visual environment where darkness, monumentality, and the search for the "orb" converge. The scene shows how adaptation turns speculative reading into spatialized suspense. The clue is inseparable from the architecture that houses it. Meaning emerges through movement around the tomb, through shifting light, and through the spectatorship imposed by the camera (Brown, 2003; Howard, 2006).

The motifs of the chalice and the blade, often mobilized in discussions of Brown's plot, illustrate the necessity of analytical caution. Within the diegesis, they operate as narrative abstractions through which gendered symbolism and the rhetoric of the "sacred feminine" are made dramatically available. Yet their diegetic usefulness does not automatically validate the historical generalizations that are sometimes attached to them. A publishable scholarly analysis must therefore separate narrative efficacy from historical proof. The novel and film deploy these motifs because they are dramatically productive, not because they settle complex debates about religion, symbolism, or antiquity.

The same caution applies to the Louvre pyramids and the Rose Line. In the story-world, these elements acquire the force of terminal clues, because they gather earlier motifs of geometry, secrecy, alignment, and hidden burial. The film

treats them with great visual solemnity, especially at the end, when Langdon's realization is converted into a ritualized gesture of recognition. But criticism must distinguish between symbolic culmination within the narrative and empirical demonstration beyond it. The fact that a location can sustain a powerful symbolic ending does not make the narrative's underlying historical claims self-evident.

This distinction becomes even more important when discussing broader symbolic genealogies such as the pentagram, the hexagram, or alleged transhistorical continuities between ancient Egypt, Judaism, Christianity, esotericism, and modern conspiracy discourse. Such connections are often advanced in popular or polemical discourse in overly assertive terms. This treatment risks collapsing narrative symbolism, ideological appropriation, and historical scholarship into one plane. A stronger academic approach acknowledges that symbols often accumulate contradictory meanings across periods and communities. Their presence in a thriller may tell us more about modern cultural imaginaries than about stable historical essences (Stam, 2005).

What, then, gives symbols their force in *The Da Vinci Code*? Not historical certainty, but narrative relay. A sign matters because it sends the characters elsewhere, reclassifies an object, reorganizes trust, opens a container, or reorients a hypothesis. Symbols operate not as inert repositories of meaning but as engines of displacement. They are powerful because they move the plot while also invoking layers of cultural memory. The adaptation intensifies this relay function by binding it to visibility. Each time a symbol comes forward, it must do dramatic work at once: attract attention, suggest depth, and propel action.

Writing itself becomes image under this regime. Ultraviolet messages, mirror writing, carved phrases, numerals, and diagrammatic bodies transform verbal inscription into visual event. The film repeatedly insists that reading is inseparable from seeing. This is one of the adaptation's most significant achievements. It converts textuality into spectacle without reducing it to superficial décor. The written sign remains interpretive, but its interpretiveness is now staged through optical emphasis, actor response, and temporal pressure.

For that reason, the symbolic density of the film should not be measured simply by counting what has been omitted from the novel. One must ask, instead, how much symbolic energy is concentrated in each visible object, each inserted fragment, each scene of decipherment. Howard's film often reduces verbal explanation, yet it increases the dramatic voltage of objects. The novel diffuses symbolic labor across paragraphs; the film stores it in frames. The difference is not between depth and shallowness, but between two distributions of semiotic weight.

5. Continuities and transformations in the adaptation

A comparison between the novel and the film shows that the adaptation is both faithful in itinerary and selective in emphasis. The main chain of events remains recognizable: Saunière's murder, the encoded message, the alliance

between Langdon and Sophie, the Depository Bank of Zurich, the cryptex, the movement toward England, Teabing's betrayal, Rosslyn Chapel, and the final return of meaning to the Louvre. What changes is not the existence of the itinerary but the manner in which it is narratively inhabited. Brown's novel lingers over commentary, speculative background, and repeated symbolic reinforcement. Howard's film streamlines this density, often preferring immediate scenic intelligibility to prolonged discursive elaboration (Brown, 2003; Howard, 2006).

