THE NEW CRITICAL IDIOM

The New Critical Idiom is an invaluable series of introductory guides to today's critical terminology. Each book:

- provides a handy, explanatory guide to the use (and abuse) of the term
- offers an original and distinctive overview by a leading literary and cultural critic
- relates the term to the larger field of cultural representation

With a strong emphasis on clarity, lively debate and the widest possible breadth of examples, *The New Critical Idiom* is an indispensable approach to key topics in literary studies.

Also available in this series:

ADAPTATION AND APPROPRIATION

Julie Sanders

INTRODUCTION

art never improves, but ... the material of art is never quite the same.
                    T. S. Eliot, 'Tradition and the Individual Talent'

This book is concerned with the literariness of literature. Any explo-
ration of intertextuality, and its specific manifestation in the forms of
adaptation and appropriation, is inevitably interested in how art creates
art, or how literature is made by literature. There is a danger, however,
that this activity of investigating or 'reading' adaptations proves rather
self-serving, merely stimulating the afterlife of texts and therefore of lit-
erary criticism as a scholarly pursuit. The literary academic or student
reads many texts throughout their learning career and the more texts
they read the more echoes, parallels, and points of comparison they
identify in the texts that they encounter. The notion that the tracing of
intertextual reference and allusion is a self-confirming exercise is reason-
able enough – Robert Weimann writes persuasively of the 'reproductive
dimension of appropriation' (1983: 14), suggesting the manifold ways
in which texts feed off and create other texts – but, as readers and crit-
ics, we also need to recognize that adaptation and appropriation are fun-
damental to the practice, and, indeed, to the enjoyment, of literature.

The late twentieth century made a particular virtue out of querying
the ability or even necessity of being 'original', not least in the arts.
Edward Said suggested in 'On Originality' that 'the writer thinks less of

writing originally, and more of rewriting' (1983: 135); Jacques Derrida noted that 'the desire to write is the desire to launch things that come back to you as much as possible' (1985: 157). The 'rewriting' impulse, which is much more than simple imitation, is often articulated in theoretical terms such as intertextuality, and many prominent theorists of this practice emerge from the structuralist and poststructuralist movements of the 1960s, especially in France. In the field of anthropology, Claude Lévi-Strauss conducted many of his researches in terms of identifying repeating structures across cultures (2001 [1978]). In the literary sphere, Roland Barthes declared that 'any text is an intertext' (1981: 39), suggesting that the works of previous and surrounding cultures were always present in literature. Barthes also highlighted the ways in which texts were not solely dependent on their authors for the production of meaning, indicating how they benefited from readers who created their own intertextual networks. Julia Kristeva, herself a product of scientific and anthropological training under Lévi-Strauss, formulated the term *intertextualité* in her essay 'The Bounded Text' to describe the process by which any text was 'a permutation of texts, an intertextuality' (1980: 36). Kristeva's focus was driven by semiotics; she was interested in how texts were permeated by the signs, signifiers, and utterances of the culture in which they participated, or from which they derived. Intertextuality as a term has, however, come to refer to a far more textual as opposed to utterance-driven notion of how texts encompass and respond to other texts both during the process of their creation and composition and in terms of the individual reader's or spectator's response.

Adaptations and appropriations can vary in how explicitly they state their intertextual purpose. Many of the film, television, or theatre adaptations of canonical works of literature that we look at in this volume openly declare themselves as an interpretation or re-reading of a canonical precursor. Sometimes this will involve a director's personal vision, and it may or may not involve cultural relocation or updating of some form; sometimes this reinterpretative act will also involve the movement into a new generic mode or context. In appropriations the intertextual relationship may be less explicit, more embedded, but what is often inescapable is the fact that a political or ethical commitment shapes a writer's, director's, or performer's decision to re-interpret a source text. In this respect, in any study of adaptation and appropriation

the creative import of the author cannot be as easily dismissed as Roland Barthes's or Michel Foucault's influential theories of the 'death of the author' might suggest (Barthes 1988; Foucault 1979). Nevertheless the ability of these theories to destabilize the authority of the original text does enable multiple and sometimes conflicting production of meaning, a fact that will prove important for our analyses. The inherent intertextuality of literature encourages the ongoing, evolving production of meaning, and an ever-expanding network of textual relations.

