

Rewiring the Text:

Adaptation and Translation in the Digital Heteroglossia.

Richard Berger.

A thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Bournemouth University for the degree of
Philosophy Doctorate.

March 2005.

Bournemouth University.

Rewiring the Text: Abstract.

This dissertation is concerned with adaptation, in the context of new emerging digital media platforms. The project proposes that new media has allowed for the creation of a universal digital heteroglossia; a heteroglossia that contains the plurality of the unstable utterances of cinema, radio, television, the web and computer games. This has allowed for the process of adaptation to become more instantaneous in the simultaneous deployment of narratives across the digital heteroglossia. Therefore, the process of adaptation is far more dialogical, with previous variants of narratives being 'rewired' and gaining an 'afterlife' through adaptation, and through the creation of new variants and versions.

The Internet has allowed for adaptation to move into a participatory mode, where fanfic writers fill in 'gaps' left by the creators of televisual and filmic texts. Videogames, based on pre-existing or co-existing texts, mean that players can experience moments of supreme and non-permanent adaptation themselves. This thesis suggests that this participation has democratised adaptation, and has fundamentally altered the nature of 'traditional' adaptation.

The thesis concludes that, due to a digital heteroglossia, 'traditional' adaptation will decline, as

the process becomes more plural and instantaneous. With previous variants of narratives being summoned back into life - due to adaptation, remaking and refashioning - it is increasingly unlikely that 'fidelity' strategies of adaptation will continue to be the dominant discourse, as all variants of narratives begin to exist in a dialogical plurality with one another; a mutual exchange of fluctuating source and target texts, cross-referenced through intertextuality and assembling a collage of influences.

Rewiring the Text - Contents:

Abstract:	ii.
Acknowledgements:	vi.
Dedication:	vii.
Author's Declaration:	viii.
Introduction: The End of Adaptation?	1.
Methodology.	15.
Rationale.	19.
Part I: Sourcing the Text.	22.
Chapter 1.1: Comparative Approaches.	23.
<i>Trainspotting.</i>	32.
<i>Trainspotting: Textual Afterlife.</i>	37.
<i>The English Patient.</i>	40.
<i>The English Patient: Textual Afterlife.</i>	44.
Film as Source: The Tie-in.	47.
Film as Source: The Remake.	50.
Chapter 1.2: New Texts, New Voices.	62.
The Changing Nature of Authorship.	62.
The Auteur Theory.	68.
Death of the Author.	72.
Heteroglossia, Utterance and the Intertext.	77.
Franz Kafka and Orson Welles.	83.
New Media, New Authors.	87.
Towards Transmedia.	90.
Part II: The Digital Heteroglossia.	95.
Chapter 2.1: The Emerging Digital Heteroglossia.	96.
Introduction.	96.

Pre-history.	102.
Convergence and Remediation.	107.
Adaptation, Disruption and the Digital Heteroglossia	112.
Chapter 2.2: Framing the Subversive.	118.
Television, the Web and Celebrity.	118.
Tabloids, Television and Celebrity.	120.
The Web and Celebrity.	124.
Adaptation and the ‘Democratic Genre.’	133.
Convergence and Remediation revisited.	141.
VCR revisited.	146.
Towards instantaneous adaptation?	149.
Part III: Parallel Texts.	153.
Chapter 3.1: Parallel and Hypermediate Texts.	154.
Introduction.	154.
Screening Superman.	160.
Superman: From text to screen.	161.
Superman on Film.	165.
Superman on television and the origins of <i>Smallville</i> .	167.
<i>Smallville</i> : The Hypermediate text.	169.
Interactive Television revisited.	176.
Chapter 3.2: iMP, <i>The Matrix</i> and Transmedia.	183.
The BBC and Interactive Television.	183.
Medium Specific Adaptation.	187.
The BBC and the Graf Report.	193.
The BBC’s Interactive Media Player.	203.
Videogame adaptation.	206.
<i>The Matrix</i> : The Transmedia Text.	215.
Conclusion: The End of Adaptation.	225.
The Future.	226.
The End of Temporality.	228.
Adaptation as Participation.	230.
New Adaptation.	231.
New Adaptation Studies	232.
Bibliography.	235.
Novels, Novelisations and Screenplays.	249.
Filmography.	251.
Videogames.	256.
Television Series.	258
Websites.	259.
Appendix A: <i>Trainspotting</i> paperback sales.	260.
Appendix B: <i>The English Patient</i> paperback sales.	261.

Appendix C: Time Warner companies.	263.
Appendix D: Interview with Jonathan Carter (BBC).	267.
Appendix E: Interview with Matt Walton (BBC).	270.

Rewiring the Text – Acknowledgements:

Firstly to John Ellis for getting me started and helping to focus my ideas, and foremost to David Gauntlett for his support, helpful insights, good nature and for sticking with me through the long haul and putting up with my whinging.

To my supportive colleagues at the Bournemouth Media School, particularly Stephen Bell, Robin Chater, Fiona Cownie, Sheila Daubeney, Stephen Deutsch, Joe Flitham, John Foster, Maïke Helmers, Tracy Hixson, Dan Hogan, Matt Holland, Andrew Ireland, Katrina King, Jan Lewis, Marian Mayer, Chris Pullen, Tristan Tull, Peter Legge, Jim Pope, Jan Johnson-Smith, Joe Tunmer, Jonathan Wardle and Chris Wensley.

To Jonathan Carter, Jon Cuthill, Alun Newman and Matt Walton at the BBC, for their time and patience.

Sincere thanks and appreciation to Lucy Mazdon at the University of Southampton for help in the early stages of this project, and Bronwen Thomas at the Bournemouth Media School, and Sheenagh Pugh, at the University of Wales, for their invaluable suggestions in the later stages of writing this thesis.

Special thanks to the singer, songwriter, playwright and scholar Mick Ryan, who I have had the

privilege of being taught by, and later working with and who pointed out both the path I now find myself on and E. M. Forster's *Aspects of the Novel*. I am *really* sorry about the *Lord of the Rings* chapter though.

Finally, to assorted friends, loved-ones and hangers-on, without whose constant badgering for me to go out with them, this thesis would have been finished a long time ago, namely Owen Bailey, Dale and Ailsa Ballard, Sarah Berger, Matt Bowler, Ian and Vicky Brosch, Jane Cooper, Nick Cutts, Dover, John Edwards, Jason & Sally Field, Matt Grace, Giles Gwinett, Go Mark, Ashar Hamilton, Jim & Sue Muir, Tim Oliver, Steve Parry, Dan Scully and Justin Williamson.

Any errors which remain however, are entirely my own.

Rewiring the Text – Dedication:

In memory of my parents, John and Valerie, whose infectious and combined love of literature and cinema has in part, resulted in this thesis.

Rewiring Adaptation- Author's Declaration:

Name of Candidate:

Richard John Berger.

Award for which work is submitted:

Philosophy Doctorate.

1. Statement of any advanced studies undertaken in connection with the programme of research.

N/A.

2. Concurrent registration for two or more academic awards.

I declare that while registered as a candidate for the university's research award, I have not been a registered candidate or enrolled student for an award of any other academic or professional institution.

3. Material submitted for another award.

N/A.

4. Declaration.

I hereby declare that this thesis is all my own work.

Signature of candidate.

Date:

Introduction: The End of Adaptation?

“Since the early days of its cinematic production Hollywood has adapted, copied, plagiarised, and been inspired by other works” (Mazdon, 2000: 2).

In 2005 two prequels to William Friedkin’s 1973 horror film, *The Exorcist* were released on DVD. *Exorcist: The Beginning* (Harlin, 2004) had been exhibited in cinemas the previous year, but *Dominion: Prequel to The Exorcist* (Schrader, 2005) had not, being a ‘straight to video’ release. However, Schrader’s film had in fact been made first, with an unhappy studio recalling cast and crew for Harlin’s re-shoot and a final cut that incorporated scenes from Schrader’s version. The poor commercial and critical reception of *Exorcist: The Beginning* led to the eventual release of Schrader’s version on DVD. This also coincided with a re-issue of the original *Exorcist*, as well as William Peter Blatty’s source novel and its sequel, *Legion*, previously adapted and filmed by Blatty himself as *Exorcist III* in 1990. Blatty’s book was in part based on the diaries of a priest, Father Raymond J. Bishop, in turn the source material for a, “well-researched potboiler entitled *Possessed*” (Kermode, 1997: 11). Film fans posting comments on the *Internet Movie Database* (www.imdb.com) admitted confusion:

by - pythontounge (Sat Apr 29 2006 09:00:29)

ok ive seen the 3 exorsist [sic] films in the past plus "E'3" [Exorcist III] on sky lastnight since id seen "E' the beginning" [*Exorcist: The Beginning*] last week now i learn there is another exorsist [sic] film with the same actor playing young father merin in both films can anyone tell me how all the films fit in to a credible [sic] time line excuding "E'2" [*Exorcist II: The Heretic*] which [sic] doesent [sic] deserve the right to be in the series i also thought in "E' the beginning" was quite credible as it shows merrin having a relationship with a doctor woman then loosing her but at the same time renouncing his faith it also set up the original ragan possession [sic] film up so is DOMINION [*Dominion: Prequel to the Exorcist*] a sequel to beginning[?]

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0449086/board/nest/42137005>

This example shows how new versions of pre-existing texts can cause bemusement in some audiences expecting a logical contribution to previous chronological events. It also shows how previous versions, and source material can be ‘rewired’ and can be brought back into cultural transmission, due to the appearance of new versions, subsequently gaining an ‘afterlife’. Indeed, new digital acquisition and exhibition technologies can ‘frame’ several versions of a narrative, hence pythontounge’s understandable confusion from seeing an array of *Exorcist* texts exhibited on his/her Sky television platform. In addition, 2005’s *Batman Begins* (Nolan) also *seemed* to be a prequel to *Batman* (Burton, 1989) ending at the suggested appearance of The Joker. However, Nolan’s film retold Bruce Wayne’s origins, having his parents killed by Joe Chill – therefore being ‘faithful’ to Frank Miller’s *Dark Knight Returns* (1986) comic book – instead of Jack Napier/The Joker as in Burton’s version. Similarly Bryan Singer’s *Superman Returns* seemed to both retell Clark Kent’s origins (again) and provide a sequel to *Superman II* (Lester, 1980).

The summer of 2005 also saw an adaptation of Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*, directed by Joe Wright, released in UK and USA cinemas simultaneously. However, the UK release had a

different ending, making this a simultaneous deployment of two very different variants. This is not an entirely unique phenomenon however, as the film *Clue* (Lynn, 1985), based on the board game *Cluedo*, was released in cinemas with three different endings, depending on which day the audience attended. In December, the US version of *Pride and Prejudice* was exhibited on a small selection of screens in the UK, in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Leeds and Bristol. In short, this meant that UK audiences now had access to two different texts - texts dialogically connected to each other, as well as the Austen canon – including previous adaptations, within the space of a few months. For example, the screenwriter and actor Emma Thompson, who won an Academy Award for her adaptation of Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* (1996, Lee), was involved in re-writing scenes:

“The screen says ‘screenplay by Deborah Moggach’. Certainly, Moggach worked on a substantial version but it's on the record that Lee Hall, the Billy Elliot scriptwriter, contributed further drafts and the whisper from behind the arc lights is that Emma Thompson (credited screenwriter on the movie of Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*) contributed a dialogue polish” (Lawson, 2005).

The January 2006 DVD release of *Pride and Prejudice* contained both endings, the UK ending being the ‘default’ version, with an option to select the US ending – this is essentially an extension of the UK ending, which has Elizabeth and Darcy kissing romantically before the credits roll. The film effectively ‘rewired’ its source material, particularly the 1995 BBC Andrew Davies scripted version – which was digitally re-mastered and released on DVD in the summer of 2005 – and a tie-in version of the source novel that immediately became a bestseller. A year previously, in 2004, filmmaker Steven Soderbergh announced he would make five digital films, which would be released for the cinema, television and DVD on the same day. The first of these films, *Bubble* (Soderbergh, 2005) was shown in U.S ‘art house’ cinemas, cable television and released on DVD at the same time.

A year earlier, 2003 was dubbed ‘The year of *The Matrix*’ as two sequels were released to *The Matrix* (1999, Wachowski & Wachowski). In addition, the computer game, *Enter the Matrix* and nine animated short films, collectively known as *The Animatrix*, added to 2003's *The Matrix* multiverse. Instead of being based on a text from another parallel media, here cinema was using cinema as source, as the franchise spread over several media platforms, simultaneously. The point of exhibition for *The Animatrix* was the website www.whatisthematrix.warnerbros.com, and the short-films were also exhibited on the UK television channel, five, throughout 2003, and subsequently released on DVD.

Two years before ‘The year of *The Matrix*’, the mainstream film event of the summer of 2001 in the UK was the cinematic release of *Tomb Raider* (West, 2001). However this time, instead of the film being an adaptation of a novel, or comic book or even being based on an original screenplay, it was in fact based on a computer game series; a series that preceded the date of the film's release, but continued during and after the film's exhibition.

There is nothing remarkable about this in itself, or this process: *Super Mario Brothers* (Morten & Jankel, 1993) is the first example of computer game as source for a filmic text. However, many reviewers made unfavourable comparisons with the Indiana Jones films and particularly their eponymous hero; *Raiders of the Lost Ark* (Spielberg, 1981), *Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom* (Spielberg, 1984) and *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* (Spielberg, 1989). These films in turn, were largely based on the various adaptations of *King Solomon's Mines* (Stevenson, 1937;

Bennett & Martom, 1950; Thompson, 1985) and *King Solomon's Treasure* (Rakoff, 1978). Those films, in turn, were based on H. Rider Haggard's novels, and in particular the novel's hero, Allan Quartermain. Indeed the first incarnation of the *Tomb Raider* event's heroine, Lara Croft, was deemed "a female Indiana Jones" when the first game was released (Flanagan: 1999). In a sense, the Quartermain/Indy/Lara axis can be traced back to the 'hero' narratives of ancient mythology. Joseph Cambell's (1988) 'Hero's Journey' archetype matches the plots of the Quartermain/Indy films perfectly, and the diachronic narratives of the Lara Croft videogames and films – see also Vogler (1996).

These examples serve to highlight an increasing trend of deploying narratives across perceived distinct media platforms simultaneously, whilst at the same time 'rewiring' pre-existing versions, although it is this thesis' contention that these platforms are not as distinct as some writers and theorists would suggest. The historical context of this thesis is the oncoming of digital media technologies, both in production, exhibition and acquisition. The mid-to-late 1990s - what John Ellis (2000) describes as the beginning of the 'Era of Plenty' - saw the origins of a gradual move towards digital production, acquisition and exhibition of all media, and the maturing of 'new' digital media platforms, such as videogames and the world-wide-web. This has created a 'digital heteroglossia,' which has enabled a system of dynamic dialogism between texts, and that the process of 'adaptation' has become freed from temporal constraints, and has now collapsed into instantaneity.

The terms 'heteroglossia' and 'dialogism' used here, are taken from the definitions of Mikhail Bakhtin (1994)[1], who employed them to describe the 'many languaged' nature of literature, particularly in the writings of Fyodor Dostoevsky. He argued that literature was just one of many languages, and that no one voice, including the author's own, dominated Dostoevsky's novel, *Crime and Punishment*. Bakhtin called this a 'plurality of consciousness' whereby the authorial consciousness interacts with that of the heroes/protagonists dialogically as autonomous subjects:

"Thus the new position of the author with regard to the hero in Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel is a *fully realised and thoroughly consistent dialogic position*, one that affirms the independence, internal freedom, unfinalizability, and indeterminacy of the hero [original italics]" (Bakhtin: 1994: 93).

Bakhtin's published work is fairly fragmented, and (ironically) the authorship of some of his work is disputed, however his rapid popularity from the 1960s[2] – after the first English translations – had a modest impact on emerging film studies disciplines, which for the first time began to recognise cinema as also, one of 'many languages'. As Joy Gould Boyum suggested, "[Film] might even be considered a natural next step in literature's evolution" (1985: 20) going further to say that film is a language, "like no language so much as the language of literature" (ibid: 22). Later Robert Stam (1989) and James Naremore (2000) would do much to develop Bakhtin's ideas into the sphere of media and adaptation studies, and this thesis is in part a contribution to that area.

Cinema is just over a century old, but since its inception it has looked towards other sources for material that could be re-worked cinematically. It was usually the case that films would be based on existing novels, or theatrical productions. The early cinema of the later 1800s and early 1900s adopted the theatre aesthetic, with films usually featuring one static shot with the action taking place in front of the camera, on the 'stage.' It wasn't until innovators such as D.W Griffith introduced three camera set-ups – in films such as *Birth of a Nation* (1915) - and used editing as a

stylistic and artistic tool, that cinema began to develop a language of its own. Indeed, cinematic pioneers such as the Russian Formalist filmmaker, Sergei Eisenstein, were quick to point out cinema's great debt to literature, claiming that Griffith himself had taken his techniques of montage and close-ups, from the imagery in the novels of Charles Dickens claiming that, "from the Victorian novel stem the first shoots of American film aesthetic" (Eisenstein: 1999: 135). Later Robert Richardson would claim that cinema was a:

"Branch of literature [in that] literature had already achieved some unusual and purely visual effects before film had even arrived" (1969: 15).

Written fiction and film have been dialogically related since the earliest days of cinema. From the 1930s onwards, classical texts such as *Madame Bovary* (Renoir, 1933/Chabrol, 1991), *Jane Eyre* (Stevenson, 1944/Mann, 1970/Zeffirelli, 1996), *Anna Karenina* (Brown, 1935/Duvivier, 1947/Rose, 1997) and *Wuthering Heights* (Wyler, 1939/Kosminsky, 1992) have been adapted for the screen in Hollywood and Europe:

"By classic novel was usually meant a British novel of the Victorian or Edwardian period, with occasional forays into Jane Austen or occasionally into the eighteenth century" (Giddings & Selby: 2001: viii).

The film industry has also relied on more contemporary novelists, although historically this has been played down by studios. Orson Welles adapted Booth Tarkington's popular novel, *The Magnificent Ambersons* in 1942. Welles professed to be a fan of the novel, but Tarkington was also a family friend (Boyum, 1985). Even later, few audiences perhaps realised that *Psycho* (Hitchcock, 1960) was an adaptation. Timothy Corrigan recognises that there was a shift into the 1940s, "between critically canonized literatures and minor literatures" (1999: 42). In the 'era of plenty' authors of contemporary texts, such as J. R. R. Tolkien, C. S Lewis, Stephen King, Mario Puzo, Thomas Harris and J. K Rowling have gained a great deal of cultural cachet from adaptations of their work, suggesting perhaps that the contemporary novel has risen in status since the 1940s. As Giddings and Selby (2001) point out, authors can become canon by virtue of having their work adapted for film or television. By 1996, three quarters of Academy Awards for best picture had gone to literary adaptations (McFarlane, 1996: 7). Corrigan suggests that from the 1950s:

"Literature began...to lose its hierarchical control over film, and films began claim their own rights and powers as an independent way of examining and employing the literary paradigms of the past and the harsh realities of a postwar world" (1999: 48).

In this thesis, I shall suggest that this same thing is happening for all media, indeed, many critics have pointed out that now videogames are perhaps being seen as a more culturally significant form, again with its roots in literature:

"The stories we read in computer games are not just pale reflections of novels, plays, films, or television programmes, but they have a different relationship with both other textual forms and the 'real world' that it (and other forms of 'realist' fiction) claim to represent" (Atkins, 2003: 6).

So here, Barry Atkins is staking a claim for a more plural media spectrum, encompassing literature, drama, cinema, television and videogames, whilst at the same time foregrounding videogames' uniqueness, that is 'interactivity.' I would suggest that any study of adaptation and translation in this context, should therefore avoid medium specific positions.

In terms of the study of literary adaptation the dominant discourses have been comparative

approaches, usually a direct comparison between the novel (source text) and film (target text). As Sarah Cardwell puts it: “contemporary discourses determined that adaptations be considered almost entirely in comparison with their source novels” (2002: 1). One such comparative position, the fidelity approach, attacks the ‘faithfulness’ of adaptation and implies that a straightforward translation is possible. As Corrigan notes, “in most discussions of adaptation, a key term is fidelity” (1999: 20). In addition, the fidelity approach positions the source text in an unassailable position of dominance, particularly in the adaptation of ‘classic’ novels. Adaptation studies for the most part, has generally overlooked adaptations of the contemporary novel, videogames and comic books. So, the dominant discourse usually positions the source as being superior to the target text. Critics such as Frank Magill (1980) assume that the film owes something to the original source novel. However, for George Bluestone:

“Changes are inevitable once one abandons the linguistic for the visual medium...the end products of a novel and film represent different aesthetic genera, as different from each other as ballet is from architecture” (1957: 27).

Traditional notions of authorship are also challenged as adaptation can create new authors of new texts; therefore the fidelity approach’s assumption of one supreme author is problematic.

The concept of the target text’s literary sources can be developed to encompass an understanding of the influence of film on the novel. This discussion will look closely at the novels of Franz Kafka, a writer particularly influenced by early cinema, and who in turn influenced the films of Orson Welles. Bruce Morrissette posited that the relationship between the two mediums involves a two-way relationship of influence, with each medium innovating new techniques that the other can follow (Morrissette, 1985: 37). Corrigan called this a, “mutual dependence” (1999: 1). I will develop this position to highlight a dialogic relationship between a range of related texts. Fidelity critics have disputed this equality of the two mediums, mostly staking their claims for literature as the superior form. Virginia Woolf likened adaptation to being abused, stating that, “cinema fell upon its prey with immense rapacity and to this moment largely subsists on the body of its unfortunate victim (1994: 350). However Boyum (1985) has pointed out that Woolf was complaining about the then silent cinema - the cinema much loved by Kafka - and its obvious technical limitations. In addition Sharon Ouditt (1999) has also pointed out the cinematic visual aesthetic in Woolf’s novel *Orlando*.

Richardson, despite his view that cinema is a ‘branch of literature’ made a clear distinction between the classic and contemporary novel, and stated that, “what makes a good novel, rarely makes a good film” (1969: 16). This view was somewhat echoed by Jonathan Miller – himself an acclaimed adaptor - in his 1983 McTaggart lecture: “Novels are an absolutely untranslatable art form except in the trivial and the second-rate” (cited in Cardwell, 2002: 31). However, Giddings and Selby (2001) are quick to point out that Miller had television drama of the 1980s in his sights. I would suggest here that these critics are often drawing attention to the medium’s technical limitations, an issue overlooked by many adaptation theorists, and one I shall explore in detail. Also, many such critics see the younger medium as inferior to that which has been the basis for learning for centuries, such as Edel who claims that “it requires more imagination to read. Camera vision cripples the use of the mind’s eye” (cited in Giddings et al, 1990: 52).

However, in contemporary media practice, the emphasis on the visual is paramount, with most transmedia forms being visual ones; from web-sites to computer games and DVD special editions. This phenomenon highlights and broadens out Corrigan’s (1999) ‘mutual dependence’ to other

media, as it is doubtful that the *Tomb Raider* films would have been so successful if the videogames had not been so popular. It is likely that the films have influenced future versions of the videogame. So there clearly is a two-way relationship of exchange between these two forms, as Morrissette suggests.

However, despite attempts to distance oneself from any notion of hierarchical structures – such as comparative approach’s simplistic notion of source and target texts – a hierarchy of sorts is in place. This can be seen clearly from the texts that adaptation theorists like to write about: usually the classic novel, or more contemporary ‘high-brow’ novels, and their adaptations. Indeed, it seems that the adaptation of the classic novel is often the very point of adaptation, as some writers astutely recognise that:

“The Capitalist movie industry especially in Hollywood, has always operated by a dialectically opposite logic. It recognized [sic] from the beginning that it could gain a sort of legitimacy among middle-class viewers by reproducing facsimiles of more respectable art or by adapting literature to another medium” (Naremore: 2000: 4).

It could be argued that the classic novel is *still* seen as the superior form, and that is a cultural construct. In adaptation theory, comparative approaches *usually* locate the novel as the superior text, and this is due to cultural constructs, and therefore cinema is negatively connotated, as Pierre Bourdieu observes:

“Tastes (i.e., manifested preferences) are the practical affirmation of an inevitable difference. It is no accident that, when they have to be justified, they are asserted purely negatively, by the refusal of other tastes. In the matter of taste, more than anywhere else, all determination is negation, and tastes are perhaps first and foremost distastes, disgust provoked by horror or visceral intolerance...Aesthetic intolerance can be terribly violent” (Bourdieu, 1984: 56).

Perversely perhaps, in texts that are adapted into a range of different media forms – what I shall call here ‘transmedia texts’ - it could be suggested that the film is viewed as the superior form. If the film fails commercially, so will all the other peripheral texts. So again, there is a process of dependency at play. There is an historical precedent for this phenomenon; the proportion of original screenplays declined during the period 1953-6 to less than thirty percent of the total output of film production (Bordwell et al, 1996). A reason for this could have been the anti-trust legislation of 1948, which forced the studio system to dismantle. As profits declined, the ‘in-house’ scriptwriting departments were closed (ibid). In later decades vertical integration was a factor, with Paramount’s take-over by the Gulf and Western Group leading to the parent company operating over 300 subsidiaries by 1977 (Izod, 1993: 102). So, the 1970s was the era of accelerated conglomeration.

By the 1970s, film and literature were part of an emerging global media industry, as large conglomerates pursued a policy of vertical and horizontal integration by buying up film, television and publishing companies, as well as investing in new media technologies such as satellite/cable television provision and DVD – later explored in Part II. Conglomeration meant that the novel secured audiences for the film and vice-versa. Also, these new corporations did not need to

purchase the rights for a particular title if it was one they already owned. The majority of copyrights for literature are now solely held by companies such as Microsoft, News Corp and AOL Time Warner (Burnett & Marshall, 2003).

The trend for cross-media ownership resulted in Rupert Murdoch's News Corp owning the film Studio, Twentieth Century Fox; the TV networks, Fox TV, BSKyB & Star; the publishers Harper Collins and 152 newspaper and magazine titles worldwide. Many film studios have their own animation houses, which in turn produce special effects for the film, as well as computer games; George Lucas' *Star Wars* franchise is underpinned by companies owned by Lucas including Skywalker Films, THX, Lucas Arts and Industrial Light and Magic, as well as licensing deals with toy manufacturers. Lucas is an interesting case in point; as a filmmaker he constantly revises and updates his texts, to keep pace with technological change, deploying his *Star Wars* narrative across several media simultaneously. Subsequent variants of the *Star Wars* narrative directly reference and summon back into being, earlier versions, so that the temporal aspects of film production, and the contexts of earlier versions are rendered void. In a sense, this is similar to the novelist Henry James, who in his lifetime would constantly revise and 're-release' his own work. In addition, J. R. R Tolkien rewrote part of *The Hobbit*, after completing his *Lord of the Rings* trilogy, namely the 'Riddles in the Dark' chapter, concerning the finding of the 'one ring' (see Smith & Matthews, 2004). More recently, John Fowles published a "stylistic revision" of his 1966 novel, *The Magus*, in 1977 (1977: 5). However, these examples took place within one medium, and as such a medium specific comparative approach is workable perhaps, but Lucas' *Star Wars* transmedia revision, is a constant and continuing process.

Another problem with comparative positions, such as the fidelity approach, is that many supposed target texts can become source texts themselves. For example, the original *James Bond* films were based on the novels of Ian Fleming, who died during the post-production of the first film, *Doctor No* (Young, 1968). The franchise continued with original screenplays, which were later adapted into 'novelisations', which were based on the film. This became a common occurrence and happened to a diverse range of texts, from *Ghostbusters* (Reitman, 1984), Tim Burton's *Batman* (1989) and *Batman Returns* (1992) to Jane Campion's *The Piano* (1993). The novelisation, or tie-in novel, came about through Hollywood's trend of producing literature from film. As early as 1911, the film industry had begun to turn film plots back into literature (Bordwell, et al, 1996: 99).

In terms of a visual aesthetic, again the fidelity approach is problematic, as the so-called target text can also use more than one source. Part I of this thesis shows how *The English Patient* (Minghella, 1996) was adapted from the 1992 Booker prize winning novel by Michael Ondaatje. Although the film differs considerably from the novel, its mise-en-scène is borrowed from *Lawrence of Arabia* (Lean, 1962). For film critics:

"Remembering that Britain's most exportable aristocratic-looking actors...are the leads – [one] comes to expect something like a David Lean movie" (James, 1997).

It is clear that Minghella's film combined the historical narrative of *Lawrence of Arabia* with the romantic narrative of *Dr Zhivago* (Lean, 1965) in the same way that *Tomb Raider* was compared to the *Indiana Jones* films, which may have influenced both the film and the original computer games. It is also clear, despite the substantial contribution of Brian McFarlane (1996) and Sarah Cardwell's (2002) research, that comparative approaches still have a great deal of currency in the arena of popular discourse, as we have seen just from the small example of the reception of the two *Exorcist* prequels quoted at the start of this introduction. In terms of comparative positions, the fidelity approach dominated adaptation theory at least until the mid-to-late 1990s, as Cardwell notes:

“Although in the 1990s the field of adaptation studies diversified into a plurality of approaches, the comparative approach has been historically predominant in the field from the 1970s onwards” (2002: 51).

This approach assumes a binary relationship between source and target text, and this shall be explored in detail in this part of the thesis. However, as I shall argue, even in relation to the 'classic' novel-to-film trajectory, this mode is problematic. This relationship is also hierarchical, with the source being viewed as superior to the target text. Historically, this kind of study has usually focused on the relationship between literature and cinema, however here, I shall widen this debate to look closely at technology, particularly new emerging forms of digital production and acquisition, largely ignored by adaptation theorists, apart from Corrigan (1999) and Cardwell's (2002) brief examination of television and VCR technology. The 2004 Graf report into the BBC's online provision called for the corporation to focus on '360' content – that is a simultaneous deployment of content across radio, television and the web. Increasingly, technologies such as the BBC's Interactive Media Player (iMP)[3] have facilitated this approach and theoretically discourses of convergence and remediation are mobilised, later discussed in Parts II & III of this thesis. In addition, 'traditional' adaptation of classic novels has (and will continue), however, these texts now exist as situated utterances in a digital heteroglossia. Recent adaptation theorists have called for more medium specific approaches, whilst others, such as Naremore (2000) have attempted to broaden the scope of study into a more heteroglossic positions, which foreground intertextuality. Both these perspectives will be explored here, as well as an attempt to sketch out a heteroglossia that encompasses all digital media, so that mediums act as unstable utterances in such a heteroglossia and the process of adaptation increasingly establishes clear intertextual relays, which serve to 're-wire' a range of source material, and summon source texts which gain an 'afterlife' through new variants and repetition which causes dialogism to occur.

Many critics of comparative approaches, such as McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002) do recognise the differences between the literary and the visual, and therefore usefully point towards the redundancy of comparative approaches, however neither examine the nature of media or the relationship between media in any close detail. In attempting to demolish comparative positions, such as the fidelity approach, such theorists are at pains to highlight the distinctiveness and therefore I would suggest, the 'separateness' of different media. This view inhibits the study of the transmedia event and discounts the dialogical technological heritage and 'improvement' of media

technologies. In addition, much of this work focuses on the adaptation of ‘classic’ novels into film or television texts. This thesis will go further and examine the adaptation of contemporary novels, as well as adaptations within the confines of the same media – for the visual to the visual - such as ‘remakes’ and texts which themselves are adaptations of previous adaptations.

This research will focus on what I have called ‘transmedia events’ from the 1990s onwards; that is narratives that are non-platform specific. Although this study is specific to Ellis’ (2000) ‘Era of Plenty’ I hope to show that historically the processes I describe have occurred elsewhere, but these process are now becoming far more instantaneous and dialogic. For example, as Giddings notes on regarding the publication of Charles Dicken’s first novel:

“[*Pickwick Papers*], once in popular circulation, rapidly took on other lives, metamorphosing into numerous forms, ranging from imitation, parody, stage plays, musical shows and, in our century, film radio and television” (2000: 48).

So, it seems that successful narratives tend to ‘bleed’ into all available mediums and forms, and then other media if and when they appear. At a micro level, the history of the *Pickwick Papers* narrative began in March 1836 and continued right up until the 1985 Brian Lighthill television adaptation. In this dissertation I will argue that the establishment of a digital heteroglossia will erode such time-lags between texts and adaptations. Those ‘classic’ novels and their adaptations will either be re-released in a new digital form, or if this is not possible, they will be re-adapted for a new audience. No doubt the success of Andrew Davies’ 2005 adaptation of *Bleak House* will result in a revisit to the Dickens canon by adaptors. In the realm of the contemporary novel, comic books, videogames, cinema and DVD, the process will become virtually instantaneous and fluid, perhaps rendering the very term ‘adaptation’ void. Adaptation of the classic novel will continue, but it will either be far more dialogic, re-wiring previous versions and related texts into a heteroglossia, or it will decline.

