

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	2024-03-02 17:44:09
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/10643



Introduction

*Rachel MagShamhráin, Nikolai Preuschoff
and Bernadette Cronin*

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

6 Adaptations are not the endeavour of a singular hero, but proceed by
7 collaborative processes. However, practitioners in the field of adaptation
8 eventually have to turn around and look back, too. This moment of the
9 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

© The Author(s) 2020
B. Cronin et al. (eds.), *Adaptation Considered
as a Collaborative Art*, Adaptation in Theatre and Performance,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25161-1_1

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

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

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

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

59 We were interested in the identity of the adapter; in the roles of the
 60 writer, screenwriter, dramaturg, director, actor, translator, composer and
 61 audience; in processes of re-mediation and re-contextualisation; in adap-
 62 tation in the ‘second [and indeed third and fourth] degree’: adaptations
 63 of adaptations; in the act of brokering between idioms: the communi-
 64 cation between collaborators during the course of the adaptive process;
 65 and in the transfer of knowledge. The volume’s joint focus on processes
 66 and the practitioners, and therefore on the collaborative as such, hopes
 67 to offer a unique contribution to the field of adaptation studies. Process
 68 shifts the focus from beginnings and ends to the in-between from which
 69 vantage point adaptation starts to reveal hitherto hidden dimensions.

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

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

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

111 Of course, much of the heavy lifting intended to move adaptation stud-
 112 ies away from the comparative approaches, which marked its early phase
 113 and in which original and derivative are set side by side and examined
 114 for similarities and differences, was achieved by the work of Sarah Card-
 115 well, Robert Stam and others in the early part of this millennium. In her
 116 2002 *Adaptation Revisited: Television and the Classic Novel*, Sarah Card-
 117 well argued for adaptations to be considered in terms of the processes of
 118 their creation and as independently aesthetically valuable products, while
 119 consistently resisting the backward glance, and the temptation to collapse
 120 the study of adaptations back into the default mode of text–screen, origi-
 121 nal–derivative comparisons. She noted that, at least since the 1990s, there
 122 had been a dawning realisation of the limitations of that comparative
 123 approach, with Brian McFarlane, for example, expressing doubts about
 124 the juxtapositional form that adaptation studies had classically taken, while
 125 as yet unable to visualise an entirely new approach. So, although his own
 126 study had been conceived as an attempt 'to see if any apparatus might be

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

142 Drawing on these impulses, the volume at hand aims to increase the
 143 breadth of adaptation studies even further, not only by departing from
 144 the traditional binary literature–film adaptation case study, but by mov-
 145 ing deliberately into more interdisciplinary territory, considering adapta-
 146 tion across the creative and performing arts, with one tertium comparationis
 147 only: the collaborative. Putting very different subfields into concert
 148 with one another has the salutary effect of preventing that disciplinary
 149 insularity which makes the field more susceptible to the pull of the tried-
 150 and-tested comparative approach. Most importantly, the volume places
 151 the theatre front and centre. Perhaps more than any cultural form, the
 152 theatre is acutely aware of the collaborative and the adaptative dimen-
 153 sions of all textual engagements, for both of these elements are funda-
 154 mental to its existence. It is the live presence of the theatre audience that
 155 drives this home; their copresence in and compenetration of every theatri-
 156 cal space inflects each unique performance. In *theatre & audience*, Helen
 157 Freshwater writes, '[a]s Handke's characters acknowledge in *Offending the*
 158 *Audience* (Theater am Turm, Frankfurt, 1966), the relationship with the
 159 audience provides the theatre event with its rationale. This relationship
 160 is indispensable' (Freshwater 2009: 2). Freshwater reminds us that other
 161 writers have suggested that reader-response theory in general and Barthes
 162 in particular might enhance our understanding of theatre: 'Applying this
 163 theory to theatre implies a shift in emphasis from preoccupation with the
 164 biography and intention of the playwright or director towards interro-
 165 gation of the frames of reference which the audience brings to a show'

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

231 Various kinds of collaboration—between artists, between artists and curators,
 232 between artists and others—are once more appearing and becoming
 233 an increasingly established working method. For some this offers an alternative
 234 to the individualism that dominates the art world, for some it is understood
 235 as a way of re-questioning both artistic identity and authorship through self-organization.
 236 And for others, it is a pragmatic choice, offering the possibility of shared resources,
 237 equipment and experience. At the same time, these collaborations often constitute
 238 a response to a specific, sometimes local situation, and they run a constant risk
 239 of becoming incorporated into the system they are reacting against. (Lind 2009: 53)
 240

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 condi-
 254 tions, 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.