Literary texts 'are built from systems, codes and traditions established by previous works of literature' (Allen 2000: 1). But they are also built from systems, codes, and traditions derived from companion art forms. If Kristeva is credited with formulating the theory of intertextuality, hers was a theory that was far from exclusive in its application to literature. She saw art, music, drama, dance, and literature in terms of a living mosaic, a dynamic intersection of textual surfaces. We might wish to add film to this list, but following the Kristevan model, much of the terminology adopted by this study to describe literary adaptation and appropriation is harnessed from the parallel disciplines of fine art and musicology. The vocabulary of adaptation is highly labile: Adrian Poole has offered an extensive list of terms to represent the Victorian era's interest in reworking the artistic past: '(in no particular order) ... borrowing, stealing, appropriating, inheriting, assimilating ... being influenced, inspired, dependent, indebted, haunted, possessed ... homage, mimicry, travesty, echo, allusion, and intertextuality' (2004: 2). We could continue the linguistic riff, adding into the mix: variation, version, interpretation, imitation, proximation, supplement, increment, improvisation, prequel, sequel, continuation, addition, paratext, hypertext, palimpsest, graft, rewriting, reworking, refashioning, re-vision, re-evaluation. The glossary at the back of this volume grapples with a small selection of these terms but embedded within the pages of the book the reader will encounter many more. I make no apologies for the profusion rather than fixity of terms offered: the idiom in which adaptation and appropriation functions is rich and various; that is part of its essence and importance, and any study of the same should surely reflect this fact.

J. Hillis Miller has explored various permutations of the paratextual, the peritextual, and the hypertextual in his critical writings, delineating the multifarious ways in which a literary text can be 'inhabited ... by a

long chain of parasitical presences, echoes, allusions, guests, ghosts of previous texts' (Gilbert and Gubar 2000 [1979]: 46). This volume concerns itself at various turns with these textual ghosts and hauntings, both literal and metaphorical. In turn, questions of dependency and derivation are broached. Studies of adaptation and appropriation invariably conjure up questions of ownership and the attendant legal discourses of copyright and property law. Following on from Barthes's destabilization of fixed textual meaning, however, as both procedure and process, adaptation and appropriation are celebratory of the cooperative and collaborative model.

Certain distinctions remain, nevertheless, crucial to understanding the operations of adaptation and appropriation. There is a need, for example, to distinguish between direct quotation and acts of citation. Quotation can be deferential or critical, supportive or questioning; it depends on the context in which the quotation takes place. Citation, however, presumes a more deferential relationship; it is frequently self-authenticating, even reverential, in its reference to the canon of 'authoritative', culturally validated, texts. Many nineteenth-century novels, those of Thomas Hardy, the Brontë sisters, and George Eliot, for example, deployed Shakespearean citation in this manner. But citation is different again to adaptation, which constitutes a more sustained engagement with a single text or source than the more glancing act of allusion or quotation, even citation, allows. Beyond that, appropriation carries out the same sustained engagement as adaptation but frequently adopts a posture of critique, even assault.

Adaptation and appropriation are inevitably involved in the performance of textual echo and allusion, but this does not usually equate to the fragmentary *bricolage* of quotation more commonly understood as the operative mode of intertextuality. In French, *bricolage* is the term for 'Do-it-yourself' (DIY), which helps to explain its application in a literary context to those texts that assemble a range of quotations, allusions, and citations from existent works of art. A parallel form in art is the creation of *collage* by assembling found items to create a new aesthetic object or in music the creative act of 'sampling'. This purposeful reassembly of fragments to form a new whole is, undoubtedly, an active element in many of the postmodernist texts explored in the course of this study.

There are also important ways in which the act of *bricolage* shades into the literary practice of pastiche. Pastiche is another term of French derivation which in the musical sphere refers to a medley of references, a composition made up of fragments pieced together (Dentith, 2000: 194). In the domains of art and literature, however, pastiche has undergone a further shift or extension of reference, being applied most often to those works which carry out an extended imitation of the style of a single artist or writer. There are, undoubtedly, some current novelists who are exponents of the medley style of pastiche – Jonathan Coe, for example, in his richly allusive *What a Carve Up!* (1994), which mimics everything from journalism to James Joyce in the course of its narrative – but frequently it is the more sustained act of artistic imitation which is accorded the label of pastiche in contemporary literature. Pastiche is often assumed to have a satiric undertow or a parodic intention, although there are exceptions to this rule. In some respects there is often a complicated blend of admiration and satire at play in pastiches of particular authors or literary styles. J. M. Coetzee's *Foe*, discussed in detail in Chapter 6, reworks with both celebratory and satiric intent the aesthetics of eighteenth-century prose, and the writings of Daniel Defoe in particular, in its version of novels written in the epistolary or journalistic style; Peter Carey effects something similar in his self-conscious revisiting of the tropes and idioms of nineteenth-century fiction, and in particular Dickensian narrative, in *Jack Maggs*, explored in Chapter 7. There are also, in both these novels, moments when *bricolage* and pastiche are jointly in play, but, on the whole, when assigning a political or ethical commitment to acts of literary appropriation such as these postcolonial rewritings of canonical texts (*Robinson Crusoe* and *Great Expectations* respectively), we acknowledge that stylistic imitation is neither the essence nor sole purpose of the approach to the source text, even though it may be a defining feature.