The dialogic mode of any digital heteroglossia is underpinned by the economies of scale as different platforms are often owned by the same parent company. It is now beneficial for the multinational company to utilise all its interests in the marketing of a transmedia event. For example, the website associated with the *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy (Jackson, 2001, 2002, 2003) was one of the most visited in the world during the two-year period of principal photography and postproduction. J.R.R Tolkien’s original source novel was also been reissued with a tie-in cover that appropriates imagery from Jackson’s filmed version. The *Tomb Raider* event saw an upsurge in sales for the *Tomb Raider* games, including the release of the computer game, *Tomb Raider 5*, to coincide with the film’s release. Even the soft-drink Luco-zade was renamed ‘Lara-zade’ in reference to the event’s main protagonist. This is of course innovative marketing rather than a full deployment of the *Tomb Raider* narratives across different media platforms. Again, the film was also supported by a strong web presence (both official and unofficial), as well as TV advertisements for *Landrover* and the Irish rock group U2’s recording, *Elevation*, featured in the film and the accompanying soundtrack.

The James Bond and *Star Wars* films are huge franchises that are part of cinematic history. However these events readily exploit the transmedia event. The cinematic release of *Star Wars Episode 1: The Phantom Menace* (Lucas, 1999) was preceded by the re-release of the original trilogy – the first of which was ‘renamed’ and re-branded *Star Wars - Episode IV: A New Hope* - with enhanced special effects and added scenes, as well as a new batch of children’s toys and videogames. There are now more *Star Wars* videogames than films, and they include titles such as *Star Wars* (1992), *Star Wars: Rebel Assault* (1994), *Star Wars: Rogue Leader* (1998), *Star Wars: Demolition* (2000), *Star Wars: Starfighter* (2001), *Star Wars: Galactic Battlegrounds* (2001), *Star Wars: The New Droid Army* (2002), *Star Wars: Episode II – Attack of the Clones* (2002), *Star Wars: Clone Wars* (2002), *Star Wars: Bounty Hunter* (2002), *Star Wars: Knights of the Old Republic* (2003), *Star Wars: Battlefront* (2004), *Star Wars: Episode III – Revenge of the Sith* (2005) and *Star Wars: Empire at War* (2005). These videogames are designed by the same company which designs and renders the special effects in the films.

This research will also explore the relationship between the different aspects of the transmedia event. It could be suggested that the *Star Wars* videogames change the visual aesthetic of the films, or even vice-versa. Certain sequences could be written into a film to then be deployed separately in an interactive version, such as a videogame. The terrain of this project is an attempt to map the dialogic relationship between different variants of the textual narrative, and this in turn will highlight the technological relationship between media that facilitate these mutual relationships of exchange. In short, I will argue that with the advent of new digital technologies and a gradual ‘switching-on’ of existing ‘old media,’ a more universal digital platform will create a digital heteroglossia; ‘many voices.’ Even critics of comparative approaches, such as McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002) cite the differences between novels and film/television, with adaptors themselves, such as William Goldman, announcing:

“Here is one of the main rules of adaptation: you *cannot* be literally faithful to the source material...you *should not* be literally faithful to the source material. It is in a different form, a form that does not have a camera...You *must* be totally faithful to the *intention* of the source material [original italics].” (2001: 179)

However, I shall argue that all media are dialogically linked and that the hitherto perception of distinct media is no longer valid, if it ever was, in the new digital heteroglossia.

Methodology.

McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002) have done much to shift adaptations studies away from value-judgement based fidelity comparative positions. However, their proposal for medium-specific studies is limiting. For example, a medium-specific adaptation study of the 2005 *Pride and Prejudice* film would shutdown the scope for examining this text in the light of the 1995 BBC television adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice*, scripted by Andrew Davies. I would argue that these two texts are dialogically linked, particularly in the former’s reinterpretation, or adaptation, of the latter’s Darcy characterisation.

In Part I of this thesis I shall look closely at the adaptations of two contemporary novels from the beginning of Ellis' (2000) 'Era of Plenty' in the 1990s. *The English Patient* by Michael Ondaatje and *Trainspotting* by Irvine Welsh make for a fruitful case-study. The former won the Booker Prize in 1992, and was instantly heralded as a modern classic. The latter became an underground 'cult' hit. Both novels were published and adapted at almost the same time, and both adaptations took advantage of their source materials' already established cultural cachet and the reputation of their authors. This section will examine authorship in detail, as often, in fidelity criticism, it is the author who is seen to be damaged; it's not necessarily a poor adaptation of *Sense and Sensibility*, but a poor Jane Austen adaptation. Many adaptation theorists also write about a 'decentred' author, and these ideas need revisiting in the light of a transmedia adaptation. Part I will also look closely at writers influenced by cinema, in particular Franz Kafka, who in turn influenced Orson Welles, to highlight the heteroglossic nature of adaptation. This section will close by attempting to highlight the mutual exchange of influence between so-called source and target texts, and expanding the notion of heteroglossia to look at the mass media as a whole. By rightly showing how the fidelity approach is a largely historical construct, Cardwell dismisses the theory under the banner of 'comparative approaches,' and I will argue here that a comparative position does not necessarily mean a fidelity-type methodology. I shall therefore be using a pluralist approach in this thesis, that is non-medium specific, but is text, narrative and technology specific.

Technology is an issue that both McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002) use to support their medium specific approaches, and I intend here to widen this technological debate to look at the full scope of media in the digital heteroglossia in Part II. Paul Levinson (1999 & 2001) suggests that media technologies go through a process of natural evolution, and constant 'improvement.' Some writers have linked adaptation to technology, with Richardson even claiming that:

"There is still some demand for the film's simple capacity to copy, for film as theatrical xerography" (1969: 20).

I will argue that in 1969, 'xerography' was not technically possible, but now perhaps we are closer, with new media technologies allowing for complex novels and their diegesis to be realised, such as *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy. Not only has technology improved media, such as the television, it has also improved adaptation. Levinson argues that the VCR improved television and gave it the same time-shifting qualities of the novel. Adaptation theorists agree:

"Watching movies now more often a domestic or private experience that comes, in some ways, closer to the conditions of reading a work of literature" (Corrigan: 1999: 70).

Part II will also introduce the notion of 'hypermediacy' – texts that act as windows which open out onto other texts – and will examine intertextuality. This section will look at a range of texts from the history of adaptation that show evidence of hypermediacy and that assemble a collage of influences, and phenomenon now heightened by new media technologies such as the web. This section will plot the relationship between digital media and the fluidity between new media and older more established forms. In addition, I propose a new study of texts, produced by audiences, as a way of understanding the role of media technology in facilitating participation in the process of adaptation itself. Texts produced by audiences can help us to understand adaptation as an increasing mode of reception. For Henry Jenkins, "fan writing is a...response to mass media

texts” (1995: 196).

A study of such texts in Part II, such as ‘fanfic,’ exhibited on the web, ‘amateur’ filmed remakes and sequels, can show that comparative approaches are still fairly significant, and although issues of fidelity are still mobilised, these relationships are far more playful, as audiences derive pleasure from filling in the ‘gaps’ provided by novelists, and filmmakers. New digital media, such as the web, offer these possibilities, so Part III of this thesis is concerned with adaptation as reception, as John Fiske suggests that:

“The moment of reception becomes the moment of production in fan culture...Fan texts then have to be ‘producerly’...in that they have to be open, to contain gaps, irresolutions, contradictions, which both allow and invite fan productivity.” (1992: 41-42)

In this section, I will argue that this phenomenon, due to the proliferation of new digital media platforms and emerging ‘interactivity’ is no longer confined to the fan, or ‘cult’ texts. I also hope to demonstrate that new media, in particular genuine interactivity, is now almost a ‘Holy Grail’ of the transmedia event. However, I shall confine those aspects of this research to areas of new media where narrative deployment occurs, eschewing the marketing strategies of film producers, although the marketing of texts will be acknowledged where useful. The videogames industry is now overtaking Hollywood in terms of revenue. It must be noted that it costs far less to manufacture a videogame than produce a feature film. Also in relation to cinema, there is only one platform and perhaps several supporting standardised formats such as VHS and DVD. The games industry is different with many different and competing platforms. In terms of the history of such devices as the computer and the VCR, until the 1990s, the dominant strategy was one of compatibility, with software being ‘locked in’ to hardware, such as Betamax, VHS etc. From the late 90s onwards, with the emergence of the digital heteroglossia, there has been shift away from this position as all media ‘switches on’ to digital formats. Increasingly VCR and computer platforms co-exist and all need software support and often try to secure interactive utterances of transmedia events to ensure survival. In short, the move towards a universal digital platform has ended a long period of incompatibility and ushered in a new phase of standardisation. Some writers argue that this could facilitate technological convergence, however this stance is premature as I shall also demonstrate in Part II.

This research will attempt to undermine notions of source and target in the traditional comparative arena. The comparative position, particularly the fidelity approach is nothing if not a value-based judgement system, is the film as good as the book? However, in terms of this approach, this thesis is primarily concerned with the dialogic relationship between supposed source and target texts, for even the staunchest critique of the fidelity approach seems to signify a source text somewhere. If there is an increasing dialogical link between texts in the digital heteroglossia, how useful are comparative approach’s notion of source and target in relation to adaptation? Part III, in proposing a new model and methodology in examining these texts, I will hope to show how texts, which through being deployed in differing media forms, gain a textual afterlife (Benjamin, 1999), as

previous variants are summoned back and rewired into cultural interplay. I intend refine comparative approaches to look specifically at certain elements of the process.

The fidelity approach is quite an easy theory to discredit - particularly after the work of McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002) – and especially in terms of new/interactive media. However, proposing a new discourse that is not fettered to hierarchical structures is problematic. The project proposes a more post-modern approach in examining simulacra; the process whereby we consume copies that don't have tangible originals, which for Baudrillard is where it is now, “impossible to isolate the process of the real, or to prove the real” (2000: 21). This more pluralist approach seems pertinent but it is still the case that some forms are dependent on others for a successful deployment. ‘The End of Adaptation’ is a deliberately provocative position, and one that should be read with care. This thesis is not suggesting an immediate halt in the translation of texts from one medium to another, but it does posit that ‘traditional’ notions of adaptation – and their theoretical baggage – will decline, as the process becomes more fluid and instantaneous. In many ways, adaptation is the glue that holds the digital heteroglossia together. Therefore, adaptation, in its traditional sense, will continue, particularly in the arena of the classic novel, mainly for heritage reasons. The small Wiltshire village of Lacock boasts its associations with both the 1995 and 2005 adaptations of *Pride and Prejudice*, as well as the *Harry Potter* films. The Jane Austen Centre in Bath continues to display furniture used in Austen adaptations, and sells watercolour renderings of the principle actors from the 1995 *Pride and Prejudice*. However, even this ‘adaptation for heritage sake’ will, I suggest, decline in turn. As the focus of this discussion is contemporary media practice, there are few texts that can currently be called transmedia, such as *The Matrix* trilogy. So, these examples will be drawn upon throughout the thesis. However, and in addition, much analysed adaptations, such as John Fowles’ *The French Lieutenant’s Women*, will be returned to and re-examined in the light of new media technologies and theoretical notions of heteroglossia. In short, the history of adaptation will be re-contextualised in the light of an emerging universal digital media spectrum in the ‘era of plenty’. Therefore a new framework and vocabulary is needed to define this emerging matrix of technological relationships and associated texts, and this thesis in part, will offer a contribution to this area.

Rationale.

This project came about due to my own background as a literature and media studies undergraduate and a film studies postgraduate student. I was often confused and frustrated at the theoretical distances between these disciplines, particularly the latter’s obsession with psychoanalytic and apparatus theories, as if many decades of media studies research on audiences had never existed. Indeed, in general terms, film studies grew from literature and media studies from sociology. As an undergraduate in the mid-1990s, the then Conservative Minister for Education, John Patten, attacked the academic credibility of such subjects.

Later, my teaching career began with A-Level Film Studies, Media Studies and English Literature studies, and often the same students were taking two, or even all three subjects. As Corrigan (1999) notes, it would now be hard to find a literature or even history course, which does not include a media and/or film studies element. As I began teaching media production undergraduates at the Bournemouth Media School in 2000, I noticed that much of their own practical work was influenced by other media. Level I students on the BA (Hons) Interactive

Media Production degree are even required to design a videogame based on a film, and I was impressed by the sophistication of some of these texts. Often, the students would use this as an opportunity to critique, or perhaps improve, their source material. As well as drawing on their chosen film for inspiration, the students would also inevitably be influenced by certain genres of videogames. The students themselves seemed frustrated at the lack of an approach to adaptation which wasn't medium specific.

As a 'theory' lecturer teaching across several medium specific programmes, I was asked to design a new unit that introduced students to new/interactive media theory. I used this opportunity to design a curriculum that was non-medium specific but which looked at the broad media spectrum as a whole. The work of theorists such as Roland Barthes, and in particular Mikhail Bakhtin, seemed to become more volatile, resonant and relevant when applied to new forms of digital media.

Excited by this, and perhaps as a challenge to the medium specific nature of teaching at the Bournemouth Media School, I decided to develop these themes into a PhD project, using adaptation as a way into understanding the (changing) relationship between different media, and new texts that were emerging from these relationships. Digital television was not only allowing me to revisit texts from my youth, but new versions of these texts were rewiring the older versions for a new audience, a point illustrated to me when a student's mobile phone played the theme tune from *Airwolf* (1984-1986) – a text originally exhibited before the student was born – in a dissertation tutorial. The student was proud of his 'polyphonic' ringtone, a term used by Bakhtin in 1929 to describe the novels of Dostoevsky. I was also working for BBCi at this time, and witnessed a radical restructuring that embedded new media producers within generic departments that included television and radio. The 2004 Graf report – discussed at length in this thesis – added fuel to this. It also seemed to me that adaptation studies often ignored the contemporary novel, and in particular videogames and comic books, despite both now becoming more credible areas for study.

This thesis then, as an attempt to make links between different subject positions. Media studies, film studies and adaptation studies scholars have largely overlooked technology and this discussion will in some ways redress that imbalance, and perhaps provide an interdisciplinary and non-medium specific approach to adaptation, one which allows the re-appraisal of the sphere of adaptation studies as a whole, as the slow improving nature of technology has inevitable led to the establishment of a digital heteroglossia, which has had a profound impact on the nature of adaptation.

Rewiring the Text – Part I.

Sourcing the Text.

Chapter 1.1: Comparative Approaches.

There has been much work on literary adaptation, almost as soon as cinema began adapting ‘classic’ novels and plays for the screen. Much of this theoretical and critical work has been fettered in some way to the fidelity approach – the view that adaptation should be a direct reflection of the source material, as Gueric DeBona observes:

“As a general rule, those writing about film adaptation tend to think of the ‘precursor’ text in purely literary terms, not recognizing [sic] that every movie is conditioned by a large set of influences from other media” (2000: 114).

An anthology of such work, edited by Frank Magill, compares sixty-five novels to their cinematic adaptations. On *Great Expectations* (Lean, 1947) Magill states:

“One who knows the book may wonder about the omission of Miss Skiffins, or Orlick, or those two alarming representations of youth, the Avenger and Trabb’s boy” (Magill, 1980: 219).

Comparing *Apocalypse Now* (Coppola, 1979) with Joseph Conrad’s novel *Heart of Darkness*, he is even more scathing:

“Apocalypse Now [compared to the novel] seems weighted by an overly ambiguous tone as well as disappointing characterisations” (Magill, 1980: 236).

Magill’s analysis deals solely with adaptations of classic texts, apart from one interesting exception; he compares *2001: A Space Odyssey* (Kubrick, 1968) with Arthur C. Clarke’s novel. This analysis is fundamentally flawed, if using a fidelity analysis; an oppositional strategy is actually at play, as the novel is based on the screenplay, which was a collaboration between Kubrick and Clarke, loosely based on Clarke’s already published short-story, *The Sentinel*. Clarke’s narrative would, *in time*, become a transmedia text:

“After Arthur C. Clarke’s short story ‘The Sentinel’ became the critically acclaimed movie *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968), the same year Clarke developed it into a novel with the same title. He wrote a sequel novel, *2010: Odyssey Two*, which was made into a film in 1984, and that was followed by yet another novel, *2061: Odyssey Three*, in a series of spin-offs and tie-ins binding the

fiction and the films” (Corrigan, 1999: 71).

Therefore the film is source. This already calls the comparative position into question, particularly the citing of a single source text. In short these value judgements centring on the text are limiting, as the adaptation will always be seen as inferior.

Critics such as Magill assume that the film owes something to the source novel. An explanation of the emphasis on classical texts is that these novels are imbued with a ‘high-art’ status or ‘aura’ and critics seem keen on retaining this (see Bourdieu 1984 and Benjamin 1999). However, the fidelity approach still has currency in the arena of popular criticism. The actor Sam Neill was interviewed about *The Horse Whisperer* (Redford, 1998):

Neon: “There’s a lot of plot in the book which isn’t in the film.”

Neill: “I don’t know that it’s so much a matter of plot actually, I just think it has a resonance that I don’t detect in the book too much.”

Neon: “The film’s ending is different from the book’s. Which is better?”

Neill: “I think the ending in the book is rather trite and a bit melodramatic and slightly vulgar too. I much prefer the ending in the movie, although I suspect some people might be disappointed by it” (O’Toole, 1998).

Some writers even see the adaptation as an improvement: on the film of his own novel, *About a Boy* (Weitz & Weitz, 2002), the novel’s author, Nick Hornby when commenting on the film’s different ending, even suggested that:

“People who have read the book will notice that the ending of the film is completely different, and I love the ending of the film. I think it’s true to the spirit of the book, it really, really works, and it’s nothing to do with me. I don’t feel that I’ve been raped or robbed in any way, I just think it makes the film work. It’s like you’ve written the first two thirds and it could spring any way, they’ve chosen a path that I didn’t choose, but now wish I had” (cited in Millar, 2002).

This could be a clear example of what Cardwell sees as the adaptation’s potential to “rewrite, review, re-activate and reconfigure” the source text (2002: 205). Her work is extremely useful, and will be examined in depth later, however she mainly confines herself to the television adaptation of the ‘classic’ novel. Arguably, it is easier for an adaptation of a recently published novel to ‘rewrite’ the source. However this focus on a single source is limiting.

Horton and Magrette noted that work on adaptation has centred around a disdainful notion of how good books become inferior filmed versions, what they termed “a perverse backwardness of the adaptation as betrayal approach” (1981: 1). They also cited the unchallenged view that if films cannot handle the complexities of point-of-view, stating that if adaptation is successful, then the source novel must have been an inferior work in the first instance. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan take a more ominous view, and suggest that:

“This cultural elitism is nowhere more apparent than in the adaptation...where the finished product tends to be judged against the impossible – its closeness to what the writer and/or the reader ‘had in mind’” (1999: 2).

Going against Bluestone’s initial attempts to separate the two texts, adaptation theorists went on to develop categories in which to arrange the different ways adaptors could introduce necessary changes. Several attempts have been made at classification; such as Geoffrey Wagner’s transposition, commentary and analogy. Transposition is merely a direct translation from source to target text, similar to Richardson’s (1969) ‘theatrical xerography’, and as such “it has...been the

least satisfactory...and typically puerile” (Wagner, 1975: 222-3). In fact, Wagner also echoes Richard’s notion that only poor novels make for satisfactory adaptations, by using his transposition category to examine the 1956 adaptation of George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: “The story is virtually non-existent as such. The ‘fictional’ side of the book is so weak as to be embarrassing” (Wagner, 1975: 288).

Commentary includes those adaptations that make changes, shift emphasis and yet remain broadly loyal to the source. Analogy covers films, which take a novel as a starting point or inspiration, using analogous techniques and often departing markedly from the source. Wagner points out that despite diverting further from the source text, analogy is likely to cause less offence to defenders of the source than commentary; it goes far enough to not be considered an attempt to bring the novel to the screen:

“For our purpose here analogy must represent a fairly considerable departure for the sake of making *another* work of art [original italics]” (ibid: 227).

This approach is the only one of the three that is any significant distance from the fidelity approach, despite still citing the novel as source.

So according to Wagner, an adaptor who wishes to do more than merely illustrate the text with images (which is impossible) is faced with two options: The first is to restructure, and Wagner cites *The Shining* (Kubrick, 1980), reworked from Stephen King’s novel: alternatively he/she could begin anew with the novel as starting point, such as *Apocalypse Now*. Even this position is problematic, as Wagner still cites Joseph Conrad’s novel, *Heart of Darkness*, as source, whereas *Apocalypse Now* is very much a multi-sourced text, reworking elements of Michael Herr’s Vietnam War reportage, *Dispatches*; elements of T.S Eliot’s *The Hollow Men* - which in itself references Conrad’s novel - and Sir James Frazer’s *The Golden Bough* - which also influenced Eliot (see French, 2000). As Boyum notes:

“[*Apocalypse Now*] is the kind of film we don’t ordinarily think of as adaptation...it doesn’t acknowledge its literary source...[but it] remains not only deeply indebted to Conrad’s tale, but not fully comprehensible without reference to it” (1985: 110).

It is this aspect of Wagner’s taxonomy, however, that offers the potential to open up adaptation to an array of source texts, as an analogous position suggests other texts can be at play. However, Wagner suggests that each approach will inevitably incur the wrath of the reader to some extent. *Time Magazine*’s review of *Bonfire of the Vanities* (De Palma, 1990) is a succinct explanation of this wrath:

“Novel readers are a possessive lot because they have already made their own imaginary film version of the book – cast it, dressed the sets, directed the camera. In many cases, so have the novelists themselves: De Palma’s film flopped because Tom Wolfe had already created a great movie in the minds of his readers” (Cited in Thompson, 1996: 14).

This critique does perhaps highlight cinema’s impact on the realm of fiction, particularly from the 1940s onwards, where as Corrigan noted, the shift towards “minor literatures” began (1999: 42), and the cinema’s influence on the novel was becoming more pronounced.

So why adapt, rather than write original screenplays? Aside from the obvious fact that literature is a vast bank of ready-made plots, how do we explain the popularity of adaptation, despite the canon of fidelity criticism? Thompson explains that adaptations fulfil readers’ desire to compare “the movie to our movie, which is our view the author’s movie, and praise or blame, forgive of

condemn, as we see fit” (Thompson, 1996: 14).

However, this is difficult to quantify; if it could be argued that those who have read the original are generally in a minority of a film’s audience; equally likely is that those who have not read the book choose to see the film instead. Did *Bonfire of the Vanities* fail because it was a poor film, or an unfaithful and unsatisfactory adaptation? It could even have been a mixture of the two. This example also highlights the impact of conglomeration, because “if the book was essential to the picture, the picture, in turn, has been vital to the creation of a wider audience for the book” (Orr, 1993: 1).

Whilst some would view the idea of film adaptation as an alternative to literature as an indictment of our time, this can be conceptualised as part of evolution of communication; oral to written to visual (Giddings et al: 1990: 62), a point also made by Levinson (1999 & 2001) in his study of the evolution and improvement of media technologies, discussed in Part II. Shifting the focus from the audience to the producers reveals another motive for adaptation. When film, still close to its side-show or ‘attraction’ origins (see Darley, 2000), takes the novel as its source material it is borrowing – in addition to the novel’s content – its cultural cachet. In a sense the younger medium is dressing itself in the clothes of the older and more respected, to underline its own importance, which as McFarlane suggests, points towards “a high-minded respect for literary works” (1996: 7).

In addition, from a technological position, this does seem to point towards what McLuhan (1998) termed ‘remedial’ media in the 1960s, an idea developed later by Levinson (1999 & 2001) and Bolter and Grusin (2000) whereby a ‘new’ media borrows from older more established media, which in turn adopts elements of the ‘new’ media, in a process of reaffirmation and re-purposing. This is also discussed further in Part II.

Until McFarlane (1996) published his useful study, the fidelity approach was the dominant discourse of adaptation. As late as 1993, Reynolds was arguing:

“Whatever subtext lies behind the general uneasiness and prejudice towards adaptation, most of the specific arguments raised against adaptations of novels into live or recorded performances seem to revolve around questions of fidelity” (Reynolds: 1993: 8).

McFarlane’s (1996) work - and pretty much all writings on adaptation since, in the ‘era of plenty’ - is an attempt at undermining comparative value-judgements between texts, although he clearly cites source texts in his analysis and he does distinguish between different media, as his methodology uses the notion of ‘functional equivalents’ to delineate the translation from one media form to another. For McFarlane’s rather structuralist approach, some elements of a novel offer themselves more freely for adaptation than others. Post-McFarlane, other theorists have developed this further, many widening this analysis to include the recognition of multi-sourced texts, and more interestingly for the purposes of this thesis, ‘parallel texts.’ In fact, Reynolds hints at this - possibly heteroglossia as well - by suggesting that:

“The [literature] student is encouraged to recognise that meanings in novels are fluid and unstable, made and not given, and that their study may involve exploring parallel texts (such as paintings, film and television, and theatre) without a dominant hierarchy that assumes literature as origin” (Reynolds, 1993: 2-3).

Here, Reynolds seems to be suggesting that even perceived source texts, are in fact themselves

made-up of an array of sources and influences, and therefore, I would argue, could be both source and target; a position that fractures the linear binary relationship between source and target texts, expounded by comparative theorists to date.

By far the most useful approach in understanding a more mutual relationship of exchange between source and target texts, is Cardwell's research on the televisual adaptations of the 'classic' novel that continues the call for a, "severing of the connection between source text and adaptation" (Cardwell, 2002: 1).

Cardwell writes continually about the 'end product' suggesting that adaptation is a 'closed' system, whereas I will argue that adaptation is dialogical, evolutionary and more instantaneous than is otherwise perceived. As we shall see in Part II, Levinson (1999 & 2001) writes about the evolutionary and 'improving' nature of media technological development, and Cardwell's (2002) focus on 'generic adaptation' seems to be in line with this. However – along with McFarlane (1996) – Cardwell mostly ignores technology outside the realm of television, but does suggest that:

"Few would argue that with each further adaptation to the screen *Wuthering Heights* develops – or evolves – towards the creation of a far better *Wuthering Heights* than that penned by Emily Bronte" (2002: 13).

This is a bold shift from value-judgement loaded comparative approaches. However, I am sure, despite her protestations, that many would disagree with Cardwell's assertion. In a sense, adaptations of *Wuthering Heights* summon the book back into cultural existence and can bestow value upon it, by virtue of its dialogical relationship to it. I have already noted Giddings and Selby's (2001) notion that authors can become canon by virtue of being adapted, and as the appendices of this thesis show, the classic novel can be rewired and can gain considerable commercial success by being adapted. In addition, older previously adapted versions can be rewired too – by being re-released in a digital format - and can also influence the new version. Interestingly Cardwell does recognise the "linear textual history of adaptation available to each new adaptor" (ibid: 14).

So, in contemporary media practice, a century of cinematic adaptation, and half-a-century of televisual adaptation, means that a rich history of previous variants is mined by subsequent versions – again this does much to problematise the single source position. Cardwell adds that:

"It would be more accurate to view adaptation as the gradual development of a 'meta-text.' This view recognises that a later adaptation may draw upon any earlier adaptations as well as the primary source text" (ibid: 24).

This is a similar position to that of Reynolds (1993), in that this view hints at the heteroglossic and dialogic nature of adaptation. The difference being, that, as we shall see, new versions of texts increasingly and explicitly summon into being a range of source texts and dialogically engage with them. Darlene J. Sadlier notes how a single film can weave together multiple prior texts in "an experiment in pastiche and intertextuality" (2000: 192). In many respects, adaptations themselves act as 'meta texts' encompassing and referencing elements of the many versions that have gone before, overtly and in some cases provocatively as explored in Part III, with *Smallville*, a 'version' of the *Superman* narrative.

Cardwell also offers an interesting and subtle distinction between adaptation and ‘version’ where the latter “does not imply a process as dependent upon the source text, except for a reliance on salient narrative events” (2002: 21). This distinction seems more credible in the heritage arena in the adaptations of ‘classic’ novels, but in the digital heteroglossia, as we shall see, the notion of a source text is problematic. However, Cardwell’s definition of ‘version’ is useful here, as in a sense, every adaptation is therefore a version. However, her medium-specific approach is limiting, particularly with new emerging forms of adaptation, but she does agree with Sadlier that perhaps intertextuality is a more useful sphere for study, as:

“The ways in which the [adaptation] utilises imagery from sources other than the source book in order to convey specific meanings frequently pass un-remarked” (Cardwell, 2002: 68).

This level of intertextuality will be examined later in reference to the adaptations of *The English Patient* and *Trainspotting*.

It is this thesis’ contention that adaptations in the digital heteroglossia are dialogically linked with a range of source and target texts, mediated through digital media platforms, acting as a system of restraint. However Cardwell’s work on the adaptation’s impact on its perceived source is useful here, particularly in the realm of contemporary fiction - again an area often ignored by adaptation theorists.

In the UK, the highest and most respected prize for literature is the Man Booker Prize. It has only been in existence since 1970, but is viewed as a benchmark for quality contemporary fiction. Many shortlisted novels have been adapted for the screen; Roddy Doyle – nominated twice, winning once – has had three of his novels adapted. The filmed versions of the Booker long-listed *Trainspotting* (Doyle, 1995) and the Booker winning *The English Patient* (Minghella, 1996) were released at the same time McFarlane published his research calling for a rejection of value loaded comparative approaches. Both films are based on contemporary novels, also published at the same time, by Irvine Welsh in 1993 and Michael Ondaatje in 1992 respectively. So, these two adaptations represent perhaps the beginning of a new type of adaptation, in the ‘era of plenty’ underpinned by a rapid development and dissemination of new media technologies and the origins of the digital heteroglossia.

At first glance there seems to be a debate surrounding notions of high and low culture centring on these two texts. Reasons for this seem to extend to traditional discourses, such as a need to extend the British canon of high-art. The BBC seems to focus on British ‘heritage’ authors such as Jane Austen and Charles Dickens, to underpin its public service ideals, what Reynolds calls an “infusion of morally uplifting doses of...cultural heritage” (1993: 4).

In addition, most adaptation theory has been focused on this arena. These adaptations have been received favourably, such as Andrew Davies’ BBC version of Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* (1995), despite its liberties with its perceived source material. This form of adaptation is also economic as the copyright only stays with the author’s estate seventy years after the author’s death (see Burnett & Marshall, 2003). However, there seems to be less anxiety when adapting contemporary fiction, as these novels seem to be considered more open to reproduction. They are not seen as occupying the same status as older ‘classical’ texts.

Both texts traded on their cultural kudos as *Trainspotting* revelled in its notoriety, whilst *The English Patient* was perceived as a high cultural artefact and a very ‘literary’ text. However, these

seemingly straight traditions are problematic if viewed using a comparative approach; *The English Patient* was marketed as a romantic epic and links were made to colonial/heritage cinema, particularly the David Lean canon. The film was also viewed by the press as a welcome return to 'quality' British cinema as "one of the most successful British independent films ever made" (Thomas, 2000: 197).

In truth *The English Patient* was not a British film, as it was funded by Miramax, an American studio. Therefore, the film was in reality a medium-budget Hollywood production. Its success at the Academy Awards reflected this and the film was viewed by huge global audiences.

Similarly *Trainspotting* was marketed on its counter-cultural kudos. The film traded on the subversive reputation of the novel's author, Irvine Welsh. The film was littered with counter-cultural indicators, such as drug references and an eclectic soundtrack. Despite, and because of the film's controversial content, *Trainspotting* became a huge cultural event. In this part of the thesis, it would be pertinent to examine these texts, and the process of adaptation behind them, in doing so highlighting the limiting scope of fidelity based comparative approaches to adaptation. In addition, it seems that adaptation often centres on the reputation and status of the author whose work is adapted. So, the following section will be a close examination of this, as many adaptation theorists have written about a 'decentred' author. In many ways, these two films mark the end of adaptation, in the traditional sense, as their reception demonstrated the redundancy of fidelity based comparative approaches in the field of contemporary fiction.

Trainspotting.

Irvine Welsh wrote the novel *Trainspotting* over a two-year period at the end of the 1980s. He claimed that he "submitted [the novel] for publication in 1992, and it came out in 1993. It instantly became a 'cult' book and was dramatised for the stage in 1994. The following year it was filmed and on its release became probably not just 'the' cinematic event of 1996, but 'the' cultural event" (Welsh, 1997). As Derek Paget notes:

"The film adaptation built on the cultural pulse-taking of Irvine Welsh's novel and both film and book have become classics in their own media" (1999: 130).

