Title	Introduction: Adaptation Considered as a Collaborative Art: Process and Practice
Authors	MagShamhráin, Rachel;Preuschoff, Nikolai;Cronin, Bernadette
Publication date	2020-05-09
Original Citation	MagShamhráin, R., Preuschoff, N. and Cronin, B. (2020) 'Introduction', in Cronin, B., MagShamhráin, R. & Preuschoff, N. (eds.) Adaptation Considered as a Collaborative Art: Process and Practice. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 1-16. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-25161-1_1
Type of publication	Book chapter
Link to publisher's version	https://link.springer.com/ chapter/10.1007%2F978-3-030-25161-1_1 - 10.1007/978-3-030-25161-1_1
Rights	© The Authors 2020. Published by Springer International Publishing. The final authenticated version is available online at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25161-1_1
Download date	2024-04-25 05:34:14
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/10643

Introduction

*Rachel MagShamhráin, Nikolai Preuschoff
and Bernadette Cronin*

Looking back means, inevitably, to face a moment of loss. When Orpheus stepped into the sunlight from the caves of the underworld, after he had charmed Persephone and the cold heart of Hades with the beauty of his music, for a second, he broke faith and violated the strict condition for Eurydice's release. Do not look back. Eurydice's shadow never became human again.

Adaptations are not the endeavour of a singular hero, but proceed by collaborative processes. However, practitioners in the field of adaptation eventually have to turn around and look back, too. This moment of the backward gaze involves a closure, a circle (or more precisely, a helix); it

R. MagShamhráin (✉)
Department of German, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland
e-mail: R.Magshamhrain@ucc.ie

N. Preuschoff
University of Erfurt, Erfurt, Germany
e-mail: nikolai.preuschoff@uni-erfurt.de

B. Cronin
Department of Drama and Theatre Studies,
University College Cork, Cork, Ireland
e-mail: b.cronin@ucc.ie

1

is the point at which the creative process comes to a halt and perhaps has to concede a loss. Adaptations, as Orpheus' famous and countlessly referenced gaze suggests, eventually seem to fail as they cannot hope to do more than bring back a ghost, a story or a concept for a limited amount of time to the ephemeral present in which we find ourselves. Adaptations, as they engage with the past, are temporary and transformative acts of engagement and understanding, and as such part of a larger, collaborative endeavour to, as Eric Rentschler puts it, shape a 'discourse from the stories and history with which we live' (Rentschler 1986: 3). In this regard, the political and ethical dimensions of adaptations in their dealings with the past have, as Linda Hutcheon has pointed out, an analogy in the other meaning of 'adaptation': the human effort to adapt to change and to life's challenges (see Hutcheon 2010: ix). The myth of the singer Orpheus, however, reminds us that these challenges include not just present obstacles but challenges and interference from the dead. Orpheus is unwilling to adapt to Eurydice's death, and his stubborn memory of her is the only help that is left to her. The dead that Adorno writes about in his study of Mahler's *Kindertotenlieder* (1936) are helpless: 'they pass away into it [memory], and if every deceased person is like someone who was murdered by the living, so he is also like someone whose life they must save, without knowing whether the effort will succeed' (Adorno 2002: 612). The conjoined ideas of murder and salvation inhabit and animate the corpus of adaptation.

While the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice is at one level a story about love and loyalty, recent discourse in adaptation studies has moved on from the question of an adapted artwork's 'fidelity' to its source, and most scholars in the field now seem to agree with Robert Stam's thesis that 'fidelity', with its vague moral implications, is a chimera and therefore not necessarily the point of adaptation (Stam 2000). Rather, adaptations are no longer seen as a single, linear transfer from an original, but as part of a larger and interconnected constellation of works, or texts across time. Although Orpheus, while alive, was only allowed to enter and alter the underworld once, adaptations return there repeatedly, and continue to adapt again (and again) what has gone before. These continual acts of reentry into and mining of the underworld are always also acts of collaboration—a collaboration with the dead, as Thomas Leitch suggests in the opening chapter of this volume.