James Joyce's 1922 novel *Ulysses* could be viewed as the archetype of the adaptive text. The title alone indicates a structuring relationship with Homer's Ancient Greek epic of the wandering and journeying Ulysses (also known as Odysseus): *The Odyssey*. That relationship was even more apparent in the pre-publication instalments of Joyce's novel where each chapter heading signified a specific relationship with an event or character in the Homeric narrative: 'Telemachus'; 'Lotus

Eaters'; 'Scylla and Charybdis'; 'Sirens'; 'Circe'; 'Penelope'. Joyce's decision to suppress these referential chapter headings in the final published version of the novel raises the question as to whether we require knowledge of *The Odyssey* to understand in any comprehensive sense his Dublin narrative. What this question highlights, however, is the fundamental contradictory impulse towards dependence and liberation implicit in the majority of the adaptations and appropriations that will be invoked in the course of this volume. Gérard Genette has categorized *Ulysses* as 'the very type of the self-proclaimed hypertext' and yet as 'an extreme case of emancipation from the hypotext' (1997: 309), with 'hypertext' here equating to the adaptation and 'hypotext' to the source. Joyce's novel can undoubtedly be read alone and appreciated as a narrative, as a remarkable vignette of a day in the life of an ensemble of Dublin inhabitants in the 1920s; this is by no means a failed or insufficient reading. And yet a reading of that narrative alongside an informing awareness of the events of Homer's epic clearly enriches the potential for the production of meaning, so that we see, as Jennifer Levine has noted, the quasi-father–son relationship that emerges between Stephen Daedalus and Leopold Bloom in the novel as suggestive in its own right and yet register how 'it sharpens our sense of the potentially filial relationship between them to see them also as Telemachus and Odysseus' (1990: 32). Of course, the intertextuality of Joyce's characters does not rest with the Homeric comparisons alone, since Stephen and Leopold's relationship also suggests that of Hamlet and Old Hamlet, and *Ulysses* resonates with Shakespearean echoes and refrains. Elsewhere the narrative indulges in numerous virtuoso performances of literary pastiche.

If Leopold's wife, Molly, who speaks the infamous closing monologue of *Ulysses*, is a version of Odysseus's wife, Penelope, patiently awaiting her wandering husband's return from his epic adventures, there is also a self-conscious rewriting of the informing sourcetext in the fact that Molly proves a distinctly adulterous version of the archetypal loyal wife. Joyce expands the frame of reference further by evoking Shakespeare's wife, Ann Hathaway, as another Penelope, since she was left behind in Stratford-upon-Avon when the playwright went to London to make his name: 'We begin to be interested in Mrs S' (Joyce 1986 [1922]: 165). There is often humour as well as intellectual richness at work in the parallels and consonances Joyce evokes. This Irish epic compresses the decades and continents of the Homeric text into a single Dublin day, punctuated by pub gatherings, and cooking on the stove. Cyclops becomes an obstructive drinker in Barney Kiernan's bar, Circe a brothel owner. There is undoubtedly an element of parody, or the 'mock-epic', implicit in this approach, comparable to Alexander Pope's reduction of the epic form to a story of a vain woman at her dressing table in his long eighteenth-century poem 'The Rape of the Lock'. In this respect, *Ulysses* embodies the reduction and compression that Genette has identified as a common impulse in some hypertextual literature and yet in its verbal complexity and twisting, web-like narrative *Ulysses* also deserves recognition for its art of amplification: making the quotidian lives of its Dublin community epic in scope. An intertextual reading of *Ulysses* draws readers' imaginations into the realms of Homer, Dante and Shakespeare, stretching far beyond its self-proclaimed horizons and cultural geography. The signifying field appears vast as a result.