At first glance the novel is seemingly a collection of short stories or episodes, eight of which were published individually in Scottish literary magazines. So the novel itself, as a single text, is multi-sourced and multi-voiced, what Bakhtin (1994) would perhaps term 'polyphonic.' As well as attracting publicity for its controversial content, the novel followed in a tradition of controversial writing from Scotland; the media had previously lauded Iain Banks and James Kelman.

In 1993 the novel *Trainspotting* was on the penultimate shortlist for the Man Booker prize, just failing to make the final shortlist of six novels. That year the winning novel was Roddy Doyle's *Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha*. The previous year's winner was Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient*. In an early interview, Welsh firmly links himself with popular culture and claimed:

"Music television and magazines and comics have always influenced me more than books." (cited in Young, 1993)

This highlights the multi-sourced nature of literary fiction, and that this form is not adverse to

overtly signposting its sources for its readership, in many ways, this is seen to enhance the novel, perhaps proving Sadlier (2000) and Cardwell's (2002) point that intertextuality is a more useful field of study. However, the heritage 'classic' adaptation avoids the overt and explicit signalling of sources, although as we shall see, almost all adaptations mobilise a range of source texts, it is just that classic adaptations, certainly before 1996, try to mask this, only citing a single 'supreme' source text; its (perceived) original source novel.

The novel *Trainspotting* had unspectacular sales up until the filmed version's release in 1996. In fact the initial print run was for only 3000 copies. The film's UK release was in March, but in February *The Bookseller* reported that the Minerva edition of the novel had sold 70,000 copies, which is by no means an insignificant amount. After the film's release three print versions of the *Trainspotting* narrative became bestsellers; two editions of the novel, and the film's screenplay.

In February 1994, during the post production of the film *Shallow Grave* (Boyle, 1994), the film's screenwriter, John Hodge, began to adapt *Trainspotting* for the screen. *Shallow Grave*'s producer, Andrew MacDonald had bought the film rights of the novel soon after publication in 1993.

Initially Hodge was reluctant to begin adapting the novel, saying that:

"It is a collection of loosely related short stories about several different characters. Only towards the end does it take on a continuous narrative form... The characters, each with a distinctive voice, are defined by internal monologue as much as anything, and the language is uncompromisingly specific to a time and place" (Hodge, 1996: 9).

During the many drafts of the screenplay, Hodge had no input from the author of the novel. In fact, apart from a brief cameo role in the film, Welsh had no contact with Hodge during the writing of the screenplay. Giving his reasons for allowing so much liberty with his material, Welsh remarked:

"Almost everyone I spoke to about the sale of the film rights wanted to make a po-faced piece of social realism... in other words, a piece of mind-numbing tedium which nobody but a few broadsheet bores wanted to watch" (Welsh, 1997).

When *Shallow Grave* a critical and commercial success in the UK, Channel 4 invested £1.7 million into the adaptation of *Trainspotting*. However the filmmakers had concerns of over-expectation with MacDonald claiming "I still don't feel it will be as popular as *Shallow Grave*. There's a line to cross, namely heroin" (cited in MacNab, 1996). *Trainspotting* also included two cast members common to both films, namely Keith Allen and Ewan McGregor, highlighting the influence previous texts produced by a production team have on an adaptation.

It seems that the *Trainspotting* production team wanted to maximise the scale of their film's audience by building on those who were already fans of the novel. By trading on Welsh's and the novel's 'cult' status, they intended to create a cultural event that was paradoxically portrayed as both counter-cultural and something that the youth market could not ignore. If comparative approaches are employed to analyse the adaptation, it is evident that the target text is very different from its source. In addition, the completed film differs from Hodge's screenplay, published in a volume containing the screenplay of *Shallow Grave* in 1996 by Faber & Faber. It would be unfruitful to risk an absolute comparison of the film to the novel, but an examination of the processes inherent in the adaptation of *Trainspotting* would highlight difficulties in the perceived source-text to target-text trajectory, and highlights the decline of such dominant

discourses in the field of this study.

The changes in the target text compared to the source have a direct correlation to the audience the filmed version was marketed at. Aside from the novel's structure, Hodge had a vast array of characters to select from for his version. There are many more principal characters in the novel than in the film, as one would perhaps expect. It would be impossible to film every scene in the novel and include every character. For example, in the novel's heroin deal denouement, there are five characters not four. The fifth is Rab McLaughlin or 'Second Prize.' This character appears throughout the novel, but he rarely speaks and is defined through other viewpoint characters, which is a trick available to novelists, but not filmmakers.

For Hodge, adapting the novel meant "amalgamating various characters, transferring incident and dialogue from one character to another, building some scene around minor details and making up a few things altogether" (Hodge, 1996: 10). Whilst reducing the amount of characters in translating the novel to film, Hodge has drawn from the full range of incidents and viewpoints. Tommy, for instance, does not die in the novel; his unpleasant death and subsequent funeral are actually suffered by Matty in the novel, another character missing from the film. This device underpins the downside of heroin addiction, without the contrivance of introducing an extra character. A major character, Gavin, appears at the funeral in the film, and in the screenplay he has one line earlier in the text, but this was then edited out from the completed film, although it was included in the published screenplay. The scene in the film where Spud inadvertently showers Gail and her parents with vomit and excrement actually happens to Davie in the novel, another minor character missing from the completed feature.

During the process of adaptation it is necessary that changes are made. It is obviously ridiculous to attempt to film every scene that occurs in a book in an adaptation. This alone makes other types of comparative positions, such as the fidelity approach, a theoretical cul-de-sac as "adaptations themselves reflect very different notions of fidelity" (Boyum, 1985: 68). Hodge also softens some of the harder aspects of the novel, to make them more palatable for the intended audience and to offset some of the nihilism of the novel. His choice of Renton as view-point character, is interesting; Renton is by no means the main character of the novel, however his elevation during the adaptation process makes him the most sympathetic. He is the most humorous and references are made to a university education.

Although a great deal of omission is necessary in order to compress the narrative down to an acceptable time; the choices made will have a profound effect on characterisation. The film's Begbie is an unpleasant violent man, but we do not see the full extent of his behaviour. In the film the character is played for humour and shock. The actor Robert Carlyle added a sexual subtext, dressing as a "homosexual Ian Rush" (cited in Grundy, 1998). In the novel he is humourless and regularly beats his pregnant girlfriend. A similar approach was taken in adapting *American Psycho* (Harron, 2000). The explicit violence in Brett Easton Ellis' novel was toned down, in favour of concentrating on the novel's suggestion that it all took place in protagonist and viewpoint character Patrick Bateman's imagination.

Analysis of the extra-textual can also undermine comparative approaches. A re-reading of the film in this way highlights several key indicators that the fidelity approach cannot adequately be used as a theoretical tool in exploring the process adaptation. For example, the opening song on the

film's non-diegetic (outside the diegesis/story-world) soundtrack is Iggy Pop's *Lust for Life*. This is a direct reference to the novel, where the 70s icon is featured in many anecdotal incidents. This is the only musical source that has been directly transferred from the novel. The whole soundtrack is a hybrid mix of different styles from different eras; a cover-version of Blondie's *Atomic* by Sleeper is located alongside Lou Reed's 1972 recording, *Perfect Day*, which for some reviewers added a "fashionably Britpop adjunct" (Malcolm, 1996).

A re-reading of the film in the light of the extra-textual, is useful in understanding the deviations from the source novel. The novel is located temporally in a very specific context; largely the end of the 70s, right up to the 'housing boom' and the Conservative government of the 1980s. The soundtrack shifts the film's temporal location; the film seems to occupy no definite space. The scope of the music that make up the soundtrack spans several decades; the sequence in the nightclub underscore this analysis with Heaven 17's 1987 recording, *Temptation*, blends into Sleeper's version of *Atomic*. Renton moves to London, this displacement continues with a dance track from the 1980s. The film does not occupy the same temporal space as the novel solely for the reason its space is undermined and subverted by the soundtrack. This could be a reflection of the postmodern nature of contemporary music; based on Fredric Jameson's (2000) notions of recycling, pastiche and nostalgia. This renders the text both non-specific temporally and very contemporary at the same time. It could also point towards the three-year time-span between the novel's publication and the film version's exhibition. As you would expect, in the contemporary fiction arena, the distance between source and target texts is short, as the process of adaptation becomes faster. The extra-textual here, is sourced by the postmodern and nostalgic nature of popular music in 1996; an era of 'Brit-pop' which in many respects was a 1960s/70s revivalist cultural period. Therefore, *Trainspotting* is just reflecting the intertextuality that was already ingrained in popular culture, not just the novel's temporal specificity.

It could be argued that this emphasis on the extra-textual was a definite intention by the authors of the target text to maximise their market. To put it crudely the *Trainspotting* production team widened the demographic of the novel's readership to envelop youth culture. Welsh's status as a 'cult' author is undermined by this mainstream currency. Other forms of youth culture play upon this binary as a marketing device and it was noted in popular discourse that, "Welsh is fast becoming the most mainstream 'cult' author ever published" (Adams, 1996).

In terms of traditional notions of adaptation, there was a relatively short space between the novel's publication and the theatrical and cinematic versions. *Trainspotting* is neither just a book, or just a film, or both; it is a clearly defined cultural event. The aftermath of the film's release is a good example of the dialogic process of adaptation.

Trainspotting: Textual Afterlife.

Writing about translations, Walter Benjamin claimed that texts have an 'afterlife' where "translations that are more than just transmissions of subject matter come into being when in the course of its survival a work has reached that age of its fame" (Benjamin, 1999: 72). He further argues that all texts are translatable and therefore there must be something latent that is translatable. This is a marked divergence from the fidelity notion of untranslatability. Like Jenkins (1992) and Pugh's (2005) position on audience generated fanfic – further discussed in Part II -

Benjamin perceives 'gaps' in texts which are not only inherently translatable, but that actually demand translation. Adaptation and translation have been viewed as a threat in the same way that Bolter and Grusin (2000) argue a 'new' media is a threat to an older one. Boyum notes that for many "adaptation is synonymous with betrayal" (1985: 8). However Benjamin sees translation not as a threat, but as an extension of the life of the text.

The extra-textual soundtrack contained a recording by British dance band, Underworld; *Born Slippy* was released in 1995, and was critically well received but did not gain a chart position. Its inclusion on *Trainspotting's* soundtrack album merited its re-release which resulted in a chart position (number six). The soundtrack album was such a commercial success that EMI released a second soundtrack album, *Trainspotting 2*. The packaging was almost identical to that of the first album; featuring the same actors from the film. Benjamin suggests that "...a translation issues from the original – not so much its life, but its afterlife" (Benjamin, 1999: 71).

Benjamin further proposes that by looking at the translation, rather than the original we can realise the original version's potential afterlife, in a similar vein to Cardwell's (2002) statement that adaptations draw upon previous adaptations. In this analysis the filmed version of *Trainspotting* does have a definite textual afterlife; the second soundtrack album only contains one track that is featured in the film. The soundtrack albums only exist because of the filmed version. Therefore, the relationship between the novel, the film and the extra-textual is far more dialogic than intertextual, as perhaps comparative positions, such as the fidelity approach would have.

The filmed version of *Trainspotting* is capable of being the source for other texts, perceived as extra-textual. In 1996 Minerva published a new edition of the novel. In terms of packaging the new edition of the novel appropriated the iconography of the film. Benjamin argues that adaptations do not so much serve the original source, but owe their existence to it, for adaptation "would not be possible if in its ultimate essence it strove for likeness to the original. For in its afterlife...the original undergoes a change" (Benjamin, 1999: 73). The original, the so-called source, alters because it has been adapted. Fidelity, therefore, is rendered irrelevant if – as Benjamin suggests – no text is set in stone. Again, this supports Cardwell's (2002) position that adaptations 'rewrite' their source texts.

The original Minerva edition of the novel was available right up to the film's exhibition. Minerva then re-printed the novel; re-appropriating the same iconography utilised in all the extra-textual elements of the film. Therefore, the 'source' novel has a direct referent in the film posters, the two soundtrack albums and eventually the video/DVD release of *Trainspotting*. I am not suggesting here that these extra-texts constitute new variants of the *Trainspotting* narrative, but I am arguing that this process goes some way to highlighting a dialogic relationship between texts; a relationship in its instantaneity that points towards a more heteroglossic mode and sets the conditions for a more stable deployment of variants in the field of cultural transmission.

A further undermining of the source text to target text trajectory becomes significant when examining the new edition of the novel. This edition – which is termed a 'tie-in' in publishing parlance – was not available until the month of the film's release. However, press coverage caused sales of the first edition of the paperback to increase, so that it was a bestseller for the first time,

by December 1995 – see Appendix A, figure 1.

By the end of March 1996, the month of the film's exhibition, the new tie-in version of the novel was available. This edition of the novel was identical to the first edition, except for the packaging. It was the same price (£5.99). The publication of the tie-in almost instantly usurped the first edition from its brief placing in the bestseller lists – see Appendix A, figure 2. Admittedly, the two editions are the same text, however, the tie-in did not replace the first edition of the Minerva paperback, and it continued to be published.

The list for March 1996 also shows three Irvine Welsh titles in the Top Ten, as other works by the *Trainspotting* author became popular with consumers, not just variants of the *Trainspotting* narrative, suggesting that afterlife through translation - in the Benjamin (1999) sense - is not just confined to texts, but to the *status* of the author as well. I would argue that in a sense, as with Jane Austen, it is this authorial reputation that is being adapted as well. The very nature of the filmic text's existence, alters the authority of the first edition of the novel. The film tie-in version of the novel was selling over 10,000 units a week, as opposed to the original print of the novel's 6,000 units at this time (*Bookseller* April 1996). Over the next two calendar months, the first version of the novel was no longer a best-seller, but the tie-in was. In November 1996, it was the thirteenth best-selling paperback. A version of the Irvine Welsh's novel was the only novel to have been constantly in the top-twenty throughout the latter part of 1995, to early 1997.

The tie-in version edition is identical in content, but it would not arguably exist if not for the film. The tie-in edition can be positioned as both target and source textual, as it does constitute a variant of the *Trainspotting* narrative. Similarly, the second soundtrack album – containing only one piece of music from the completed film – would not exist if not for the success of the first soundtrack and the overall success of the film.

This phenomenon problematises comparative approaches and any emphasis on the source text to target text trajectory, as well as its claims of an untouchable and untranslatable 'supreme' source text. The text is obviously translatable - deployable over several platforms (including the theatrical version) – and therefore reproducible. *Trainspotting* does have an afterlife; that is a life due to, and beyond, the first text's existence. This process extends the text's afterlife. It is no longer sufficient to term the novel as source and the film as target. This binary relationship must be extended to something more plural, as Reynolds (1993) and Cardwell (2002) suggest. This assumed linear trajectory seems to be a more complex series of relationships and interplays between the two texts of novel and film. A comparative approach could view this relationship as mediated by the screenplay. It could be posited that the film is no longer the target text, but is the source text for a range of subsidiary textual artefacts. Therefore the terms 'source' and 'target' need to be reconsidered in terms of a proviso for an interchangeable status.

The English Patient.

The English Patient's journey to the screen is in direct contrast to that of *Trainspotting*, which is why it is interesting to compare the two processes, as each adaptation has unique differences. The novel was written by Michael Ondaatje and published, in hardback, in 1992 by Bloomsbury. It

was shortlisted for the Man Booker Prize in that year. The novel was joint winner with Barry Unsworth's *Sacred Hunger*. This is only the second time in the Booker's history that the prize had been split by two winners; in 1974 Nadine Gordimer's *The Conservationist* and Stanley Middleton's *Holiday* had similarly been joint winners.

A Booker nomination is usually a guarantee for large sales. As Ondaatje's novel had won, it became a bestseller in paperback, this time published by Picador. Anthony Minghella was a successful film director and writer; he had written scripts for the original BBC TV series of *Grange Hill*. He also wrote and directed plays for the Royal Court Theatre, before going on to adapt Colin Dexter's *Inspector Morse* novels for ITV. Minghella's greatest critical success thus far was the 1990 film, *Truly, Madly, Deeply*, which he also wrote and directed. Minghella gave the novel of *The English Patient* to the film producer Saul Zaentz, with a view to its adaptation. Zaentz in many ways was a perfect choice; he had already produced adaptations of Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (directed by Milos Forman in 1975) and Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* (directed by Philip Kaufman in 1987). The latter starred Juliette Binoche who would later star in the filmed version of *The English Patient*. Michael Ondaatje is Canadian and an enthusiast of cinema, claiming that:

“When I became a writer I continued to love film because they were completely different from books” (cited in Minghella, 1997: 6).

As Thomas observes:

“Undoubtedly Ondaatje is a writer who is fascinated by film” (2000: 198).

Minghella immediately recognised the cinematic qualities of the novel saying:

“Brilliant images are scattered across its pages in a mosaic of fractured narratives, as if somebody had already see a film and was in a hurry trying to remember all the best bits” (ibid: 13).

From the beginning of the film's production Ondaatje was very much a collaborator, along with adaptor Minghella and producer Zaentz. A year after their first meeting in autumn 1992, Minghella produced the first draft of the screenplay. Zaentz stated that this script had, “too many countries, too many characters and was 185 pages long” (cited in Minghella, 1997: 11). After every draft of the script, Ondaatje would subject Minghella to “ruthless, exasperating, egoless, pedantic and rigorous scrutiny [until] some kind of blueprint for the film began to emerge” (ibid: 14).

Ondaatje even travelled to the film's locations in Italy and the Sahara. In complete contrast to Irvine Welsh's involvement in *Trainspotting*, Ondaatje was integral to the production of the film. As Thomas notes, “the collaboration between the two med seems to have been especially harmonious and must have been the envy of many an adaptor” (2000: 198-9). The author of the film's assumed source text was already familiar with the spectre of comparative approaches and the undeniable fact that the film would be different from his novel, he explained “right from the start, all three of us never wanted the film...to be a dutiful version of the book. None of us wanted just a faithful echo” (Minghella, 1997: 8).

The film was financed by Miramax and cost £20 million to produce, as opposed to *Trainspotting's* £1.7 million. Immediate comparisons were made to cinema history, especially British cinema, even before the film was exhibited and “the most frequent comparison is with David Lean, and in particular his *Lawrence of Arabia*...such comparisons have led to the promotion of the film as an old-fashioned romantic epic” (Thomas: 2001: 202-3). However, others noted that “desert movies naturally inspire comparisons to David Lean's classic *Lawrence of*

Arabia” (Glass, 1996). Direct references were being made to generic codes mobilised by other British texts, such as Colonial cinema, so critically, a range of source texts was being assembled and cited, as other texts were summoned into being surrounding the film’s exhibition.

In this light it is interesting to note the changes Minghella made when transferring the novel to the screen, perhaps tailoring his film to suit the comparison to a range of source material. *The English Patient* was heavily promoted as a romantic epic; a love story between the mysterious patient – a Hungarian Count – and his friend’s wife, Catherine Clifton. This narrative was central to Minghella’s film. Other aspects of the novel were discarded. Most controversially, a key character of the novel, Kirpal Singh, a Sikh sapper in the British army, was reduced substantially in the film. His full name is never mentioned – he is just known as ‘Kip.’ Minghella called this diminution, “a necessary process of distillation... You can’t tell the history of so many characters” (cited in Jaggi, 1997). However Kip was more of a central character in earlier drafts of the screenplay:

“[Minghella’s] scenes of Kip in England...did not survive. Time spent on that flashback would have diverted the audience from the plot for too long, and seeing Kip’s bomb defusing work would held no tension because we would know he had survived it” (cited in Minghella, 1997: 8).

In the novel, Kip is pivotal to the questioning of versions of history and nationality. He struggles with the effects of British colonial rule on India and with the ‘greatness’ of English culture. At first he only sees all that is good about England, but eventually he sees all that is destructive. The final shock of the novel – news of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs, to which Kip reacts with particular anger as an Asian and an explosives expert – is absent from the film. After the film’s release Ondaatje retracted some of what he had written in the introduction to Minghella’s screenplay:

“I didn’t want Kip to be a background figure. I wanted him to be a central character” (Ondaatje cited in Jaggi, 1997).

The harshest criticism came from Ondaatje’s native Canada; as one critic noted, “If the novel is any one character’s story, then, it is Singh’s and certainly the subversive power of the novel is spoken through his voice” (Rundle, 1997). Rundle also viewed the character as a “powerful critique of Western colonial powers.” In addition, while Kip’s character is reduced, Katherine Clifton’s role is increased, to bring the romantic narrative into focus. Therefore Kip serves his purpose as nothing more than a love-interest for Hana, the French-Canadian nurse. The Hiroshima ending of the novel must be understood as an “extreme manifestation of colonial racism,” argues Rundle employing a comparative approach, whilst noting, echoing McFarlane (1996) perhaps, that “the book and the film are two different works the question still remains – why were some parts worthy of translation while others were not?” Rundle accuses both Ondaatje and Minghella of racism, and argues that the film of *The English Patient* is subject to the worst form of Eurocentrism (Rundle, 1997).

The reasons for the reduction of Kip’s character could be more complex. The only way in which Kip could have been further incorporated into the narrative structure of the film was through the device of flashback. Scenes featuring Kip were written by Minghella in earlier drafts of the screenplay. The first edition of the published screenplay differs markedly from the completed filmic text in several aspects. The screenplay was published before the film was completed, during post-production. The first edition of the screenplay adheres strongly to the shooting script and the

edit script. This version of the screenplay is the blueprint for what Minghella originally intended. During editing - a collaborative process involving both Minghella and Ondaatje - Kip's scenes were reduced and most were removed entirely. For example, in the first edition of the screenplay during the scene where Kip bids Hana farewell he asks her to go to India with him, and when she hesitates he says: "I know – here I am always a brown man, there you would always be a white woman." This exchange clearly has links with the novel's critique of colonialism, it was scripted and almost certainly shot.

Many reviewers remarked on the parallels between *The English Patient* and the films of David Lean. It seems that for many critics, Minghella's film combined the historical narrative of *Lawrence of Arabia*, with the romantic narrative of *Dr Zhivago*. Others made comparisons with directors also noted for their 'epic' texts, calling *The English Patient* "a Bertolucci scale of opulence...a heroic cinema Korda might be proud of" (James, 1997).

Another change made during adaptation is the age of the English Patient/Count Almasy. In the novel he is much older than Katherine, but in the film they are closer in age. This services to heighten the romantic content of the film. In fact Ralph Fiennes, who plays the patient, is featured on all the extra-textual artefacts relating to the filmed version. *The English Patient* was marketed on its romantic narrative, and the use of Fiennes' appeal in this way, as the archetype 'leading man' serves to highlight Minghella's textual intentions.

The English Patient: Textual Afterlife.

The English Patient was originally published in hardback in 1992. As hardbacks do not sell as many units as paperbacks, only a modest amount of sales are needed to assure best-seller status; in this case 175, 000 (Bookseller, December 1992). A year later the novel was published in paperback by Picador. Trading on the novel's success as a Booker prize winner, *The English Patient* became a best-seller again, enjoying sales of 400,000 for that year (Bookseller, December 1993). By 1994, the figures had fallen, and the novel continued to sell smaller amounts throughout the next few years. At the beginning of 1997, Picador reprinted the novel in a new edition, appropriating the iconography of the film, in a similar vein to *Trainspotting*. Both the first edition of the novel and the tie-in were available at the same time and at the same price. The film opened in January 1997 in America, and by March, the tie-in version of the novel had sold 600, 000 copies in that country (Jaggi, 1997).

The English Patient's screenplay was published in January 1997, two months before the film was first exhibited in Britain. The text of Minghella's screenplay was published by Methuen.

Unusually the screenplay was reviewed in *The Observer*, as if it were a new novel:

"Next to the novelisation, traditionally the most promising way to make money out of films, or course, was the so-called tie-in edition which worked especially well if the adaptation was a faithful one" (McCrum, 1997).

Penguin in fact sold 250,000 extra copies of *Pride and Prejudice*, since the BBC's acclaimed adaptation (*Bookseller* April 1997). Certain screenplays have become best-sellers ever since the publication of Quentin Tarantino's script for *Reservoir Dogs* (1991) by Faber & Faber. All of Tarantino's screenplays have become best-sellers, as they included exclusive interviews and introductory essays by the award-winning writer and director. In 1994 Oliver Stone wrote and directed *Natural Born Killers*, based on a Tarantino screenplay. Faber & Faber then published Tarantino's original script; and the screenplay for a film that had never been made became a best-seller. Stone's screenplay, however, remains unpublished.

The week before the UK release of *The English Patient*, the novel had become a bestseller for the third time – in its third incarnation as a tie-in edition – being placed as the twentieth best-selling paperback (*Bookseller* April 1997). However, in the week of the film's release, both editions of the novel were bestsellers; the original Picador paperback re-entering the top ten UK paperbacks for the first time in four years. In similar circumstances to the *Trainspotting* event, the tie-in version of the original source text seemed to be more popular than its older counterpart, which was still being published in large numbers. The tie-in version of the novel became the number one best-selling paperback, at the end of the month, the film having been on general release for two weeks (see Appendix B figures 3 and 4).

By the following April, another extra-textual phenomenon had started to emerge; *The Histories*, an ancient classical text by Herodotus, had become an overnight bestseller. This was solely due to the filmed version of *The English Patient*. This is again a fairly recent event in the cycle of a film's production; *Four Weddings and a Funeral* (Newell, 1993) had popularised W.H. Auden's poem, *Stop all the Clocks*. Anthologies of Auden's poetry became best-sellers, and Faber & Faber even published the poem in a separate volume for the first time. A similar occurrence happened with *The Histories*. Herodotus is central to the narrative of *The English Patient*; *The Histories* is the patient's sole possession as he recovers from the plane crash. An episode from Herodotus provides the catalyst for the meeting of the two romantic leads in the film as Katherine Clifton recounts the tale of Candaules, who lost his throne to his servant Gyges.

There is no copyright on Herodotus' work, so a publisher does not need permission to publish it. Penguin Classics already had a version, *Tales from Herodotus*, in print and Everyman published *The Histories* in full. In March, Tim Bates, commissioning editor of Penguin Classics announced "we are considering doing a small Penguin 60s type Herodotus. If the timing works with the film and the Oscars, we will get it out as quickly as possible" (cited in Glaister, 1997). The timing of this statement reveals Penguin's early perception of the film's impact on literary markets. Before the film, sales of Herodotus had been slight; "it's an ancient literary classic that ticks over" (ibid). Again, supporting Cardwell's (2002) view of the intertextual, the film *The English Patient* summoned into being a 'lost classic' which for a time existed in dialogic parallel with the film, gaining an 'afterlife' through the adaptation process. So, the filmed version of *The English Patient* was now successfully rewiring its source texts.

The UK print media were quick to praise the re-discovery of a lost classic by readers, but paradoxically condemned the way in which Herodotus had become a best-seller:

"The world has finally gone to the dogs...Have we reached the point where people read Herodotus only because his Histories appear in the film *The English Patient*?" (Rusbridger, 1997).

The Times was also scornful, suggesting that "it is not his fault if [Herodotus] has risen to fame on

the back of the trivia of the entertainment world” (Jones, 1997). By April the Penguin Classics’ version of Herodotus was the eventual best-seller, with three literary texts related to the filmed version of *The English Patient* selling in vast quantities (see Appendix B figure 5).

A week later, however, *Tale from Herodotus* had overtaken the first edition of the novel, the tie-in version now out-selling its predecessor. All three texts stayed in the top ten best-selling paperback chart until the end of May. By this time, only the tie-in version of the novel was still a best-seller; *Tales from Herodotus* having disappeared completely and the first edition of *The English Patient* falling to eighteenth place. By June of that year, the tie-in had also fallen to eighteenth place, before dropping out of the best-seller lists altogether.

A second edition of the screenplay was published in 1997. This time, the published shooting script adhered closely to his completed film. There were no extra scenes featuring Kip, and the structure of the new published screenplay matched the completed film. So, in similar circumstances to *Natural Born Killers*, a screenplay for a film that had not been seen was in circulation briefly during 1997. This version is now unavailable. However, the original screenplay for *Trainspotting* is still, at the time of writing, in print complete with scenes that were scripted, and even shot, before being removed from the final version of the film. A year after the video release, *Trainspotting* was re-released on video, and later on DVD when that digital format appeared complete with the cut scenes restored.

So, this analysis serves to undermine comparative approaches further; the tie-in version of *The English Patient* sold more copies than the original, or ‘source.’ Again this artefact is essentially the same as the first source. However as Benjamin (1999) and Cardwell (2002) have noted, the original alters once it has been translated, or adapted.

Film as Source: The Tie-in.

The tie-in version of a novel is not a new trend in media practice. Historically, the tie-in as a form was established through a Hollywood centrist trend of producing literature from film, an inverse strategy regarding the source text to target text trajectory. From the earliest days of cinema, as soon as film was positioned as primarily a narrative form, the film industry perceived many advantages in adaptation. Firstly there was the lure of a pre-sold audience; people who had read the novel would go and see the filmed version.

Secondly Hollywood saw the need to establish itself as a legitimate art-form, and the use of literature, especially the adaptation of the ‘classic’ novel or play, was a strategy to ensure cinema’s cultural credibility. However, those films produced from original screenplays, were similarly translated into literature. As early as 1911, the film industry had begun to turn film plots back into literature as, “production companies exploited the residual value of stories which had been featured on the screen by having writers rework them into the appropriate literary style for publication in movie magazines intended for sale in cinema foyers” (Bordwell et al, 1996: 99). These publications became known as ‘tie-ins’ and their circulation began to rapidly accelerate. Titles such as *Motion Picture Story Magazine* and *Moving Picture Tales* were dedicated to reworking original scripts back into literature, featuring still photography from the film. The film

was source and literature was the beneficiary target text.

By 1914, the first 'novelisations' started to appear. Book publishers were now promoting, "limited editions of novels based on films, illustrated with stills taken from them" (ibid). These variants of the film's narrative would be released in parallel with the film, so unlike 'classic' novel to film, novelisations constitute an instantaneous deployment of adaptations or versions, is also not a new phenomena. Izod gives another reason for this market strategy, claiming that the relationship between the novel and cinema has always been close because "it was often advantageous to shout up the costliness of a pre-sold title, and to add to its attraction by giving it glamorous and extravagant treatment...when this ethos prevails, it makes the expensively acquired bestselling novel or smash-hit theatrical production an attractive property for a studio to own" (1993; 99). A reversal of this strategy was also an effective marketing tool, making literary products of the film attractive to audiences.

During the early days of cinema, literature was seen as a very attractive source for films. However, this trend was subsequently reversed. In 1935, thirty-five per cent of feature films had a literary source, with a further eight per cent deriving from the stage and forty-seven per cent having been written as original screenplays specifically for the screen. Only a decade later the amount of films deriving from a literary source had fallen to eighteen per cent. The majority, about sixty-five per cent, were original scripts (Handel, 1976: 22). This marked shift could be down to economic factors; American cinema prospered during the Second World War and the film studios did not need to market special attractions to gain large audiences. By this time the studio-system was firmly entrenched and economies of scale reigned as the studios established in-house script-writing departments, and therefore had a plethora of exploitable talent.

The anti-trust legislation of 1948 effectively ended the dominance of the U.S studios, as they were forced to divest themselves of their cinema chains. During this period the studios lost the profits they had gained during the war years and had to rely on the revenue from renting films out to the now independent cinema chains. Arguably as television became a mass medium in the mid-1950s, large parts of the regular cinema audiences stayed away. Film production therefore declined, and as a consequence "almost all the studios found they could no longer afford to keep permanent staff on contract...scenario departments were disbanded and...there was no longer any need to keep employed writers fully occupied" (Izod, 1993: 101). So the studios returned to literature as source material for film.

The studios also needed something to offer audiences, and the lure of the pre-sold title became favourable again. By 1956, the proportion of original screenplays had declined to less than thirty per cent of the total. (Dowdy, 1975: 209). Soon companies were set up whose sole purpose was to arrange tie-ins between film producers and publishers. In the seventies, the global trend of cross-media ownership and conglomeration had begun, with many film studios becoming subsidiaries of companies also owned book publishers, TV stations, magazines and video-rental outlets. Throughout the eighties the novelisation was still a popular extra-textual format. Many films were translated back into literature; one such novelisation was *Ghostbusters* by Larry Milnes in 1984, the cover stating:

"A novel based on the screenplay by Dan Aykroyd and Harold Ramis."

The reverse of the book carries reviews, not of the novelisation, but of the film:

"A cute, rip-roaring good time comedy."

