



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Lewis, Ann and Arnold-de Simine, Silke (2020) Introduction. In: Lewis, Ann and Arnold-de Simine, Silke (eds.) *Adapting the Canon: Mediation, Visualisation, Interpretation*. Oxford, UK: Legenda, pp. 1-18. ISBN 9781781887080.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/47404/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

Adapting the Canon

Mediation, Visualization, Interpretation



EDITED BY
ANN LEWIS AND SILKE ARNOLD-DE SIMINE



LEGENDA

Transcript 1

Modern Humanities Research Association

2020

Published by Legenda
an imprint of the Modern Humanities Research Association
Salisbury House, Station Road, Cambridge CB1 2LA

ISBN 978-1-78188-708-0

First published 2020

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or disseminated or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system, or otherwise used in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the copyright owner, except in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS, England, or in the USA by the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers MA 01923. Application for the written permission of the copyright owner to reproduce any part of this publication must be made by email to legenda@mhra.org.uk.

Disclaimer: Statements of fact and opinion contained in this book are those of the author and not of the editors or the Modern Humanities Research Association. The publisher makes no representation, express or implied, in respect of the accuracy of the material in this book and cannot accept any legal responsibility or liability for any errors or omissions that may be made.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

© Modern Humanities Research Association 2020

Copy-Editor: Charlotte Brown

INTRODUCTION



Adapting the Canon: Mediation, Visualization, Interpretation

Silke Arnold-de Simine and Ann Lewis

The emergence of ‘adaptation’ as a highly dynamic and growing field of research is amply evidenced by a rapidly expanding critical and theoretical literature. Since 2010, there have been at least seven substantial ‘handbooks’ and ‘companions’ surveying the field of adaptation studies, setting out some of its parameters as a distinct area of study and scholarship, and/or serving as an introduction to this area.¹ Since 2015 alone, a significant number of monographs and collections of essays focusing on adaptation in relation to less studied genres and media (such as television, comics, and illustration) have appeared,² while a number of important monographs and collections are just published or forthcoming in 2019–2020.³ Two learned associations, three dedicated journals, and several book series focusing on adaptation have established a clearer identity for this body of critical writing, especially since 2008, and at any time one can find a number of international conferences and/or calls for papers focusing on this subject.⁴

At the interface between a range of disciplines (film and screen studies, media and cultural studies, digital humanities, modern languages and comparative literature, English studies, performance and reception history, history of the book and visual culture, and others), the study of adaptation foregrounds a range of key methodological questions, regarding the status of the ‘text’, the ‘author’ (or *auteur*), and the ‘consumer’ of literary and cultural artefacts. Interdisciplinary and comparative by its very nature, the study of adaptation encourages the bringing together of perspectives and approaches such as narratology, (visual) semiotics, and reception studies, and promotes the questioning of assumed ‘norms’ within each discipline. But this ‘in between’ status (rarely if ever is adaptation studies granted institutional recognition as a separate department or offered as a programme in its own right) can also provoke unease, and even hostility from other disciplines. Often relating to the perceived value or quality of ‘adaptations’, this is as much a feature of reactions from film or media studies as from literary scholarship, as well as resulting from the ‘dysfunctional relationship between adaptation and theorization’ evoked by Kamilla Elliott.⁵ Much of this is bound up in problematic questions of definition — both how to define an adaptation, and adaptation studies as a field —

and its relationship to the (literary) canon with all that that notion implies about aesthetic values and hierarchies. Questions around focus and methodology have been at the centre of debates within adaptation studies since its early phase, and the move away from ‘fidelity studies’, broadly conceived, to approaches centred on adaptation’s creative and subversive potential, have been usefully charted in several recent surveys of the different generations of ‘adaptation studies’.⁶ Although such debates suggest some ongoing unease and scepticism at the heart of the adaptation studies project, the richness and rigour of the voluminous output outlined at the start of this introduction, suggests that such sceptical self-awareness creates a productive dynamic. Or, as Thomas Leitch puts it, ‘it is healthier for the field to be riven by debates than to produce methodological consensus’.⁷ Indeed, his outline of a series of ‘foundational questions’ or unresolved tensions, may, as he suggests, be seen as the basis of a canon of thinking and writing which has been core to the establishment of adaptation studies, in their structuring of debates at different moments. These critical fault lines are summarized by Leitch roughly as follows: 1) what counts as an adaptation? should adaptation be defined as a particular group of texts? 2) is there any validity to approaches which assess the ‘fidelity’ between a ‘source’ and its ‘adaptation’? 3) should adaptation studies be primarily analytical or evaluative (and given that no-one would seriously propose that we stop evaluating adaptations altogether, what place ought evaluation to play in the field)? 4) what is the value of the case study as a methodological tool? Especially where this can result in a simple ‘compare and contrast’ exercise, and 5) is adaptation scholarship better served by close readings or by more general synthetic, holistic approaches, and how can such approaches be integrated? (pp. 7–9).

The adaptation scholars who, at different stages, have engaged with these questions, producing very different responses, may be seen as the canonical authors of this discipline: Deborah Cartmell, Dennis Cutchins, Lars Elleström, Kamilla Elliott, Christine Geraghty, Kate Griffiths, Linda Hutcheon, Thomas Leitch, Julie Sanders, Robert Stam, Bradley Stephens, Imelda Whelehan, amongst many others. We understand this canon of critical and theoretical frameworks (like any form of canon) as a dynamic and fluid dialogue, constantly shifting in relation to new debates and new considerations; in short, an adaptive canon.

Canonization and Adaptation

The relationship between adaptation studies and notions of canonicity has, nonetheless, been fraught at the best of times. Julie Sanders brings out some of the double-edged nature of this relationship, in her discussion of adaptation and appropriation, simultaneously suggesting the ways in which adaptations rely on the authoritative status of an existing canon, and equally, their potential to reshape it, and to ‘write back’:

The debate that has raged around canon formation in literary studies in recent decades is inescapable [...]. Adaptation both appears to require and to perpetuate the existence of a canon, although it may in turn contribute to its ongoing reformulation and expansion. [...] Adaptation becomes a veritable marker of canonical status; citation infers authority. To this end, adaptation could be

defined as an inherently conservative genre [...]. Yet as the notion of hostile takeover present in a term such as ‘appropriation’ implies, adaptation can also be oppositional, even subversive.⁸