Ulysses is a potent reminder of the rich possibilities of the adaptive technique and of readings alert to the politics of appropriation, but it is also a fine example of the sense of play that many theorists have stressed as central to the adaptive instinct. Paul Ricoeur describes appropriation as 'the "playful" transposition of the text, and play itself ... as the modality appropriate to the reader *potentialis*, that is, to anyone who can read' (1991: 87). As this volume will stress, there is frequently heartfelt political commitment standing behind acts of literary appropriation or 're-vision'. Adrienne Rich's coining of this phrase with its crucial inserted hyphen was a product of her personal feminist and lesbian politics (1992 [1971]). But the political aspect of 're-visionary' writing should never occlude the simultaneously pleasurable aspects of reading into such texts their intertextual and allusive relationship with other texts, tracing and activating the networks of association that we have been describing. As Genette observes: 'one who really loves texts must wish from time to time to love (at least) two together' (1997 [1982]: 399). Such statements encourage us to categorize and define adaptation and appropriation and their cultural histories while at the same time taking care to ensure that these elements of pleasure are neither lost nor underestimated.

T. S. Eliot's 1919 essay 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' has been described as 'perhaps the single most formative work in twentieth-

century Anglo-American criticism' (Widdowson 1999: 49). Eliot's essay is certainly essential reading for students of adaptation and appropriation. Eliot sought to rethink notions of originality and value, querying the 'tendency to insist, when we praise a poet, upon those aspects of his work in which he least resembles anyone else' (Eliot 1984 [1919]: 37). The unapologetically masculinist emphasis aside, Eliot's comments are pertinent to this project. Suggesting an alternative literary value-system in which the reworking and response to the texts of the past would take centre-stage, Eliot questioned why originality was valued over 'repetition': 'No poet, no artist, of any art, has his complete meaning alone' (38). He was not advocating blind adherence to precursor texts or ages, an action that would after all be little more than literary plagiarism; his notion of the 'individual talent' was that it created new material upon the surface and foundation of the literary past.

Peter Widdowson is correct to acknowledge that Eliot's case for an historical awareness of literary tradition served to justify his own intertextual, discursive style and the aims of the Modernist movement (1999: 49). Modernist poetry, not least Eliot's own, practised intertextuality in the form of quotation, allusion, collage, *bricolage*, and fragment. As already stressed, in this study we are looking at something rather different, a more sustained engagement between texts and their creators. We are seeking to theorize an interrelation between texts which is fundamental to their existence and which at times seems to get to the heart of the literary, and especially the reading, experience. Eliot's delineation of the 'historical sense' (1984 [1919]: 38) is helpful; he suggests that meaning stems from the relationships between texts, relationships which encourage contrast and comparison. As the close readings conducted here underline, this is exactly what an aesthetic and historicized critical study of adaptation is concerned with.

Eliot's essay has sometimes been attacked on the grounds that it implicitly assumes a literary canon, a series of valued texts that are (re)turned to and consulted by subsequent ages (Eagleton 1994 [1981]: 54). The debate that has raged around canon formation in literary studies in recent decades is inescapable in this context. 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. As Derek Attridge has astutely observed: 'The perpetuation of any canon is dependent in part on the references made to its earlier members by its later members (or would-be members) ...' (1996: 169). The required 'reading alongside' of source and adaptation, the signifiers respectively of 'tradition' and 'individual talent' in Eliot's terminology, demands a knowledge on the part of the reader (or spectator) of the source when encountering the derivative or responsive text. In this respect, adaptation becomes a veritable marker of canonical status; citation infers authority.

To this end, adaptation could be defined as an inherently conservative genre. As Attridge continues: 'through their frequently overt *allusiveness* ... novels offer themselves not as challenges to the canon, but as canonic – as already canonized, one might say. They appear to locate themselves within an established literary culture, rather than presenting themselves as an assault on that culture' (1996: 169). Yet, as the notion of hostile takeover present in a term such as 'appropriation' implies, adaptation can also be oppositional, even subversive. There are as many opportunities for divergence as adherence, for assault as well as homage.

Another influential essay for studies of appropriation, then, is Adrienne Rich's 'When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-vision', first published in 1971. In that essay she made the much-cited observation that for women writers it was essential to take on the writing of the past in order to move beyond it into a free (liberated) creative space of their own: 'Re-vision – the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entering an old text from a new critical direction ... We need to know the writing of the past and know it differently than we have ever known it; not to pass on a tradition but to break its hold over us' (Rich 1992 [1971]: 369). The suggestion is similar to Eliot's in that it invokes the literary past and insists on an historical understanding to foster creativity both in the present and in the future, but it is also entirely antithetical to Eliot's mindset in that it simultaneously advocates a radical break with that tradition, a dissonant and dissident rupturing of its value-systems and hierarchies. This critical perspective on the relationship between tradition and the individual talent is one shared by writers producing work from feminist, gay and lesbian, and postcolonial subject-positions.