The book also contains stills from the film. The novelisation of *Batman* (Burton, 1989) cited itself firmly as an extra-textual product of the film, written by “Craig Shaw Gardner, based on the story by Sam Hamm and the screenplay by Sam Hamm and Warren Skaaren and the character created by Bob Kane.” These texts cite the screenplay as source and they are very much a combination of literature/the screenplay, and the visual/the film. So in a sense, these novelisations are heteroglossic, as they encompass and contain different variants of the film’s narrative, and they assemble a broad range of sources, or ‘utterances,’ all dialogically linked.

So it seems that, historically, the tie-in format is not a recent strategy. However, it is clear that ‘tie-in’ was a term originally used to denote a literary product derived from a filmic text, which in turn was derived from an original screenplay. Novelisations were considered to be similar; a novel produced with the film as source. In contemporary media practice these terms are no longer appropriate; ‘tie-in’ now denotes a re-print of the film’s literary source - such as the new editions of the *Trainspotting* and *The English Patient* novels released to coincide with the films’ exhibition - whereas ‘novelisation’ is the creation of a novel using the film as source. It could be argued, in this instance, that the film becomes the novel’s literary source. Since the earliest era of cinema, the source text to target text trajectory is flawed as it has not been a dominant mode of film production; an oppositional strategy seems to have been employed. In fact, the comparative approach only really has value in the direct adaptation of a ‘classic’ novel for the screen, however, even this position is flawed as I have shown. This changed in the post-war period, as cinema returned to literature as source.

Film as Source: The Remake.

All cinema is adaptation/translation. All films have a literary basis: a screenplay. It is a filmmaker’s task to translate and rework those words into a visual form. The term ‘adaptation’, which is used almost generically, just refers to a more obvious source for the screenplay, a novel/play etc. Even original screenplays have sources, as there are no source-less texts, even in the ‘classical’ text arena because “even the most original works of movies and literature might be considered ‘adaptations’ of materials drawn from one source or another” (Corrigan: 1999: 20). Martin Scorsese and Paul Schrader have been in conflict over the authorship status of *Taxi Driver* (Scorsese, 1975), both claiming that the film is ‘theirs.’ (Jackson, 1995). Scorsese has admitted that his film was influenced by *The Wrong Man* (Hitchcock, 1956). He also claimed he wanted to portray the ‘outsider’ character of Travis Bickle, and this had its basis in John Wayne’s portrayal of Ethan Edwards in *The Searchers* (Ford, 1956) (cited in Thompson & Christie, 1997: 60). *Taxi Driver*’s screenwriter, Paul Schrader based his original script on Dostoevsky’s *Notes from the Underground* and Nouvelle Vague cinema, such as *Pickpocket* (Bresson, 1959 and Jackson, 1995).

In terms of cinematic production, the question of authorship is problematic, as is locating an absolute source text. Adaptation, as a concept, and for the purposes of a comparative fidelity approach, depends on a single source text. Adaptation therefore is the narrative transferral between differing - and often conflicting - media forms. So the nature of 'remakes' can perhaps be viewed as a type of adaptation, or in Cardwell's (2002) term, a 'version.' As Laura Grindstaff suggests:

"Remakes are also fundamentally concerned with the issue of originality. Like adaptations, they are re-readings that both secure the status of some prior text as originary while at the same time challenging the fixity of its meaning" (2002: 277).

A key difference is that in conventional adaptation (novel to film) the assumed source (novel) is positioned as an autonomous media text, with its own clearly defined market and audience. In terms of remakes, the screenplay's prime motivation is to be the basis for a feature film; although screenplays are sold and enjoyed by audiences as a complete text in their own right. However, a screenplay *needs* a film and owes its existence to it.

Hollywood has always remade its own films, often using the cultural output of other nations for source material for its own cinema. The history of remakes highlights nothing if not the fluid, and often trans-national, two-way mutual relationship of exchange between different versions. *Seven Samurai* (Kurosawa, 1954) was the Japanese director's homage to the Hollywood western of filmmakers like John Ford and Howard Hawks. Kurosawa's film was itself remade as *The Magnificent Seven* (Sturges, 1960). Kurosawa has become the filmmaker of choice for remakes; *Yojimbo* (Kurosawa, 1961) was remade as *A Fistful of Dollars* (Leone, 1964) and again as *Last Man Standing* (Hill, 1996). George Lucas cites *The Hidden Fortress* (Kurosawa, 1958) as source for *Star Wars: Episode IV - A New Hope* (Lucas, 1977/1997).

So remakes can be seen to cross cultural boundaries. Some filmmakers remake their own films; *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (Hitchcock, 1934/1954) was remade because the first version was made during the 'silent' era and Hitchcock wanted to return to his earlier work and remake it with sound. *Spoorloos* (Sluzier, 1988) was a Dutch/Belgium co-production and was remade by the same director in an English language version in 1993, as *The Vanishing*.

The Hollywood studio system of the 1930s found itself in the middle of the USA's 'Great Depression.' Remaking existing films was a more cost effective way of film production. It also meant the some studios could constantly rework and recycle their own material, rather than commissioning untried and risky projects. From 1931 onwards, the growth of the 'double-bill' meant that there was effectively double the demand for cinematic output than there had been.

However, Mazdon (2000) suggests that there has been a continuous trend to remake and that this has accelerated since the 1980s, as, I will argue, the process becomes more fluid and dialogic and less fettered to notions of fidelity. Therefore the 'gaps' (the time difference) between versions have become compacted, as the temporal nature of remakes almost collapses. The 1980s saw the end of the brief New Hollywood auteur cinema, and the rise of the 'blockbuster,' first heralded by *Jaws* (Spielberg, 1975) and the first *Star Wars* film (now-revised and re-branded as *Episode IV- A New Hope*). This was also the decade of conglomeration as the studios became subsumed into large multi-national corporations. These new conglomerates owned book publishers, back catalogues and copyrights that covered nearly all media forms. This vertical integration made it

cost effective to look 'in-house' for source material for cinema. A successful film adapted from a novel can increase sales of the original assumed source text. This happened with both *Trainspotting* and *The English Patient*, and more recently with *The Beach* (Boyle, 2000) – adapted from Alex Garland's novel (itself loosely based on William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* and John Fowles' *The Magus*) and the *Lord of the Rings* trilogy (Jackson, 2001/2002/2003) increasing sales of J.R.R Tolkien's original books.

Also, in terms of a remake's audience, if the first version had been successful, then studios have an indicator – no matter how inaccurate – of the remake's appeal. Contemporary film practice is a huge financial undertaking, so any indicator of a project's market potential is welcomed. However a form of fidelity criticism still exists in the arena of the remake; this time a direct comparison between the first 'original' version of the film, and the remake, as Thomas Leitch puts it:

“Remakes differ from other adaptations to a new medium and translations to a new language because of the triangular relationship they establish among themselves, the original film they remake, and the property on which both films are based” (Leitch, 2002: 39).

Again, the term 'original' is bestowed. It seems that the literary adaptation cannot live without its 'source,' whereas according to Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos, neither can the remake live with the first filmed version:

“[The remake] often reflects an effort not only to mask the source material by hiding it in another genre, but also to tap the talents of the stars carrying the vehicle” (2002: 4).

This is further problematised when the remake is based on the first version's screenplay, and not the first *filmed* version. Can the remake then, be viewed as another filmmaker's version, another interpretation, separate and distinct from other variants? If this ever was the case, I would argue that this view no longer has value in an emerging digital heteroglossia.

Mazdon (2000) argues that if the first filmed version was already an adaptation of a novel, then very often those involved will cite the first 'source' text and almost attempt to deny the existence (or ignore) the first filmed version. Bazin claimed that all remakes were not made for artistic endeavours, but solely for commercial reasons (cited in Mazdon 2000):

“For Bazin [the remake] is clearly a case of plagiarism and economic terrorism” (Forrest & Koos, 2002: 8).

Luc Besson only agreed to a remake of *Nikita* (Besson 1990) if he could be involved. He soon pulled out of the production claiming that the English language version, *The Assassin* (Badham, 1993) was just being made for profit. However, Besson has benefited as his *Nikita* is now part of a franchise that also includes the TV series *La Femme Nikita* (1997-2001).

Hollywood would often purchase the rights of a French film, and would quickly remake and release it before the French version can be exhibited. The earliest example of this technique is when the French *Pépé le Moko* (Duvivier, 1937) was remade in the US as *Algiers* (Cromwell, 1938). As Philip French notes, the original film was “based on a novel by a former French cop, who write under the pseudonym Detective Ashelbe” (2006). *Algiers* was exhibited in the US and *Pépé le Moko* was blocked or ignored by distributors. The latter was finally released two years later to widespread critical acclaim. A decade later it was remade again as *Casbah* (Berry, 1948) and then again in Italy as *Totó le Mokó* (Bragalia, 1949). The French film *Le Dernier Tourant* (Chenal, 1939) was remade twice by Hollywood as *The Postman Always Rings Twice* (Garnett, 1946 & Rafelson, 1981).

In the 1930s and 1940s, changes were often made between remakes because Europe especially France, had a more liberal and relaxed censorship code than that of the US and the UK, who started to be dominated by the Hays Office and the BBFC respectively. The 1980s saw an acceleration in remakes especially Hollywood remaking French cinema. Since the writings of the *Cahiers du Cinema* from the late 1950s and the adoption of the Auteur theory in the 1960s, the French cinema movement, Nouvelle Vague, had been critically exalted. In the same way that cinema would sometimes plunder 'classical' literature in the hope of gaining critical kudos, French cinema was seen as the most culturally significant by the rest of the world, especially by a new breed of academics and film theorists, who at the time Bourdieu (1984) termed the 'new academy.' The Hollywood studios seemed to agree, and with encouragement from the French Government, they've been remaking French cinema for decades. Jean-Luc Godard's *A bout de Soufflé* (Godard, 1960) was reworked as *Breathless* (McBride 1983).

I would argue that remakes were, and are, made because of the original version, and are often deliberately constructed to engage dialogically with their 'sources', as Leitch puts it: "Remakes always present themselves as remakes, films to be watched with reference to the classic films they replace" (2002: 58). However, I will suggest here that remakes do not 'replace' their source material, quite the opposite, they dialogically engage with it. For example, American filmmakers would often remake films in the name of homage and a respectful reverence for the original version. When Martin Scorsese remade *Cape Fear* (Thompson, 1962) in 1991, he kept the original Bernard Hermann score, and even recast some of the original actors; Robert Mitchum and Gregory Peck. He also persuaded Saul and Elaine Bass to produce the title sequence, as they had done for Thompson's version in 1962. (Christie, 1997). However, Scorsese's interpretation of *Cape Fear* – itself adapted from John D. McDonald's novel – was far more morally ambiguous and it had a different ending, which is often the case in remakes. In a sense, and going against Mazdon's (2000) position, the remake of *Cape Fear* was deliberately and overtly referencing the original film, whilst ignoring the novel on which it was based.

Benjamin (1999) and Cardwell's (2002) assertion that a translation/adaptation will change/alter the 'original' is more apparent in terms of remakes. Orson Welles adapted Franz Kafka's novel *The Trial* in 1962. He also directed it and starred in the film as the Advocate. In addition, Welles dubbed the voices of many of the other characters. He took liberties with Kafka's novel, preferring to shoot the film in many different contemporary European locations, rather than Kafka's native Prague. He changed the narrative structure, preferring to have the Priest's sermon as an animated parable at the start of the film. Critics regarded the completed film as yet another example of Welles' creative decline. The writer/director didn't complete many films after this and *The Trial* was considered a poor adaptation. It is a much studied text by adaptation theorists, and most find fault with the film:

"It is evident from *The Trial* that [Welles] felt less attraction to Kafka" (Boyums: 1985: 241). Geoffrey Wagner is no less critical, and categorises the film as an analogous form of adaptation. Clearly showing that any fidelity approach is subject to an adaptor gaining a single correct reading – which is impossible – Wagner states that Kafka's novel in the first instance is a dream:

"Welles tries, but somehow his tricks never really seem to convince" (1975: 332).

In 1993, Harold Pinter's adaptation of *The Trial* was released in UK cinemas. It received mixed reviews, despite its attempt at locating the story in an 'authentic' fidelity universe of a period Prague, and its efforts to be chronologically faithful to the narrative of Kafka's novel. Pinter's film premiered on the 18th June, 1993, and on the following night, 19th June, the BBC screened

the 1962 Orson Welles' – distinctly 'unfaithful' - adaptation of *The Trial*, which provoked outrage among the creators of the 1993 film:

"[Harold] Pinter, said to be furious at the scheduling, has always hated the idea of comparison between his screenplay and that used by Welles, which the coincidental screenings will make inevitable... Those associated with the new film are worried that viewers will watch the 1962 Welles version at home and balk at the idea of another two hours of Kafka in the cinema. David Jones, the director, called the planning 'lousy and incompetent, not without its farcical element'... Although Mr Jones is a fan of the Welles version, and worked with the great director on a 45-minute documentary about the making of *The Trial*, he insisted that the new film was not a re-make and that comparisons were 'not wildly helpful'... Charles Denton, head of the Drama Group at the BBC, called the scheduling an 'improbable and unwelcome coincidence'. He said: 'The BBC does not wish to upset any film-makers. We would have preferred this not to happen, but we are certainly not going to change the television transmission. I don't think that viewers who have seen the Orson Welles movie will necessarily not want to see the new one'" (Roberts, 1993).

It seems, from this example, that the filmmakers, and Pinter, viewed the exhibition of the Welles version as somehow having the potential to 'damage' their text. As a consequence, Welles' film was re-appraised in the light of the Pinter adaptation:

"David Jones's *The Trial*, adapted from the Kafka by Harold Pinter and shot in Prague, remains resolutely theatrical. This seems to be both the director's and the writer's fault, despite the skill displayed.... The whole is watchable throughout, like one of those faithful translations of a literary classic that rise above the strange medium in which they find themselves... But too many words and too little imaginative direction make one contrast it unfavourably with the panache of the Orson Welles version" (Malcolm, 1993).

Similarly John Orr states that:

"For here we have the rare case of one masterpiece inspiring the creation of another. The paradox is that of a film adaptation of an artwork transforming itself into an artwork that exists in its own right, and yet somehow still has to be understood as 'a film version' of the book. In retrospect both artworks are now cultural facts and there can be no invidious comparison between the book-as-original and the film-as-artefact. Their connection is unprecedented and perhaps will never again be matched" (1993a: 26).

I will later demonstrate the influence that cinema had on Kafka, and in turn his influence on Welles, which culminated in the 1962 film, a prime example of heteroglossic adaptation.

The 'Director's Cut' is a more recent phenomenon than the remake. The first of these was *Blade Runner* (Scott, 1982). The studio originally balked at the film's downbeat ending, and director Ridley Scott was forced to remove some scenes and add a *film noir* style narration. Outtakes from *The Shining* (Kubrick, 1980) were even added as the film's conclusion, similar to scenes from *The Bounty* (Donaldson, 1984) being added to 1995's television adaptation of Jane Austen's *Persuasion* (Giddings & Selby, 2001: 102). The film was not a success on its initial exhibition, but gained a cult following on its subsequent video release. Under pressure from fans of the film, the studio re-edited the film after some lost scenes were discovered. The film was re-released in 1992, with the addition of the lost scenes, and the removal of the narration and upbeat ending. It was marketed as the 'director's cut,' although Scott claims that this is still not his version. There are in fact six different versions of the film that have been seen, possibly even seven (see Sammon, 1996).

Since then, many films have had been re-released as directors' cuts. The advent of DVD has led to

a boom in Director's Cuts and Extended/Special Editions. Perhaps George Lucas has gone furthest by actually reworking and revising some scenes from scratch for his definitive version of the first three *Star Wars* films (from 1977). In the aftermath of the *Star Wars* prequels (from 1999) these definitive versions were again revised, with some characters, such as Jar-Jar Binks, from the prequels now appearing in the DVD release of the original trilogy. In addition Hayden Christensen who plays Anakin Skywalker/Darth Vader in the final prequel to the original trilogy, *Star Wars: Episode III – Revenge of the Sith* (Lucas 2005), replaces the actor Sebastian Shaw at the end of the final film, *Star Wars: Episode VI – Return of the Jedi*, originally released in 1983, in the DVD release. Lucas plans to revise all six texts for eventual HD-DVD release, and is even proposing animated and live action television versions. In a sense, Lucas straddles the analogue-digital divide, and the digital heteroglossia has allowed his work to undergo constant revision, with each new version effectively replacing older variants.

The original *Star Wars* films are no longer available on any format in their 1970s/80s cinematic cuts. The same is true for the first cinematic version of *Blade Runner*. So, in terms of remakes and revisioning, the new digital versions of texts can serve to 'cancel out' previous variants, although the 'memory' of them can affect the reception of the 'new' version by an audience. Steven Spielberg's 2002 re-release of *ET: The Extra Terrestrial* (Spielberg, 1982) added scenes and removed firearms from some characters. The advent of technological developments that have facilitated acquisition formats such as DVD have accelerated this phenomenon, and made it a very profitable strategy.

Each of Peter Jackson's filmed versions of the *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy has had two separate DVD releases, five months apart. The latter 'Special Edition' versions contain between thirty and forty-five minutes of added scenes, as well as the inclusion of dozens of documentaries. The 2002 DVD release of *The Wicker Man* (Hardy, 1973) actually contains two full versions of the film; the original theatrical release and a restored director's cut with added scenes, a strategy going against the grain of the *Star Wars* and *Blade Runner* re-releases. Although in 2006 it was announced that the original theatrical versions of the first three *Star Wars* films would be released on DVD, due to pressure from fans.

Peter Jackson's filmed versions of *Lord of the Rings* are a prime example of Cardwell's (2002) 'rewriting' of the source material. J.R.R Tolkien's books are themselves multi-sourced, as the author drew upon European mythology and literature to create his own mythology of Europe, renamed 'Middle Earth.' *The Lord of the Rings* itself is a small part of the history of Middle Earth, told in full in his meta-text, *The Silmarillion*. This text was unfinished and completed by the author's son, Christopher Tolkien, and not published until 1977; *The Hobbit* was published in 1937, and the *Lord of the Rings* trilogy was published in 1954. In their exhaustive comparative study of all versions of *Lord of the Rings*, Jim Smith and J. Clive Matthews claim that:

"Part of Tolkien's world-building exercise was the conceit that *The Lord of the Rings* itself was an adaptation of extant material, lost for millennia, then rediscovered (by a mariner named Aelfwine on the 'lonely isle' of Tol Eressëan in the far west, who translated it into Anglo-Saxon) and translated into modern English by the author himself... So *The Lord of the Rings* was a translation of a translation of a multiple-author, multiple source text, much of which was itself translated from other multiple-author texts" (Smith & Matthews, 2004: 204).

Of course, this is a conceit, as Smith and Matthews recognise, as there is no doubt that Tolkien

himself wrote all the material: however, in constructing a myth, he clearly drew upon a range of source material, adapting them for his own needs, and creating a meta-text, elements of which would be adapted again and again. As Michel Foucault notes:

“The frontiers of a book are never clear-cut: beyond the title, the first lines, and the last full stop, beyond its internal configuration and its autonomous form, it is caught up in a system of references to other books, other texts, other sentences: it is a node within a network” (2003: 25-26).

This is true of both Tolkien’s books and Jackson’s filmed versions of them.

The first radio version of *The Lord of the Rings* was in 1956, with a television version of *The Hobbit* made in 1977 by Arthur Rankin Jr and Jules Bass, followed by an animated feature film of half of *The Lord of the Rings* (Bakshi, 1978). A television adaptation of *The Hobbit* and elements of the final book of *The Lord of the Rings*, *The Return of the King* were adapted as *A Tale of Hobbits* in 1980, again directed by Rankin & Bass, before the BBC’s much admired radio adaptation of the complete *Lord of the Rings* in 1981. The New Zealand filmmaker, Peter Jackson, was a fan of the Bakshi animation as a child, stating:

“The first copy of *The Lord of the Rings* that I ever owned was the paperback edition that had a still from the Ralph Bakshi film on the cover of the Black Riders galloping out of Bree...I remember it really clearly” (2002 Director’s Commentary).

Not only is Bakshi’s film cited as source, so is the tie-in version of the novel, at least in terms of imagery. By including these comments on the DVD release of *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*, Jackson is explicitly summoning into life the animated version, and its subsequent target texts. In an example of Benjamin’s (1999) ‘afterlife’ the Bakshi film was released on DVD for the first time in 2002, to coincide with Jackson’s filmed trilogy. This is what Stam describes as a ‘paratextual’ relay, the “relation, within the totality of a literary work, between the text proper, and paratext,” such as the title page and any illustrations (2004: 28).

To support Cardwell’s (2002) point that all adaptations are also adaptations of previous versions, Jackson drew widely from a broad range of source material other than the three *The Lord of the Rings* books. His films featured the romance between Aragorn and Arwen which only appears in the Appendices of *The Lord of the Rings* books. Also, Jackson took elements from *The Hobbit*, for his *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King* (2004), concerning Gollum’s finding of the ‘one ring.’ As the previous quotation shows, Jackson was also influenced by the imagery from previous adaptations and he enlisted the artists Alan Lee and John Howe to design the sets, and the topography of Middle Earth. Both Lee and Howe had already illustrated new editions of Tolkien’s books - including a 1991 edition of *Lord of the Rings*, published to commemorate the centenary of Tolkien’s birth – as well as other extra-textual material such as *Tolkien: The Illustrated Encyclopedia*, published in 1991, as well as calendars, mugs and t-shirts. The mise-en-scène of Jackson’s films is startlingly ‘faithful’ to Lee and Howe’s artwork, and would therefore resonate with Tolkien’s readership, who were used to the illustrations.

Narratively, Jackson and his co-script writers – Philippa Boyens and Fran Walsh – took much from the previous versions of *The Lord of the Rings*. The most obvious ‘adaptation of an adaptation,’ is Jackson’s use of a ‘prologue’ at the beginning of *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*. The structure of the books posed problems for all adaptors, as events often don’t happen in chronological sequence, particularly in *The Two Towers*. Also, the complicated diachronic narrative (back-story) was problematic to convey to a mass cinema audience. The 1981

BBC radio version included a prologue, and Jackson used this as the start of his trilogy. As Smith and Matthews note:

“While the fact the same information is conveyed [as the BBC radio series] can be, in part, explained by the simple fact that this is the information that *needs* to be conveyed, this is perhaps the clearest example of each successive adaptation building on the earlier ones [original italics]” (2004: 101).

Jackson also cast Ian Holm as Bilbo Baggins in his films, Holm already having played Baggins’ nephew Frodo, in the 1981 adaptation. Again, this casting acts as a signifier to an earlier adaptation that audiences may be familiar with - the BBC radio adaptation was re-mastered and re-released on CD in 2002. The narrative complexities of *The Two Towers* were also overcome by putting events back into chronological order and moving the encounter with Shelob to the final film, *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King*. Again, this was done in the 1981 BBC version. Excised characters – such as fans’ favourite Tom Bombadil – had their dialogue transposed to other characters in Jackson’s film, in this case Treebeard. Jackson and his co-writers also mined the appendices of the three novels, and added the romance between Aragorn and Arwen, based on the device of switching the novel’s Glorfindel character, with Arwen’s for the films.

As expected, and with the adaptations of *Trainspotting* and *The English Patient*, Jackson’s filmed trilogy renewed interest in Tolkien’s work, and his books, and other related texts were rewired and became bestsellers again. Other versions of *The Lord of the Rings* were re-released in digital formats, such as CD and DVD. Smith and Matthews’ study is a comparative one, as noted, however it managed to eschew the fidelity approach as they both argued that Jackson’s films were superior than the books, and had in fact *improved* them:

“To some, this may sound like sacrilege but, if anything, the New Line Cinema trilogy is better, on a narrative level, than the original book upon which it is based” (2004: 219).

I would argue that this is in part due to advances in technology, which make for a more satisfying rendering of the books’ diegesis. In short, Jackson’s adaptations may have improved some of its source material, but the very process of adaptation has been improved by technology.

So, instead of the target text ‘rewriting’ the source text in Cardwell’s (2002) position, adaptations – or new versions – of text ‘rewire’ all other related texts into a network of intertextual and dialogical relationships. The extra-textual variants can in themselves become source texts for new target texts, which in turn dialogically reference previous variants that have gone before. Therefore, more source texts are resurrected with each adaptation, which undermines the comparative view of a binary relationship between source and target texts. In an emerging digital heteroglossia, adaptation can be seen to ‘improve’ and update previous sources and adaptations, but explicitly reference them at the same time. Adaptations do not deny the existence of previous versions, rather they are brought back into cultural play, and gain an ‘afterlife’ through, and because of, adaptation. In a sense, adaptations can act as an interface whereby access is gained to all other variants. This ‘improvement’ is often a technological one, as we have seen, new versions are often produced because of technological innovation. Levinson (1999 & 2001) argues that media technologies undergo a process of constant evolutionary improvement, and this can be said of adaptation also, a process which is discussed further in Part II.

As we have seen, authorship, or certainly the status of an author, is an important factor in the process of adaptation. Fidelity critics and film reviewers often write about an author being

damaged by adaptation, whilst others, such as Giddings and Selby (2001) see the status of authorship being enriched by having work adapted for the screen. The following section returns to the nature of authorship then, and examines this in the light of the changing nature of adaptation, whilst continuing to explore the impact of technology in the creation of a digital heteroglossia.

Chapter 1.2: New Texts, New Voices.

The changing nature of ‘authorship.’

A prime – and often overlooked – function of the fidelity approach is its emphasis on authorial roles, particularly, the notion of a ‘decentred author.’ As Reynolds argues “the whole process of the adaptation of literary texts into performance texts de-centres the original author and makes the attribution of authorial responsibility problematic” (1993: 8). In all other art forms – the novel, painting, sculpture, composing etc – the attribution of authorship is usually straightforward, however this becomes muddied when applied to cinema and television, and murkier still in terms of adaptation.

In literary adaptation, by locating the novel as ‘source’ the role of the author becomes bound up in this powerplay. In terms of adaptation, comparative approaches suggest that the adaptor’s voice should be synonymous with the author of the source text. The fidelity approach privileges the author as *prime* source and in adaptation, the author of the source can be viewed as the author of the adaptation. In fact, some filmic adaptations of literature have used the name of the author of the source material as an indicator of the film’s fidelity credentials, and more importantly, as a

nod to the supposed high-mindedness of literature, eg *Bram Stoker's Dracula* (Coppola, 1992) and *Mary Shelley's Frankenstein* (Branagh, 1994). This strategy both elevates the author and attaches their kudos and reputation not only to the text, but to the adaptor as well. This could be seen to reinforce the perceived comparative approach's source text to target text trajectory, so it would be pertinent here to return to earlier examples and examine the decentred author in adaptation.

During the marketing of the film *Trainspotting*, the author of the novel – Irvine Welsh – became part of the *Trainspotting* cultural phenomenon. Welsh became a highly visible marketing tool, and he arguably began to mythologise himself in the light of the film's success, which would eventually lead to his 'cult' status in youth media. In an interview, Welsh immediately forged links with underground music, and counter-cultural discourses:

“Growing up in the punk era made a great impression on a lot of people...now you've got a generation who've grown up with the dole queue and YTS schemes – there is no work” (cited in Young, 1993).

The music press, in publications such as *NME* and *Select* did not review the novel *Trainspotting* when it was published in 1993. However, Welsh's subsequent titles, *The Acid House* (1994), *Marabou Stork Nightmares* (1995) and *Ecstasy* (1996), were extensively reviewed. Similarly the marketing of these texts heightened Welsh's authorial status, with *Select's* review of *Ecstasy* stating “You're never in any doubt which side of the fence he's on, because he is so intrinsically our generation's...anger” (Perry, *Select*, 1996).

However, Welsh's growing 'underground' literary cachet was in many ways paradoxical. In 1994 – a full year after the novel *Trainspotting* had been published – James Kelman won the Booker Prize (now the Man Booker Prize) for his fourteenth book, *How Late it was, How Late*. Kelman was another Scottish writer whose milieu was similar to that of Welsh; his prose was vernacular Glaswegian, similar to Welsh's Edinburgh dialect. Kelman had been shortlisted for the prize in 1989 with *A Dissaffection* and was a very controversial winner in 1994 – the first Scottish writer in twenty-five years to win the award. Many critics complained about the novel's language and use of expletives; the novel was called, “literary vandalism,” and Kelman himself was described as an “illiterate savage” (Jenkins, cited in Jaggi, 1998).

The same year, a collection of short stories by Welsh was published: *The Acid House*. These short stories were eventually made into a film, itself borrowing many of the conventions of the *Trainspotting* film, in 1998. In the mainstream press, the book received mixed reviews. *The Guardian* said the “result is patchy” before going on to claim that Welsh “never really intended to be a writer. [His] lack of reading inevitably means that he attempts subjects already used in short stories. Here 'Vat 69' echoes a Roald Dahl plot and two others correspond closely to obscure stories by Scott Fitzgerald and Tennessee Williams. This is obviously done in complete innocence” (Young, 1993).

Welsh's debut novel was already being reappraised in terms of the filmed adaptation of *Trainspotting*, and his previously and subsequent published novels and short stories, whilst at the same time he was being deified in youth culture media. Welsh's second novel, *Marabou Stork Nightmares*, was garnering further criticism, for example:

“Welsh doesn’t yet know what to do with his terrifying fatalism. A gory feminist vengeance leaves us none the wiser” (Tonkin, 1995).

The adaptation of *Trainspotting* was recalling Welsh’s other work, and that work was beginning to gain an ‘afterlife’ due to the film. All of Welsh’s work was becoming dialogically linked, and these relationships mobilised discourses of authorship and authenticity.

Throughout 1996, the growth of the ‘target’ text into a full cultural phenomenon continued, mainly in the youth media. It is clear that the producers of the film were trading on Welsh’s cultural capital, as the ‘voice of a generation.’ Welsh fuelled this image, as again *Select* had cause to remark:

“Irvine’s never been a fan of literature. He’s more influenced by Iggy Pop than any novelist, and his forewords thank techno nightspots like Slam and Sabresonic. Welsh’s books sit on shelves next to ‘Definitely Maybe’ [the debut album of the band Oasis] and Weatherall [popular DJ and record producer in the mid-90s] not *The Information* [recently published and critically panned Martin Amis novel] or the latest Will Self” (Grundy, 1996a).

Welsh’s authorial status was firmly situated in the circuit of popular culture, as the music press repositioned itself to embrace ‘cult’ literature. The *Select* interview with Welsh also featured interviews with Boyle, Hodge and MacDonald.

The film was also garnering reviews before it had been released, ‘framed’ in reviews of extra-textual artefacts – on the soundtrack album:

“The film may elevate the record by virtue of its imminent monstrous success, but it’s a class artefact in itself” (Harrison, 1996).

Select’s review of the film also appeared in the same edition, where the text was described as being “the cruellest, nastiest, funniest movie you’re going to see this year” (Collins, 1996). Future reviews of Welsh’s oeuvre in the magazine would later claim “he’s brilliant, and if he is indeed spearheading a new wave of Scottish authors, he’s definitely the Sex Pistols of the piece” (Perry, 1996).

In 1996, the publisher Faber and Faber placed full-page advertisements in the music and youth press, highlighting some of their recent paperbacks. Four books were featured, including Hodge’s *Trainspotting* screenplay, another screenplay by Harmony Korine for the film *Kids* (Clark, 1995), Hanif Kureishi’s novel *The Black Album* – itself borrowing its title from the Beatles’ *White Album* – and C.J Stone’s counter cultural memoir *Fierce Dancing*. The advertisement also appropriated a line from the opening soliloquy from the film *Trainspotting*: “I chose not to choose life: I chose something else.” Again, this was another direct link, and reinforces the problems with assuming binary relationships between ‘source’ and ‘target’ texts, as other texts were being brought dialogically into play, as Welsh’s ‘utterance’ was being situated alongside other texts, not just the filmed adaptation. Interestingly the mainstream press was questioning the *authenticity* of Welsh’s work:

“Earlier this year [Welsh] revealed to the media a hidden past. Welsh hadn’t always been a struggling artist. The eighties had, he claimed, seen him in London prospering out of the property boom. The broadsheet press lapped up the story, but now his friends say he made it all up. Whether or not the story is true, it is typical Welsh” (Molloy, 1995).

The Observer began a concerted campaign to further question Welsh’s authentic ‘voice’: “The author’s real age is shrouded in mystery. Welsh claims he was born in 1958...his records show his

birthdate to be some seven years earlier” (McKay, 1996). The article also questioned Welsh’s working class background, his drug-taking and alcohol abuse:

“He even gained an MBA...His former district council mates speak highly of him...he had mythologised his life in order to conceal how embarrassingly straight he really was” (ibid).