Despite its persistence in academic scholarship, the notion of the canon as a sanctioned corpus of established classics which excludes large segments of cultural production, has oft been considered ideologically suspect.⁹ When considered in the context of adaptation studies, a key problematic is the way in which the notion of ‘canonicity’ (and adapting the canon) seems to privilege the literary text over its adaptations especially in visual media such as film, comics, or video games. Here, ‘literature’, especially the novel, often appears (or is constructed) as a prior, primary, and more culturally validated artistic form within a ranking of aesthetic value, promoting an hierarchical imbalance that the pursuit of studies focused on the question of fidelity in the early development of adaptation studies only exacerbated. Deborah Cartmell talks of ‘the dominance of classic adaptations to adaptation studies and the elitism and sense of inferiority that this has perpetuated (good book = bad film, bad book = good film)’, also noting that a focus on the adaptation of canonical literature has excluded a wealth of material still ripe for exploration, ‘video games, advertising adaptations, [...] and film to theater’.¹⁰

From the perspective of cultural studies, moreover, questions of aesthetic value are broadly irrelevant, and the idea of bestowing a timeless or transcendent quality on texts/artefacts elevated to the canon risks disregarding their socio-cultural, economic, and industrial context and ignoring the wider networks within which they are located. In this light, both adaptation and canonization could be framed differently, as vital parts of the workings of cultural memory. Following this line of thinking, adaptation serves to keep narratives, characters, and themes alive through ongoing (re-)interpretations, transferring them from the potentiality of the archive into active memory through public circulation.¹¹ As Astrid Erll states, ‘remediation tends to solidify cultural memory, creating and stabilizing certain narratives and icons of the past’.¹² These processes are involved in a form of modern mythmaking in which stories are told and retold, reconfigured in different media environments and across media platforms, enabling audiences to engage in creative activities such as gaming, reading, watching, listening, and indeed in rewriting and developing the narrative (in the case of fanfiction or creative reversionings via YouTube clips, for example).

The different chapters within the present volume interrogate these various premisses and problematics, exploring the multiple ways in which the relationship between adaptation and canonicity can be played out and complexified. Armelle Blin-Rolland provides a number of very suggestive remarks in her chapter (drawing on the work of E. Dean Kolbas, Brian Rose, and others), bringing out the ways in which the process of adaptation renews the canon within culture as an ongoing and unfixed ‘constellation’, continuing rather than preserving it:

‘Serial adaptation’ is involved in canon formation, in the sense that it contributes to the canonical text becoming culturally familiar. As a result, the palimpsestuous reading of adaptations of canonical texts, as Linda Hutcheon points out, may not rely on a ‘direct experience’ of the text, but rather on a

memory partly shaped by its serial adaptation, and resulting ongoing presence of the story in culture. [...] Through the lens of adaptation, the canon appears as a constellation of texts that are repeatedly returned to and rearticulated in new historically-situated contexts, shifting meaning and shape, repeated with a difference. While adaptation perpetuates the canon, it ‘continues’ rather than preserves it, in the sense that it turns it into a hybrid and dynamic, un-final construction inscribed in broader intertextual and intermedial networks.

Adaptation, Mediation, and Intermediality

In our title, we have suggested that the adaptive encounter is one of ‘mediation’. Mediation suggests not only a connecting link, an interface between two or more terms, but also potentially an abrasive or disruptive quality (one of the *OED*’s definitions is ‘intervening between people in a dispute to bring about agreement or reconciliation’). The act of adapting is frequently one of ‘writing back’, subversion and revision — self-consciously and perceptibly bridging or building relationships between cultures, genres, languages, and media. Put another way, ‘adaptation studies ought to focus on the space of disjunction between texts and media to ask what that space, that necessary difference enables’.¹³ The essays collected within the present volume stage a number of encounters between texts, artworks, films, and other artefacts, all of which cross time and place. While transnational dynamics are one of the most fascinating aspects of the adaptive process, the dominance of Anglo-American corpora within studies on adaptation (whether collections or monographs) has often been noted by scholars.¹⁴ In contrast, almost every chapter within this collection involves some kind of intercultural exchange (many centred on cross-Channel dialogues between France, Germany, Italy, and England, but also interactions between France and the US, Japan and the wider world). Correspondingly, one of the aspects of adaptation that comes to the fore in several chapters (such as Komporalý’s discussion of Thomas Ostermeier’s *Hamlet* in Chapter 9, or Pascolini-Campbell’s analysis of Ezra Pound’s radio play of François Villon’s *Le Testament* in Chapter 10), is transformation through linguistic translation and invention. The bringing together of case studies which foreground the transnational dynamic is a central aspect of what this volume seeks to achieve, in the juxtaposition of a wider range of national perspectives than is often found in collections of this kind.

Likewise, our volume is also a reaction to the novel-to-film paradigm that, as oft noted, continues to dominate the field. Despite the increasing visibility of work focusing on other medial forms and a more varied range of transpositions (see n. 2 above), a quick examination of the works included in our bibliography immediately shows the preponderance of critical writing focusing on the text/screen interface. The contributions to our volume have generally moved away from this paradigm, to explore the adaptive process in connection with (relatively) less discussed media, such as apps, the radio, and comic books — indeed, a major focus is on visualization, especially within various forms of graphic adaptation. The chapters also bring together a much wider range of literary forms and genres than the novel:

the medieval *ballade*, the short story, the theatre, the mash-up. Furthermore, many of the chapters juxtapose several different media rather than focusing on a single transposition: in Chapter 4 Blin-Rolland looks at film together with comic-book versions of *Jekyll and Hyde*, in Chapter 5 Stephens traces *Les Misérables* in manga and anime, and in Chapter 11 Griffiths considers film, television, and radio reworkings of *Thérèse Raquin*.

The majority of chapters within this collection explore adaptation across media, which brings us to our last point: the relation between adaptation studies and ‘intermediality’. As we have seen, defining adaptation and situating adaptation studies is one of the core problems at the heart of the discipline.¹⁵ Whilst Linda Hutcheon’s definition of adaptation as ‘an extended, deliberate, announced revisitation of a particular work of art’¹⁶ remains influential, the specificity of ‘adaptations’ as a particular form of transtextuality, or intertextuality, can be difficult to pin down.¹⁷ If the model of intertextuality threatens to dissolve the specificity of adaptations as a recognizable form of cultural production, this porosity also applies to adaptation studies as a separate field of enquiry.¹⁸ Given the central importance of different types of media interaction in processes of adaptation, several scholars (such as Lars Elleström) have, likewise, attempted to situate or subsume adaptation studies within the broader field of ‘intermediality’.¹⁹ There are, however, significant differences between these two concepts: not all forms of adaptation are intermedial — some adapt across genre rather than medium for example, as in the reworkings of *Pride and Prejudice* explored by Jeremy Strong in Chapter 8 of this collection; and not all types of intermediality correspond to forms of adaptation. Nonetheless, the connections and overlaps between adaptation and intermediality are suggestive and have given rise to some of the most exciting new work in the field.²⁰ Notwithstanding this, Leitch notes that the problem of getting adaptation scholars and intermedialists to engage with each other ‘remains as urgent as ever’ (p. 8), ‘the search for a common language that would foster productive dialogue between the two approaches [...] continues to be maddeningly elusive’ (p. 16). To see adaptation as an intermedial process allows us to think through the relationship between different ‘media configurations’ as ‘relative, dynamic and interactive rather than unidirectional, fixed and hierarchical’.²¹ Interpreting adaptations as hybrid intermedia and interart practices clearly signals a departure from traditional concerns such as the source text, its translation, and related questions of fidelity.