Another theorist of literature's relationship to its own past whose work is both acknowledged and challenged by these subject-positions is Harold Bloom. His seminal book *The Anxiety of Influence*, first published

in 1973, considered the fraught relationship between writers and their literary inheritance, constructing it in self-consciously Freudian terms as an Oedipal struggle between young 'sons' and their literary forefathers. Several flaws in this argument have subsequently been exposed, not least that Bloom writes from an exclusively masculinist position. He also constructs a very particular literary history, one with an emphasis on the individual creator or literary 'genius', and therefore one that unduly privileges the Romantic era when a special stress on the individual creative mind and the unique personal contribution of the poet emerged. Several critics have since traced alternative teleologies of literary influence, indicating, for example, the impact of the classics on early modern writers such as Shakespeare (Bate 1993), and acknowledging a strong female presence within the communities of influence as well as those influenced (Gilbert and Gubar 2000 [1979]). Nevertheless, Bloom's central thesis of 'misprision', the often happenstance or inevitable reinterpretation of texts during the process of adoption, translation, and reworking them into new contexts, remains a highly suggestive one for appropriation studies and one which has influenced the vocabulary with which many scholars operate in this field.

The central problem with any tradition is the ability to recognize not only those who constitute that tradition but those who are at various times excluded from it, or, at the very least, consigned to its margins. Henry Louis Gates Jr has examined this phenomenon in relation to African-American writing, a literary domain that in its desire to assert its own methodologies and ways of operating, nevertheless found a need to confront the white literary tradition within its pages; this is what Graham Allen has described as the 'struggle of black subjects to enter into Western literary culture' (2000: 168). For Allen, 'The core of Gates's argument is that African-American writing is double-voiced and self-consciously intertextual in its relation to both standard English and a black vernacular discourse ...' (2000: 168). Gates's most expansive discussion of these ideas takes place in *The Signifying Monkey* (1988), and invokes the crucial analogue of jazz music and the improvisational yet allusive techniques it deploys: 'In the jazz tradition, compositions by Count Basie ("signify") and Oscar Peterson ("signifyin'") are structured around the idea of formal revision and implication' (Gates 1988: 123). This discussion of adaptation and appropriation will invoke the example

of jazz on several occasions, and of musicology on several more. But the specific relevance to African-American writing of 'signifying' and its relationship to jazz deserves notice. As James Andreas Sr acknowledges: 'To signify in African and African-American cultures is to improvise upon a given *topos*, narrative, or joke the way a jazz musician improvises on a progression of chords, melodic structure, or spontaneous riff in the previous musician's solo' (1999: 107). Andreas Sr's specific example of this in action is the work of Gloria Naylor. Her novels have been much studied due to their intertextuality with Shakespeare, Faulkner, Dante, Chaucer, and the Bible among others (Erickson 1996). In *Bailey's Cafe*, this signifying practice is played out through a complex series of layers, allusions, and shaping influences. The café of the title is a literal space in the novel but one that appears able to cross geographical and temporal borders. The characters who visit the café each have a tale to tell and their tales are reworkings of biblical ones, including those of Eve and Mariam. The intertextuality does not stop there, for the name of the café as well as the characters' tale-telling invokes a seminal work of English medieval literature: in Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*, the host of the Tabard Inn where the pilgrims gathered before their journey to Canterbury, and who proposed that they tell their individual stories en route, was called Harry Bailey.

Shakespeare, a familiar hypotext throughout Naylor's *oeuvre*, is present in the novel's evocations of *The Tempest* among other texts (Sanders 2001: 170–90), but it is the manner in which the narrative structure is shaped by movements more familiar from the musical domains of blues and jazz that seems most overtly to acknowledge Gates's theories. Sections entitled 'Mood Indigo' and 'Miss Maple's Blues' explicitly acknowledge the literary riffs and improvisations being effected by Naylor on a diverse range of influences and sources. Naylor is a writer steeped in other writers and yet her voice remains distinctly her own; Gates suggests this is a typical feature of African-American writing, which consciously positions itself in relation to canonical (white) Western culture and the companion productions of fellow African and African-American writers. As Andreas Sr notes in his discussion of Naylor's *Tempest*-soaked appropriation *Mama Day*, her work embodies the familiar African-American practice of 'playful but wilful manipulation of the signifier [that] alters perception of the signified ...' (1999: 107).