It was inevitable that a film about heroin abuse would be controversial. I have already demonstrated that certain elements of the ‘source’ text’s bleakness were excised, and in some cases sanitised, for the filmed version. Despite this, the authenticity of the film, and its *perceived* author, Welsh, were under attack. *The Daily Mail* claimed that:

“Trainspotting [the film] pours scorn on conventional values and pokes fun at capitalism while subscribing to a much more vicious and depressingly consumerist ethos of its own...it is not a film I would care to have on my conscience” (Tookey, 1996).

The Sunday Times was equal in its condemnation:

“These junkies laugh...but in reality every heroin story is a tale of betrayal and isolation...Why then, is the film presented as a laugh-a-line buddy movie with horror effects thrown in?” (White, 1996).

Others disagreed and were perhaps commenting on the film’s lack of fidelity to the novel:

“It’s [the film’s ‘dead baby’ scene] a striking image, and an index of the utter out-of-itness of the smackhead’s mind; but even so it feels like something of a cop-out” (Kemp, 1996).

The most damning criticism of Welsh’s authentic voice came from novelist and former heroin user Will Self. His article is illuminating for its attack on the novel, the film and Welsh’s authenticity:

“The book never dodges the emotional, economic and psychological realities of [heroin] but the film adapted from it has managed to do all three.”

Self then attacks Welsh: “I don’t believe, on the basis of having read his book, and watched the film adapted from it...that Irvine Welsh has ever had an injecting drug habit. If he had, I don’t see how he could have counselled the making of a film in which a human tragedy is turned into a source of rich belly laughs” (Self, 1996). This seems to suggest that Welsh is viewed as the author of, and therefore responsible for, both texts, and the film is synonymous with the author’s voice, a phenomenon, which as Cardwell (2002) suggests, is inherent in adaptation. Michel Foucault proposes that:

“An author’s name is not simply an element of discourse (capable of being either subject or object, or being replaced by pronoun, and the like); it performs a certain role with regard to narrative discourse, assuring a classificatory function...in addition, it establishes a relationship among the texts” (1991: 107).

Was Welsh being positioned as ‘subject’? Welsh had always (and still is) vague about whether or not he was a heroin addict – something that the press deemed important in reaffirming the novel’s (and film’s) authenticity. It also seems that Self is subjectively judging Welsh’s experience – and therefore *authenticity* – against his own: a curious manifestation of the fidelity approach. The French actor Xavier Beauvois attacked the *film’s* authenticity saying, “you can tell it’s made by people who’ve never done heroin” (cited in Romney, 1996).

So it can be clearly argued that Welsh was constructed as author – of both the novel and the filmic texts – as both ‘object’ and ‘subject.’ Once this was established, the ‘author’s’ authentic voice was

questioned as was used as a benchmark to judge the *Trainspotting* phenomena's cultural value. As previously stated, Welsh had very little to do with the film's inception and production – apart from a small cameo role as Mikey. The reception of the film, however, generally posited Welsh as author, and he was the prime referent on which the film's reception was centred.

In terms of *The English Patient*, despite the novel's literary cache – in contrast with that of the *Trainspotting* novel – the filmmaker, Anthony Mingella, was more securely positioned as author of the text than Danny Boyle had been for *Trainspotting*. As had already been highlighted, Michael Ondaatje had a very heavy involvement in every level of the film's production – himself being a filmmaker. So in terms of adaptation, the fidelity approach's emphasis of authorial privilege is vague here.

In terms of film production, the notion (and question) of the film's director being the author is regarded to be a fairly recent phenomenon. Foucault (1991) links authorship to property, claiming that it was established in law at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In fact the first legislation that recognised authorial status was the 1709 Statute of Anne, which:

“...sought to prevent printers and booksellers from selling books which had been published without the author's permission...Thus copyright was 'invented' to help authors earn a decent living from their writings” (Burnett & Marshall, 2003: 138).

Also, historically, it is only those 'high' art texts that are privileged by authorial status (painting, sculpture, music, theatre, literature – and later cinema) whereas 'low' cultural forms (television, computer games, music video etc) seem to be devoid of an authorial framework, although as we shall see, attempts have been made to confer authorial status on these forms. The notion of 'auteur' has always been a problematic stance in film studies, however, adaptation can further impinge upon establishing a clear authorial framework as the author of the adapted text can on occasion override any authorial position of the filmmakers. Is the adaptor's voice (and authorial privilege) diminished by, and through, adaptation? Some adaptors even attempt to deny 'supreme' authorial privilege, citing the source texts, as Goldman, on his adaptation of *Maverick* (Donner, 1994), notes ironically:

“This adaptation had to be a breeze – all I need to do was pick one of the old TV shows that had too much plot, expand it, and there would be the movie” (2001: 59-60).

The Auteur Theory.

The auteur theory is essentially the first film theory, and ironically can be seen as a reaction to, if not against, adaptation theory. Almost as soon as cinema had established itself as primarily narrative form, the debate about authorship began. In terms of the study of cinema, analysis had been limited to a structuralist approach, by the formalist school who:

“...favoured a 'scientific approach concerned with literature's "imminent" properties, structures and systems, those not dependent on other orders of culture” (Stam, 2000: 48).

Françoise Truffaut's 1953 polemic *A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema* was in a sense an attack on French cinema's obsession with 'faithful' adaptations, as well as a call for the establishment of the film director as supreme author of the text:

“Today no one is ignorant any longer of the fact that Aurence and Bost rehabilitated adaptation by upsetting old preconceptions of being faithful to the letter and substituting for it the contrary idea of

being faithful to the spirit” (1976: 225).

His contemporary at the *Cahiers du Cinema* journal, André Bazin, would join Truffaut in *La Politique des Auteurs*, by arguing for:

“...choosing in the artistic creation the personal factor as a criterion of reference and then postulating its permanence and even its progress from one work to the next” (1976).

These two writings firmly established the ‘politique des auteurs’ later developed by Andrew Sarris, although Alexander Astruc had already sketched out a notion of ‘filmmaker as artist’ in *Birth of a new Avant-garde: The Camera Pen*, 1948. Boyum (1985) states that the *Cahiers du Cinema* group recognised that “the filmmaker had become the novelist’s competitor” (1985: 7). Even Geoffrey Wagner noted that “the dependency of film on fiction has been such that it has clearly exasperated so-called *auteur* directors” (1975: 28). This can be pinned down to the fact that if a film was to be viewed as a worthy competitor to the novel, then not only did it have to be original (that is *not* an adaptation) but it must have a clearly signified author as well.

These debates were already somewhat established in critical spheres, for example in an early review of *Citizen Kane* (Welles, 1941) – tellingly subtitled *And One-Man Pictures in General* – Hermine Rich Issacs commented that:

“It [*Citizen Kane*] is another success in this year’s stream of successful ‘one-man pictures.’ And just as Orson Welles, producer and director, deserves credit for the excellence of *Citizen Kane*, Orson Welles, co-author (with Herman Mankiewicz) and Orson Welles, actor, must be held responsible for the fact it falls short of greatness. The phrase ‘one-man picture’ is, or course, anomalous. Motion pictures have always been collaborations, and must be so because of the way they are conceived and reproduced...What is meant by a one-man picture, then, is rather a film in which one man’s artistic personality dominates the whole production” (Isaccs, 1941).

In addition, the Italian Futurist movement provocatively suggested in 1912 that the (then) fledgling new media of cinema, would not only replace the book, but also traditional education and become:

“The ideal instrument of a new art, immensely vaster and lighter than all the exciting arts. We are convinced that only in this way can one reach that polyexpressiveness towards which all the most modern artistic researches are moving” (Marinetti, Corra, Settimeli, Ginna, Balla & Chiti, 2001: 11).

The Futurists, some 40 years before Truffaut’s manifesto, were already criticising the auteur theory’s monological discourse.

The *Cahiers du Cinema* critics perceived of cinema as a new means of artistic expression, alongside painting, sculpture, literature etc. The *Cahiers* group attacked ‘stagers’ - or the *metteur-on-scène* - for their lack of innovation, and obsessive faithfulness to scripts and scenarios. In a comparison between the Italian filmmakers Roberto Rossellini and Vittorio De Sica, Bazin claims that:

“Rossellini’s love for his characters envelops them in a desperate awareness of man’s inability to communicate; De Sica’s love, on the contrary, radiates from people themselves” (1971: 62).

Again, positioning the auteur as both subject and object at the centre of his film he argues that:

“It follows that Rossellini’s direction comes between his material and us, not as an artificial obstacle set up between the two, but as an unbridgeable, ontological distance, a congenital weakness of the human being which expresses itself aesthetically in terms of space, in forms, in the structure of his *mise-en-scène*” (Bazin: 1971: 63).

The *metteur-on-scène* was constructed as a mere 'stager', a competent technician. Up until this time, certainly in terms of contemporary Hollywood production, the producer, or even scriptwriter, was seen as the author of a film. For example *Gone with the Wind* (1939) was directed by Victor Fleming, George Cukor and Sam Wood. The screenplay was written by Sidney Howard, F Scott Fitzgerald and Ben Hecht, among others – based on the novel by Margaret Mitchell - creating a text that “is as near as dammit to that will-o’-the-wisp of modern critical theory: the authorless text” (Rushdie, 1992: 16). Interestingly Rushdie chooses the term ‘authorless’ rather than multi-voiced text, or heteroglossia, as if the very number of those involved in the film’s genesis, cancels out the monological nature of authorship.

Opponents were quick to point out that the auteur theory underestimated the importance of production personnel on the conditions of authorship. However, the *Cahiers* critics argued that even under the conditions of the Hollywood studio system, some filmmakers did have a tangible and discernable voice that transcended the confines of their texts, and in fact, moved through them, notably Welles, John Ford, Alfred Hitchcock and Howard Hawks. The *Cahiers* critics proposed a ‘new’ cinema that would resemble the person who conceived it:

“...not so much through autobiographical content, but rather through the style, which impregnates the film with the personality of its director” (Stam, 2000: 84).

The theory would develop over time and would be adopted by the “new academy” (Bourdieu, 1984). Andrew Sarris imported the theory into American critical circles with an article entitled *Notes on the Auteur Theory* in 1962. This new version imposed a hierarchy on cinema, where directors worthy of study and analysis – and the title ‘auteur’ – were elevated to the ‘pantheon,’ which he argued, is:

“...somewhat weighted towards seniority and established reputations. In time, some of those auteurs will rise, some will fall, and some will be displaced either by new directors or rediscovered ancients” (1999: 157).

Structuralist approaches were also deployed, which served to highlight “the idea of an auteur as a critical construct, rather than a flesh-and-blood person” (Stam 2000: 123). Wollen uses this approach in his reading of John Ford’s westerns, where he conceives of structural oppositions at play:

“The master antinomy in Ford’s films is that between the wilderness and the garden” (1999: 527).

But Stam goes on to argue that:

“...auteur structuralism had little to say on the issue of cinematic specificity since many of these motifs and binary structures were not specific to the cinema but were rather broadly disseminated in culture and the arts” (2000:123).

The auteur theory was quite poorly received by some quarters of film production. Some saw the policy – or Sarris’ interpretation of it – as having a detrimental effect on cinema. Even Bazin distanced himself from what he perceived as the ‘cult of the director’ as, for him, it impacted upon his vision of a realist cinema. The auteur theory, as the basis for the new emerging critical study of cinema, became something of a self-fulfilling prophecy. The screenwriter William Goldman - who when told of the theory asked “what’s the punchline?” - drew attention to the many ‘authors’ involved in a single cinematic text. He cites Hitchcock as one such example saying that the director believed his own press, and that:

“...the last two decades of Hitchcock’s career were a great waste and sadness. He was technically as

skilful as ever. But he had become encased in praise, inured to any criticism” (1983: 105). Sarris, with his pantheon, suggested even bad films by auteurs, were better than good films by *metteurs*, a reversal perhaps of the ‘good books make bad films’ position of some comparative adaptation theorists.

Essentially, the auteur theory attempts to privilege the author, in essence “it reveals authors where none had been seen before” (Wollen, 1999: 520). But it is problematic: not only does it ignore key film personnel, but it has arguably created the ‘cult of the director.’ As we have seen, the film director Martin Scorsese and screenwriter Paul Schrader have been in dispute over the authorship of *Taxi Driver*. Is there room for *both* utterances?

Death of the Author?

The Americanised ‘auteur theory’ had its origins in literature studies, both in its rejection of formalism, and its structural approach. In literature studies, the ‘death’ of the author has been prophesied by writers. Benjamin argues that the storyteller is not a present force:

“He has already become something remote from us and something that is getting more distant” (1999: 83).

Benjamin links this ‘retreat’ to the rise of the novel as a cultural form, and the demise of the oral tradition, which has:

“...gradually removed narrative from the realm of living speech and at the same time is making it possible to see a new beauty in what is vanishing” (ibid: 86).

Barthes offered a perhaps more simplistic but similar position to that of Benjamin. Barthes recognises the potential located in readership to be rebellious. He argues that the act of seeking a truth in a text ‘kills’ the author, but warns against attempting to recreate truth in the reader:

“The image of literature to be found in ordinary culture is tyrannically centred on the author, his person, his life, his tastes, his passions...The explanation of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produced it, as if it were always in the end, through the more or less transparent allegory of the fiction, the voice of a single person, the author confiding in us” (1977: 143).

Barthes also makes a comparison between ‘scriptors’ and ‘authors’ in a similar vein to the *Cahiers’* critics distinction between the artistry of the *auteur*, and the ‘staging’ of the *metteur-en-scène*:

“In complete contrast, the modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing” (ibid: 145).

Barthes seems to be positing that all ‘scriptors’ are merely *metteurs* – and his concept is remarkably similar, in both tone and scope, to Bazin’s analysis of De Sica. Foucault too, seemed to dwell on a separation between author and text, which he described, by saying that “the mark of the writer is reduced to nothing more than the singularity of his absence; he must assume the role of dead man in the game of writing” (1991: 103).

So, authorial status is problematic even for ‘source’ texts. However, I would suggest that it is translation and adaptation which elevates the status of the author of an original work, especially the ‘classic’ text. The authorship of novels or plays is sustained and enhanced by the very act of adaptation, and as more versions and variants occur, the dialogical nature of the heteroglossia

further entrenches an author's reputation. Shakespeare and Austen therefore, owe, in part, their literary and cultural cachet to the fact that their work has been performed and adapted with the advent of cinema, radio and television. As an authorial construct however, the process of adaptation can diminish the status of the adaptors themselves.

Some novelists have gone further - especially in the postmodern canon of late-twentieth century literature - in reinforcing their own authorial status, by locating themselves in the text, as seemingly autonomous characters. In John Fowles' *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, Fowles himself appears in a railway carriage and engages one of the main characters, Charles, in conversation. Fowles also suspends the story at one point to inform the reader that:

"When Charles left Sarah on her cliff-edge, I ordered him to walk straight back to Lyme Regis. But he did not; he gratuitously turned and went down to the dairy. Oh, but you say, come on - what I really mean is that the idea crossed my mind as I wrote that it might be more clever to have him stop and drink milk...and meet Sarah again. That is certainly one explanation of what happened; but I can only report - and I am the most reliable witness - that the idea seemed to come clearly from Charles, not myself" (Fowles, 1969: 86).

In Martin Amis' *Money*, the viewpoint character, John Self, meets the author in a pub:

"I was just sitting there, not stirring, not even breathing, like the pub's pet reptile, when who should sit down opposite me but that guy Martin Amis, the writer. He had a glass of wine, and a cigarette - also a book, a paperback. It looked quite serious. So did he in a way" (1984: 87).

In this instance, the text constructs the author, perhaps in an attempt to open-up the constructedness of the text - as Jean Luc Godard, and the 'dogme 95' filmmakers did with cinema. In a later work, *London Fields*, the story is told in the first person pronoun by the author/central character - who is also writing a novel:

"This is the story of a murder. It hasn't happened yet. But it will. (It had better.) I know the murderer, I know the murdered. I know the time I know the place. I know the motive (her motive) and I know the means. I know who will be the foil, the fool, the poor foal, also utterly destroyed. And I couldn't stop them, I don't think, even if I wanted to...What a gift. This page is briefly stained by my tears of gratitude. Novelists don't usually have it so good, do they, when something real happens (something unified, dramatic, and pretty saleable), and they just write it down?" (Amis, 1989: 1).

In his novel, *The Princess Bride* (1999), William Goldman frames the narrative in a device whereby Goldman himself is abridging the novel of a fictitious writer, S. Morgenstern. This device was employed in the 1987 adaptation. Harold Pinter adapted *The French Lieutenant's Woman* in 1987, and he also took Fowles' complex narrative tricks, fashioning an adaptation "so stunningly original as to make the film as much of a tour-de-force as the novel" (Boyum: 1985: 105). These examples serve to perhaps highlight Barthes' contention that, "the author is never more than the instance of writing" (1977).

Paradoxically this technique also serves to further highlight and exalt the status of the author, 'living' with their text. In a sense, these novels foster a sense of 'real-time' immediacy and co-presence, in a similar manner to which Auslander (1999) and Ellis (2000) claim for television, so as not to, in Barthes' terms "impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing" (1977: 147). In a 1927 lecture at Cambridge University, the novelist E. M. Forster also attempted to remove the author from history, and perhaps in doing so sketches out a broad and preliminary definition of heteroglossia:

"We are to visualise the English novelists not as floating down that stream which bears all its sons

away unless they are careful, but as seated together in a room, a circular room, a sort of British Museum reading room – all writing their novels simultaneously.” (2000: 27)

Barthes strongly argued against a predetermined ‘author’ who could clarify or completely answer any questions or meaning from a narrative. Barthes is somewhat portentously implying that all texts are interactive, at least cognitively. Marcel Duchamp thought the same in the 1930s, claiming that all art needed an audience to complete it. His concept of:

“the art coefficient says that every work of art can be evaluated, in part, as a ratio between that which is intended by the artist and not expressed in the work, and that which is unintentionally expressed by the work. In other words, recognising that each work finally escapes, to some extent, from its maker’s intentions, and these are the two main factors, which come between the original intention of the artist and the understanding of the work by the audience” (Feingold, 2002: 126).

Barthes is not so clear-cut in that he makes distinctions between two different types of texts, in a similar vein to the *Cahiers* critics: the ‘writerly,’ and the ‘readerly.’ He suggests that the writerly text is the ambition of all literary endeavour. Its mode is to make the reader no longer *consumers* of texts, but *producers* of texts and meanings:

“Opposite the writerly text, then, is its countervalue its negative, reactive value: what can be read, but not written: the *readerly* [original italics]” (1974: 4).

So readerly texts seem to prohibit creative interpretation, and writerly texts demand active participation. The distinctions between these two modes perhaps cohere with the levels of interaction within computer games (writerly) and mainstream cinema (readerly). In a sense, as I have argued, all texts are ‘writerly,’ and this explains the prevalence of adaptation as a prime television and cinematic mode. Reynolds echoes Barthes’ ‘writerly’ view, by stating that the act of reading:

“...is, of course, the result of a dialectical process in which the reader continually makes and re-makes the text according to his or her cultural, social and historical circumstances” (Reynolds, 1993: 3).

In terms of adaptation, Boyum seems to agree with Barthes, stating that, in what she calls ‘reader response theory:

“A literary work has no mode of existence in itself – that it comes into being only as a partner in a cooperative venture with a reader who inevitably brings to bear an entire constellation of past experiences, personal associations, cultural biases and aesthetic preconceptions” (1985: xi).

Similarly Foucault attacked the privileged status of authors, where, “we began to recount the lives of authors, rather than of the heroes” (1991: 101). Where Barthes had condemned the readerly text as ‘product,’ Foucault posited that the authorial mode itself had been commodified, as the author’s ‘proper’ name is somehow at odds with their literary authorial status:

“...the proper name and the author’s name are situated between the two poles of description and designation: they must have a certain link with what they name, but one that is neither entirely in the mode of designation nor that of description; it must be a specific link” (Foucault, 1991: 105).

Foucault sees a clear separation between author and text, as authors - unlike in Forster’s (2000) position - have to have temporal specificity, and can acquire what Benjamin (1999) calls ‘afterlife,’ that is a state of permanence because artistic production separates the author from time. For Foucault, the author is little more than a function, a way to sell books and films etc, illustrated

here by the role Irvine Welsh played in the marketing of the *Trainspotting* film. In short the term 'author' does not refer to a person, but to a 'name,' so the author – in opposition to Barthes' prophesy - cannot die.

The author, as both 'object' and 'subject,' will always be bound up in his/her text. Benjamin also recognises the differences between the 'proper name' and the cultural value bestowed upon authors:

“It would be just as wrong to equate the author with the real writer as to equate him with the fictitious speaker; the author function is carried out and operates in the scission itself, in this division and this distance” (Benjamin, 1999: 112).

So in essence, what Barthes is suggesting is a more multi-voiced mode, or 'many languagedness':

“...aiming for...the opportunity for multiple voices to emerge from a text along with multiple readership positions” (Fuery and Fuery, 2003: 98).

Heteroglossia, Utterance and the Intertext.

Mikhail Bakhtin, writing in particular about the polyphonic nature of Dostoevsky's novels – where all characters' voices have equal authority - examines the relationship between the author and his characters – what Bakhtin sees as a textual plurality of unmerged voices and consciousnesses, within a meta-narrative, or sphere of ideas. This analysis serves to position the author in a more active mode to that perhaps proposed by Barthes and Foucault, but here the author is alert to the dialogical: the array of voices the author reproduces, interrogates, amplifies and answers. Again, in a similar vein to both Barthes and Foucault, Bakhtin attempts to deflate the myth of 'author' as supreme creator of a text, and therefore prime referent for analysis. However, interestingly, Stam argues that Bakhtin imposes “a kind of dignity and importance to the author as the stager and metteur-en-scène of language and discourses” (1989: 14).

This position perhaps is the most useful in understanding the relationship between author and adaptor in adaptation. In reference to *The Lord of the Rings*, both Tolkien and Jackson could be positioned as 'stagers,' however it is arguable that Tolkien's authorial status has been enhanced by Jackson's adaptation. Bakhtin proposes that the author gives a platform to his/her characters, and these can act in rebellion again him/her – as John Fowles openly suggests in *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. At the heart of Bakhtin's work, is the process of 'dialogism.' As the author himself argues,

“[That] in the novel, dialogism energises from within the very mode in which the discourse

conceives of its object and its means of expressing it transforming the semantics and the syntactical structure of the discourse. Here the dialogical reciprocal orientation becomes, so to speak, an event of discourse itself, animating it and dramatising it from within in all of its aspects” (Bakhtin cited in Todorov, 1984: 60).

Like Freud and Metz, Bakhtin uses the mirror to explain that even the very act of ‘looking’ is mediated by the voices of our parents and friends, as we are looking upon ourselves, through the eyes of others, as well as our own. For Holquist, dialogism “is a way of looking at things that always insists on the presence of the other, on the inescapable necessity of outsideness and unfinalizability” (2002: 195).

So, every ‘utterance’ is part of a much wider social and historical context; these utterances resonate with past, and present usages. The auteur theory proposes a body, or canon of work, the product of an individual - and it is that individualisation, or privilege that is problematic. However, the auteur theory does propose that the author’s ‘utterances’ are deployed over time, in a body of work. For Bakhtin, the author lives thanks to intertextuality, in that the literary world is constantly aware of another world alongside it, as Todorov suggests, “at the most elementary level, all relations between two utterances are intertextual” (1984: 60).

So literature is just one of many languages, that in the case of adaptation, exist alongside and in parallel with cinema, radio, television and the web. Unlike the formalist film critics - and even the auteur structuralists - Bakhtin rejects the fetishisation of the art object, refusing to dissociate these forms from other signifying practices. Again, Bakhtin seems to follow Barthes’ notion of the author only living in the instance of writing, to a certain extent, by proclaiming that “this dialogue – the ‘great dialogue’ of the novel as a whole – takes place not in the past, but right now, that is, in the real present of the creative process” (Bakhtin, 1994: 93).

So, Bakhtin’s work is seemingly at odds with film theory in this context, refusing to recognise a formalist vision of a closed supreme text, or a (auteurist) monological form. All texts are therefore ‘heteroglossic,’ a proliferation of competing and intersecting languages cohabiting within a single language. For Bakhtin, writing is always dialogical - in a sense impure and no cultural production exists outside of language so therefore adaptation is one such language, or a constituted ‘utterance’ within a language.

For Stam, the mass media is nothing more than a complex network of ideological signs, what he calls an “ambient heteroglossia” (1989: 220). It seems here that Stam is suggesting that such a heteroglossia is a harmonious one. However, Stam published this study in the late 1980s, a period at towards the end of an “era of availability” (Ellis, 2000: 61). Arguably the disparate forms of the mass media have, technologically at least, shifted from polyglossic texts – a instantaneous existence of mutual incomprehensible and *incompatible* forms – since then, to operating in a more heteroglossic mode of cohabitation within a single language; in short a shift from technologically autonomous analogue forms to one single digital platform. So in a Bakhtinian sense, it can be proposed that there are no supreme texts or producers of supreme texts or readers/users of supreme texts, but a conflictual heteroglossia, where television functions as one *situated* utterance, alongside cinema and the web. This, in a sense, is the view taken by the 2004 Graf report into the future of BBC Online, which termed the corporation’s web content a “third medium” which existed parallel to and in peer with radio and television. This is examined in more detail in Part

III, but for Bakhtin, each situated utterance “not only answers the requirements of its own language as an individualised embodiment of a speech act, but it answers the requirements of heteroglossia as well” (1994a: 75).

Television, unlike cinema, has had no concrete critical attempts to locate an ‘author.’ As Caughie observes,

“It has become a commonplace of television studies that, whereas in classical cinema authorship is invested in the director who turns a screenplay into images and who animates the conventions of genre, in television drama the status of ‘auteur’ has historically been accorded – as a matter of routine as much of critical theory – to the writer who creates *ab nihilo* [original italics]” (2000: 127-28).

However, even this seems to be rather a sweeping statement. Certain television writers are accorded authorial privilege, such as Troy Kennedy Martin, Alan Plater, Dennis Potter and latterly Paul Abbot, Russell T. Davies, Lynda La Plante and Jimmy McGovern. However, this is certainly the exception, rather than the rule – as these are usually authors of one-off texts that are deployed in a privileged fashion. Stam suggests that:

“Auteurism also required modification to apply to television, some argued, the real auteurs were producers like Norman Lear and Stephen Bochco. What happens to a person’s status as authors when T.V commercial directors (Ridley Scott, Alan Parker) move into feature films, or when consecrated directors (David Lynch, Spike Lee, Jean Luc Godard) move into commercials or when Michelangelo Antonioni choreographs a psychedelic spot for Renault?” (Stam, 2000: 91).

A move from television to cinema would enhance authorial status - such as Spike Jonze’s move from MTV promos to cinema - however the opposite strategy does not apply, as the authorial framework bestowed on a more ‘superior’ media usually endures, as television often seeks to ‘borrow’ the cultural cachet of cinema, with filmmakers such as Quentin Tarantino directing episodes of *E.R* and *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation* and Martin Scorsese directing a Michael Jackson promo. In this sense, when cinema began adapting ‘classic’ texts, it was not only attempting to appropriate the literary cachet of an older media, as previously discussed, but also the authorial status of the original work. For cinema, as with television later, it was often Foucault’s (1991) notion of author as ‘vehicle’ that was a parallel strategy for adaptation. I would suggest that the adaptation of ‘classic’ novels and plays gave television an author function, in an otherwise largely authorless terrain.

The mainstay of television – soaps, games shows, talk shows, reality TV etc – are clearly authorless. Since the birth of Channel 4 in 1982, the independent production company sector has matured to such an extent, that there is a case for arguing that authorship is located institutionally with companies such as Endemol, Talk Back, Hat Trick, Tiger Aspect etc – or with ‘stars’ that have superseded the texts that frame them, such as Oprah Winfrey or Jamie Oliver.

In essence the television industry reflects the classical Hollywood model in many respects, the very thing that Truffaut attacked in 1953; an obsession in its drama adaptations, with faithfulness and ‘staging.’ The lack of television auteurs, for Caughie (2000) reflects a hierarchy of script and image, a hierarchy which, in its turn, reflects the privilege given to theatre as the cognate form which brings prestige to television drama, and therefore the utterance of television as a whole. Giddings and Selby (2001) attach significance to the fact that there was a flurry of Jane Austen

adaptations in the 1980s; *Pride and Prejudice* (1980), *Mansfield Park* (1986) and *Sense and Sensibility* (1986). All of these were BBC television adaptations, and as they occur just before the historical context for this discussion, could be classed as marking the beginning of the end for the 'classic' television adaptation and the fidelity period of dramatisation. It is significant that the 1995 Andrew Davies BBC adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice* did not rewire the 1980 Fay Weldon scripted adaptation, also Davies' series was clearly rewired by the 2005 filmed adaptation. I would argue that the 1995 *Pride and Prejudice* saw the beginning of a new type of adaptation in an emerging 'era of plenty.' However, the 1980 version was released on DVD in 2004, perhaps as the 2005 filmed version rewired all previous versions in its wake.

In a similar way to that of cinema, television is structured along generic lines. Bakhtin uses the term 'chronotope' to express his ideas of intertextuality. Although not strictly interchangeable, the term is used in a similar way as the term 'genre' is used in cinema and television studies; a constellation of distinctive temporal and spatial features within a 'genre,' which Bakhtin describes as a stable utterance. So the chronotope is *of* someone, *for* someone and *about* someone.

Caughie suggests that television drama is centred on character, and that the televisual form seeks to 'frame' the character, in, "a biographical time which places character at its centre and subordinates space and time to its logic" (2000: 134). So, Caughie is arguing that time and space is organised around character – similar to novelistic discourse - so chronotope is organised around *performance*. He further suggests that television is far less dependent on narrative, than other forms, but far more dependent on transmission and reception – which is a very specific chronotope, which involves an everyday domestic space, and a scheduled time. This view is supported by the minutes of the meeting I attended at the BBC, regarding an 'interactive' episode of *Casualty*, where research was presented to suggest that fans of television soap opera are watching because they have a favourite character, or star, and this can be more important than narrative – see Part III.

In terms of heteroglossia and the transmedia event, character can be more important, in the context of wider media forms, than Caughie suggests. In the situated utterance of television, Caughie makes a pertinent point, but in an emerging heteroglossia, character can be centralised by cinema and new digital forms. To return to some earlier examples in detail, the character of Lara Croft first appeared in the 1996 video game, *Tomb Raider*, as a promiscuous computer game version of the Indiana Jones character from *Raiders of the Lost Ark* (Spielberg, 1981), *Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom* (Spielberg 1984) and *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* (Spielberg, 1989). The games were very successful, and themselves were the basis for two live-action filmed versions; *Lara Croft: Tomb Raider* (West, 2001) and *Lara Croft Tomb Raider: The Cradle of Life* (de Bont, 2003). However, some reviewers pointed out that the first film was not:

"...a visualisation of the computer game that made the aristocratic adventurer into a virtual icon; it was a 21st century action movie based on the character of Lara, with a powerful heroine and a strong emotional undertow" (Floyd, 2004: 652).

So, in the Caughie sense, the film – a fairly stable utterance – was 'framing' the character of Lara Croft. Some critics, however, described the films as being unsatisfying pastiches of the Indiana Jones trilogy. In locating the Indiana Jones trilogy as source, we can, like with the adaptations of *Lord of the Rings*, see that the source was not a wholly stable utterance, and is multi-sourced,

which problematises such comparative positions. When Stephen Spielberg and George Lucas teamed-up to make the Indiana Jones films, they both envisaged a return to the Saturday matinee films of their childhood. However, there were disagreements over characterisation:

“The most serious disagreements came over [Harrison] Ford’s character. Lucas’s initial concept of Indy as a James Bondian playboy who uses archeological [sic] expeditions to fund his expensive lifestyle met resistance from Spielberg...[he] wanted to go to the opposite extreme, thinking of Indy as resembling Humphrey Bogart’s unscrupulous bum Fred C. Dobbs in John Huston’s *The Treasure of the Sierra Madre*” (McBride, 1998: 316-7).