263 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

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

292 Bernadette Cronin's chapter entitled 'playing "the maids": Devising an
 293 Adaptation—Collaboration and the Actor's Process' considers the multi-
 294 ple modalities of adaptation in the context of a transdisciplinary, inter-
 295 cultural performance piece, *playing 'the maids'* (2015), a devised adap-
 296 tation of Jean Genet's classic modernist drama *The Maids*. The work
 297 emerged from the nine collaborating artists' creative responses to Genet's
 298 play from their varied cultural, social, aesthetic and artistic perspectives.
 299 Cronin reflects critically from the perspective of one of the collaborat-
 300 ing artists on the adapting and devising process that characterised the
 301 developmental phases of the work in the studio, on how ideas and 'entry
 302 points' arising out of the artists' engagement with Genet's play translated
 303 in the process and found their way into the piece. She addresses the ques-
 304 tion of ownership in the context of a collaborative devised adaptation and,
 305 finally, she makes a case for including the voice of the actor-practitioner-
 306 researcher in the discussion around adaptation studies and for why the
 307 actor's process enables a more nuanced understanding of how adaptation
 308 can function in contemporary, devised theatre.

309 In her contribution entitled, 'The Not-So-Singular Life of Albert
 310 Nobbs', Mary Noonan, focuses on the multiple adaptations and trans-
 311 lations of the short story 'Albert Nobbs' by the Irish novelist George
 312 Moore. The story first appeared in *A Story-Tellers Holiday*, in 1918. In
 313 1977, a play, *La Vie Singulière d'Albert Nobbs*, adapted from the Moore
 314 story, was written and directed by the French theatre director Simone
 315 Benmussa, and performed at the Théâtre d'Orsay, Paris. The play was sub-
 316 sequently translated into English by Barbara Wright, and later again made

317 into a film starring Glenn Close in the titular role. Noonan first considers
 318 the techniques Benmussa used to make a play that exposes the coercive
 319 nature of narrative within patriarchy, and the relationship between per-
 320 formance and gender. She goes on to show that Benmussa ransacks the
 321 original text to serve her own ends. Drawing on Julie Sanders’s work
 322 on the relationship between adaptation and appropriation (Sanders 2006
 323 [2016]), Noonan frames Benmussa’s *Albert Nobbs* in the context of works
 324 of literary appropriation—works that seek both to foster historical under-
 325 standing and insist on a radical break with tradition. However, in the case
 326 of Benmussa’s *Albert Nobbs*, appropriation of George Moore’s original
 327 narrative enables an intense form of creative play, where multiple ver-
 328 sions of Albert become manifest on the stage, creating a space of fluidity
 329 between source text and appropriation, past and present, fiction and the-
 330 atre.

331 Under the title ‘Adaptation, Devising and Collective Creation: Tracing
 332 Histories of Pat McCabe’s *The Butcher Boy* on Stage’, Siobhan O’Gor-
 333 man draws on conceptions of devising and collective creation to promote
 334 a renewed understanding of different processes of adaptation, the diverse
 335 modes of collaboration involved, and the various intersectional points at
 336 which conventionally designated and usually hierarchical roles associated
 337 with such forms as theatre overlap and bleed into each other. The analy-
 338 sis of different productions of the stage adaptation of Pat McCabe’s *The*
 339 *Butcher Boy* (1992) suggests that the fruitful blend of adaptation and
 340 devising could also inform the ways in which we theorise adaptation as
 341 collaborative art more broadly.

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

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

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

367 In “His world had vanished long before he entered it.” Wes Ander-
 368 son’s homage to Stefan Zweig’, Nikolai Preuschhoff analyses the 2014
 369 feature film *The Grand Budapest Hotel* as a borderline case of adapta-
 370 tion. While the film is loosely based on a variety of Zweig’s ficitonal and
 371 autobiographical writings, yet it proudly curates these ‘elements that were
 372 sort of stolen’ from Zweig to a rosy tribute to the Austrian writer. From
 373 its stylised cinematography, its choreographies and nested narrative struc-
 374 ture to its satirical, confectionery miniature worlds, the film both sets out
 375 to reanimate and to comment on Zweig’s storytelling craft. As a result,
 376 Anderson’s *Grand Budapest Hotel* is as much an homage to Zweig and
 377 the lost Central European world he lived in as it is a film about adaptation,
 378 with the film’s two protagonists—a concierge and a lobby boy—allegori-
 379 cally playing with the traditional understanding of adaptation as a ‘service’
 380 to a literary text. While Anderson’s homage may not be an adaptation in
 381 the narrow sense of the term, it is a striking example of a cooperation
 382 with the dead that entailed the posthumous publication of a Zweig story
 383 collection, translated by Anthea Bell, to help finding a new audience for
 384 the Austrian exile.