Just as adaptation involves collaboration with (works of) the past, the process of compiling this anthology has brought back the collaborative

efforts of organising an adaptation conference in Cork, Ireland. When the conference was first conceived, we, the organisers, shared a fascination with the practical aspects of adaptation, beyond questions of fidelity and the concomitant and negative rhetoric about the status of the product as 'secondary' or 'derivative'. We were clear that it was the 'how?' of adaptation that most interested us, and that would drive the discussion of adaptation into new and stimulating realms. For that reason, we wanted to focus on the work practices of practitioners across a range of disciplines, genres and media, rather than to focus on the politics of authorship and ownership.

We were interested in the identity of the adapter; in the roles of the writer, screenwriter, dramaturg, director, actor, translator, composer and audience; in processes of re-mediation and re-contextualisation; in adaptation in the 'second [and indeed third and fourth] degree': adaptations *of* adaptations; in the act of brokering between idioms: the communication between collaborators during the course of the adaptive process; and in the transfer of knowledge. The volume's joint focus on processes and the practitioners, and therefore on the collaborative as such, hopes to offer a unique contribution to the field of adaptation studies. Process shifts the focus from beginnings and ends to the in-between from which vantage point adaptation starts to reveal hitherto hidden dimensions.

While there has been growing interest in adaptation studies in recent times, and the field has moved on from a fascination with the 'original' to a scrutinising of the adaptation per se, there is still a clear emphasis in the field on the novel–film dyad.[1] This collection considers the underlying issue here to be a preoccupation with the *what*[2] of adaptation, which manifests itself in a tendency towards such film–literature comparisons. If we shift our focus to the *how* of adaptation, we notice a change in the landscape of case studies: with this shift from the product to the process of adaptation, there is a concomitant shift away from scrutinising the work of individual authors or directors acts to the how of collaborative techniques. Building on recent re-conceptualisations of adaptation as a species of translation, this volume seeks to look at the techniques involved in that adaptive practice—broadly conceived—with a particular focus on the collaborative dimension which any investigation of the processes and contexts of cultural production will necessarily reveal to be constitutive of the realm.

Despite the now long-established idea of the death of the author which liberated texts from the vice-like grip of their progenitors, and the

influence of theories of intertextuality and intermediality on the study of cultural products, with Linda Hutcheon famously declaring adaptation to be nothing more nor less than a form of intertextuality (Hutcheon 2006: 8), curiously, the modes and dimensions of collaboration in the adaptation process have not received sustained attention. Nevertheless, our own work builds on and is in dialogue with all those that came before it, and without which it would not be possible. The collaborative moment involved in retellings has been explored before, albeit within a limited context. In Neal Norrick's 'Twice-Told Tales: Collaborative Narration of Familiar Stories' (1997), for example, the author explores the circulation of oral tales within families and how their retelling functions both to create and modify family dynamics. In 2008, Jack Boozer's edited collection *Authorship in Film Adaptation* focused on the screenplay as intermediary stage between an idea and its filmic realisation, and used this transitory text, often written by a person or persons other than the director, to illustrate the collaborative nature of film and specifically film adaptations. And in 2015, a landmark study by Shelley Cob, *Adaptation, Authorship, and Contemporary Women Filmmakers*, emphasised the collaborative quality of female creative practice, examining film adaptations by female directors in an attempt to shed light on the collaborative nature of screen authorship as such. Nevertheless, the focus on the collaborative dimension of adaptation more broadly speaking has remained a desideratum until this point.