The final archetype can arguably have its lineage in the Allan Quatermain character from H. Rider Haggard’s *King Solomon’s Mines* novel. There have been several filmed adaptations of the novel, including one made in 1937 and directed by Robert Stevenson, and another adaptation in 1985, directed by J Lee Thompson, with Cedric Hardwicke and Richard Chamberlain playing Quatermain respectively. In both these adaptations – in an example of how the imagery established by previous versions can be adapted by newer adaptations similar to Jackson’s *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy - both actors wear khaki fatigues, a brown leather jacket and a fedora – as does Indiana Jones. However, it was Stewart Granger’s Quatermain in 1950 that is considered the definitive text. Critics were quick to compare the 1985 adaptation to the Indiana Jones films, and there was another interpretation a few years earlier, *King Solomon’s Treasure* (Rakoff, 1978), this time starring David McCallum. In addition, Sean Connery - who played Indiana Jones’ father in *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* - also starred as Allan Quatermain, in the comic book adaptation, *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen* (Norrington, 2003), thereby dialogically engaging with a referent text.

It is easy to see therefore, certainly visually at least, that the Quatermain archetype was established in literature and was translated into film; a lineage that also includes the Indiana Jones and Lara Croft characters. So, arguably, this archetype with differing chronotopes, has been ‘framed’ by the stable utterances of cinema, television, and computer games at different times. These different texts and interpretations are all part of an ambient heteroglossia, and are all in dialogue with each other. Indeed, the *Tomb Raider* computer game’s release - *Lara Croft Tomb Raider: The Angel of Darkness* - was timed to coincide with the second filmed version of Lara Croft, so that the two texts live simultaneously, however, unlike Orson Welles and Franz Kafka’s heteroglossia, these two texts now *share* the *same* chronotope.

Franz Kafka and Orson Welles.

Again, to return to an earlier example, we can see how chronotopes need to be matched, or need to be in some form of dynamic synergy for a polyphonic text to exist in any heteroglossia. As we have seen, Orson Welles’ adaptation of Franz Kafka’s *The Trial* has been attacked by fidelity adaptation theorists, and then reappraised when the novel was adapted again 1993. Many adaptation theorists have recognised the impact that cinema has had on the novel, particularly Robert Richardson (1969). Kafka was a writer very influenced by the silent cinema of his day, and here I aim to show how he in turn influenced the films of Orson Welles, and how the very process of adaptation itself is heteroglossic.

Franz Kafka was born in Prague in 1883, and at that time it was still part of the Hapsburg Empire in Bohemia, where numerous nationalities, languages and political and social orientations intermingled and coexisted. His first novel, *The Trial*, was published in 1925, and was first

translated into English in 1935, with Orson Welles' adaptation being released in 1962. It seemed that Kafka had an identity crisis from the beginning of his literary life; he was a Czech born German speaker, living in the centre of a Jewish ghetto. Kafka's second novel, *America*[4], published in English in 1938 is notable not only because it is his most accessible, but also for the fact that he never went to America. In fact he rarely left his native Prague, and then only to visit friends and relatives in Germany, or to attend health spas. The imaginative scope of this work was drawn solely from Kafka's reception of early-classical Hollywood cinema:

"Beginning in 1907, Prague had a full-time cinema, the Biograph Ponrepo at Karlová 20. At the time, cinema was little more than relatively filmed theatre. However, Kafka – who could summon up little sympathy for music but therefore all the more enthusiasm for moving pictures – loved going to the 'picture-theatre.' He would then discuss with his friend Max Brod what he had seen, and occasionally wrote down his observations in his diary" (Salfellner, 2003: 21-22).

His view, sometimes startlingly accurate, of America was shaped totally by cinema, for example he writes:

"From morning to evening and far into the dreaming night that street was the channel for a constant stream of traffic which, seen from above, looked like an inextricable confusion, for ever newly improvised, of foreshortened human figures and the roofs of all kinds of vehicles, sending into the upper air another confusion, more riotous and complicated, of noises, dust and smells, all of it enveloped and penetrated by a flood of light which the multitudinous objects in the street scattered, carried off and again busily brought back, with an effect as palpable to the dazzled eye as if a glass roof stretched over the street were being violently smashed into fragments at every moment" (1993: 42).

In writing about 'the real,' Baudrillard (1995 & 2000a) argues that simulations of reality have replaced actual reality and consequently prime referents for experience are mediated images. This example highlights the fact that Kafka's view of America was shaped by a mediated representation, and that cinema had a significant impact upon his work, which should be taken into account when examining Kafka adaptation in a more heteroglossic light.

In the late 1950s, a (by now) out of favour Orson Welles was offered the opportunity to film an adaptation. Welles was, for much of his career, an innovative adaptor of 'classic' texts. This was especially evident in his theatre and radio work, particularly *War of the Worlds*, but also *Macbeth* and Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. *Macbeth* was 're-adapted' into a film in 1948. So it is with a history of successful adaptations, that Welles came to *The Trial* in early 1960. He was offered a list of books, all out of copyright, by the producer Alexander Salkind and his son, Ilya. *The Trial* was the most attractive prospect. Displaying a knowledge of Kafka's work, Welles asked if he could adapt *The Castle* instead. But the Salkinds refused and Welles eventually agreed (see Thompson, 1996). Despite the problems that had dogged his career since *Citizen Kane*, Welles was allowed as much freedom as he wanted. He wrote the script and was able to cast whom he chose, although his official biographer would later write that Welles had no respect or sympathy for Kafka's work (Leaming 2004).

In terms of heteroglossia, Welles' filmed version of *The Trial*, the Kafka novel and the Pinter version can all be read as part of the heteroglossic mode. A sequence at the beginning of Kafka's unfinished novel, *The Castle*, describes it as follows:

"It was late when K. arrived. The village was in deep snow. The Castle Hill was hidden, veiled in mist and darkness...with his eyes fixed on the Castle, K. went on further...the tower above him was uniformly round, part of it graciously mantled with ivy...topped by what looked like an attic, with battlements that were irregular, broken, fumbling as if designed by the trembling hands of a child...It

was as if a melancholy mad tenant who ought to have been locked in the topmost chamber of this house had burst through the roof and lifted himself up to the gaze of the world” (Kafka, 1993a: 18).

This sequence from Kafka’s novel could almost be read a staging directions for the opening scenes of *Citizen Kane* as Thompson describes it:

“We see the sign “No Trespassing,” and the camera climbs up the wire fence on which it hangs, Then a dissolve takes us deeper in. The energy of the film is all music, movement and dissolves: it’s teaching us how to know it....What do you see in this night?

- A huge K on the gate and the shape of a castle on the mountain beyond.

- What do you think of?

- Kafka! *The Castle*. Did Welles know them, then in 1941?” (Thompson, 1996: 170-71).

Kafka’s description of a “melancholy mad tenant” in his castle could also be a very pertinent analysis of Kane, as he dies in his self-made prison, Xanadu. In this reading of the film, the most striking aspect is when the camera reveals the wrought iron gate, emblazoned with the monicker, ‘K.’ In all of Kafka’s novels the letter K. plays in important role. In *America* the main protagonist is Karl; in *The Trial* it is Joseph K; In *The Castle* it is simply K.

Welles’ film rests alongside Kafka’s novel and other works, and the Pinter version of *The Trial*. Not only that, but this could take into account *Brazil* (Gilliam, 1985), Stephen Berkoff’s theatrical version of *The Trial* (1971) Steven Soderbergh’s biopic *Kafka* (1991) Peter Capaldi’s Oscar winning short-film adaptation of Kafka’s *Metamorphosis* filmed as *Franz Kafka’s Wonderful Life* (1993) and an entire canon of literary criticism and supplementary reading material, including the many biographies of both Welles and Kafka. However locating this corpus into any ambient heteroglossia is problematic. The chronotopes of each text are too specific to each other and are not engaged in any kind of synergy. The Pinter adaptation of *The Trial*, for example, is at pains to be as faithful to the source novel as possible, ignoring all other adaptations and versions. Pinter’s version therefore is not a remake of Welles’ film, in Mazdon’s (2000) definition, but an attempt to create a fidelity text, fettered to Kafka’s novel. Its critical reception helped to resurrect Welles’ early critically ignored version, and it was, in Cardwell’s (2002) definition, ‘re-configured’ in this light. The Kafka narrative has been deployed over different forms, at different times; a process that spans several decades. However, the narrative is still heteroglossic for the multiple voices it mobilises, and the multiple readings it invites, but at its centre is still an authorial mode of privilege centred on Kafka, as *auteur*. So it is Kafka’s authorial position that creates the dialogism between all variants. This, as I shall outline in Part II, is perhaps the last gasp of ‘pure’ fidelity adaptations, as an emerging heteroglossia allowed for a more fluid and explicit dialogism between texts.

In a similar fashion to Caughie’s description of television as a form that ‘frames’ character, Bakhtin warns that:

“The following must be kept in mind: that the speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is – no matter how accurately transmitted – always subject to certain semantic changes. The context embracing another’s world is responsible for its dialogizing [sic] background, whose influence can be very great. Given the appropriate methods for framing, one may bring about fundamental changes even in another’s utterance accurately quoted” (1994a: 78).

This point serves to render comparative frameworks redundant, as heteroglossia begs further adaptation and translation – and therefore ‘changes’ - something, when writing about translation,

Benjamin (1999) also noted.

So in terms of the Kafka narrative, or ‘utterance,’ it has been framed by literature, theatre, cinema etc, at different times – each version with its own specific chronotope. Six years later Welles would adapt the six plays of Shakespeare’s Henriad (*Richard II*, *Henry IV – Part I*, *Henry IV – Part II* and *Henry V*) in *Chimes at Midnight* (1966) a text discussed in Part II of this thesis, as an example of a emerging trend of explicitly heteroglossic adaptation.

New Media, New Authors?

Authorship, as we have seen, is problematised by adaptation, however authorship is even more problematic when applied to new forms of digital media. One of the main issues in attempting to locate an ‘authentic’ voice in new digital media forms, is the presupposition of the ‘interactive’ and ‘non-linear’ elements of texts. Writers such as Barthes (with his notion of the ‘readerly/writerly’ dialectic) and artists such as Duchamp have questioned the perceived ‘closed’ nature of texts. For Barthes and Duchamp and adaptation theorists such as Boyum (1985), texts have always been polysemic and open to creative interpretation, with Duchamp even going as far to suggest that a text is incomplete *without* a phenomenological response. Bordwell and Thompson (1997) see narrative as the dialogue between *plot* and *story*, and these two functions operate within the confines of the diegesis. Poole sees video games as being the next stage in story telling, splitting their narratives into synchronic – the present time ‘plot’ - and diachronic – the fixed ‘back-story’ functions (2000: 105). He is however sceptical of video games’ interactivity, seeing this as limiting, as players can only influence the synchronic narrative, and this in turn will not alter the diachronic narrative. Also, largely, it could be argued that the synchronic narrative is in thrall to the diachronic system, and the ‘rules’ of the diachronic narrative must be obeyed/followed for successful game-play.

However, many writers have proposed that video games and other ‘interactive’ media are the next stage of narrative, as the synchronic ‘stories’ are dynamically generated in ‘real-time’ direct response to the user/player’s responses. This should, in theory, facilitate greater emotional involvement, but Poole (2000) dismisses the notion of interactivity totally. Non-linearity is also not a new mode, for example Emily Bronte used flashbacks in her novels; Charles Dickens cross-cut between situations and Tolstoy often dissolved between scenes. Edwin Porter was the first filmmaker to move cinema towards its own aesthetic, and away from theatrical conventions, by cross-cutting between scenes for the first time in *The Life of the American Fireman* (1903) and *The Great Train Robbery* (1903). In fact, the infamous gun being pointed at the camera – and therefore the audience – in the latter text, was provided on a separate reel, so movie theatre managers could decide where to place the scene in the film themselves, or to leave it out altogether (Mathews, 2005).

However, although it wasn’t entirely a new idea, cinema in particular – and later television – embraced non-linear modes of storytelling. Essentially, the narrative does not follow a chronological chain of events. Filmmakers from the French *Nouvelle Vague*, such as Jean-Luc Godard, experimented with jump-cuts and disruptive narrative strategies, such as in his film *A bout de Soufflé*. More recent films like *The Usual Suspects* (Singer, 1995) and *Memento* (Nolan, 2000) were intellectual puzzles that demanded a high level of cognitive interactivity from

audiences.

Like any media form, computer games are subject to genres, or chronotopes. One of the most popular forms of gaming, especially on the PC/Mac platforms, is role-playing, or adventure games. Early versions of these games gave birth to the Steve Jackson and Ian Livingstone adventure role playing childrens' novels in the 1980s, an example of literature 'remediating' (Bolter and Grusin, 2000) and re-purposing elements of a new emerging media, further discussed in Part II. Lev Manovich (2001) suggests that we should think of these games in terms of narrative actions and explorations. Rather than being narrated to, by an unseen supreme author, the game player has to *perform* actions themselves to move the game forward. Unlike cinema, computer games lack extensive dialogue, and so depend on the game-player to move the narrative forward - a narrative that usually depends on a 'framed' character (Lara Croft etc) as discussed previously. In addition, video games can almost claim to be the embodiment of heteroglossic texts, as the boundaries between forms become blurred. Many games are based on films, and vice-versa. In fact many such games contain full motion video from feature films, later analysed in Part III.

Hypertext is a software technology where the 'reader' can move from text to text, or one place in a text to another using hyperlinks, now familiar to us in the form of the World Wide Web. Hypertexts are bodies of work, made up of multiple units – called 'lexias,' by Murray (1999) after Barthes. The reader/user can negotiate their way through the texts, in any way they wish (in theory). Writers such as Dovey (2002) suggest that the human brain reads and understands by association, therefore hypertext and non-linear media is a more 'natural' way of reading. Dovey also makes the link between hypertext and early experiments with montage by the Russian formalist filmmakers. Laurel (1999) who likens computer based narratives to theatre, asks if we can get the same kind of intellectual and emotional gratification from a good book, as we do a good play, invoking the hierarchical structures that seemingly divide different media.

In a Barthesian sense, these new forms of writing, perhaps need new forms of reading. Murray suggests that hypertext authors are similar to choreographers who supply:

“...the rhythms, the context and the set of steps that will be performed. The interactor (reader), whether as navigator, protagonist, explorer or builder, makes use of this repertoire of possible steps and rhythms to improvise a particular dance among the many, many dances that the author has enabled” (1999: 153).

Curiously, despite hypertext's adherence to Barthes' maxim of 'writerly' texts, some authors of hypertext fiction are actually quite visible. Hypertext is essentially a literary form, and as such, has its antecedent in the novelistic form of privileging the authorial status, and Landlow argues that:

“Most current examples of hypertext take the form of texts originally produced by the hypertext author in and for another medium, generally that of print” (2001: 151).

This point does suggest an element of adaptation, or perhaps remediation.

So, considering the 'interactive' and 'writerly' mode of hypertext, some hypertext writers, such as Michael Joyce, are reasonably well known, which serves to undermine Barthes' dichotomy, as I have argued that all texts can be viewed as 'writerly,' and therefore inherently transferable and adaptable. Barthes and Bakhtin would still perhaps view these writers as *metteurs*, rather than the *auteurs* than their authorial function could suggest, as, more than any other type of author, they exist purely in the moment of writing.

This is in direct opposition to computer and videogames, later discussed in Part III, which, like much television, do not seem to recognise, or individualise any authorial function, except the authorial status of work that is adapted. Institutional, or perhaps industrial, authorship does come into play however, as computer games are categorised by the company that produces them, notes Darley:

“Significantly, however, in all three areas [advertisements, music video, computer games] other names have consistently appeared alongside those of creative individuals: those of special effect companies” (2000: 136).

I would argue that computer games are very rarely linked to an individual as location for an authorial referent, unless it is a character such as James Bond, Indiana Jones (who come from literature and cinema) or Lara Croft. It is usually the games manufacturers that are constructed as author, eg LucasArts, EA, Rage Games, Nintendo etc. This, Darley suggests, has more to do with chronotopes, as the “focus, in other words, has more to do with generic appreciation than it does authorship” (ibid: 138).

Towards Transmedia.

Benjamin argues that the loss of the author as a present force is due to the rise of the novel. He further suggests that this dependence on the book, has meant the end of the ‘story.’ The novel, he posits “neither comes from oral tradition nor goes into it” (1999: 87). Unlike Bakhtin, Benjamin does not see the novel, and literature, existing alongside the world:

“A man listening to a story is in the company of the story teller; even a man reading one shares this companionship. The reader of a novel, however, is isolated, more so than any other reader” (ibid: 99).

For Bakhtin the novel “emerges as the form which best exploits the heteroglossic tendencies of language so that the novelistic and the heteroglossic become in effect, synonymous” (Dentith, 1995: 54). In terms of contemporary media practice, like Stam’s view of an ambient heteroglossic mass media, Caughie suggests that:

“...it may be useful, if equally scandalous to think of film and television narratives as specific twentieth century extensions of the same novelistic discourse into new media, new technologies and new forms of transmission and reception” (2000: 134).

I have argued earlier that adaptation itself is heteroglossic, and this is becoming more evident as the mass media becomes heteroglossic as well. This is a phenomenon that some adaptation theorists have noted, particularly from the late 1990s:

“In one sense, every film adaptation can be understood as a type of intertextuality or pastiche, if only because the very process of adaptation involves the deliberate imitation of a prior work” (Sadlier, 2000: 192).

Similarly, Naremore argues that:

In addition to expanding the kinds of texts we take into account, we need to augment the metaphors of translation and performance with the metaphor of intertextuality, or with what M.M. Bakhtin called ‘dialogics’” (2000: 12).

So Bakhtin’s thesis is quite pertinent and useful in this context. However, it is the argument of this dissertation that if adaptation and the mass-media is heteroglossic and dialogistic, then this has been accelerated by the advent of new digital forms of media, and the digitalisation of older more established forms. This will be explored at greater length in Part II. In Darley’s view:

“...one important dimension of this whole process involves intertextuality as the straddling of forms. For some time now texts in one form – and this has been particularly apparent with regard to blockbuster movies – have been specifically designed with an eye to translation into other branches of the culture industry...Meanwhile – in a broader sense – details, fragments, styles and techniques are constantly migrating between each of these and the other forms at play” (Darley, 2000: 139).

However, this is not merely a postmodern fusion, or ‘bricolage.’ Going back to the novel, it is fairly easy to see that the form is the antecedent of hypertext writing. Landow describes hypertext as a ‘vast assemblage’ or a ‘metatext.’ Indeed he even concludes that texts are now like velcro, “to which various kinds of materials begin attaching themselves” (2001: 153).

Both Fredric Jameson and Jacques Derrida write about collage, and meta-genres. For Jameson, film genre is centred on repetition:

“...and has had to respond to television competition by devising new meta-generic or omnibus forms, which, however, at once become new “genres” in their own right, and fold back into the usual generic stereotyping and reproduction” (2000: 132).

This is a sentiment that echoes the constant revisioning, rewiring and improving of adaptation.

Problematically, Jameson still concentrates on the form, and sees cinematic genres as being distinct and separate from television, literature, music etc. Confusingly, although the genre of a text is fixed, he seems to suggest that its chronotope is far less defined and rigid. Writing about popular music, Jameson argues that whatever the genre, or ‘type’ we,

“...never hear any of the singles produced in these genres for “the first time”; instead we live a constant exposure to them in all kinds of different situations, from the steady beat of the car radio through the sounds at lunch, or in the work-place, or in shopping centres etc” (ibid: 133).

For Derrida, media texts can be explained as ‘assemblage’, a term that:

“...seems more apt for suggesting that the kind of bringing together proposed here has the structure of an interlacing, a weaving, or a web, which would allow the different threads and different lines of sense or force to separate again, as well as being ready to bind others together” (Derrida, 1978: 131).

So, it is clear that the fidelity approach’s emphasis on authorship was problematic. In addition to the approach’s assumption of a ‘source’ text and a ‘target’ text – and a one way binary relationship between them – its narrow view of a supreme author and a closed text, suggests that the fidelity approach views the novelistic form as a monological one, and that adaptation, therefore should transpose that single voice, and this is clearly not the case. The auteur theory, in all its manifestations and permutations, is problematic in that to an extent, it also presupposes that cinema is a monological form. It is here that Bakhtin and Barthes seem to offer a way forward; Barthes especially is outlining multi-voiced texts and multiple readership positions (Fuery & Fuery, 2003). It is because of this analysis that Barthes has been adopted as the ‘theorist of choice’ for a generation of new media and digital theory scholars. Indeed, his very term ‘lexia’ has been appropriated by hypertext writers and scholars, and his ‘writerly’ texts seem to suit the new emerging culture industries, so that when:

“...we, as spectators, rest our gaze on the image we are not simply viewing a flat, singular, secular piece of art....instead we are incorporating ourselves into a chain of events – the process of creating culturally viable, sustainable and recognisable images. It is our part in reading and investing in the image a spectators that allows the mage to grow with other images into a visual culture” (ibid: 101).

In this light it is easy to see how Bakhtin’s notions of ‘heteroglossia’ and ‘dialogism’ function.

However, the mass media is not an ‘ambient heteroglossia’ as Stam would have it. He argues that there is no single, closed text or producer, or spectator, but a conflictual heteroglossia, with television as one instance of “stable utterance” (1989: 222). This view has been problematic; as we have seen with *The Trial* adaptations, chronotopes are often not shared, and media forms are perceived as being fairly distinct and incompatible technologically. The mass media is certainly polyglossic, where texts and their extra texts exist as a plurality of utterances, but they are fusing together, as heteroglossia would demand. Due to an emerging digital heteroglossia, texts now exist on different registers (games, TV, film, novels etc) and increasingly generate an ideological dynamism among themselves.

The advent of new digital means of production, acquisition and reception has led to the emergence of new forms, and the digitalisation of older, more established ones. When finally this process has worked through, then the mass media could be described as digitally heteroglossic, as there will be many languages and utterances, which would, in Bakhtin’s terms be all part of one single meta-language. So then, for authorship, herein lies the problem: for how can you:

“...attribute several discourses to one and the same author? How can one use the author function to determine if one is dealing with one or several individuals?” (Foucault: 1991: 110).

So, new modes of authorship and therefore readership, are now coming into play and for Foucault, these ‘new’ authors are “unique in that they are not just the authors of their own works. They have produced something else: The possibilities and the rules for the formation of other texts” (ibid: 114). Therefore, authorship is primarily a dialogistic function.

A novelist writing in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is doing so in a world full of visual imagery and different, and conflicting, media forms. Locating a single monological voice in a text, particularly in terms of adaptation, is now difficult:

“Authorship is being displaced by different aesthetic concerns, those centred upon the ephemeral playing with and working-over of visual forms, styles and tropes...this culture of the perpetual and regimented discharge of the fleeting of transitory would seem to demand not so much the author as the modifier, nor the originator, but rather the adjuster or the renovator” (Darley: 2000: 141).

Here, Darley proposes a *de-centred* author - someone who has been sidelined, if you will.

Returning to Fowles and Amis, we find two novelists who have placed themselves in a narrative to perhaps neuter the perceived monological nature of the novel, in the same way as Tolkien manufactured a polyphonic position for *The Lord of the Rings*. Similarly, Bakhtin praised Dostoevsky’s novel, *Crime and Punishment*, for the “narrator renouncing the right to the last word and granting full and equal authority to the word of the characters” (Dentith: 1995: 42).

For the Bakhtin school, it’s not that the author is absent, or ‘other,’ he/she is present in their work, but their voice, or ‘utterance’ is part of many other conflicting utterances, and never drowns out the dialogic nature of the text, in the same way Tolkien is present in Jackson’s *The Lord of the Rings* adaptation, but his status does not diminish that of Jackson.

The heteroglossic nature of new emerging digital media has renounced the need for spectrum, medium, or platform specificity. Adaptation theorists have longed argued against medium specific approaches; for example Wagner (1975) claimed that reaching a more plural consensus was almost impossible. Later, Boyum would add that “even pluralism has its limits” (1985: 71). Even

adaptation theorists, such as McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002), with some sympathy for more pluralist approaches seem set on medium specific positions. However, Boyum does perhaps offer a way forward, and in doing so points towards what Bolter and Grusin (2000) would later term ‘the logic of hypermediacy’:

“An adaptation is always, whatever else it may be, an interpretation. And if this is one way of understanding the nature of adaptation and the relationship of any given film to the book that inspired it, it’s also a way of understanding what may bring such a film into being in the first place: the chance to offer an analysis and an appreciation of one work of art through another” (Boyum: 1985: 62).

In the next part of this discussion, I shall broaden this approach to examine closely the impact of new digital media on adaptation, as technology is an area overlooked by most adaptation theorists. I will further argue that the new media heteroglossia will be one where texts exist as collages, sharing chronotopes, and being framed by different stable utterances, such as film, television, radio and the internet all acting as a ‘system of restraint.’ Each text will exist in a dialogical relationship with each another:

“As our society changes, at the very moment when it is in the process of changing, the author function will disappear, and in such a manner that fiction and its polysemous texts will once again function according to another mode, but still with a system of constraint – one which will no longer be the author, but which will have to be determined, or perhaps, experienced” (Foucault: 1991: 1999).

Rewiring the Text – Part II.

The Digital Heteroglossia.

Chapter 2.1: The Emerging Digital Heteroglossia.

Introduction.

Comparative approaches to adaptation, and their assumptive positions of a perceived source text to target text trajectory are clearly limiting. Theorists, such as Bluestone (1957), have tried to distance themselves from this position by formulating an approach that proposes to separate both texts (source and target) and treat them as individual works of art, although he still privileges literature over cinema. In addition, McFarlane's (1996) theory of 'functional equivalents' suggests a way of perceiving the novel as source for a new work of art, but still treats the two texts as separate and distinct artefacts. As Boyum notes:

“Though narrative film can be seen as a branch of literature, though it may share with the novel similar aims and similar reasons for being, it remains embedded in a very different medium and makes use of a language which, however it might parallel that of the novel, it is very different too. The rhetoric of fiction is simply not the rhetoric of film, and it's in finding analogous strategies whereby the one achieves the effects of the other that the greatest challenge of adaptation lies” (1985: 81).

Boyum was writing in a pre-digital age, however her position is problematic as each text cannot be a separate autonomous artefact and yet one is still considered source for the other. McFarlane still implies a hierarchical relationship between two texts, and that assumes a linearity between a source and target. He seems to want to separate the texts, as Bluestone suggests, whilst still retaining the binary interplay between them. In actuality, this relationship is a cycle of complex interplays with each text having a relationship of exchange with the other, something which Cardwell (2002) recognises, in delineating an approach which encompasses the target text's impact on its source, as a more fluid relationship of exchange.

For the examination of contemporary media practice, the fidelity approach - itself based on value-judgments - is no longer appropriate, nor are the terms 'source' and 'target.' New texts can occur, and, in Benjamin's (1999) words, these texts can bestow an 'afterlife' on the perceived original. This afterlife sustains the adaptation or translation through a complex series of relationships with extra-texts. This process alters the nature of the original and the notion of originality.

However, texts that have already been in existence before the adaptation can also gain a type of afterlife: a life beyond their original commercial and critical existence, as we have seen with the 1980 and 1995 BBC television adaptations of *Pride and Prejudice*. These texts are reappraised in terms based on the adaptation's existence. A movement away from this linearity reveals other texts that surround and penetrate the assumed adaptation. It is all these texts combined, and their relationship to each other, that can qualify a move towards a single unified event that is deployed over several platforms simultaneously. In terms of 'traditional' literary adaptation, the novel and the filmed version can both be viewed as both source and target. There is no longer a need to propose a binary relationship between them. A whole mass of other textual artefacts can be either product of the novel, or the film, or both. This circular relationship of exchange also renders any notion of a definitive, or even superior text, as problematic. This continuum can also allow for other external texts to come into play as possible source; just because a film is adapted from a literary source does not mean that this can be viewed as the sole source. As explored at the beginning of Part I, theorists such as Reynolds (1993), Sadlier (2000) and Naremore (2000) seem

to propose an approach that would include the exploration of parallel texts, and a move away from more hierarchical structures. It is this concept that this part of the thesis develops.

This emerging phenomenon and approach can be linked to new theoretical ideas surrounding technology and innovation, such as the 'convergence' debate: that all media will coalesce or 'fuse' together into one dominant form. Convergence was at the heart of many debates surrounding the emerging new media in the 1990s. However, many theorists – apart from Corrigan (2000) and Cardwell's (2002) medium-specific analysis of television - do not make the distinction between technological and aesthetic convergence, and the possible influence of each upon the other. I will examine here the impact that technology has had on adaptation, particularly new forms of digital media, in 'improving' adaptation and perhaps moving towards Richardson's (1969) notion of 'xerography.' In terms of videogames, many are starting to appropriate cinematic codes and conventions. Such games frequently contain elements of full motion video (FMV) which players/users are 'rewarded' with, on completing certain tasks/levels. *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers* videogame actually begins in exactly the same way the film does - complete with Cate Blanchett's voiceover and the back-story (or diachronic narrative) intact, utilising the prologue from the film, which in turn was appropriated from the BBC Radio production. Eventually the 'film' becomes the 'game' and the player can now interact with the synchronic narrative and initiate surface play. The game's 'characters' are voiced by the same actors playing the characters in the film. This is quite common, as Pierce Brosnan actually 'stars' in the videogames accompanying the James Bond franchise/event.

As Poole (2000) and Darley (2000) suggest, interactivity is limited, and is indeed false; players/users can only really initiate the synchronic narrative. The diachronic narrative is fixed and it is the diachronic narrative that is welded to the narrative of the film it is based on. If you don't obey the rules of the diachronic narrative, you will not progress far in the game diegesis. So in a sense, you are forced to serve the source material's (in this case the film) plot. In addition, whatever you do in the synchronic narrative, it is not possible to change, alter nor effect the diachronic narrative.

Historically - as we have seen with the trajectory of the *Pickwick Paper's* adaptations - there were substantial gaps between related adapted texts; Boris Pasternak's novel *Doctor Zhivago* was published in 1956 after the author smuggled it out of the then Soviet Union. David Lean's filmed version was made in 1965 with ITV's television dramatisation broadcast in 2002. However, instead of an adaptation, or remake, which usually happens over a period of time, there is now a move towards transmedia events. Film rights for novels are often sold before that novel has appeared in bookshops, or before the novel has actually been completed. As Corrigan observes:

“Many popular novels today appear aimed at film adaptation even when they are first published as novels, and their style and structure could be considered already that of a novelization” (1999: 71).

Videogame versions of films are often released before the film is exhibited, in a move that could be part of a wider cross-media marketing strategy. Because of conglomeration there is now a different temporal relationship between media texts.

In effect, one scenario can be simultaneously deployed over several platforms (books, film, radio, TV, sound-track, computer game, web-site etc) at the same time, saturating many global markets all at once. The relationship between television and cinema is also changing to reflect this

phenomena; the Dreamworks film studio has recently had a great deal of success with *Band of Brothers*, a series based on the film *Saving Private Ryan* (Spielberg, 1998). In South America, the extremely popular TV series *City of Men* (2002-2005) is based loosely on the film, *City of God* (Meirelles & Lund, 2002) and features some of that film's characters.

As chairman of the BFI, the British film director, Alan Parker, criticised *The Full Monty* (Cattaneo, 1997) for being a TV programme and not cinema:

“In a 1997 Bafta lecture Parker suggested that the British film industry made great TV, but not ambitious films in the tradition of David Lean and Carol Reed” (Adams, 2000).

In fact, the original pitch had been to the television company Carlton, with a view to a six-part series, but Carlton turned it down. Parker's own *Evita* (1996) was originally a musical, and the filmed version of *Chicago* (2003) was nominated for 13 Oscars, and was released while a stage version was running simultaneously in the west-end of London, and on Broadway in New York, showing the close collusion between different media in an increasingly digital and heteroglossic age.

The music channel MTV has cornered the market in 'Teen' films, as well as cult films such as *Jackass* (2003), based on its own series of the same name. The long running television series *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* was originally a film (Kuzui, 1992). Also, the *Addams Family* (Sonnenfeld, 1991) was originally a newspaper cartoon strip, before becoming a television series, and *Charlie's Angels* (Nichol, 2000) began on the small screen. The filmed version of the 1950s TV Series *Bewitched* (Ephron, 2005) is a text that frames two utterances of the original text, as the plot centres on the production of a remake of the show. Anything and everything has been the inspiration for other works of art; Mikhail Bulgakov's novel, *The Master and Margarita* (1966) being loosely adapted by Mick Jagger for the Rolling Stones' recording *Sympathy for the Devil*, and has been a major influence on Victor Pelevin's novel, *Babylon* (2000), as well as the Russian TV series *Master i Margarita* (2005).

The process of technological change has accelerated. Bolter and Grusin (2000) argue that a process of 'remediation' is taking place, where 'older' more established media forms are quickly adopting and appropriating conventions of what is termed the 'new' media. As all media forms digitise and conglomeration increases, it is far more effective to deploy scenarios over several different platforms. The traditional view of adaptation and the fidelity approach is no longer viable (if it ever was) in the emerging 'era of plenty' (Ellis, 2000). The notion of source/target is problematic and this one-way binary relationship between the assumed texts is also clearly limiting in contemporary media practice.