F. W. Murnau’s film *Nosferatu — eine Symphonie des Grauens* (Germany 1922) provides us with an illustration of how adaptation and intermediality can function together as frameworks of analysis, whose combination produces multi-layered interpretations. This film not only references Bram Stoker’s novel as source material in its credits but goes further by mimicking the medial qualities of the book or rather the way a reader ‘performs’ the book: *Nosferatu* starts with the turning pages of a chronicle. As we will suggest in the analysis to follow, the film demonstrates various different forms and aspects of intermedial relations, and their connection with adaptation. By applying Eckard Voigts-Virchow’s analytical concepts of ‘media combination, media transfer, and media contact’²² (also termed ‘media combination’, ‘medial transposition’, and ‘intermedial reference’, and ‘primary’, ‘secondary’, and

‘figurative intermediality’ by Irina Rajewsky and Werner Wolf respectively),²³ we can see how these can potentially come together in one media product:

1. Media combination or what Wolf terms ‘primary intermediality’:²⁴ as a silent film *Nosferatu* combines different aesthetic practices in one media configuration: (moving) images, (written) text and (musical) score. The film itself draws attention to its intermedial nature through its subtitle ‘a symphony’ but also through the use of five acts, in their imitation of the structure of drama, a very common feature of films from that time.

2. Media transfer/transposition: as the first film adaptation of Bram Stoker’s novel *Dracula, or the Undead* (1897), *Nosferatu* also fits Wolf’s definition of ‘secondary intermediality’ which describes the subsequent transformation of a work into another medium (and is the closest equivalent to the ‘adaptation’).²⁵ Although Murnau had changed all the names of the places and characters from the novel, he mentioned his source in the credits: ‘After the novel *Dracula* by Bram Stoker, freely composed by Henrik Galeen’. The legal issues that ensued prefigure what would become one of the central issues in the analysis of film adaptations: the question of whether it was only inspired by the original or whether it was indeed a direct media transfer. This lay at the heart of a law suit which Stoker’s widow had instigated only two months after the film was released, not least because she had set her hopes on the traditional and respectable medium of the theatre and the Broadway adaptation of her husband’s novel. In 1924 a German court decided that all negatives and prints of the film should be destroyed, but by then copies had been sold to different countries world-wide, the film had already spread and in a very similar vein to that of his protagonist it led a sort of illegitimate after-life as a revenant in damaged and varying versions and as a mere shadow of its former self, as befits the undead.

3. ‘Media contact’, ‘intermedial references’, or ‘figurative intermediality’ (to use the terms of Voigts-Virchow, Rajewsky, and Wolf respectively) describes the most specific and rarest of these intermedial relationships, when within the given parameters of a medium the structure is transformed so that it results in the simulacrum of another medium, e.g. freeze-frame in a film. A medium which is normally latent appears in another medium as form and thereby becomes visible. In this way the parameters of both medial frameworks are foregrounded. In *Nosferatu* the relationship between text and visuals seems to reverse the conventions of silent film in which the moving images are punctuated by intertitles which supply part of the narrative or the dialogue. Here, we would argue, the text is interspersed with images. *Nosferatu* suggests with its opening, that we are not watching a film but reading a chronicle. The film begins with the foxed title page of a handwritten diary which traces the events that lead to the outbreak of the plague *A Chronicle of the Great Death in Wisborg anno Domini 1838 by †††*, implying that the viewer is indeed a reader. Medial differences are made visible and are self-reflexively ‘re-inscribed’. In this sense, as Joachim Paech notes, intermediality can be seen as a self-reflexive commentary which, in highlighting medial capacities and restrictions, reflects on the general conditions of a medium.²⁶

Many of the chapters of this volume specifically engage with questions of intermediality, providing examples of ways in which ‘figurative intermediality’

generates complex and highly self-referential meditations not only on media relations, but also more specifically on the adaptive process itself. By focusing on intermediality in this context, we hope to have shown how the synergies and convergences between analytical frameworks can produce new readings, and to have suggested how the openness of adaptation studies to other approaches — arising from its status ‘in between’ (disciplines, concepts, cultures, and media) — can be seen as a strength rather than a weakness.

Overview of the Chapters

The first chapters of this book present a series of opening lines and new perspectives, suggesting different ways in which the field of adaptation studies can be situated and can orient itself, looking to the future, as well as the past. Chapters 1 and 2 each foreground new epistemologies of consumption associated with the adaptive process, particularly its interactive dimension, and its capacity to dissolve the distinctions between reading and writing. The collection opens with Clive Scott’s richly suggestive exploration of how we might approach an aesthetics of adaptation that could move beyond the drive towards presenting case studies or producing analytical methodologies (for example, by elaborating taxonomies), which has often characterized this field of study. In his teasing out of connections and differences between practises of translation and adaptation, he notes that both are capable of mitigating and even resisting the oppressive aspects of traditional notions of the canon, in their ‘minoritarian’ (as opposed to ‘official’ and ‘major’) status, and as arts of the dynamic and refractive. Key to his sketching out of an alternative model for approaching adaptation is the idea of the polyglot rather than the monoglot reader: the reader who is familiar with the source and does not need to look backwards to it, instead taking it ‘into a world of new comparabilities, into new exercises in perception’. Seeing reading as aesthetic experience rather than comprehension, and the reader’s activity as one of ‘making sense’ and engaging the senses rather than of retrieving meaning, allows for a more productive and dynamic encounter: translation and adaptation may be understood as ‘adventures in perceptual consciousness which set the source in motion, projecting it into possible futures, understanding the source as as an unquiet field of forces and energies within ever changing contexts’. His chapter uses David Shenton’s 1986 comic-book version of Wilde’s *Salomé* (1891), and various re-versionings of Goethe’s poem ‘Über allen Gipfeln’ (1780), as a way of exploring synaesthesia, metamorphosis, and montage as producers of a priismatic aesthetics that embodies the posthistorical and digital mentality, and goes beyond the discussion of the limits and possibilities of medium specificity. Ultimately, Scott suggests that the relationship between source and adaptation may be conceptualized as one of reciprocation rather than derivation: ‘works within the canon do not immobilize themselves in time-honoured aesthetic values, but are the initiators of self-proliferative creative partnerships and co-authorings which keep their values in constantly self-reconfiguring progress’.