This streamlining has important consequences for characterization. In the novel, Langdon is not only an investigator but also a vehicle for exposition. His scholarly habitus is partly constructed through explanatory discursivity: he interprets as he speaks, and his knowledge frequently mediates the reader's access to the symbolic field. The film preserves his expertise but reduces the extent to which exposition can be sustained without interrupting momentum. As a result, knowledge is more often distributed through exchange, reaction, and compressed dialogue. Langdon becomes slightly less the lecturer and more the mobile interpreter under pressure.

Sophie undergoes a related transformation, though the difference is less one of identity than of tonal emphasis. The film does not rewrite her into another national profile, nor does it install a romantic closure that would overturn the logic of the source narrative. What it does modify is the balance of her characterization. Through performance, framing, and rhythm, Sophie's relation to trauma, suspicion, and discovery becomes more immediately affective. The spectator reads her through gesture, pacing, hesitation, and facial response as much as through backstory (Brown, 2003; Howard, 2006).

The treatment of ending and ambiguity is equally instructive. Brown's novel sustains ambiguity through narration and delayed realization. The Rosslyn sequence opens onto genealogical revelation while leaving room for reflection, inheritance, and symbolic aftereffect. Howard's film preserves the broad architecture of revelation but gives greater visual ritual to the final recognition under the Louvre. This choice does not necessarily simplify the narrative into pure certainty. Rather, it transfers closure into a visible gesture—Langdon kneeling over the hidden resting place—that condenses reverence, revelation, and unresolved historical fantasy into one cinematic image. The ending becomes less discursive and more iconic (Brown, 2003; Howard, 2006).

A similar transformation affects the spectator's relation to institutions. In the novel, organizations such as Opus Dei, the Priory, the police, and academic authority are repeatedly discussed, contextualized, or interpreted. The film must render them more quickly through scene design, costume, authority figures, and accelerated confrontations. Institutional complexity is therefore somewhat narrowed, but symbolic contrast is intensified. The Church appears through ritualized secrecy; the police through surveillance and pursuit; the museum through

monumental cultural authority; the Priory through hidden continuity. The result is not a more precise sociology of institutions, but a more immediate dramaturgy of competing powers.

The adaptation also sharpens the rhythm between pursuit and pause. Explanatory scenes are more likely to be followed swiftly by danger, displacement, or a new clue. This alternation increases kinetic engagement but also changes the spectator's experience of symbolic thought. In the novel, thinking may occupy long stretches of the text. In the film, thinking must coexist with acceleration. The spectator has less time to weigh doctrinal implications in detail and more reason to attach significance to the pressure under which interpretation occurs. The code is not simply solved; it is solved while being chased, watched, misled, or cornered.

These transformations should not be mistaken for simple impoverishment. The film gains in immediacy what it loses in discursive extension. One may regret the reduction of certain explanatory strands, yet one must also recognize the compensatory force of cinematic concentration. A painting isolated by a cutaway, a cryptex framed in close-up, a whispered clue in a resonant monument, or a face reacting to sudden understanding can condense affective and symbolic weight very efficiently. The adaptation's achievement lies precisely in making such condensations carry narrative consequence.

At the same time, the limits of this condensation must be acknowledged. Because the film shortens doctrinal and historical exposition, some viewers may accept the symbolic claims at face value without perceiving the distinction between narrative hypothesis and historical scholarship. The novel shares this risk but partly counterbalances it by offering more verbal scaffolding, though it is contestable. The film, by virtue of its speed and authority of image, may naturalize suggestion more forcefully. This is one reason a scholarly reading must insist on methodological distance. Visual solemnity is not evidence.

The most productive way to describe the relation between the two works is therefore neither fidelity nor betrayal, but reallocation. Brown allocates symbolic labor across discursive breadth, repeated commentary, and lexical puzzle-making. Howard reallocates that labor across framing, montage, performance, and scenic rhythm. The same broad narrative machine persists, but the burden of meaning shifts from paragraph to frame, from exposition to visibility, from textual accumulation to perceptual concentration. Adaptation here is an operation of formal economy (Hutcheon, 2013).