Also, any notion of 'original' is also problematic, as a prime condition of postmodernity is a loss of originality. As Baudrillard (2000) argues, society is now concerned with consuming signs and simulations; a shift from production to consumption. Benjamin (1999) claims that mechanical reproduction (and what is 'adaptation' if not mechanical reproduction?) results in the original losing its aura. In the emerging era of plenty/interactivity and convergence, it may be possible to experience individual adaptations and personalised experiences of media texts - something which is developed in Part III of this thesis.

Part II of this project will examine further Stam's (1989) assertion that the mass media is an 'ambient heteroglossia' and Caughie's (2000) view that television is a 'situated utterance' in any

such heteroglossia. The scope of adaptation studies must be broadened to encompass a range of different media, as most writers on the subject are fairly medium specific, or just concerned with literature, cinema and/or television. Corrigan recognises how new media technologies have impacted on adaptation:

“Home video and computer technologies have made it possible for viewers to watch and compare even more versions of an adaptation from other periods of history” (1999: 73).

So, new technology can underpin new comparative positions that are more plural and are not fettered to supreme authors and single preferred readings, but which are far more overtly hypermediate and heteroglossic:

“One consequence of this redistribution of literature through the media may be that questions of fidelity or authenticity may be less and less a concern for both filmmakers and their audiences” (ibid: 74).

Corrigan is, in my opinion, correct, however in this part of the discussion I will examine those technologies which he signals out (the VCR and computing) as well as the internet. The following section therefore, in an attempt to map the relationship between different media, how this has been facilitated and ‘improved’ by technology, before making some conclusions about the impact on adaptation. It is my view, that the changes Corrigan points to have fundamentally changed the process, exhibition and reception of adaptation.

Therefore, if the mass media *is* an ambient heteroglossia, then this must be explored, with a view to understanding the relationship between different media, and possible new texts that come out of that relationship. It is the view of this study that the onset of digital production and digital acquisition formats has created a ‘digital heteroglossia’ that has allowed for a more fluid relationship between different media ‘utterances.’ However, these relationships are not new; the digital heteroglossia not only makes visible relationships that have always existed between different media, as we have seen in Part I, but in addition, has led to new texts that are increasingly being deployed *simultaneously* across several media platforms. So, again, as with Part I, this section will draw upon texts and examples from the history of adaptation. The move towards a perceived instantaneity and simultaneity of media production will be examined, in the light of television adaptation and new forms of celebrity narrative.

The dominant discourses of digital media history seems to focus on convergence, and more recently, remediation (Bolter & Grusin, 2000). Both will be examined here, against notions of digital heteroglossia. Other commentators believe that an inevitable convergence will bring about a coalescence of media technology (Molyneux, 1999) – a view supported by UK government communication policy, such as the 1998 Green Paper, *Regulating Communications: Approaching Convergence in the Digital Age*. Convergence, as a term, is often linked to increasing media conglomeration (see Doyle, 2002 and Collins 2002). In opposition, some have suggested that different media are moving apart, with each new technological advance (Hill and McLoone, 1999).

For Bolter and Grusin (2000), however, the relationship between different media technologies, is far more complex, and paradoxically perhaps, far more plural. They argue that just as new media appropriate the conventions of older, more established forms (as we have seen in Part I) the older, more established forms also go through a process of remediation; a mode of reaffirmation in the light of a perceived threat, from new media technologies. In a sense, as I shall show, the history of adaptation has gone through a similar process. In what they term the ‘logic of hypermediacy’ Bolter and Grusin posit that new media is the centre of remediation, and in effect acts as a

‘management’ system for all other media. It is this element of Bolter and Grusin’s work that is focused on here, in terms of adaptation, as increasingly texts are constructed to open out into an array of related texts, in a deliberate and heightened mode of hypermedia.

No analysis of the ideas of convergence, remediation and hypermediacy can be examined without looking at key moments in the development of digital media technologies. It is by studying this terrain, we can pinpoint where new digital forms arrived, and when older more established forms ‘switched-on’ to digital. This, I will argue, is the place where a digital heteroglossia can be ascertained, and how new relationships can be understood, and how that has led to the creation of new texts and new types of adaptation, further explored in Part III.

Pre-history.

Brian Winston firmly links digital media to its analogue predecessor, by defining digital media as where the “analogue wave form is sampled and each discreet level of amplitude is assigned a digital value” (2000: 133). For Winston therefore, digital media is the encoding of the original signal, and as such, is *not* a new and distinct form. This is clearly a problematic position, as many texts are made purely for a digital media, and were never previously analogue, such as computer and video games. However, in terms of this discussion, this is a moot point, as it is Winston’s failure to separate the two forms that is interesting, as is McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell’s (2002) medium specific positions. Clearly, there is a ‘conversion’ between analogue and digital, and even adaptation, but we can now say with conviction that distinct digital forms do exist.

For Levinson, the origin of digital media, or what he calls the ‘the first digital media,’ is the invention of various alphabets:

“Like the phoenix which arose resplendent from the ashes, five hundred years after its consumption in flames, the Phoenician invention – the phonetic alphabet, the voices of absent people, the papyrus products of Byblos that we call books – would return in twice that time in a form that defied the local pyre and brought us the modern world” (1999: 20).

Indeed it is clear to see the links between Egyptian hieroglyphics, the Greek alphabet and the ‘1s’ and ‘0s’ that make up digital language, as well as the symbolic metaphors used in most communications technologies today; the Graphical User Interface (GUI). However, there was a huge time delay between the invention of these early systems, and the first ‘novel’ in 1605; Miguel de Cervantes’ *Don Quixote*. Even this date is in dispute, as some scholars suggest that:

“Another curious case of cryptography was presented to the public in 1917 by one of the best [Francis] Bacon scholars, Dr. Alfred von Weber. [H]e discovered overwhelming material evidence: the first English translation of *Don Quixote* bears corrections in Bacon’s hand. He concluded that this English version was the original version of the novel and that Cervantes had published a Spanish translation of it” (Duchaussoy cited in Eco, 2001: 406).

In terms of the digital heteroglossia, Collins has a later date, suggesting that, “Marconi’s first wireless transmissions were a form of digital communication” (2002: 147). This occurred in 1897, when Samuel Morse’s code was used to transmit the letter ‘S’ from Poldhu in Cornwall to Signal Hill in Newfoundland. In fact, Sir Oliver Lodge was the first to transmit Morse code (of ‘dots’ and ‘dashes’ – again similar to digital language) in 1894 (Crisell, 2002 & Winston, 2000). Morse Code, in many ways the 19th century equivalent of email, declined in use from the 1960s, and finally ended with the advent of the World Wide Web. On 1st February 1999, the last Morse

message was transmitted to ships in French waters: “Calling all. This is our last cry before our eternal silence” (Thomas, 1999). In Levinson’s (2001) Darwinist approach to the development of media technology this is an example of a ‘remedial’ media *improving* an older one, which can sometimes lead to its complete replacement, as he suggests that colour television replaced monochrome broadcasting and the telephone replaced the telegraph. Indeed, Morse Code was here replaced first by analogue technologies, such as the telephone, and then by more digital means of communication, such as email, and digital radio. It is Levinson’s idea of ‘improving’ technology and a natural evolution of innovation that I want to explore here and link to the constant rewiring, improving and dialogic nature of adaptation.

Armes (1988) puts the date of a digital genesis at 1949, with the invention of the ENAIC computer at the University of Pennsylvania. It is fairly difficult then, to plot a clear evolution of digital media technologies, with all many different dates being cited as its genesis, as Eco recognises:

“The mass media are genealogical because, in them, every new invention sets off a chain reaction of inventions produces a sort of common language. They have no memory because, when the chain of inventions has been produced, no one can remember who started it” (1998: 146).

However, it may be pertinent to focus on the last significant analogue technology; the VCR. The home video is the device that Corrigan suggests has changed the exhibition and reception, at least, of adaptations, and therefore could be seen as a technological antidote to fidelity criticism:

“Audiences today may be more interested in the different textures of adaptation than in the textual accuracy of any one adaptation” (1999: 74).

However, this is still a medium specific view, as the VCR essentially is a televisual technology, so I will broaden the scope of this argument, to look at new media in particular; a medium that potentially combines many of the elements from the entire history of media innovation.

This domestic and media industry technology is still relatively new, and has gone through significant changes in an emerging digital era. As a technology, domestic video recording technologies straddle the gap between analogue and digital media, and as such, it can be placed at the centre of the creation of the digital heteroglossia, and as Winston notes “No device has been adopted more quickly” with the number of VCRs in the US increasing from 1.8 million to 86 million between 1980 and 1995 (2000: 126).

Like all media technologies, the VCR’s history is bound up in that of all other media technologies, as McLuhan (1998), Levinson (1998 & 2001) and Bolter and Grusin (2000) recognise. Armes (1988) links VCR history with that of the origins of photography. He cites some key technological developments that led to the birth of the video recorder; the first transistor (1949), pocket radios (1954), the silicon chip (1958) and the first digital watches and calculators (1971). The VCR’s origins are in industrial practice, when:

“Early videotape debuted on November 11, 1951, when the electronics division of Bing Crosby Enterprises first demonstrated its use for recording images in black and white” (Hanson, 1987: 18).

One of the earliest machines, the Ampex, was first demonstrated in 1956, and by 1958, the BBC was using it, albeit in a limited form. The BBC initially used it to record sport, before the comedian Tony Hancock’s production team used it to record his *Hancock’s Half Hour* shows from 1958 (Crisell, 2002), which was also the year of the first stereo records.

By 1965, Sony had invented the influential Portapak reel-to-reel video recorder, and the same company had put the lynch tape into the VCR by 1969. Subsequently, the first domestic VCRs began appearing in 1972. In tandem to these developments, the key digital technology of the Compact Disc (CD) was invented by Phillips in 1978, although it wouldn't be fully launched until the 1980s – which illustrates the time-lag between the innovation of digital media, and its adoption (see also HD-TV). Both Phillips and Sony had brought out their short-lived precursor to the DVD, with their Laser Video Disc system, in a collaboration that undermines Winston's notion of the 'law of suppression,' although undeterred by the failure of this technology – the image quality of which has not been superseded by DVD – the two companies began experimenting with Compact Disc Video in 1988. This format allowed for 5 minutes of video with sound. The Laser Disc was unsuccessful, but coupled with new compression technologies towards the end of the 1990s, it has arguably led to the creation of the DVD – discussed later in Part III.

For Winston, the VCR is a 'spin-off' technology from television (as he also suggests that video and computer games, and the CD are as well). The VCR is therefore "a technology that 'fits' culturally; that is to say, the VCR meshes with abstractions such as the ongoing drive to put entertainment in the home" (2000: 127).

Thus the domestic video acquisition and exhibition formats are at the centre of debates concerning convergence. In suggesting a form of technological – if not aesthetic – convergence, Winston further argues that digitalisation is at the "heart of convergence" (ibid: 134).

For domestic video however, its move towards a digital form - its digital 'switching on' in the form of DVD - would be relatively late, with most advances in digital formats made in the music industry, and in audio recording technologies, again with Philips and Sony as the prime innovators. The competing analogue formats of VHS, Betamax and Video 2000 were left to fight for dominance, with VHS being the outright winner, by the early 1980s.

One reason for this move towards digital acquisition and exhibition may be because the VCR's fate is bound up in that of television. Although digital television has been around in the UK since BSkyB launched its digital service in October 1998, government policy has dictated that TV's analogue 'switch-off' is to be in 2012 – with a gradual regional 'phasing in' from 2008 – combined with a digital 'switch-on.' It is currently forecasted that by 2012 most households would have moved to digital television. At the time of writing, 60% of UK households had some form of digital television (Wilkes, 2005).

Winston (2000) suggests that television's digitisation began in 1969, with experiments in High-definition Television (HD-TV). Subsequently, television has lagged behind emerging new medias, although its evolution is similar to the digitalisation of older media, such as Digital Audio Broadcasting (DAB), for radio from 1994 – although again, a full implementation probably won't occur before 2012. By 1993 the European Institute for the Media, later echoed by Levinson (1999), was suggesting that:

"The future of television is digital... Over the last century significant developments have been made in communications techniques, similar to the earlier developments in the written word. The written word has been dominant for three thousand years. Now television is playing that dominant role: we are no longer copying our words, but instead we are coding images, and the most recent innovation is digital compression" (Danilenko, 1993: 39).

It seems that only one year after the advent of the world wide web, television, and later video, was seen by most policy makers, as the central technology for digitalisation, and the centre of this process. Indeed, invoking notions of convergence, the European Institute for the Media concluded that: “Using the computer, the viewer will be able to select the programme he wants to watch on television from a huge library of video programmes” (ibid: 43).

This idea came to full fruition in January 2005, with the pilot launch of the BBC’s Interactive Media Player (iMP) which follows just such a principle, and will form a case-study in Part III. As if to make up for lost time, television is now undergoing something of a superficial change, namely interactive television (iTV) which has been facilitated by the new digital spectrum. Technologically interactive media began, in some sense, with the remote control device in the 1970s, and more significantly perhaps, with the BBC’s text based service, Ceefax, on 23rd September 1974.

In an example of Levinson’s (1999) suggestion that media technologies seek constant ‘improvement,’ BBC engineers who were working on providing subtitles for hearing impaired audiences, discovered that the standard television format of 625 lines, had room for text and numbers to run simultaneously. It was originally called Teledata, but was renamed Ceefax, and ITV launched its own version, Oracle, in 1975. Initially, Ceefax had only 30 pages, and it took almost seven years for the new range of text receiving television sets to become fully imbedded into domestic viewing experiences. By 2004 the service provided over 2000 pages of information, which could be ‘dialed’ using the remote control. By 2004, the Ceefax newsroom had merged with the BBC’s interactive news staff to provide a combined service, both for digital terrestrial and analogue terrestrial. I would argue that this cannot be viewed as a *complete* remediation, rather more it is a medium improving itself, as Levinson (1999) would suggest, especially as this interactive text based element of television existed some two decades before the world wide web.

So, at first examination, this is a merger of visual and textual elements, accessed by remote control, however interactivity is still linear and one-way, and therefore extremely limited. Indeed, Bolter and Grusin (2000) would argue that this is an example of television’s remediation, although they overlook this particular innovation. Indeed, if it is remediation, what is television remediating in this context? I would suggest that it is remediating other such text-based media, such as newspapers and listings magazines, examined later in this section.

Convergence and Remediation.

For some time convergence has been an axiom of media history, and therefore media studies. What Caughie terms the “logic of convergence” (2000: 201) has been used to define the terrain of developments of and in digital media. At the centre of this logic of convergence seems to be television, or computing, or both. Indeed as Seiter suggests:

“The technologies of broadcast television and of computers are becoming increasingly intertwined – in terms of the box – as computers with television tuners and video-stream capabilities become more commonplace...[and] as the internet develops from a research-orientated tool of elites to a commercial mass medium, resemblances between websites and television programming increase” (2003: 35).

However, other media historians have disagreed. Whilst Hill and McLoone recognised a convergence of “interest and dependencies” (1999: 222) when writing about television and

cinema 1999, they reasoned that:

“Television and cinema are moving apart...their divergence is becoming ever more marked with every new technological innovation...both have profited from digital image technology; each has used it differently” (1999: 107).

For governments and institutions the axiom is even further apparent. In 1998 the UK Government published a Green Paper *Approaching Convergence in the Digital Age* stating that this document:

“...sets out the Government’s preliminary views and reasoning on the likely implications of digital convergence for the legal and regulatory frameworks covering broadcasting and telecommunications. It is a consultative document designed to take the debate about convergence on to the next stage from the broad issues raised by the European Commission’s own helpful consultation” <http://www.dti.gov.uk/converg/exec.htm>.

The 1998 Green Paper did recognise that new digital production and acquisition technologies are at the centre of this perceived convergence:

“Digital technology is rapidly being adopted for the reproduction, storage and transmission of information in all media. This means that any form of content (still or moving pictures, sound, text, data) can be made available via any transmission medium, eroding the traditional distinctions between telecommunications and broadcasting” (1998).

As outlined in Part I, the trend of globalisation has perhaps facilitated convergence; large corporations now own many media outlets, from which to produce interlocked texts, across a variety of medium specific platforms. The AOL/Time Warner merger in 2000 has created the largest media conglomerate in the world (see Appendix C), and AOL Time Warner existed until 2003 when ‘AOL’ was dropped from the corporation’s name – rather like Rupert Murdoch’s Sky Broadcasting’s gradual erasure of British Satellite Broadcasting (BSB). The benefits economically of simultaneously deploying narratives across several platforms, are clear to see from Appendix C. In this instance, it is a prime example of the economies of scale, as Doyle suggests:

“Convergence and globalisation appear to have encouraged trends towards concentrated cross-media ownership, with the growth of integrated conglomerates” (Doyle, 2002: 69).

Alternatively, it could be argued that conglomeration has created the conditions for convergence, but that said, these shifts in corporate ownership from the 1970s onwards, and the gradual introduction of digital media, and the digital ‘switching on’ of older media, has created a complex matrix, which in turn has set the conditions in motion for an emerging digital heteroglossia. Doyle further recognises this, as she argues:

“When a media firm’s output is characterised by a particular theme, or subject matter, then expanding operations into several sectors will usually create important synergies” (ibid).

As can be seen from Appendix C, it is difficult to envisage a corporation such as Time Warner being characterised by having a ‘particular theme’ or ‘subject matter.’ Instead, I would suggest that Time Warner has many such themes and subjects which are distilled narratively and deployed across the corporate matrix. This, however, as I have argued, has always been a prime mode of media practice, although on far smaller scales before the 1970s. Indeed, before the USA’s 1948 Anti-trust legislation, the Hollywood studios acted very much like ‘mini’ Time Warners. Conglomeration can facilitate convergence, as the prime motivation is for increased vertical and horizontal integration – as Appendix C illustrates. Convergence would therefore ‘close-down’ such markets, if, as convergence writers suggest, all medias gradually coalesce and ‘collapse in’ on television and computing.

However, a *technological* convergence could secure separate sectors of the corporate matrix, such as Sony's *Playstation 3* entertainment system – which provides videogames, DVD exhibition and digital television on one platform – as:

“No medium today, and certainly no single media event, seems to do its cultural work in isolation from other media, any more than it works in isolation from other social and economic forces” (Bolter & Grusin: 2000: 15).

For Winston, the development of media technology has been a slow gradual change, and has been evolutionary, not revolutionary, which suggests a more measured approach to convergence. Indeed, it seems that Winston, like Stam (1989), views the mass media as an ambient heteroglossia of sorts and, like Caughie (2000), sees separate media technologies as stable utterances in that heteroglossia:

“Technologies are, as it were, utterances of a scientific language, performances of a scientific competence... The model thus suggests that we view discreet communications technologies within the social sphere as a series of performances (‘utterances’) by technologists in response to the ground of scientific competence” (2000: 5).

For Winston, a ‘pure’ evolutionary model is stymied by governmental and institutional intervention, as innovations are ‘suppressed’ for commercial gain – the “law of suppression” (ibid: 13). Digitalisation is the engine of convergence. However, Winston does see that the move from analogue to digital media by ‘older’ media is in actuality a protectionist strategy - as well as an improving one. It is an attempt to further secure markets, and maximise profits by introducing new acquisition formats, which would make older ones obsolete, as well as combating piracy. Winston further posits that the CD industry suppressed the Digital Audio Tape (DAT), because you could record onto it (ibid: 137).

Marshall McLuhan's statement that “the ‘content’ of any medium is always another medium. The content of writing is speech, just as the written word is the content of print, and print is the content of the telegraph” (1998: 8) and that “a new medium is never an addition to an old one, nor does it leave the old one in peace. It never ceases to oppress the older media until it finds new shapes and positions for them” (ibid: 174) have given rise to the theory of ‘remediation.’

Bolter and Grusin (2000) - remediation's foremost proponents - unlike Winston (2000), suggest that digital media has been rapid to develop, and traditional media has been equally rapid in its response, and as we shall see later in this section regarding the tabloid press, the web and celebrity:

“Older electronic and print media are seeking to reaffirm their status within our culture as digital media challenge that status” (Bolter & Grusin, 2000: 5).

For Bolter and Grusin, what they term the ‘digital medium’ is at the centre of a complex relationship of exchange between different media. As I have shown in Part I, especially in terms of adaptation, a new media (in that case cinema) always borrows from already established ‘older’ media. In addition, in terms of cinematic remakes, in time, single media can rework and refashion their own texts. For Bolter and Grusin, the ‘double logic’ of remediation explains how the older media also reaffirm and refashion themselves in the light of a new media. The term ‘digital medium’ here is problematic in its lack of specificity, which is why I will explore it here.

Remediation, according to Bolter and Grusin's definition, is therefore an aggressive mode of technological development, as television remediates film, and the world wide web remediates television – Bolter and Grusin here use the example of television news, which often incorporates a word wide web aesthetic into its broadcasting:

“In fact, television and the world wide web are engaged in an unacknowledged competition in which each now seeks to remediate the other” (2000: 47-48).

It does seem that remediation offers an alternative position to convergence, but Bolter and Grusin further suggest that convergence is “remediation under another name” (ibid: 244) going on to say that:

“Not only will the new media landscape look like television as we know it, but television will look more and more like new media...Convergence is the mutual remediation of at least three important technologies – telephone, television, and computer – each of which is a hybrid of technical, social and economic practice and each of which offers its own path to immediacy” (ibid).

For Levinson (1999 & 2001) the technological development of media technology, is evolutionary - similar to the view of Winston (2000). Levinson suggests that media is ‘anthropotropic,’ that is a, “humanly selected evolution of media towards ever more human function” (1999: 60). This is where he differs from Winston, who sees the technological development of media as more of a series of ‘trade-offs’ and ‘spin-offs’ – for example video and computer games, the VCR and even the CD are all spin-offs of television in Winston's view (2000: 14 & 126).

For Levinson's Darwinist approach to media history, the VCR is a ‘remedial’ media that seeks to ‘improve’ television, and provided the latter with the navigational principles it needs to become more like the novel:

“Television...was in need of remediation in many ways. It delivered motion pictures to the instantaneous, simultaneous mass audience created by radio, and was thus an improvement of both prior media. However, it cried out for further improvement in its black-and-whiteness, two-dimensionality, ephemerality, and non-interactivity (1999: 113).

So, for Levinson, remediation is not an aggressive process of reaffirmation and refashioning, but a far subtler evolution and natural progression. Evoking McLuhan, Levinson argues that:

“The answer suggests that not only do old media become the content of the new media, but in doing so retain the older media that served as their content, which in turn retain their even older media as content, going back and back...to the oldest medium of all” (2001: 41).

The ‘oldest medium of all,’ for Levinson, is the alphabet.

In the light of a gradual digital ‘switching on’ of ‘older’ media, and emerging new forms of digital media, this analysis would make more sense, and eschews Bolter and Grusin's (2000) emphasis on a single ‘digital medium.’ Levinson's position is far more heteroglossic, but also recognises, as does Winston (2000) that an evolution, rather than a *revolution*, is taking place. However, this needs further analysis here, with a close examination of the almost instantaneous relationship of exchange that is now beginning to exist between different media, and to test Bolter and Grusin's (2000) assertions on the impact of new media on older more established forms, and any responses.

Adaptation and Disruption in the Digital Heteroglossia.

As we have seen in Part I, adaptations, certainly of ‘classic’ novels, and of the heritage kind, do not overly reference their sources in any *intertextual* sense, preferring to create as realistic a diegesis as possible, instead settling for what Stam (2004) denotes as ‘paratextual’ signposts, such as ‘Adapted from the Novel by Jane Austen,’ in the credits. As Bolter and Grusin note:

“Austen adaptations do not contain any overt reference to the novels on which they are based; they certainly do not acknowledge that they are adaptations” (Bolter and Grusin, 2000: 44).

This is a curious point perhaps, although many hypermediate adaptations do overtly reference their source material. As a criterion and a methodology for understanding adaptation, comparative approaches certainly have more potency when examining adaptation of classic literature into film, or television. These types of adaptation seem to highlight the very single, supreme source (and author) that the fidelity approach highlights.

However, more recent, and therefore, instantaneous adaptations can, and do, overtly reference a perceived source intertextually – this is ‘within’ the diegesis - indeed often a range of sources are acknowledged, and deliberately referenced and reworked, but within a single unifying meta-text which seems to hypermediate the sources that make up any particular adaptation. In the digital heteroglossia, this process is far more instantaneous and simultaneous, as we shall see in Part III. However it maybe pertinent to return to cinema, television and the history of adaptation here, for more examples of these processes, in particular the increasing heteroglossic nature of Shakespeare adaptations before and after the establishment of a universal digital media spectrum.

The Internet Movie Database (www.imdb.com) lists 56 film and television adaptations of Shakespeare’s play *Hamlet*, in many different languages and produced by many different countries. The earliest adaptation was in 1909 (the same year the UK Government introduced cinema’s first piece of legislation, the Cinematograph Act) and there were two television adaptations in 2004. Here I wish to examine a ‘classic’ fidelity approach adaptation, and a more modern, hypermediate (one that acts as a ‘window’ on a range of texts) adaptation, the first created many decades before a digital heteroglossia and the latter adaptation at the beginning of the ‘era of plenty.’ Laurence Olivier wrote, directed and starred in a filmed adaptation of *Hamlet* in 1948. Olivier, with his high cultural cachet as one of the UK’s greatest actors, spent his career engaged in bringing theatre, in particular Shakespeare, to the screen. His Shakespeare adaptations of the 1940s, in particular, came at a time, before television, when cinema was still perceived as a low cultural art form.

Before *Hamlet*, Olivier had written, directed and produced *Henry V* in 1944. This adaptation is interesting, also from the point of view of hypermediacy, as the film begins as a play, staged in a recreated Globe Theatre, before the text eventually gains immediacy on the fields of Agincourt. Richardson noted the “theatrical limitations offered by this play” (1969: 21) and it is as if Olivier is letting his ‘high-brow’ audience down gently, by filming a staged play – similar to the cinema of the early 1900s - and then later employing cinematic conventions to ‘shift’ into a film – which is a rare example of a ‘classic’ text dialogically engaged with its source, or a more ‘natural’ environment for adaptation of the source, as Corrigan suggests:

“The movie both acknowledges [the play’s] past and draws attention to the historical distance between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries” (1999: 41).

He made perhaps the definitive *Richard III* in 1954 – the year after Elizabeth II’s coronation and

the year in which television became a mass medium in the UK - *Othello* in 1965, *The Merchant of Venice* in 1973, before his final Shakespeare adaptation, *King Lear* in 1984.

Olivier's *Richard III* is an important example in the context of this thesis, as in the USA, it was screened by 146 NBC television stations on the same day as its cinematic release, and gained a television audience of 25 million viewers. The television exhibition however was in monochrome, as opposed to the cinematic Technicolor version (Reynolds, 2000: 62). *Richard III* is the last of four plays of the 'minor tetralogy' that deal with the Wars of the Roses, and Olivier took lines from *Henry VI* to flesh out the diachronic narrative of his film, and as Reynolds adds, his adaptation visually borrows from Olivier's own adaptations of *Hamlet* and *Henry V*. So, a perceived 'classic' adaptation firmly in the heritage mould is, subtly at least, and multi-sourced text, rendering straight comparisons between Shakespeare's play and Olivier's adaptation rather clumsy.

However, Olivier was still bound by the limits of this relatively new medium, particularly technologically, and perhaps this is why both adaptations were overtly 'stagy'. Cuts were also made to the plays for adaptation, mainly due to the running time, although occasionally these changes were political, such as the excising of the hanging scene in *Henry V* (the finished film was exhibited at the height of WWII). *Hamlet* is a lengthy play, and there have been few filmed versions that included all the scenes and dialogue from the play, just as there have been few adaptations of *anything* that have retained all the elements of a source text – Kenneth Branagh's 1996 filmed version of *Hamlet* being a rare exception. If we apply the fidelity approach to Olivier's *Hamlet* as a criterion on which to judge the target text, the following lines, spoken by Hamlet to his friends Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, are missing:

"I have of late – but wherefore I know not – lost all my mirth, forgone all custom of exercises. And indeed it goes so heavily with my disposition that this goodly frame the earth seems to me a sterile promontory. This most excellent canopy the air, look you, this brave o'erhanging firmament, this majestical roof fretted with golden fire – why, it appeareth nothing to me but a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours. What a piece of work is a man, how noble in reason, how infinite in faculties, in form and moving how express and admirable, in action how like and angel, in apprehension how like a god: the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals! And yet to me what is this quintessence of dust? Man delights not me – nor woman neither" (II.2. 295-309).

This line appears rarely in filmed adaptations of *Hamlet*. It does however appear at the very end of *Withnail and I* (Robinson, 1986), a film that constantly references *Hamlet* subtly and overtly, with even the Uncle Monty character intoning:

"It is the most shattering experience of a young man's life, when one morning he awakes, and quite reasonably says to himself, I will *never* [original italics] play the Dane. When that moment comes, one's ambition ceases..." (Robinson. 1995: 34).

Not only were Olivier's heritage and high-minded adaptations multi-sourced, the original plays resonate in other films, and at different registers intertextually, each adaptation building upon another, as Cardwell (2002) recognises, but in turn, referenced by often seemingly unrelated texts. In a sense, adaptation, especially of Shakespeare, is built upon repetition, and the constant process of adaptation reinforces the original author's status.

Indeed, the characters of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are the central characters of a play by

Tom Stoppard, which in turn was eventually filmed: *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* (Stoppard, 1990). This particular film also employs the ‘play within a play’ device, similar to Olivier’s *Henry V* – a marked example of remediation perhaps.

This speech is also missing from Michael Almereyda’s adaptation of *Hamlet* in 2000. In this ‘modernised’ version Denmark is exchanged for contemporary New York, with Hamlet as a confused filmmaker, the son of the CEO of the Denmark Corporation. The film is hypermediate and heteroglossic, shot through with many of the utterances of other adaptations of *Hamlet* – as well as overt, and I would argue, deliberate intertextuality which serves to playfully disrupt the narrative. For example, the film subverts audience expectations by having Hamlet edit a film, where he himself speaks the following soliloquy on screen, which begins:

“To be, or not to be – that is the question; Whether tis nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. Or to take arms against a sea of troubles” (III.I 56-9).

This is probably the most famous and well-known line in the play, if not in the entire Shakespeare canon. In the Almereyda adaptation, Hamlet edits a sequence of film, where he himself is speaking these lines, although Hamlet rewinds and plays continuously, so that the audience never gets more than a few words, but enough to recognise the soliloquy. The filmmaking process is constantly on display, with Hamlet’s own films being woven into the overall meta-film, and we also see Hamlet filming, editing and watching his own films, some of which contain lines from the play, but displayed here out of sequence as a deliberate and perhaps postmodern, moment of disruption. Indeed, when Hamlet does come to speak the famous soliloquy, much later in the film, he is walking around a Blockbuster video rental store. In another scene, Hamlet is again seen in his bedroom, surrounded by screens, televisions and film equipment; one screen displays a sequence of James Dean from *Rebel Without a Cause* (Nicholas Ray, 1955) and another screen shows the “Alas poor Yorick, I knew him Horatio” sequence from Olivier’s 1948 *Hamlet* adaptation.

This serves to highlight the deliberately disruptive elements of this adaptation. The ‘classic’ adaptation is supposed to refuse overt intertextuality, and remain fettered to a supreme source text and recreation of an authentic diegesis. However, this is clearly not the case, as Olivier’s *Richard III* shows. However more contemporary adaptations, such as Almereyda’s *Hamlet*, can deliberately and provocatively reference their literary – and visual – sources, playfully acknowledging other adaptations – and therefore visual referents and possible additional sources – but also disrupts audience expectations by employing non-linear narrative devices. Whereas Olivier’s adaptations are more subtle, but no less heteroglossic, this adaptation of *Hamlet* is hypermediate, in that:

“In every manifestation, hypermediacy makes us aware of the medium, or media and (in sometimes subtle and sometimes obvious ways) reminds us of our desire for immediacy” (Bolter and Grusin, 2000: 34).

So, this text acts as an interface, or ‘window’ onto other *Hamlet* adaptations and other source texts, and engages with them dialogically, in moments of playful disruption. Bolter and Grusin see this as remediation:

“We call the representation of one medium in another *remediation*, and we will argue that remediation is a defining characteristic of the new digital media [original italics]” (ibid: 45).

I would add that it is now increasingly a defining characteristic of adaptation in the digital heteroglossia.