Kamilla Elliott’s argument, in Chapter 2, is similarly oriented towards future developments, and to the ways in which our engagements with the adaptive

process are conditioned or even determined by new technologies and the digital mentalities which accompany them. She creates the portmanteau ‘ad-app-tation’ in her ground-breaking exploration of apps as a form of adaptation technology, focusing on the British literary canon. Considering the major significance of apps used on mobile devices within contemporary culture, she surveys a range of apps allowing readers to engage with literary texts — those allowing the purchase of and access to ebooks, those embodying virtual bookshelves, collections, and even libraries (such as *Free Books Ultimate Classics Library*); those delivering packages of ‘snackable fiction’ (such as *DailyLit*) and those providing an immersive experience (such as iClassics’s *PoeYourself*). She contrasts the approaches of apps which present authors with different degrees of reverential awe, subversive playfulness, and/or haunting artistry (for example, *Eye Shakespeare* or *Dickens: Dark London*) with those focused on the critical presentation of their *œuvres* (*Explore Shakespeare, Shakespeare at Play, RE:Shakespeare*) or particular works such as Eliot’s *The Waste Land* (Touch Press with Faber and Faber, 2011).

Elliott contrasts the conservative approach of many educational apps, which present the literary canon to an audience as a pedagogic and scholarly tool (often selecting texts from the traditional humanist canon rather than from the new canons which have emerged since the 1960s) with the more radical and creative apps designed for very young children, including ‘augmented reality apps’ such as *Alice in Wonderland AR Quest*. Even in those apps which aim for an unquestioned presentation of the canon, though, tensions emerge between authoritative and open interpretations, the latter a corollary of the interactive structures and media combinations which allow the reader a certain freedom to navigate their own path. Elliott explores the way in which ad-app-tation creates new epistemologies of consumption, charting the shift away from modalities of reading and vision arising from print culture and cinema (such as narrative) to haptic and interactive experiences (more characteristic of gamification). Ultimately, she argues, because they change the way in which the literary canon is produced and consumed, new technologies ‘change not only the answers to prior questions’ (as Siobhan O’Flynn does in her Epilogue to the second edition of Hutcheon’s *A Theory of Adaptation*), ‘they also require new questions’.

Chapter 3 moves away from the broader perspectives sketched out in the first two chapters, to provide a more archaeological account, excavating some of the historical critical positions that have been adopted in relation to adaptations. Here, Christine Geraghty considers the way in which a specific film, Vincente Minnelli’s *Madame Bovary* (1949) produced for MGM and based on Gustave Flaubert’s celebrated novel of 1857, can be used as a test case for contrasting the critical approach of writers from different disciplinary backgrounds, and uncovering some of the assumptions and preoccupations underlying their constructions of genre and canonicity. She focuses on five divergent interpretations of this popular Hollywood prestige picture and its fictional heroine — three by scholars in the field of adaptation studies at various moments of its development (Robert Bluestone in 1957, Robert Stam in 2005, and Mary Donaldson-Evans in 2009), and two from film studies as it emerged in the

1980s (Lesley Stern in 1981 and Robin Wood in 1986). Within these accounts, treated thematically rather than in date order, the status of the ‘source’ text shifts significantly, indeed Geraghty notes that ‘film studies was itself predicated on a lack of interest in adaptations as adaptations’. This serves as an important reminder that the emergence of both adaptation studies and film studies as recent disciplines has determined tensions that underly some of the critical attitudes that are played out in the reception of particular works, and more generally. While Flaubert’s novel has been the inspiration for many adaptations which have generated a significant body of critical writing, Geraghty’s analysis in the present volume sheds particular light on the ways in which canonicity has been differently construed within the critical reception of a particular film: from Bluestone’s traditional measuring of the (lack of) ‘success’ of the adaptation by reference to its relationship with the canonical source text, to Wood’s attempt to establish the canonicity of *Madame Bovary* (1949) by elevating Minnelli to a pantheon of film directors (a status which has little or nothing to do with Flaubert or his novel).

As noted earlier, given the continuing dominance of the novel-to-film paradigm within studies of adaptation, the contributions to this volume have — with the exception of Geraghty’s meta-critical analysis outlined above — tended to move away from this approach, deliberately foregrounding a broader range of relationships between texts and media, and combining discussion of film adaptation with other forms of visual interpretation. The following four chapters each focus, in different ways, on strategies of visualization in the adaptive process within the context of print culture, with a particular emphasis on comic books (manga, graphic novel, and comics) and — a different but related bimodal product combining text and image — the illustrated book.

In Chapter 4, Armelle Blin-Rolland provides an incisive analysis of Jean Renoir’s 1959 film *Le Testament du Docteur Cordelier* (*Experiment in Evil*) and Lorenzo Mattotti and Jerry Kramsky’s 2002 comic book *Docteur Jekyll et Mr Hyde*, inscribed within what she calls the ‘ever-expanding polymedia network’ created through the ‘serial adaptation’ (using Brian Rose’s term) of Robert Louis Stevenson’s popular tale *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886).²⁷ Like many other encounters captured in the present collection, this chapter not only brings together adaptations in different media, closely analysing the creative possibilities opened up by the techniques and artistry of film and of comic books respectively, but it also bears witness to complex cross-cultural and linguistic dynamics: both film and comic book are non-Anglophone (indeed Mattotti and Kramsky’s comic book was initially written in Italian, but first published in French), and both transpose the story through time and place — from Victorian England to 1950s France and Weimar Germany.

Through the close reading of particular scenes, which have become visually established as key points in the narration through the process of serial adaptation (despite being relatively short in the ‘source’ text), Blin-Rolland focuses her analysis on the ways in which the dual figure Jekyll/Hyde is used to re-articulate the notion of evil within very different contexts: through an explicit engagement

with the historic moment in the case of Mattotti and Kramsky's comic art, and its occlusion in Renoir's 1959 film. Renoir's film makes no direct reference to recent French history, although this absence is itself read by Blin-Rolland, following Colin Davis, as a highly significant reflection on France still in denial about its war-time collaboration. In both the film and comic book, what has been termed 'figurative intermediality' or 'intermedial reference' (Wolf, Rajewsky) is an important dimension of the work and its capacity to generate multi-layered meanings. Renoir's film evokes theatricality and self-consciously dramatizes the audio-visual mechanisms of its own forms of representation to figure the duality of the character Cordelier/Opale; Kramsky and Mattotti's comic book references the visual arts, and Expressionism in particular, an association that both defamiliarizes the reader from their memories of the story and, through the recognizable artistic context, identifies the unleashing of evil that is depicted with the rise of Nazism. A key notion throughout this chapter is what Blin-Rolland calls 'adaptive reading': the reader's ability to perceive a complex play of 'repetition and difference' (Hutcheon) or 'interaction and transformation' (Miller) in relation to the genealogy of adaptations (and in the case of *Le Testament*, a performance tradition) within which each reworking of the tale is inscribed, and which, as we have seen, also connects outwards to the intertextual and intermedial weave more broadly.