Of course, much of the heavy lifting intended to move adaptation studies away from the comparative approaches, which marked its early phase and in which original and derivative are set side by side and examined for similarities and differences, was achieved by the work of Sarah Cardwell, Robert Stam and others in the early part of this millennium. In her 2002 *Adaptation Revisited: Television and the Classic Novel*, Sarah Cardwell argued for adaptations to be considered in terms of the processes of their creation and as independently aesthetically valuable products, while consistently resisting the backward glance, and the temptation to collapse the study of adaptations back into the default mode of text–screen, original–derivative comparisons. She noted that, at least since the 1990s, there had been a dawning realisation of the limitations of that comparative approach, with Brian McFarlane, for example, expressing doubts about the juxtapositional form that adaptation studies had classically taken, while as yet unable to visualise an entirely new approach. So, although his own study had been conceived as an attempt 'to see if any apparatus might be

found to replace the reliance on one's subjective reponse to the two texts as a basis for establishing similarities and difference' (McFarlane 1996: 195), it still relied at its heart upon the act of comparison. In the second edition of her study (2007), Cardwell's emphatically non-comparative approach softened somewhat, because, equally and oppositely, any study of adaptation that point-blank refuses to cast the slightest backward glance at its antecedents must also remain partial and of limited value. Similarly, Robert Stam had argued for a move away from the limited study of source–target comparisons to questions of processes of selection and deselection in adaptations understood as intertexts. He considers adaptation as an 'ongoing whirl of textual reference and transformation, of texts generating other texts in an endless process of recycling, transformation, and transmutation, with no clear point of origin' (Stam 2000: 66). And yet, questions of adaptation cannot sufficiently be answered by theories of intertextuality.

Drawing on these impulses, the volume at hand aims to increase the breadth of adaptation studies even further, not only by departing from the traditional binary literature–film adaptation case study, but by moving deliberately into more interdisciplinary territory, considering adaptation across the creative and performing arts, with one tertium comparationis only: the collaborative. Putting very different subfields into concert with one another has the salutary effect of preventing that disciplinary insularity which makes the field more susceptible to the pull of the tried-and-tested comparative approach. Most importantly, the volume places the theatre front and centre. Perhaps more than any cultural form, the theatre is acutely aware of the collaborative and the adaptive dimensions of all textual engagements, for both of these elements are fundamental to its existence. It is the live presence of the theatre audience that drives this home; their copresence in and compenetration of every theatrical space inflects each unique performance. In *theatre & audience*, Helen Freshwater writes, '[a]s Handke's characters acknowlege in *Offending the Audience* (Theater am Turm, Frankfurt, 1966), the relationship with the audience provides the theatre event with its rationale. This relationship is indispensable' (Freshwater 2009: 2). Freshwater reminds us that other writers have suggested that reader-response theory in general and Barthes in particular might enhance our understanding of theatre: 'Applying this theory to theatre implies a shift in emphasis from preoccupation with the biography and intention of the playwright or director towards interrogation of the frames of reference which the audience brings to a show'

(ibid., 12). Indeed, we might usefully see the audience as working in collaboration with the performer in the co-creation of the theatrical event for, in the absence of an audience, there can be no event. Iain Mackintosh sees this relationship as a fusing of energy akin to that experienced in the most intimate or spiritual of encounters:

> Although this energy flows chiefly from performer to audience, the performer is rendered impotent unless he or she receives in return a charge from the audience. This can be laughter in a farce, a shared sense of awe in a tragedy and even a physical reciprocity to the achievement of dancer or actor. The energy must flow both ways so that the two forces fuse together to create an ecstasy which is comparable only to that experience in a religious or sexual encounter. (quoted in Freshwater 2009: 10)

Peter Brook has famously identified the most essential elements of this interaction between performer and spectator:

> I can take any empty space and call it a bare stage. A man walks across this empty space whilst someone else is watching him, and this is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged. (Brook 1984: 11)

In a broader perspective, collaboration is very much a mode of our time, an era of casualised labour and the gig economy which the so-called 'creative economy' replicates in nuce. This is the new socio-economic milieu in which the modern artist or 'culture worker' exists, and which requires him or her increasingly to behave as a flexible, reactive, collaborative freelancer, endlessly improvising within a hyperactive culture of art-labour precarity that demands constant networking and extemporisation. That hive of activity, the network, in which these various precarious cultural agents are linked with one another and with projects is, of course, facilitated by information technologies. Those technologies have in turn changed the nature of art itself and indeed of artistic collaboration, allowing, as they do, the ready reception and appropriation of other people's work and ideas for re-, co- and de-semination. However, this hyperlinked and hyperactive realm is one that threatens at every turn to replace depth of engagement with dispersal: a fragmentation of attention which now has to spread itself ever more thinly across a globally networked and always online sociocultural realm. In this world, an accelerated entrepreneurial freelancing that must rely on the readily available proliferation of the pre- and re-made becomes the new underlying principle of artistic work. It