This economy also reveals something more general about the passage from literature to cinema. A novel can multiply possible images by leaving them partially indeterminate; a film must choose and stage a particular visible version. Yet this choice does not necessarily close interpretation. It simply changes its starting point. In reading, interpretation often moves from words toward images. In film

viewing, it moves from images toward discursive reconstruction. The *Da Vinci Code* demonstrates this inversion with unusual clarity because its very subject is coded meaning. The adaptation becomes an indirect theory of interpretation: it shows that every sign must be made to appear before it can be argued over.

In that sense, the film remains faithful to the novel at the level that matters most: not in exhaustive detail, but in procedural imagination. Both works are fascinated by the idea that cultural forms hide messages, that objects can become passages, that seeing and reading are unstable acts, and that secrecy acquires force when tied to institutional memory. What differs is the medium-specific grammar through which this fascination is staged.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of Dan Brown's novel and Ron Howard's film shows that the passage from literature to cinema should not be understood as the mere loss of textual richness. What changes most decisively in adaptation is the status of the clue. In the novel, the clue is read, explained, and repeatedly recontextualized through discursive extension. In the film, the clue is framed, sounded, isolated, and rhythmically inserted into the flow of action. Meaning is not simply transferred from one medium to another; it is reorganized according to new conditions of visibility and temporality.

This reorganization is especially clear in a corpus driven by codes and symbols. The Fibonacci sequence, the anagram, the cryptex, the Vitruvian body, Newton's tomb, and the Louvre pyramids all survive the passage from page to screen, but not unchanged. Their weight is redistributed. The novel allows them to expand through commentary and speculative narration. The film intensifies them through close-ups, cutaways, movement, sound, and ritualized climaxes. Symbolic density remains, yet it is compressed into cinematic thresholds rather than dispersed across explanatory prose.

The study also demonstrates the importance of methodological vigilance. The *Da Vinci Code* is a powerful narrative precisely because it blurs the lines between art history, theology, esoteric speculation, institutional memory, and popular conspiracy. A scholarly reading must therefore separate diegetic effectiveness from historical validity. Symbols in the narrative are dramatically productive because they condense cultural memory and orient the plot; this does not mean that every symbolic genealogy advanced by the story can be adopted uncritically. Scholarly criticism must preserve that distinction (Stam, 2005).

Ultimately, literature and cinema converge here around a shared desire to make interpretation dramatic. Both works stage reading as pursuit, secrecy as form, and discovery as a transformation of one's relation to the visible world. Yet they do so through different semiotic contracts. Brown's novel trusts the expansiveness of discourse; Howard's film trusts the concentration of the frame.

To compare them is therefore to understand two distinct but equally revealing ways of converting culture into suspense.

A fuller study could extend this analysis toward reception history, censorship, translation, and the global circulation of religious controversy in popular media. Even within its current limits, however, the comparison clarifies a central point: adaptation is not the afterlife of meaning but one of its productive regimes. The move from literary code to cinematic sign is not a simple reduction. It is a change in how symbols are made to appear, how they are made to matter, and how audiences are invited to believe in their dramatic power.

Bibliography

- Bazin, A. (2005). *What is cinema?* (Vols. 1–2). University of California Press.
- Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (2019). *Film art: An introduction* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, D. (2003). *The Da Vinci code*. Doubleday.
- Chatman, S. (1978). *Story and discourse: Narrative structure in fiction and film*. Cornell University Press.
- Gaudreault, A., & Jost, F. (1999). *Le récit cinématographique* (2e éd.). Nathan.
- Howard, R. (Director). (2006). *The Da Vinci Code* [Film]. Columbia Pictures; Imagine Entertainment.
- Hutcheon, L. (2013). *A theory of adaptation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Metz, C. (1974). *Film language: A semiotics of the cinema* (M. Taylor, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- Mitry, J. (1997). *The aesthetics and psychology of the cinema*. Indiana University Press.
- Monaco, J. (2009). *How to read a film: Movies, media, and beyond* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Stam, R. (2005). *Literature through film: Realism, magic, and the art of adaptation*. Blackwell.