The focus on visual culture, and the combined analysis of film animation with comic book adaptation continues in Chapter 5. Here, Bradley Stephens turns to a relatively unstudied facet of the vast array of adaptations provoked by Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* (1862): those produced in Japan in the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century. His focus is on two specific adaptations: an animated television series of fifty-two half-hour episodes broadcast over the course of 2007 — *Les Misérables: Shōjo Cosette* [A Girl Named Cosette] — directed by Hiroaki Sakurai as part of Nippon Animation's World Masterpiece Theatre and within a recognizable *shōjo* genre destined for family viewing; and a 2009 graphic novel, *Re Mizeraburu*, by East Press within its *Manga de Dokuha* [Reading through with Manga] series of socially conscious titles, aimed at an adult audience (republished in French by Soleil Manga in 2011). Situating these works within the context of the reception of Hugo's novel in Japan more broadly, and within the culture of manga and anime, he shows how each version of the story is adapted to a different audience, and within a different production context (both producers examined here specialize in adapting classic literature for popular audiences of different kinds).

Stephens also provides a close comparative analysis of how visualization is used within the two media to produce powerfully emotive effects (for example, in the representation of Fantine's misfortunes). Throughout this chapter, he considers questions relating to the representation of cultural alterity in the adaptation process, especially pertinent in the case of a text whose Romantic vision of common humanity and of a unified human race is at stake. The complex negotiation of the relationship between cultures is an inherent aspect of manga and anime, which are directed at a transnational entertainment market and deliberately leave aspects of their representation culturally indeterminate while at the same time producing a unique aesthetic style in the context of a genre that is recognizably Japanese.

Chapter 6 further develops our collection's engagement with graphic adaptation and various forms of interplay between the verbal and the visual, with Juliane Blank's multifaceted survey of 'the Kafka image', as it has been explored within a new generation of comic books and graphic novels since the 1990s. She notes that Kafka, with Goethe, are the two most adapted German-speaking writers of all time. But rather than focusing on the adaptation of a single text, Blank brings together several of Kafka's most famous and popular works ('Das Urteil' ['The Judgement'], 1912, *Die Verwandlung* [*The Metamorphosis*], 1915, and *Der Prozess* [*The Trial*], 1914/15) and considers how, since the 1990s, comic books have engaged both with previous traditions of illustrating and adapting Kafka's works, and with the complex status of Kafka as an iconic figure (in respect of his personal appearance, as established by photographic portraits, and his reputation as a writer), within both academic and popular culture. Indeed, Blank notes that within popular culture, Kafka has achieved a kind of celebrity cult status, and has to some extent even come to embody the 'modern' or 'postmodern' condition.

The illustrated biography *Kafka for Beginners* (1993) by Robert Crumb and David Zane Mairowitz, which also includes short graphic adaptations of Kafka's most popular works, is seen as a cornerstone of the new approach, and as a canonical adaptation in its own right, which has strongly marked subsequent adaptations within the 1990s generation of graphic novels. Through a close analysis of the strategies of visualization adopted by this work, together with Peter Kuper's *The Metamorphosis* (2003) and Chantal Montellier and David Z. Mairowitz's *The Trial* (2008), Blank explores how they engage with the formal and aesthetic complexity of Kafka's texts, for example, by experimenting with the visual possibilities for conveying narrative perspective, rather than simply attempting to 'extract' the plot. She brings out their commitment to retaining some of the 'funny' dimension of comic strips, through visual humour and visual means of producing irony, and examines their interpellation of various frameworks of interpretation taken from popular and academic traditions, including the biographical approach, and the playfully post-modern attitude, for example. These self-conscious and experimental modes of visualization, she suggests, not only reflect on their own status as post-modern adaptations, but they also allow for a new understanding of graphic adaptation in its own right, whose rejuvenation in recent years owes much to the figure of Franz Kafka.

In Chapter 7, Christina Ionescu turns to the illustrated book as a relatively neglected example of the adaptative process. Despite the fact that illustrations of literary works are a very long-standing form of transposition from text to image, illustrations and the illustrated book as a whole have rarely been theorized from the perspective of adaptation studies, especially when compared to the burgeoning field of theoretical and critical work surrounding comics adaptations/the graphic novel. Ionescu notes that the illustrated book is of particular interest in that the visual adaptation is in this case 'source-bound', which is to say that the illustrations usually appear alongside the text which they adapt whereas most other forms of adaptation such as films, plays, and comic books, create a stand-alone product,

which may incorporate text directly taken from the source, but do not do so in its integrality. Ionescu brings together the perspectives of book history, word-and-image, and adaptation studies, in order to explore illustrations and the illustrated book as a material object and consumer product that is adapted in multiple ways and arises out of a creative and collaborative process involving many different agents including artists, translators, editors, typographers, book designers, printers, binders, publishers, and booksellers, amongst others.

In this survey of the ways in which the visual presentation of the illustrated book is adapted for, marketed at, and sold to different audiences, Ionescu focuses on four illustrated editions of Voltaire's bestselling tale, *Candide* (1759), published in New York in the interwar period: the 1927 Bennett Libraries' *Candide*, illustrated by Clara Tice; the 1928 *Candide* by Random House, designed and illustrated by Rockwell Kent; Ives Washburn's 1929 *Candide*, illustrated by Howard Simon; and Williams, Belasco and Meyers's 1930 *Candide*, illustrated by Mahlon Blaine and Arthur Zaidenberg, which respectively adapt the text as a product for book collectors, for the art connoisseur, for more modest book lovers, and for the mass market. This fascinating corpus sheds light not only on the complex ways in which illustrations function within different material supports (as well as in connection with their 'source text') and how different processes of adaptation are combined within each illustrated edition, but also on the way in which the adaptations of Voltaire's Enlightenment tale had a key role to play in the development of the arts of the American book and printing industry at an important moment of its history.