In all of the instances discussed in this introduction, and elsewhere in this volume, the 'rewrite', be it in the form of novel, play, poem or film, invariably transcends mere imitation, serving instead in the capacity of incremental literature (Zabus 2002: 4), adding, supplementing, improvising, innovating. The aim is not replication as such, but rather complication, expansion rather than contraction (Andreas 1999: 107). In scientific terms, we might speak about the crucial difference between a clone and a genetic adaptation. And if musicology offers us one highly applicable and suggestive set of metaphors and idioms for conducting a discussion of literary adaptation and appropriation within these pages, it will also be registered that the scientific domain of genetics, stretching from the nineteenth-century horticultural experiments of Gregor Mendel and Charles Darwin's controversial theory of natural selection and environmental adaptation through to the research into DNA in the twentieth century, provides a further set of productive correspondences.

Using a separate field of terminology derived from the world of horti-culture, Genette has written at length about the 'palimpsestuous nature of texts', observing that 'Any text is a hypertext, grafting itself onto a hypotext, an earlier text that it imitates or transforms' (1997 [1982]: ix). Grafting is just one of several creative metaphors for the adaptive process that this volume will favour. As Chapter 2 explores further, there is a need to establish a more diverse vocabulary for discussing and describing the relationship between texts and hypertext, source and appropriation, than these labels at present enable. In these phrases the relationship is often viewed as linear and reductive; the appropriation is always in the secondary, belated position, and the discussion will therefore always be, to a certain extent, about difference, lack, or loss. Travel can change for the better though, so the metaphor of the journey may still be helpful, even though it implies a linear movement from point A to point B.

By eschewing a linear epistemology altogether, however, phrases such as 'grafting' or models derived from musicology, which allow for greater dynamic impetus in the new composition or variation, serve us well. To quote Genette: 'In music, the range of transformational possi-bilities is probably broader than in painting, broader than in literature certainly, given the complexity of musical discourse, which, unlike the literary text, is unhampered by the strict "linearity" of the verbal signi-fier' (1997 [1982]: 386). Chapter 2 explores further the potential for

phrases appropriated from the discipline of music and musicology, terms such as variation and sampling, for example, to revivify our understandings of the kinetic processes of adaptation.

As this endless ruminating over terminology suggests, this is a study sympathetic to pluralism rather than fixity. To this end, the volume is divided into three parts. The first section 'Defining Terms' offers a series of definitions for, and ways of thinking about, adaptation and appropria-tion as practice and process. The aim is to open out and widen the range of terms and their applications, rather than fixing or ossifying specific concepts of adaptation and appropriation. The second section on 'Literary Archetypes' examines the recurring interest of adaptation and appropriation in many of the central texts of Western culture: myth, fairy tale and folklore, and Shakespeare. The latter playwright, of course, reworks in his texts many of the structures and storylines of myth and fairy tale, indicating the cultural osmosis that regularly occurs between adaptive writers and texts. It will be witnessed in this study how fre-quently adaptations adapt other adaptations. There is a filtration effect taking place, a cross-pollination; we are observing mediations through culture, practice, and history that cannot be underestimated. The final section widens the parameters yet further, considering the 'Alternative Perspectives' offered by adaptations and appropriations. As well as exploring specific re-visions of canonical texts by William Shakespeare, Daniel Defoe, Charlotte Brontë, and Virginia Woolf, this section con-siders the ongoing interest in recreating and critiquing the Victorian era in various acts of reworking and pastiche, not least in the field of prose fiction. From a detailed focus on appropriations of fictional writing, the latter chapters of the volume consider the appropriation of historical 'fact', and the adaptation of alternative art forms in the domain of the literary and the cinematic.

What becomes clear as these sections progress is how frequently adaptations and appropriations are impacted upon by movements in, and readings produced by, the theoretical and intellectual arena as much as by their so-called sources. Many of the texts and films studied here are produced as much by the tenets of feminism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism, queer theory, and postmodernism as by the literary canon *per se*. As the critical anxieties and the Robert Weimann quotation at the beginning of this introduction indicated, the reproductive capacity

of appropriation and the study of appropriation cannot be underestimated. Texts feed off each other and create other texts, and other critical studies; literature creates other literature. Part of the sheer pleasure of the reading experience must be the tension between the familiar and the new, and the recognition both of similarity and difference, between ourselves and between texts. The pleasure exists, and persists, then, in the act of reading in, around, and on (and on).

PART 1

DEFINING TERMS