is no coincidence that the collage, the assemblage, the ready-made all emerge under modern labour conditions. Since the elements of speed, precarity and interconnectedness determine everything including the field of artwork in our neoliberal age, it is unsurprising that this is also the age of the remix, bricolage, the meme, the fanic, the homage, the recycled, the inventory and all in tandem with and in response to a vast and ever-accelerating 24-hour news cycle which constantly demands of culture and art an ethical responsiveness. If we are to talk about collaboration in its relation to adaptation, the socio-economic conditions under which artistic practice now occurs cannot be ignored. In this creative economy, the cultural project has inevitably taken on a quality of the globalised and flexible market environment in which it occurs. The public financing of artist practice means that artists often have to tailor their work to tender requirements. Alongside ideas of creativity, concepts (and measures) such as impact, inclusion, social awareness and public engagement come to inflect the work. Art measured by key performance indicators cannot remain unchanged by the new yardstick. If we imagine the cultural practitioner within the modern creative economy, their labour precarious, casualised, their interconnectedness technologically enhanced, it comes as no surprise that these flexible cultural practitioners, who are forced endlessly to improvise (and compromise), and who must and can work across a variety of fields, are increasingly reliant on collaboration to achieve economies of labour. This environment favours an 'open source' approach to work, in which boundaries between individual art workers and their individual and original work are broken down in order, or so the logic, to achieve creative synergies that are seen as necessarily more productive simply by analogy to other forms of 'productivity'.

As Maria Lind has astutely argued, collaboration is the hallmark of modern artistic practice:

> Various kinds of collaboration—between artists, between artists and curators, between artists and others—are once more appearing and becoming an increasingly established working method. For some this offers an alternative to the individualism that dominates the art world, for some it is understood as a way of re-questioning both artistic identity and authorship through self-organization. And for others, it is a pragmatic choice, offering the possibility of shared resources, equipment and experience. At the same time, these collaborations often constitute a response to a specific, sometimes local situation, and they run a constant risk of becoming incorporated into the system they are reacting against. (Lind 2009: 53)

241 Lind's realisation that collaboration is a Janus-faced and treacherous crea-
242 ture is important. Collaboration is neither a bonum nor malum in se,
243 although there seems to be an increasing encouragement to see it as the
244 former: sharing as opposed to selfishness; the collective versus the individ-
245 ual; the collaborative as opposed to the genius. Economies of all kinds can
246 be achieved with shared equipments and other material, and this is, after
247 all, an age that apotheosises economic frugality. If these are the socio-
248 economic conditions of art-labour nowadays, then adaptation is not just
249 a curiosity among artistic practices, but rather a demand. The motto of
250 our cultural age would seem to be adapt or perish. If originality is the new
251 outlier, then adaptation starts to occupy the central ground, and magpies
252 and thieves and other borrowers are the artistic norm.

253 But beyond the demands of current socio-economic and technical con-
254 ditions, there has always been restlessness and relentlessness with regard
255 to past and lost objects. From the Proustian Madeleine to Citizen Kane's
256 Rosebud, we cannot leave them alone. We worry at the space they leave
257 as a tongue worries at the gap left by a lost tooth. Everything once cre-
258 ated has past, but with that passing is born a nostalgia that refuses the
259 passage. That desire to reinvigorate dead objects, artworks, to go back
260 and fix things that appear outdated or broken, against the trajectory of
261 time, is a rejection of death itself. From this perspective, adaptation is the
262 very art of life.