In Chapters 8 and 9 we move away from the model of adaptation across media, and specifically, from various forms of interplay between verbal and visual modes arising out of graphic adaptation, to forms of adaptation that remain broadly within the same medium (text, or theatre) but cross generic boundaries to produce striking effects, and create ideological ramifications that may change our understanding of both the source and its web of existing adaptations. Jeremy Strong brings together three recent textual re-versionings of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, each of which occupies a different position within current literary hierarchies, and engages playfully with its status. For each of these re-versionings, a working knowledge of the original text is essential for the reader's construction of meaning in and enjoyment of the new work, while also knowingly referencing earlier adaptive trends. In Jo Baker's *Longbourn* (2013), this is achieved by creating a parallel narrative interwoven with the plot but focusing on characters who are marginal, and marginalized, in Austen's novel; in P. D. James's *Death Comes to Pemberley* (2011) a sequel is added which engages with Austen's plot, shifting to a 'murder mystery' genre and potentially unravelling the tidy resolution of *Pride and Prejudice*; lastly, Seth Grahame-Smith's *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* (2009) is a comic mash-up which incorporates much of Austen's text but adds new material involving Britain's affliction by a plague of zombies, and generates comedy through a combination of gore and subtle social observation, while retaining central elements of Austen's plot. Through a comparative analysis of these works, Strong identifies major themes which are occluded — or only barely present — in Austen's novel such as 'domestic

work', 'race', 'war', and 'the wider world', but are foregrounded in these adaptations, providing critical and at times subversive readings that, in Sanders's terms, 'write back' both to the source text and the interpretations offered by some of its screen versions.

In Chapter 9 we turn to the theatre. Jozefina Komporalý provides an overview and analysis of the adaptive strategies employed by Thomas Ostermeier, in his theatrical adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, which combines an assertive linguistic translation with experimental forms of dramaturgy and *mise en scène*, and a self-conscious engagement with various forms of intermediality in performance. This production is characteristic of the German director's aim of shaking up theatrical conventions, approaching canonical theatre 'through the lens of Sarah Kane', and using it first and foremost as a vehicle to interpret contemporary society, with a strong political inflection and elements of ideological critique (he has also adapted a number of other European classics, by Ibsen and Büchner amongst others). His *Hamlet* was commissioned for the Avignon Festival, as a high-profile international production, and is a showpiece of the Schaubühne theatre company which he directs.

Komporalý examines the role of Marius von Mayenburg's translation for this production of Shakespeare's language into accessible down-to-earth contemporary German prose as a key aspect of the adaptive process, together with a *mise en scène* which updates the play's cultural contexts to the here and now, and a fragmented performance aesthetic which owes much to postdramatic theatre, and strongly emphasizes interaction with the audience and improvization. Concomitantly, the production as a whole privileges the avoidance of cliché and predictability. Ostermeier's refusal of traditional markers of genre, in his accentuation of comedy within the piece, is a significant aspect of how he disrupts hierarchies and expectations associated with canonical productions. Perhaps most interesting in the context of the present volume is the way in which this production stages other media, whether through the inclusion of television game shows, DJ performances, video recordings, or Hamlet's own filming via a hand-held camera, which allows for the juxtaposition of live action on stage and documented performance via recording (viewed alongside each other) — a self-reflexive dramatization of contemporary society's obsessive cult of the self and of celebrity and, more generally, a critique of consumer culture. Hamlet's descent into madness is shown to be intrinsically linked to all of this, and he is characterized as a spoilt brat (a 'tantrum-throwing talk-show host'). In terms of the cross-cultural dynamics that this adaptation embodies, as Komporalý notes, it is interesting that despite Ostermeier's international acclaim, he has been much criticized in Germany, where he is at odds with current institutional opinion regarding the theatre, and is considered 'an exiled artist of sorts' (George Banu), although he shares with a number of other directors an interest in experimenting with the boundaries of staging classical work.

Claire Pascolini-Campbell shifts our focus to radio adaptation, one of the least explored media within this field of study. She provides a detailed analysis of Ezra Pound's adaptation of the fifteenth-century French poet François Villon's *Le*

Testament as a radio melodrama for the BBC in 1931, noting that this was but one of a number of Pound's adaptive engagements with Villon through various genres and media including pastiche, translation, and opera amongst others (within a context of multiple adaptations of Villon's *œuvre* more generally, for example in sculpture, music, theatre). Pound's inclusion of Villon in his various critical works and anthologies similarly suggests both his fascination with this writer, and also a deliberate attempt to establish his position within a revised and re-evaluated literary canon. Pascolini-Campbell explores Pound's 1931 radio play as an adaptation of an adaptation (his 1924 opera of the same text, composed in collaboration with the avant-garde American composer George Antheil), at the centre of a complex weave of genres and media. At the same time it brings out different aspects of Pound's formal experimentation with the creative possibilities afforded by new technologies associated with radio, a relatively new medium at the time, and one with a potential to reach mass audiences (BBC radio broadcasting began in 1922).

The central status of language itself within this adaptation for the aural medium of radio is played out on many levels. Pound's interest in the musical qualities of poetry, his theory of 'meloepoia', which explores the capacity of its sounds to communicate meaning, is key to understanding his adaptive strategy. Pound's radio play combined the libretto of his opera (Villon's Old French *ballades* as sung poetry), based on the idea that the sound of the verse would convey its own emotion and beauty as well as meaning, with a new dialogue in English, in order to make the events of the story more accessible to an English-speaking public. Like Mayenburg's translation into German of Shakespeare's language, discussed in Chapter 9, Pound's additional dialogue navigates not only the shift between languages (French and English) but also the distance between medieval, early modern, and contemporary idioms. Pound opts for linguistic inventiveness, rather than straightforward modernization, attempting to create a simulacrum of 'Villonian' English which situates Villon and his companions 'as part of a timeless urban working class' through a medley of different influences (including modern slang, American, and cockney, archaic language redolent of medieval usage, amongst other registers). In conjunction with the Old French libretto and English script, Pound furnishes an aural 'landscape' for the audience through his experimental use of 'foley' and a range of other sound effects to communicate the aspects of time and place (assisted by his producer, Edward Archibald Harding, who was a pioneer in radio technologies). An examination of the possibilities allowed by radio also forms part of the next chapter, which is similarly centred on cross-channel dynamics, adapting from France to England.

In the final article of this collection, Kate Griffiths uses Harold Bloom's notion of 'the anxiety of influence' as a model for considering adaptive relations. Whereas Bloom's account is concerned with writers and their combative relationship with canonical forbears, here Griffiths explores how such dynamics are self-consciously played out in the adaptation's figuration of its own relationship with various sources, and as a theme within each work. Focusing her analysis on Émile Zola's novel *Thérèse Raquin* (1867), which has been a huge adapting phenomenon since its initial

publication, she brings together a range of its afterlives in different media including films by Marcel Carné (1953) and Charlie Stratton (2013); television adaptations in 1980 and 2002, dramatized by Philip Mackie and by Caroline Huppert respectively; and a BBC radio adaptation in 1998, by Melissa Murray. She examines each in turn, starting with Zola's text, showing that in each case the self-reflexive celebration of intertextual and intermedial borrowings may suggest a creative rather than destructive vision of influence, despite the potential for anxiety — an anxiety which manifests itself more clearly within the critical reception of many of the adaptations. In its delineation of a dense and multilayered set of influences, in which celebrated adaptations themselves become canonical references to be reworked and reinvented in subsequent afterlives, this chapter provides a fascinating example of how influence cannot be understood as a simple linear movement from 'source' to 'adaptation', but rather as a more complex encounter between cultural products circulating within multiple intertextual and intermedial networks.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