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

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

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

412 Guillaume Lecomte's contribution entitled 'Same Player, Shoot Again:
413 Géla Babluani's *I3 (Tzameti)*, Transnational Auto-Remakes, and Collab-
414 oration' examines the transnational auto-remake as a potential site for col-
415 laboration between a director and a new national film production environ-
416 ment. Focusing on Géla Babluani's remake of his own *I3 (Tzameti)* for
417 the American market, Lecomte draws notably on Thomas Leitch's notion
418 of disavowal in the context of remakes in order to reveal the real imbal-
419 ance of power that characterises this type of production. After a brief his-
420 torical overview of similar occurrences in the light of Raymond Williams'
421 definition of hegemony, Lecomte posits Babluani's remake as a manifes-
422 tation of imperialism in disguise on the part of the American film sector
423 known as Indiewood, which merges independent aesthetics with main-
424 stream production practices.

425 In 'Anselm Kiefer's Signature Or: Adapting God', Cairtriona Leahy
426 argues that Kiefer stops signing his works in imitation of God's Old Tes-
427 tament gesture of refusing to name himself. That refusal to name goes
428 hand in hand with an intense concern with exploring and expanding the
429 boundaries of selfhood. Leahy identifies a number of different forms of
430 collaboration and appropriation in Kiefer's work which drive the expan-
431 sion of the self and which underpin his overall aim: to represent a posited
432 unity of all things. At the centre of that unity is an artist imitating God.

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

445 Thomas Van Parys investigates the links between value judgement,
 446 legitimation and degree of collaboration in the case of David Hewson’s
 447 novelisation of the Danish television series *The Killing* (*Forbrydelsen*). Just
 448 as *The Killing* has been received as a quality European drama series, the
 449 novel is presented as a prestige novelisation because of the high profile
 450 of its British author and its atypical adaptation process. Van Parys decon-
 451 structs the discursive position of both the television series and the novel-
 452 isation as prestige texts by looking at the writing process and by uncover-
 453 ing their generic and stylistic layers. Moving beyond the explanatory
 454 functions of a standard novelisation, Hewson’s *The Killing* also delivers a
 455 corrective reading of the television series, which is made possible by the
 456 freer adaptation process. In this sense, the novel can be interpreted as a
 457 materialisation of fans’ wish fulfilment.

458 In her chapter entitled ‘Things You Can Do to an Author When
 459 He’s Dead: Literary Prosthetics and the Example of Heinrich von
 460 Kleist’, Rachel MagShamhráin explores the adaptations allowed—if not
 461 demanded—by the death of the author in terms of what this author dubs
 462 a ‘literary prosthetics’, in which the corpus is imagined as being aesthet-
 463 ically supplemented and potentially also enhanced by new and artificial
 464 devices. Taking the example of Heinrich von Kleist (1777–1811), the
 465 author examines the space for adaptation left by his premature death
 466 and the various lacunae in his biography and literary corpus, and asks
 467 if the ultimate act of Kleist reception lies in adaptations which forge new
 468 authentic works by the long-dead author. It further asks if a critical pros-
 469 thetics 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.

491 NOTE

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

502 WORKS CITED

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

- 505 Aragay, Mireia, ed. *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship*,
 506 Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.
- 507 Boozer, Jack, ed. *Authorship in Film Adaptation*, Austin: University of Texas
 508 Press, 2008.
- 509 Brook, Peter. *The Empty Space*, London: Penguin, 1984.
- 510 Cardwell, Sarah. *Adaptation Revisited: Television and the Classic Novel*, Manch-
 511 ester: Manchester University Press, 2002 and 2007.
- 512 Cob, Shelley. *Adaptation, Authorship, and Contemporary Women Filmmakers*,
 513 Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- 514 Freshwater, Helen. *Theatre and Audience*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan,
 515 2009.
- 516 Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*, New York and London: Routledge,
 517 2006.
- 518 Hutcheon, Linda. "Foreword: Adapting (to) History." In *Reworking the German*
 519 *Past: Adaptations in Film, the Arts, and Popular Culture*, edited by Susan
 520 Figge and Jenifer Ward, vii–ix, Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2010.
- 521 Lind, Maria. "Complications; On Collaboration, Agency and Contemporary
 522 Art." *New Communities*, vol. 39 (Spring 2009), 52–74.
- 523 Lützel, Paul Michael; Schindler, Stephan K., ed. *Gegenwartsliteratur. Ein Ger-*
 524 *manistisches Jahrbuch*, no. 7 (2008), I. Literatur und Film, II. Literatur und
 525 Erinnerung.
- 526 McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*,
 527 Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- 528 Norrick, Neal R. "Twice-Told Tales: Collaborative Narration of Familiar Stories."
 529 *Language in Society*, vol. 26, no. 2 (1997), 199–220.
- 530 Rentschler, Eric, ed. *German Film & Literature: Adaptations and Transforma-*
 531 *tions*, New York and London: Methuen, 1986.
- 532 Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London: Routledge, 2006 and
 533 2016.
- 534 Schönfeld, Christiane, ed. *Processes of Transposition: German Literature and Film*,
 535 Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.
- 536 Stam, Robert. *Film Theory: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.