CONTRIBUTIONS

264 Reflecting the broad of range of disciplines, genres and media engaged
265 with in this collection, the contributions are grouped under seven head-
266 ings: Conversations with the Dead I; Adaptation: Drama and Theatre;
267 Adaptation: Literature and Screen; Adaptation: Screen and Politics; Adap-
268 tation: Screen, Fine Art and Theory; Adaptation: Television; and, finally,
269 Conversations with the Dead II. The volume furthermore encompasses
270 the work of leading scholars and practitioners in the field of Adaptation
271 Studies such as Thomas Leitch and Judith Buchanan, both keynotes at
272 our conference, as well as contributions from emerging scholars in the
273 early stages of their career.

274 In his visionary opening chapter of this volume, entitled Conversations
275 with the Dead I, Thomas Leitch reviews adaptation anew as a collabora-
276 tion with the dead. Reflecting on the dead as often unacknowledged col-
277 laborators, Leitch explores the 'hypothesis that all apparently independent

agents are in fact delegated agents acting on behalf of other'. But then, Leitch asks, 'if we are always collaborating with the dead, how meaningful is it to say that we are collaborating with anyone in particular on any particular endeavor?' And further, if all acts of creation, of translation and criticism are collaborations with the dead, how can we describe the nature of collaboration, and how does this collaboration force us to reconsider terms like creation, agency, independence, performance and power? As much 'as the "I" really does mean nothing more palimpsestuous than me, myself, and I—then how many of the acts we claim as our own are the product of collaborations with our other, earlier selves, or with forbears *or partners whose participation we repress, suppress, or disavow?*' Which leads Leitch to the question in how far we are allowed to consider artworks as 'coherent entities', since this assumption depends on the belief 'that the self is unified, discrete, and in principle independent'.

Bernadette Cronin's chapter entitled 'playing "the maids": Devising an Adaptation—Collaboration and the Actor's Process' considers the multiple modalities of adaptation in the context of a transdisciplinary, intercultural performance piece, *playing 'the maids'* (2015), a devised adaptation of Jean Genet's classic modernist drama *The Maids*. The work emerged from the nine collaborating artists' creative responses to Genet's play from their varied cultural, social, aesthetic and artistic perspectives. Cronin reflects critically from the perspective of one of the collaborating artists on the adapting and devising process that characterised the developmental phases of the work in the studio, on how ideas and 'entry points' arising out of the artists' engagement with Genet's play translated in the process and found their way into the piece. She addresses the question of ownership in the context of a collaborative devised adaptation and, finally, she makes a case for including the voice of the actor–practitioner– researcher in the discussion around adaptation studies and for why the actor's process enables a more nuanced understanding of how adaptation can function in contemporary, devised theatre.

In her contribution entitled, 'The Not-So-Singular Life of Albert Nobbs', Mary Noonan, focuses on the multiple adaptations and translations of the short story 'Albert Nobbs' by the Irish novelist George Moore. The story first appeared in *A Story-Tellers Holiday*, in 1918. In 1977, a play, *La Vie Singulière d'Albert Nobbs*, adapted from the Moore story, was written and directed by the French theatre director Simone Benmussa, and performed at the Théâtre d'Orsay, Paris. The play was subsequently translated into English by Barbara Wright, and later again made

into a film starring Glenn Close in the titular role. Noonan first considers the techniques Benmussa used to make a play that exposes the coercive nature of narrative within patriarchy, and the relationship between performance and gender. She goes on to show that Benmussa ransacks the original text to serve her own ends. Drawing on Julie Sanders's work on the relationship between adaptation and appropriation (Sanders 2006 [2016]), Noonan frames Benmussa's *Albert Nobbs* in the context of works of literary appropriation—works that seek both to foster historical understanding and insist on a radical break with tradition. However, in the case of Benmussa's *Albert Nobbs*, appropriation of George Moore's original narrative enables an intense form of creative play, where multiple versions of Albert become manifest on the stage, creating a space of fluidity between source text and appropriation, past and present, fiction and theatre.