In a recent conference, on 'Illustration and Adaptation', Kamilla Elliott posed the question: 'is there — and can there be — a canon of adaptations'? Although many of the articles in this collection do take a (canonical) literary text as their starting point, the analysis of the intricate and interlocking networks of texts, images, and memories generated by the process of 'serial adaptation' in each case, has brought to the fore a number of adaptations that have themselves become canonical (and are themselves reworked, reconfigured, and remediated across a range of cultures and media): Carné's film adaptation of *Thérèse Raquin* is a good example of this, as is Crumb and Mairowitz's *Kafka for Beginners* (1993) discussed as a cornerstone of a new generation of graphic adaptation. The immense richness of the multiple cross-cultural adaptations brought together and viewed alongside each other in the context of a volume like this may go some way towards providing such a (provisional, and constantly expanding) corpus — allowing the reader to navigate between different generations of adaptation and to construct their own 'adaptation networks'.²⁸

Notes to the Introduction

1. In reverse chronological order: *The Routledge Companion to Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Dennis Cutchins, Katja Krebs and Eckard Voigts (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2018); *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Thomas Leitch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, ed. by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjølsvic and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013); *A Companion to Literature, Film and Adaptation*, ed. by Deborah Cartmell, Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture (Chichester, Oxford & Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2012); *Adaptation Studies: New Directions*, ed. by Christa Albrecht-Crane and Dennis Cutchins (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2010); *Redefining Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Dennis Cutchins, Laurence Raw and James M. Welch (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2010). We note the overlap in our title with that of Yvonne Griggs, *The Bloomsbury Introduction to Adaptation Studies: Adapting the Canon in Film, TV, Novels and Popular Culture* (London & New York:

- Bloomsbury Academic, 2016); however, our subject was determined and follows from the 2014 Legenda conference in London on which the present volume is based: the two projects are in fact very distinct in their focus and approach.
2. For example, on television: Yvonne Griggs, *Adaptable TV: Rewiring the Text* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Shannon Wells-Lassagne, *Television and Serial Adaptation* (New York & Abingdon: Routledge, 2017); on comics and comics books: *Transmédialité, bande dessinée & adaptation*, ed. by Evelyne Duprêtre and German A. Duarte (Clermont-Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise Pascal, 2019); *Comics and Adaptation*, ed. by Armelle Blin-Rolland, Guillaume Lecomte and Marc Ripley, special issue of *European Comic Art*, 10.1 (2017); *Bande dessinée et adaptation: littérature, cinéma, TV*, ed. by Benoît Mitaine, David Roche and Isabelle Schmitt-Pitiot (Clermont Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise Pascal, 2015) [*Comics and Adaptation*, ed. by Benoît Mitaine, David Roche and Isabelle Schmitt-Pitiot, trans. by Aarnoud Rommens and David Roche (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2018)]; and on illustration or visual culture more generally: *Adaptation in Visual Culture: Texts, Images, and their Multiple Worlds*, ed. by Julie Grossman and R. Barton Palmer (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); Kate Newell, *Expanding Adaptation Networks: From Illustration to Novelization* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); *Picturing the Eighteenth-century Novel Through Time: Illustration, Intermediality and Adaptation*, ed. by Christina Ionescu and Ann Lewis, special issue of *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 39.4 (December 2016); *Dante on View: The Reception of Dante in the Visual and Performing Arts*, ed. by Luisa Calè and Antonella Braidà (Aldershot & Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007). Following the *Illustration and Adaptation* conference held by Illustr4tio at the Université de Bourgogne, in Dijon, in October 2019, two volumes are projected for 2021.
 3. See, amongst others, Kamilla Elliott, *Theorizing Adaptation* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); Kate Griffiths, *Zola and the Art of Television: Adaptation, Recreation, Translation* (Oxford: Legenda, forthcoming); Laurence Raw, *Expanding Adaptation Studies* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming); *Adapting Endings from Book to Screen: Last Pages, Last Shots*, ed. by Armelle Parey and Shannon Wells-Lassagne (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019); Thomas Leitch, *The History of American Literature on Film* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019); *Intersemiotic Translation as Adaptation*, ed. by Vasso Giannakopoulou and Deborah Cartmell, special issue of *Adaptation*, 23.3 (December 2019).
 4. Three journals focus exclusively on adaptation studies broadly conceived: *Adaptation* (originally, *Adaptation: The Journal of Literature on Screen Studies*) (first published 2008); *Journal of Adaptation in Film & Performance* (first published in 2008); *Literature/Film Quarterly* (first published 1973). (The two learned associations are: the Association of Adaptation Studies, founded in 2006, and the Literature/Film Association, founded in 1989.) Palgrave's series on Adaptation and Visual Culture is an important contributor to the field's visibility (its first volumes appeared in 2015); Bloomsbury Academic also includes a significant number of volumes focusing on adaptation of various kinds; Legenda's Transcript, within which the present volume appears, focuses on 'all kinds of imagining across languages, media and cultures: translations and versions, intercultural and multi-lingual writing, illustrations and musical settings, adaptation for theatre, film, television and new media, creative and critical responses' (and began publishing in 2015). Recent/forthcoming conferences include: *Illustration & Adaptation*, conference, October 2019, Université de Bourgogne, Dijon; *Borders in/of Adaptation*, conference, October 2020, Université de Bourgogne, Dijon; the IFTR Translation, Adaptation and Dramaturgy (TAD) Working Group meeting at the IFTR conference in Galway, Ireland, July 2020. Current calls for articles include: *Adaptation as Revision*, a special issue of *Adaptation* to be guest-edited by Wieland Schwanebeck (deadline April 2020) and *Essays on Adaptation Studies*, a special issue of *Literature/Film Quarterly* (deadline January 2020).
 5. On 'adaptation as a poor relation of both literary and film studies', see Thomas Leitch, 'Is Adaptation Studies a Discipline?', *Germanistik in Ireland*, 7 (2002), 13–26. See also Deborah Cartmell '100+ Years of Adaptations, or, Adaptation as the Art Form of Democracy', in *A Companion to Literature, Film and Adaptation*, ed. by Cartmell, pp. 1–13. On the antagonistic relationship between 'adaptation' and 'theorization' and the inherent bias of the latter against the former, joined with the need for a more reciprocal discourse of 'adaptive theorization', see