Under the title 'Adaptation, Devising and Collective Creation: Tracing Histories of Pat McCabe's *The Butcher Boy* on Stage', Siobhan O'Gorman draws on conceptions of devising and collective creation to promote a renewed understanding of different processes of adaptation, the diverse modes of collaboration involved, and the various intersectional points at which conventionally designated and usually hierarchical roles associated with such forms as theatre overlap and bleed into each other. The analysis of different productions of the stage adaptation of Pat McCabe's *The Butcher Boy* (1992) suggests that the fruitful blend of adaptation and devising could also inform the ways in which we theorise adaptation as collaborative art more broadly.

Graham Allen's contribution opens the Literature and Screen section with a new look at what most believe to be Stanley Kubrick's first mature film, *The Killing* (1956). The chapter acknowledges the film's fidelity to its source novel's (Lionel White's *Clean Break*) intricate plotting of time and space, but seeks to expand discussion of these features by stressing Kubrick's existential focus on the sheer impenetrability and resistance to human intention of the physical world. Using hints from the philosophies of Lucretius and Heidegger, the chapter presents a reading that follows this largely visual dimension of the film to its famous ending. In doing so it explains in greater depth than has been done before how Kubrick and his partner James B. Harris create a film of significant philosophical richness from their noir, crime thriller source.

Donna Maria Alexander examines the adaptation of history in the poetry of Lorna Dee Cervantes, Danez Smith and Claudia Rankine. Each

poet engages with experimental styles, including documentary poetry and script poetry, in order to adapt film and television sources into critiques of racism. Chicana poet, Cervantes engages with experimental poetic modes of adaptation using documentary poetry to explore problematic representations of Latina women in the Americas. Black American poets, Smith and Rankine use script poems to recontextualise film and television sources to critique attitudes towards Black Americans throughout history. Whether these poets collaborate with historical representations shown in film, news reels, television commercials or other literary and social documents, what they are ultimately adapting is history in order to deliver critiques of present-day racism.

In '"His world had vanished long before he entered it." Wes Anderson's homage to Stefan Zweig', Nikolai Preuschoff analyses the 2014 feature film *The Grand Budapest Hotel* as a borderline case of adaptation. While the film is loosely based on a variety of Zweig's ficitonal and autobiographical writings, yet it proudly curates these 'elements that were sort of stolen' from Zweig to a rosy tribute to the Austrian writer. From its stylised cinematography, its choreographies and nested narrative structure to its satirical, confectionery miniature worlds, the film both sets out to reanimate and to comment on Zweig's storytelling craft. As a result, Anderson's *Grand Budapest Hotel* is as much an homage to Zweig and the lost Central European world he lived in as it is a film about adaptation, with the film's two protagonists—a concierge and a lobby boy—allegorically playing with the traditional understanding of adaptation as a 'service' to a literary text. While Anderson's homage may not be an adaptation in the narrow sense of the term, it is a striking example of a cooperation with the dead that entailed the posthumous publication of a Zweig story collection, translated by Anthea Bell, to help finding a new audience for the Austrian exile.

Christiane Schönfeld focuses in 'Collaborative Art with Political Intent: The 1933 Adaptation of Theodor Storm's Der Schimmelreiter / The Rider on the White Horse' on the 1933/1934 adaptation of Theodor Storm's nineteenth-century novella and analyses the collaborative process involved in adapting a famous example of the literary canon to the cinema screen within the context of Nazi ideology. Collaborative filmmaking—during a time when the Nazi regime depended on a mass base of support and required filmmakers to communicate the strength of its leader—is discussed in the context of Hans Deppe and Curt Oertel's adaptation

project. Of particular interest are the methods used by the two scriptwriters/directors and their team as they turned ideological fixation into an attainable reality and thereby contributed to successfully mediating the Hitler myth that became so central to the Nazis' rise to power.

Jean Conacher explores Andreas Dresen's film adaptation of Christoph Hein's novel *Willenbrock*, itself considered a reworking of Kleist's *Michael Kohlhaas* in 'Adapting Hein's *Willenbrock*: Andreas Dresen and the legacy of the GDR "ensemble" tradition'. The chapter traces the German director's background in the theatre and cinema of the German Democratic Republic and his studies at the Film and Television School (HFF). It reveals how Dresen's early exposure to the theatrical traditions of Brecht and Stanislavsky shapes his approach to film-directing and highlights the influence of DEFA directors (Beyer, Maetzig and Reisch) who successfully established collaborative teams within the GDR filmmaking industry. Drawing particularly on Thomas Leitch and Linda Hutcheon, Conacher examines processes of adaptation, including aspects of fidelity, altered space and time and performance, and demonstrates the critical and radical legacy of the GDR 'ensemble' tradition in Dresen's work.

Guillaume Lecomte's contribution entitled 'Same Player, Shoot Again: Géla Babluani's *13 (Tzameti)*, Transnational Auto-Remakes, and Collaboration' examines the transnational auto-remake as a potential site for collaboration between a director and a new national film production environment. Focusing on Géla Babluani's remake of his own *13 (Tzameti)* for the American market, Lecomte draws notably on Thomas Leitch's notion of disavowal in the context of remakes in order to reveal the real imbalance of power that characterises this type of production. After a brief historical overview of similar occurrences in the light of Raymond Williams' definition of hegemony, Lecomte posits Babluani's remake as a manifestation of imperialism in disguise on the part of the American film sector known as Indiewood, which merges independent aesthetics with mainstream production practices.

In 'Anselm Kiefer's Signature Or: Adapting God', Caitríona Leahy argues that Kiefer stops signing his works in imitation of God's Old Testament gesture of refusing to name himself. That refusal to name goes hand in hand with an intense concern with exploring and expanding the boundaries of selfhood. Leahy identifies a number of different forms of collaboration and appropriation in Kiefer's work which drive the expansion of the self and which underpin his overall aim: to represent a posited unity of all things. At the centre of that unity is an artist imitating God.

In the chapter entitled 'Adaptation as Arguing with the Past: The Case of Sherlock', Mark Wallace considers the significance of adapting a much older source text, and proposes the term transtemporal adaptation to describe the result. Transtemporal adaptations are proposed as a form of 'arguing with the past'. *Sherlock* (2010–) is an exemplary text, one in which is inscribed the tension between Doyle's nineteenth-century ideals and the Freudian narrative of personal development dominant in twenty-first-century popular culture, a tension that manifests itself in the depiction of the detective's (a)sexuality. The relation between adapter and source is revealed to be a collaboration marked by conflict and the mutually incompatible demands of fidelity to the source and adherence to dominant narrative formations within the adaptation's own context.

Thomas Van Parys investigates the links between value judgement, legitimation and degree of collaboration in the case of David Hewson's novelisation of the Danish television series *The Killing* (*Forbrydelsen*). Just as *The Killing* has been received as a quality European drama series, the novel is presented as a prestige novelisation because of the high profile of its British author and its atypical adaptation process. Van Parys deconstructs the discursive position of both the television series and the novelisation as prestige texts by looking at the writing process and by uncovering their generic and stylistic layers. Moving beyond the explanatory functions of a standard novelisation, Hewson's *The Killing* also delivers a corrective reading of the television series, which is made possible by the freer adaptation process. In this sense, the novel can be interpreted as a materialisation of fans' wish fulfilment.

In her chapter entitled 'Things You Can Do to an Author When He's Dead: Literary Prosthetics and the Example of Heinrich von Kleist', Rachel MagShamhráin explores the adaptations allowed—if not demanded—by the death of the author in terms of what this author dubs a 'literary prosthetics', in which the corpus is imagined as being aesthetically supplemented and potentially also enhanced by new and artificial devices. Taking the example of Heinrich von Kleist (1777–1811), the author examines the space for adaptation left by his premature death and the various lacunae in his biography and literary corpus, and asks if the ultimate act of Kleist reception lies in adaptations which forge new authentic works by the long-dead author. It further asks if a critical prosthetics might flourish on the basis of this literary prosthetics.