- Kamilla Elliott, 'The Theory of Badaptation', in *The Routledge Companion to Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Cutchins, Krebs and Voigts, pp. 18–27.
6. See Christa Albrecht-Crane and Dennis Cutchins, 'Introduction: New Beginnings for Adaptation Studies', in *Adaptation Studies: New Approaches*, ed. by Albrecht-Crane and Cutchins, pp. 11–22; Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen, "'There and Back Again": New Challenges and New Directions in Adaptation Studies', in *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, ed. by Bruhn, Gjelsvik and Hanssen, pp. 1–16; and especially Thomas Leitch's 'Introduction', in *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Leitch, pp. 1–20, which identifies three specific waves or generations of 'Adaptation Studies' and their shifting preoccupations, since George Bluestone's foundational *Novels into Film* (1957).
 7. Leitch, 'Introduction', in *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Leitch, p. 17 (further references to this introduction are given after quotations in the text).
 8. Julie Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, 2nd edn (London & New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 8–9.
 9. On debates around the canon within a literary context, see John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), Harold Bloom, *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (New York: Papermac, 1995), Dean E. Kolbas, *Critical Theory and the Literary Canon* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001), and *Fame and Glory: The Classic, the Canon and the Literary Pantheon*, ed. by Elizabeth Benjamin and Jessica Goodman, special issue of *MHRA Working Papers in the Humanities*, 8 (2013) <<http://www.mhra.org.uk/publications/Fame-Glory>> [accessed 10 August 2019].
 10. Cartmell, '100+ Years of Adaptations', p. 10.
 11. Aleida Assman notes that: 'While emphatic appreciation, repeated performance, and continued individual and public attention are the hallmark of objects in the cultural working memory, professional preservation and withdrawal from general attention marks the contents of the reference memory. Emphatic reverence and specialised historical curiosity are the two poles between which the dynamics of cultural memory is played out', in 'Canon and Archive', in *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, ed. by Ansgar Nünning and Astrid Erll (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), pp. 97–107 (p. 101).
 12. Astrid Erll, 'Literature, Film, and the Mediality of Cultural Memory', in *Cultural Memory Studies*, ed. by Nünning and Erll, pp. 389–98 (p. 393).
 13. Albrecht-Crane and Cutchins, 'Introduction', p. 20.
 14. See, for example, Leitch, 'Introduction', p. 6; Cartmell, '100+ Years of Adaptations', p. 7. A notable exception to this trend is the nineteenth-century French novel, which has recently generated a significant body of critical work in relation to adaptation. See, for example: Kate Griffiths and Andrew Watts, *Adapting Nineteenth-century France: Literature in Film, Theatre, Television, Radio and Print* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2013); Kate Griffiths, Bradley Stephens and Andrew Watts, 'Introduction: Multimedia Adaptation and the Pull of Nineteenth-century France', in *Adaptation*, special issue of *Dix-Neuf*, 18.2 (2014), 126–33; Kate Griffiths, *Émile Zola and the Artistry of Adaptation* (Oxford: Legenda, 2009) and *Zola and the Art of Television* (Oxford: Legenda, forthcoming); *Les Misérables' and its Afterlives: Between Page, Stage and Screen*, ed. by Kathryn M. Grossman and Bradley Stephens (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015); Mary Donaldson-Evans, *Madame Bovary at the Movies: Adaptation, Ideology, Context* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009); and *L'Œuvre de Victor Hugo à l'écran: des rayons et des ombres*, ed. by Delphine Gleizes (Quebec: L'Harmattan/Presses de l'Université Laval, 2005). In the French context more generally, see also *Adaptation: Studies in French and Francophone Culture*, ed. by Neil Archer and Andreea Weisl-Shaw (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), and *French Literature on Screen*, ed. by Homer B. Pettey and R. Barton Palmer (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019).
 15. For a recent discussion of this, see amongst others, Timothy Corrigan, 'Defining Adaptation', in *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Leitch, pp. 23–35.
 16. Linda Hutcheon, with Siobhan O'Flynn, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 2nd edn (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2013) p. 170.
 17. See Thomas Leitch, 'Adaptation and Intertextuality, or, What isn't an Adaptation, and What Does it Matter?', in *A Companion to Literature, Film and Adaptation*, ed. by Cartmell, pp. 87–104.

18. For an interesting discussion of this problem, see Sarah Cardwell, 'Pause, Rewind, Replay: Adaptation, Intertextuality and (Re)defining Adaptation Studies', in *The Routledge Companion to Adaptation*, ed. by Cutchins, Krebs and Voigts, pp. 7–17.
19. See, for example, Lars Elleström, 'Adaptation Within the Field of Media Transformations', in *Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Bruhn, Gjelsvik and Hanssen, pp. 113–32.
20. For influential accounts of 'intermediality', see Irina O. Rajewsky, 'Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality', *Intermedialités*, 6 (2005), 43–64, and 'Border Talks: The Problematic Status of Media Borders in the Current Debate about Intermediality', in *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*, ed. by Lars Elleström (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 51–68. See also Lars Elleström, 'The Modalities of Media: A Model for Understanding Intermedial Relations', in *Media Borders*, ed. by Elleström, pp. 11–48; *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature, Image, Sound, Music*, ed. by Gabriele Rippl (Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter, 2015); Werner Wolf, 'Intermedialität', in *Metzler Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie: Ansätze, Personen, Grundbegriff*, ed. by Ansgar Nünning (Stuttgart: Metzler Verlag, 1998), pp. 238–39, and the recently published collection of English translations of Wolf's essays: *Selected Essays on Intermediality by Werner Wolf (1992–2014): Theory and Typology, Literature-Music Relations, Transmedial Narratology, Miscellaneous Transmedial Phenomena*, ed. by Walter Bernhart (Leiden & Boston, MA: Brill Rodopi, 2018).
21. Regina Schober, 'Adaptation as Connection: Transmediality Reconsidered', in *Adaptation Studies*, ed. by Bruhn, Gjelsvik and Hanssen, pp. 89–112 (p. 95).
22. Eckard Voigts-Virchow, *Introduction to Media Studies* (Stuttgart: Klett, 2005), pp. 85–86.
23. See Rajewsky, 'Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation', p. 50, and 'Border Talks', pp. 55–56.
24. Wolf, 'Intermedialität'.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 238 ff.
26. Joachim Paech, 'Intermedialität: Mediales Differenzial und transformative Figurationen', in *Intermedialität: Theorie und Praxis eines interdisziplinären Forschungsgebiets*, ed. by Jörg Helbig (Berlin, Schmidt, 1998), p. 16.
27. Brian A. Rose, *'Jekyll and Hyde' Adapted: Dramatizations of Cultural Anxiety* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), pp. 15–16.
28. For an interesting discussion of the metaphor of 'networks' in adaptation studies, see Newell, *Expanding Adaptation Networks*, pp. 1–2, 8 & 20 (esp. n. 2).