⁴⁷⁰ The volume closes with the section Conversations with the Dead II.
⁴⁷¹ Here, Judith Buchanan examines three contemporary Shakespeare pro-
⁴⁷² ductions in which representatives of those ghosts are made explicitly man-
⁴⁷³ ifest through an archival Shakespeare film print embedded centrally within
⁴⁷⁴ their performance. The contributions by Judith Buchanan and Thomas
⁴⁷⁵ Leitch, both keynotes at our conference, complement each other in fasci-
⁴⁷⁶ nating ways. The idea of collaboration with the dead runs through these
⁴⁷⁷ two different, yet equally compelling works. In 'Collaborating with the
⁴⁷⁸ Dead, Playing the Shakespeare Archive; or How We Can Avoid Being
⁴⁷⁹ Pushed from Our Stools', Buchanan considers that theatre and film are
⁴⁸⁰ both art forms inhabited and dynamised by ghosts. Productions discussed
⁴⁸¹ are: the 2006 Wooster Group/LeCompte *Hamlet* in engagement with
⁴⁸² the Richard Burton 1964 film, the 2013 Silents Now *Richard III* in
⁴⁸³ engagement with the 1910 Frank Benson *Richard III* film and the 2018
⁴⁸⁴ Kit Monkman *Macbeth* feature film in engagement with a 1909 silent
⁴⁸⁵ Italian *Macbeth*. The case study first analyses then generates broader ques-
⁴⁸⁶ tions about the reciprocity of relationship between contemporary Shake-
⁴⁸⁷ speare performance and the historical archive and an examination of the
⁴⁸⁸ dramatic agency with which the performance archive can be invested.
⁴⁸⁹ With Buchanan's emphasis on the processuality of adaptation, it only
⁴⁹⁰ seems appropriate to conclude this collection.

Note

1. See, for example, Mireia Aragay (ed.), *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Inter-textuality, Authorship*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005; Christiane Schönfeld (ed.), *Processes of Transposition: German Literature and Film*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007; or *Gegenwartsliteratur. Ein Germanistisches Jahrbuch*, edited by Paul M. Lützeler and Stephan K. Schindler, no. 7 (2008), I. Literatur und Film, II. Literatur und Erinnerung.
2. In *A Theory of Adaptation*, Hutcheon (2006, xiv) draws on a structure learned from Journalism 101 as a framework around which to build her theory of adaptation, "the *what*, *who*, *why*, *how*, *when*, and *where* of adap-tation."

Works Cited

Adorno, Theodor W. *Essays on Music*, ed. by Richard Leppert, translated by Susan Gillespie, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002.

Aragay, Mireia, ed. *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.

Boozer, Jack, ed. *Authorship in Film Adaptation*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008.

Brook, Peter. *The Empty Space*, London: Penguin, 1984.

Cardwell, Sarah. *Adaptation Revisited: Television and the Classic Novel*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002 and 2007.

Cob, Shelley. *Adaptation, Authorship, and Contemporary Women Filmmakers*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Freshwater, Helen. *Theatre and Audience*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

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

Hutcheon, Linda. "Foreword: Adapting (to) History." In *Reworking the German Past: Adaptations in Film, the Arts, and Popular Culture*, edited by Susan Figge and Jenifer Ward, vii–ix, Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2010.

Lind, Maria. "Complications; On Collaboration, Agency and Contemporary Art." *New Communities*, vol. 39 (Spring 2009), 52–74.

Lützeler, Paul Michael; Schindler, Stephan K., ed. *Gegenwartsliteratur. Ein Germanistisches Jahrbuch*, no. 7 (2008), I. Literatur und Film, II. Literatur und Erinnerung.

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

Norrick, Neal R. "Twice-Told Tales: Collaborative Narration of Familiar Stories." *Language in Society*, vol. 26, no. 2 (1997), 199–220.

Rentschler, Eric, ed. *German Film & Literature: Adaptations and Transformations*, New York and London: Methuen, 1986.

Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London: Routledge, 2006 and 2016.

Schönfeld, Christiane, ed. *Processes of Transposition: German Literature and Film*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.

Stam, Robert. *Film Theory: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.