Orson Welles, perhaps inspired by Olivier, adapted elements of all of *The Henriad* (*Richard II*, *Henry IV* Parts 1 & 2 and *Henry V* Parts 1, 2 & 3) for his own *Chimes at Midnight* (1965) focusing on the relationship between Hal/Henry V and Sir John Falstaff, probably the most explicit heteroglossic Shakespeare adaptation. A later adaptation of *Richard III* (Lonchaine, 1996) was described by Reynolds:

“Where the ballroom scene is quintessentially ‘heritage,’ the movie also quotes from the John Woo action movie, documentary newsreels, traces of the gangster movie, tropes from Dennis Potter’s television scripts, and in some sequences, a destabilising mix of realism and surrealism reminiscent of a Luis Buñuel move like *The Discreet Charm of the Bourgeoisie* (1972)” (2000: 231).

It seems, therefore, that as theorists mount ever more credible and robust challenges to comparative positions such as the fidelity approach, adaptations are also moving away from misguided attempts at ‘faithfulness’ and are overtly referencing a range of source material – including previous adaptations and versions - in ever more playful ways. This can also be seen increasingly in television adaptations, although the level of hypermediacy is minimal in this context, as television is a medium that, particularly in drama and adaptation, seeks immediacy.

Chapter 2.2: Framing the Subversive.

Television, the Web and Celebrity.

In Part I, I proposed that adaptation often fills in the ‘gaps’ left by writers, and that more participatory forms of media were now allowing audiences to actively contribute to the process of adaptation. Any understanding of adaptation in the digital heteroglossia must first examine the relationship between different media. As Corrigan observes:

“The questions provoked by the dialogs between film and literature have been and will continue to be so central in their relentless particularity” (1999: 76).

As we have seen, Corrigan has recognised how new media technologies have changed the way in which adaptations are exhibited and received. However, this section is concerned with how new technologies have shaped adaptations themselves. This chapter is an attempt to understand the relationship between media, and Part III will examine new types of adaptations, and texts, which form from these relationships. In essence, this chapter will broaden the scope of adaptation studies to technologies beyond that of cinema and television.

Here follows an examination of how new cultural forms, such as message boards, have fundamentally altered the behaviour of older, more ‘traditional’ media forms. This is almost an instantaneous phenomenon, and it creates a sphere for more audience involvement, which, as I shall explore, has challenged traditional notions of adaptation. It is important to examine closely the relationship between the web, and other media, as it provides a basis and a platform for exploring more participatory forms of adaptation, such as fanfic, later in this section.

At the end of 1999 an email list called *Popbitch* began in the UK, detailing the type of celebrity gossip not seen in other mainstream media. After 10 weeks it had 80 subscribers, and after 27 weeks, over 1000 had signed-up to receive it (Veitch, 2001). A website, www.popbitch.com, soon followed, complete with a message-board, and by 2001 *Popbitch* had over 36,000 users and

subscribers. I will argue here that *Popbitch* marked a new engagement with celebrity, and that, for the first time, subversive and oppositional aspects of celebrity were seemingly more overtly public than they had ever been. The perceived hermetically sealed ‘back-region’ (Goffman, 1990) and ‘closed world’ of celebrity had been breached by new media; a new media that was largely untouched by the restrictive content regulation of other more ‘traditional’ media forms.

However, *Popbitch* - and other similar sites such as *Holy Moly* and *The Smoking Gun*, also discussed here – was not just a ‘scandal sheet’ or an online version of a tabloid newspaper, but its particular brand of gossip, and its presentation, had an impact on the mainstream media in a way not seen before. I would argue that celebrity functions as a narrative, and its ‘back-region’ is typically not on display. For example, it was not until Rock Hudson’s death on October 2nd 1985, that much of the world knew that he was gay, having had an image created for him by the studio system of being a happily married man. In writing about the initial attraction for adapting the classic novel to the screen, Corrigan links this to the emergent star system of early cinema:

“Readers learned to empathize with literary characters like Dickens’s Little Nell, but real people and personalities perform movie characters, and one consequence is perhaps a more potent form of sympathy and identification with faces and personalities, a sympathy on which a star system is built. Here, at this juncture at the beginnings of classical cinema, the forces of literary narrative and its psychology of character met the materials of theatre” (1999: 23-4).

The decline of the Hollywood studio system after the anti-trust legislation of 1948, led to the collapse of the large studios, and ended their micro-conglomerate power and the control they exerted over their stars’ public image. The ‘rebirth’ of this studio system from 1980, facilitated by increased conglomeration from the 1970s, allowed studios and marketers control over their charges once again.

The advent of the world wide web, and its seemingly lawless nature – although this is often disputed (see Slevin, 2001) – has allowed for the last ‘hidden’ elements of celebrity to be discussed and analysed by a public with an increasing thirst for celebrity gossip; magazines such as *OK*, *Heat*, *Hello*, *Now*, *Nuts* and *Zoo*, the content of which is informed by celebrity narratives, all began post-*Popbitch*.

If celebrity can be read as a narrative, then we can see that elements – often oppositional – are framed by different media forms at different times, but today this is increasingly simultaneous, which is why it is pertinent to study it here, as it allows us an insight into the changing relationship between distinct media in the digital heteroglossia. These framed ‘utterances’ have always impacted upon one another, but the often ‘scandalous’ and subversive nature of some of these utterances – and the public’s increasing thirst for such content – have been framed by unstable utterances such as gossip websites. The discussion here will examine how these subversive elements are framed, and how they are reworked and recycled in mainstream popular media, in light of ideas of remediation (Bolter and Grusin: 2000) and heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1994a & Stam, 1989). It is no coincidence that the UK’s *Daily Mirror* tabloid newspaper’s ‘3am’ columns read very much like the *Popbitch* mailout (which now appears in thousands of inboxes, across the world, on Thursdays). Much of the content of this type of celebrity focused journalism is gleaned from such gossip pages on the web, but is recycled in more palatable (and legally acceptable) forms in such utterances as the ‘3am’ *Wicked Whispers*; celebrity gossip provided without actually mentioning the celebrity in question.

Sites like *Popbitch* frame the subversive elements of the celebrity narrative, and in turn, provide content for the mainstream media, *almost* instantaneously. Therefore, celebrity becomes a heteroglossic narrative that is deployed across different platforms, with all oppositional and unstable utterances in play simultaneously, and affecting one another dialogically. However, these 'subversive' utterances can in turn be subverted to serve the needs of the mainstream media. In addition, the main focus - although by no means exclusively - of sites like *Popbitch* are narratives concerned with, as Rojek (2001) calls them, 'Celetoids,' that is an 'attributed' form of celebrity narrative.

Tabloids, Television and Celebrity.

The fixation with celebrity, and 'stars' has been explored and explained, largely by the proponents of apparatus theory - notably Jacques Lacan (see Mayne 1995) and Christian Metz (1999) - based on Freud's three essays on sexuality (1977). Drawing on Freud's work on the 'mirror phase' of childhood, Lacan suggests that this moment is one of recognition and mis-recognition, and this is where the 'self' is constructed. This analysis serves to explain why the 'self' is split. Metz applied such ideas to cinema, and argued that the viewing experience, in which the spectator identifies with the glamorous star, is similar; the self is again split, as this is an identification with an ideal, which is also a mis-recognition.

Richard Dyer (1998) uses Jane Fonda as an example in highlighting this contradiction of identification, in which Fonda was read as both a sex symbol and a serious actor. Dyer, paradoxically perhaps, posits that these two elements were seen as separate and contradictory although he later argues that both these facets of her star persona fed each other, as they were so similar - and that is an important point in this context.

Judith Mayne (1995) also adopts this position of contradiction. She concentrates on Bette Davies, whose image circulated in a variety of different forms. As previously outlined, the Hollywood star system allowed the stars' private lives to overlap their roles. So, this overlapping of private lives allowed for more intimacy between the actor and spectator. Mayne argues that these dynamics of stardom and spectatorship encourage opposing terms, so the celebrity narrative can be read as an ambivalent one.

Writing about stars in a cinematic context, John Ellis recognises this ambivalence and establishes the notion that celebrities are narratives, in that "stars have a similar function in the film industry to the creation of a 'narrative image'...stars are incomplete beings outside the cinema" (1992: 91). Agreeing to some extent with Dyer and Mayne he argues that "star images are paradoxical. They are composed of elements which do not cohere, of contradictory tendencies. They are composed of clues, rather than complete meanings" (ibid: 93). In doing so, Ellis suggests that stars, or celebrities, cannot exist without media texts to contain them and 'finish' the narrative. Whereas Ellis sees stars as 'extra-ordinary' - although he recognises that paradoxically they are often presented as 'ordinary people' - television is dominated by the 'personality' who "exists very much more in the same place as the television audience, as a known and familiar person rather than as a paradoxical figure, both ordinary and extra-ordinary" (ibid: 106).

Returning to Rojek's idea of 'celetoid' celebrity narratives as "a media generated, compressed,

concentrated form of attributed celebrity” (2001: 18) this is exactly the utterance that television, and popular journalism, has successfully framed in recent years. Texts such as *I’m A Celebrity, Get Me Out Of Here* (ITV1 & ITV2), *The Farm* (five), *Big Brother* and *Celebrity Big Brother* (Ch4/E4) have traded on this new cultural cachet. The latter two are particularly interesting, as *Big Brother* purports to display ‘ordinary people’ in extra-ordinary environment, bestowing celestoid status on many of the contestants. The *Big Brother* house is nothing if not a clash between public and intimate spheres, a hyperreal situation, where the contestants eventually become ‘simulations’ of more ‘authentic’ modes of celebrity. *Celebrity Big Brother* has also featured mainly, in Ellis’ definition, TV personalities, and people who have had ‘attributed’ celebrity status from other media forms, such as the tabloid press. The fact that audiences have seen ‘ordinary people’ in the *Big Brother* house, in a sense bestows ‘ordinariness’ on the participants of *Celebrity Big Brother*. Both TV shows are narratives deployed over more than one platform, and have their own ‘official’ presence in cyberspace. In addition, both *Big Brothers* have extensive coverage in other media, particularly the tabloid press and gossip sites such as *Popbitch* and *Holy Moly*.

As suggested earlier, it can be argued that the web has had an effect on popular journalism, notably the *Wicked Whispers* column in the *Mirror*, as even the anonymous founder of *Popbitch* admits that:

“The email works because it contains bite-size chunks of celebrity gossip. The short paragraphs make it very easy to read, and easy to forward to friends. Also, it’s about famous people, and it’s hard to find anyone in media being nasty about famous people – because the celebrities tend to have the upper hand” (cited in Veitch, 2001).

The ‘3am’ column in the *Daily Mirror* is exactly that, with the *Wicked Whispers* elements being confined to short paragraphs of salacious celebrity gossip, dispersed throughout the main body of the text – perfectly lending itself to the browsing/scrolling mode of reading on the web. This was even cited as a reason why *The Times* re-launched in a ‘compact’ version, with editor Robert Thompson explaining:

“The traditional broadsheet involves what you might call scanning skills, but for an increasing number of people, especially young people who are used to Internet presentation, they have developed scrolling skills... We have reached the point where we in newspapers are learning from the Internet experience” (quoted in Greenslade, 2004).

As we have seen, Bolter and Grusin (2000) argue that this process is complex and plural; not only does a ‘new’ media appropriate the conventions of the older, more established media forms – such as *Popbitch*’s appropriation of a tabloid fixation with celebrity - but the ‘new’ media also effects the older media. In addition, they suggest that, the older media goes through a process of ‘remediation,’ whereby it reaffirms itself in the light of the ‘new media.’

This can also be seen with television, and the recent move towards ‘interactive TV’, a ‘catch-all’ term used to describe digital TV viewers’ - albeit fairly limited - ability to access texts through their television sets. Many television shows, particularly those produced by the BBC – who seem to be at the vanguard of the new technology in the UK – have a web presence. In fact, in the BBC’s case, that web presence even extends to particular programming having clearly defined websites of their own, which ‘frame’ specific utterances such as *EastEnders*, *Casualty/Holby City*, *Newsnight* etc, as well as Ch4’s *Big Brother* website – which will be

discussed further in Part III. Personalities and production members of particular shows are also often on hand for live 'web-chats' immediately after transmission – again making accessible and tangible the methods of production and the personalities, or stars, involved. Ellen Seiter argues that this is because television companies have been “concerned to hang onto their diminishing and dispersed audience [so] broadcasters have promoted tie-ins between programmes, and the web, with a proliferation contests, chat rooms, live interviews with stars web cast” (2003: 35).

The BBC interactive TV service (BBCi) even has an area dedicated to celebrity gossip (page 502 on Sky Digital), often portraying the same jaded cynicism pioneered by websites like *Popbitch* and *Holy Moly*. TV shows like *Big Brother*, in a meta-textual sense, have satellite subsidiary texts that circulate during the transmission period, such as *Big Brother's Little Brother*. This particular text often frames different aspects of emergent celebrity narratives as participants take part in *BBLB* as presenters for a week, post- eviction, and often tabloid journalists are featured as guests as well. Shows like *Big Brother* have been successful, as they claim to reveal the 'back-region' of emergent celebrity narratives, which has fuelled the demand for such content. However, this in many ways, is a false analysis, as *Big Brother* is still very much 'front-region' presented as 'back-region.'

The Web and Celebrity.

Erving Goffman (1990) - like Metz, Lacan, Dyer, Ellis and Mayne - splits 'the self,' but into two distinct regions. Identity here, is about *performance*, and identity is split between front and back regions; the back region being more authentic, but the front region is the one that is on display.

The setting for this front region performance involves:

“...furniture, décor, physical layout, and other background items which supply the scenery and stage props for the spate of human interaction played out before, within, or upon it” (Goffman, 1990: 32-33).

When looking at the celebrity narrative on the web, we can explicitly see these regions, and the contexts of these performances.

The web is the realm of anonymous and negotiated identity, particularly in chat-rooms and message boards. Early internet research concluded that chat-rooms were patriarchal spaces, with only 5% of female interactors and that male users adopted 'centring' positions, and therefore controlled communication (Spender, 1995). Also, 70% of online conversations were dominated by men (Herring, 1996). Recent research has moved away from these positions – perhaps reflecting the way that the web has now embedded itself into everyday experience – with women now being perceived as 'subjects' and not 'objects' in cyberspace (Harcourt, 2000). The NUA Internet Survey 2000 concluded that over 200 million people were online, more than half of those were in the USA and Canada, with 46% of registered users being female. By 2005, it was estimated that over 1 billion people were online globally, and the gender divide was perhaps now more equal (see <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm>).

The *Popbitch* message board seems to have many female posters, with 'front region' identities

such as jedibitch, miss_pinot_grigio, silkybunbuns, britnee, deidre, minky_chinky and chelseabun being regular contributors. However, the board does seem to be dominated by male identities. The content of conversations is often ironically homophobic and sexist, with homosexuals referred to as "Gayers" or "Bummers" genuine homophobia usually results in the poster being banned. Many openly homosexual participants even adopt these terms to describe themselves and their activities. Much of the conversations are dominated by male identities discussing the sexual elements of the celebrity narrative, with one identity, clueless_joe, often describing sexual and/or violent acts he would act out on particular personality. clueless_joe's unique and peculiar syntax has proved so popular with the message board fraternity, that he now has his own 'Insite' (sic) column on the *Holy Moly* website: holymoly.co.uk, and has his own range of T-Shirts.

In terms of discussing celebrity narrative, the board's main staple is gossip that cannot be published in mainstream media, with much of the content being libellous. So, the 'back region' of celebrity is of concern here, which directly feeds into more 'front region' areas of the celebrity narrative, i.e. the popular press. As Veitch puts it:

"[The] message board...swiftly became regularly populated by journalists exchanging this kind of unprintable material. Of course, this community is the perfect entity from which to harvest top-quality content from email publication, and so a virtuous [sic] circle was formed" (2000).

Content from the message board entirely makes up the content of the Thursday mailout, which in turn is recycled in more palatable form, in the popular press, and this is often commented on:

<http://www.popbitch.com/newboard/29/59/15/9/>

**The 3am girls ran one of the things from the mailout
did kylie date 'greenshield stamps heir' as i had it down as James gooding after the 'clues'**
minky_chunky, 12:58 18/11

**Whilst the Dave Lee Roth story
had already been in the papers, tsk.**
celtiagirl, 13:28 18/11

In addition, stories from the popular press are often discussed on *Popbitch*, especially if a story does not mention actual celebrities, and a form of guessing game begins:

<http://www.popbitch.com/newboard/29/56/09/6/>

News of the Screws story on international vice ring involving top models & actress hoors u_w's investigations have revealed 'tis shite. The "secret website" (no url given) is Nici's Girls an "escort" service that sez it has *top models & actresses, pRon stars, Playboy centrefolds ect ect ect* among its girls (top pRon star Janine Lindemulder in site photo). Nici's Girls is not a new or secret outfit. An account of Nici's Girls pops up in this 2001 Philadelphia magazine article about a local kid who made millions trading interweb stocks,

then blew it all on prostitutes, strippers and eventually a Playmate girlfriend. Nici's claim to have sleb hoors should be viewed with scepticism. Luke Ford wrote back in the late 1990s about pornstars listed as available for "escort" work on nicis girls. and other sites, and concluded "*Most of the girls on the site do not escort but buy banner advertising space to direct traffic to their personal web sites.*". Then later qualified his findings. More Luke v Nici. Case closed.
uncle_whuppity, 15:22 16/11

As an unstable utterance, *Popbitch* serves to frame the 'back region' of celebrity. Increasingly however, this narrative is played out almost simultaneously across different, but related, media platforms, and, as I have suggested earlier in Part I. In a Bakhtinian sense, there can be no utterance without relation to other utterances. The *Holy Moly* mailout is distributed on Fridays, with additional celebrity gossip provided in 'newsflash form' such as this from the 12th November 2004:

```
|[pic]
|HOLY MOLY! WORLD EXCLUSIVE!
|
|Holy Moly would like to be the first in the world (apart from her bloke I
|should hope) to offer its congratulations to Mutya Sugababe on her
|pregnancy.
|
|Congratulations!
|
|Holy Moly!
```

This story was immediately discussed on *Popbitch*, later that same day, in a thread that displays *Popbitch's* typical ironic misogyny and obsession with celestoids (Abi Titmuss is also mentioned):

<http://www.popbitch.com/newboard/29/53/81/1/>

munter pregnant?
Is she really? Who's having sex with her and do they get her to wear a bag...
tabloidwhore, 15:20 12/11
fuck off, she's gorgeous

mandaliet, 15:38 12/11, Reply

In 'real life' she's actually very pretty
derek, 15:28 12/11

Her cousin is a presenter on one of the NTL Shopping Channels
she looks like Son-ye (not Jackson, the other one)..
She is being lined up to do a new TV project with Abi Eastwood for Blaze TV.
She is quite a good presenter though does go on about 'Muts' all the time. Oh and her surname is
Titmuss.
silicone_carny, 15:33 12/11

It was in yesterdays paper (mirror i think)
so not an exclusive
titch, 15:28 12/11

mutya mutya mutya
she's the queen of them all
bolan_boogie, 15:24 12/11

Pikey young mum shockah
67, 15:24 12/11

Although reference is made to the *Daily Mirror* having already had reported it, in fact both the *Daily Mirror's* '3am' column and *The Sun's* Biz column reported the story as an 'exclusive' the very next day, 13th November 2004.

In another example highlighting the speed of the transtextual nature of celebrity, a story about the BBC Director General, Mark Thompson appeared on the *Popbitch* message board on Wednesday, the 23rd March 2005. The story was immediately subject of a *Holy Moly* newsflash mail-out, which reported the incident in detail, and even included the email in question, but with the names of the co-responders blanked out. The story was published with the names in the *Popbitch* mail-out the following day, Thursday 24th March:

>> BBC Boss's hands-on approach <<
Mark Thompson gets a grip on staff

There's an email going round the BBC like wildfire, which has left staff quaking with fear about their new Director General, Mark Thompson. It appears to be an exchange between Jeremy Paxman and World deputy editor Anthony Massey which not includes the revelation that Thompson bit Massey back in the 80s during a Nine O'Clock News show, but also claimed he throttled a picture editor who messed up a lead story, resulting in the picture editor's nervous breakdown and departure from the BBC.

Massey says, "The joke in the newsroom is that if ever they make me redundant, I'll be off to the Daily Mail or the Sun with my arm in a sling."

Paxman's reply, "Bloody hell, if any of this came out, he'd be toast."

However, the story had gained currency throughout the Wednesday March 23rd, and for once the tabloid press were ahead of *Popbitch*. By Thursday 24th March, it was reported in most newspapers, and even made the front page of *The Daily Mirror* with the headline "Beeb Boss Bit Me." The BBC were quick to respond and posted a news story themselves about it on their website that day, under the title "BBC Playing Down Biting Incident." Again, this illustrates the speed that now defines the dialogical nature of the celebrity narrative.

In writing about 'time,' Thomas Eriksen argues - echoing Jenkins (1992 and 1995) and Benjamin (1999) - that speed now "threatens to fill all the gaps" (2001: 59). With regards to television he points to "a fundamental change in our culture; from the relatively slow and linear to the fast and momentary." For Anthony Giddens, such 'gaps' are 'empty spaces' which make possible the "substitutability of different spatial units" (1997: 19). These 'empty spaces,' in terms of the celebrity narrative, were the 'back regions' now framed by the web, which in turn feed the mainstream press, connecting all these utterances in a dialogic relationship.

As all these utterances connect to each other, it is not simply a relationship of exchange between 'front' and 'back' regions; different 'framed' aspects of the 'back' regions engage in a dialogic relationships with themselves. The web's transnational nature facilitates this type of exchange, with other gossip websites and message boards in other spatial locations commenting on each other. The US based gossip site, *Gawker*, even had reason to critique a story that featured in the 18th November 2004 *Popbitch* mailout;



In Defense Of Owen Wilson: Probably Sans Needles #



"We love our sassy British cousin Popbitch, but we're questioning a particularly juicy item in this week's newsletter:

Everyone's favourite laconic funnyman Owen Wilson recently made a stop off at a "celebrity relaxation centre" to help curb his "partying". However, the story coming out of Wilson's hometown in Texas suggests it may have had more to do with his affinity for horses. And not the kind of horse Texans are famously associated with.

That's funny; while we've heard Owen might dabble in some fun and games, his people were offering him up for interviews as recently as, oh, yesterday."

At a micro level, this serves to highlight Giddens' broader assertion that indeed, time and space have now split, in that, "the dynamism of modernity derives from the *separation of time and*

space and their recombination in forms that permit the precise time-space “zoning” of social life [original italics]” (Giddens, 1997: 17). Giddens argues that time has always been linked to ‘place,’ but this has also become separated, and so now we have a situation, in Eriksen’s view of ‘everything at once’ (2001). In a very surreal moment of dialogism, and perhaps a clash of ‘front’ and ‘back’ regions, in the summer of 2004 *Holy Moly* claimed to have a ‘mole’ inside *The Big Brother* house, as well as several contacts in the production team:

Tut tut Big Brother...

You’ve spent 5 years provoking the poor little mites and now, after prodding them with your evil stick to provoke some action, you have to cover it up.

Remember The Sun’s plane earlier on this week regarding Michelle’s nomination? Well, BB have flatly denied that it caused a riot - which simply isn’t true.

It was Dan who remembered Becki being called into the diary room after nominations and worked out when she did the deed (HM likes Dan) and cleverly confided in Stuart.

Stuart (being either head over heels or frightened to death) ran straight to Michelle who confronted Becki who didn’t deny it.

They had a big screaming match and Michelle dived at Becki, Dan caught her and pulled her away (very clever again of Dan).

The two girls had to speak with the producers face to face and only agreed to keep things peaceful because if there is another scrap, the police will close the show.

They even made them do that ‘link up your little finger’ handshake thing.

The web therefore has been instrumental in a change in the currency of celebrity, by framing the subversive elements of the celebrity narrative. Celebrity is an ambivalent narrative, containing many oppositional elements, all in play at the same time. These oppositional elements are provided, and discussed, by ‘switched-on’ gossip boards and websites, themselves populated by anonymous identities. Metz (1999), Mayne (1995) and Ellis’ (1992) assertion that celebrity is paradoxical is limiting in this light, particularly taking into Goffman’s account of a self split between ‘front’ and ‘back’ regions. Goffman (1990) argues that the front region is based on a ‘performance’ dependent on context, and that is certainly the nature of modern celebrity.

Popbitch and *Holy Moly*’s particular obsessions with ‘attributed’ forms of celetoid personality,

frame the ‘back regions’ of the celebrity narrative, that in turn inform and shape the content of more ‘front’ region aspects of celebrity. But this is not just a case of a blurring between front and back regions, or a framing of the subversive that enters into a relationship of exchange between more acceptable spheres of media content; nor is the tabloid press and television’s appropriation of *Popbitch* style language and presentation just a process of remediation. Gossip about celebrities has always had a great deal of cultural currency; however, utterances that would have been hidden in more controlled, and less mediated times, are framed by gossip sites and message boards. The US website www.smokinggun.com publishes legal documents obtained from American law firms, and has even published witness statements for high-profile trials, for example the child abuse allegations surrounding the 2005 trial of popstar Michael Jackson.

The celebrity narrative is heteroglossic, shot through with all the unstable utterances, which compose the modern celebrity. Bolter and Grusin hint at heteroglossia, in that new media has created an era of hypermediacy, whereby new media acts as a management system for accessing content. This they describe as a heterogeneous space “in which representation is conceived of not as a window on the world, but...[full of] windows that open into other representations [and] or other media” (2000: 33-34). This seems similar to the way Boyum (1985), Sadler (2000) and Naremore (2000) all suggest how adaptations function in relation to their source material. There is clearly a dialogic plurality between utterances, connecting through and by the web. For Bolter and Grusin, new media acts as an interface which allows access to all other media, and related texts. This has implications for adaptation, as we shall see, and does suggest the emergence of a digital heteroglossia, but this perceived plurality of utterances, framed by new digital media, certainly does not exist yet. Indeed, Bolter and Grusin’s positioning of new media as the dominant media in any such heteroglossia is problematic, as I shall explore in Part III.

The same hierarchies that exist in ‘traditional’ media, mainly centring on issues of access, are beginning to emerge online. For example, *Popbitch* and *Holy Moly* are becoming ever more exclusive. Indeed, *Popbitch* in particular has appropriated its own brand of celebrity fixated syntax, from internet chatrooms, using terms like, ‘GYAC,’ [5] ‘IMHO,’ [6] and “ICM£5” [7] – although this is no different to SMS/text messaging - and even deploying pseudonyms to describe celebrities; David Beckham is known as ‘Derek,’ Kerry Katona is ‘Chipshop’ and actor Billie Piper is referred to as ‘Chazbaps,’ – all of which would act as a barrier to new users, or ‘newbies’ as they are known. The BBC television presenter, and celetoid, Jeremy Clarkson is even monikered ‘J***** C*****’ due to his (unsuccessful) legal action against the website.

The web is often referred to as a non-hierarchical space, but again, this isn’t true of either *Popbitch*, or *Holy Moly*. A team of editors, who have the power to delete posts, and ban users, regulates the *Popbitch* message board. In addition, because of dissatisfaction with the tabloid press’ appropriation of content, a new ‘closed’ board was established, www.bobpitch.com, referred to as ‘the other place’ by *Popbitch* participants. This message board is password protected and is populated by the *Popbitch* ‘old guard’ and contributors who have regularly posted gossip that has turned out to be credible. *Popbitch* contributors can only be invited to join *Bobpitch*, after ‘proving’ their value on *Popbitch*. Similarly, the *Holy Moly* message board was closed to new subscribers in 2003, for similar reasons. So, subversive utterances of the celebrity narrative, have been ‘framed,’ and reclaimed by new, more exclusive ‘back regions.’

So, by examining the relationship between the web, the tabloid press and the celebrity narrative, the relationship between different media is not as plural as Bolter and Grusin (2000) posit, all framed under the digital umbrella of new media. The terrain in this context is far more hegemonic, with the different unstable 'utterances' engaging with each other, across a heteroglossic ambivalent matrix. Subversive utterances – which not only resonate with their actual time and context, but also with the echoes and reverberations of their past usages - are framed by the web, and these are recycled elsewhere in the heteroglossia, but the hierarchies are all too apparent.

Adaptation and the 'Democratic Genre.'

Many critics of new digital media, specifically computer and video games, are sceptical of their potential for interactive and participatory experiences (see Poole 2000 & Darley 2000). However, in relation to video games and returning to Walter Benjamin, Atkins is more positive:

"If the work of art of that mechanical age had been infinitely reproducible and homogenised, and stripped away of the mystery and 'aura' one associated with the original...then the work of art in our own supposedly digital age appears to restore the mystery and return the 'aura' to us – we all have access to, and only to, an original...No other player or reader reads or writes the same text. It is unique. It is an original" (Atkins, 2003: 153).

Those 'original' elements are the texts provided by writers, both professional and amateur, that fill in the 'gaps' provided by the creators of early versions. In short, instead of 'adaptation,' – a direct translation from one medium to another - increasingly in the digital heteroglossia 'adaptors' are adding to what is 'already there.' The more texts that are brought into play, the more 'gaps' appear. So, the very term 'adaptation' is problematic in this context, not only because recent adaptation studies (McFarlane, 1996 and Cardwell, 2002) had done much to move debates away from comparative approaches. While their work has been fruitful in moving the canon away from value-based fidelity discourses, I would argue that comparative approaches, freed from notions of 'faithfulness' still have value as more transmedia events provide ever more gaps for writers to fill. In Henry Jenkins' view:

"The text becomes something more than it was before, not something less" (1992: 52).

As we have seen, the rise of the internet and the popularity of the world wide web - which has led to many celebrity gossip sites, that directly feed from, and feed into 'traditional' media spheres - has allowed space for a vibrant fan community, whereby consumers of texts elsewhere, can debate their merits with like-minded audiences, as for the fan, "the most primal instinct a fan has is to talk to other fans about their common interest" (Clerc, 2001: 216). According to McKee, the term 'fan' is:

"...an abbreviation of 'fanatic' – [it] was developed in its current sense in the late 19th century to describe 'a keen a regular spectator of a (professional) sport, originally baseball'" (2003: 67).

Fan culture has become increasingly participatory with many paper-based 'fanzines' being sold in music shops, sports grounds and by post, from the late 1960s onwards, and as John Fiske observes:

"Fans produce and circulate among themselves texts which are often crafted with production values as high as any in the official culture" (1992: 39).

However, these spheres of cultural reproduction are increasingly dialogical. McKee argues that the internet has allowed fan communities to form more quickly, and these fans therefore display “agency in their everyday media consumption” (2003: 67).

Again, echoing Jenkins (1992 and 1995), Giddens (1997), Benjamin (1999) and Eriksen (2001), Clerc writing about television, suggests that:

“Fans, whether online or off, discuss characterisation [and] speculate about what would have happened if some feature of a story had been different...Fans try and fill in the gaps left by writers and form connections between episodes” (2001: 216-7).

The internet has led to a rise in ‘fan fiction’ or ‘fanfic,’ where fans produce their own texts based on other texts, either in the form of adaptations, new versions or even remakes. Again, the precedent for this is in more traditional media, as Jean Rhys published her novel *Wide Sargasso Sea* - which was a prequel to Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* - in 1966. The novel was eventually adapted for film in 1993. The ‘classic’ novel is seemingly popular with six sequels to Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* having been published; Juliette Shapiro’s *Excessively Diverted*, Skylar Hamilton Burris’ *Conviction*, Kate Fenton’s *Vanity and Vexation*, Norma Gatje-Smith’s *Trust and Triumph*, Linda Berdoll’s *Mr Darcy Takes a Wife* and Ted Bader’s *Desire and Duty*. However, these are sequels produced for texts that were written some time before. I would argue that any other *Pride and Prejudice* spin-off novel would also dialogically link with the 1995 BBC adaptation, as has the 2005 cinematic adaptation and perhaps *Bridget Jones’s Diary* (both novels and films). As Sheenagh Pugh notes, echoing Cardwell’s (2002) assertion that all adaptation is based on previous adaptations:

“For those who have not read Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*, or who read it after they saw the series, some of the purely Davies elements [adaptor of the 1996 BBC version] may well become indispensable to their vision of the story. Who knows, perhaps...Darcy’s plunge into the Pemberley lake will...become accepted as canon” (Pugh, 2005: 22).

The novelist Emma Tennant has also reworked elements of Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* (*Pemberley* and *An Unequal Marriage*) *Emma* (*Emma in Love*) and *Sense and Sensibility* (*Elinor and Marianne*), as well as Emily Brontë’s *Wuthering Heights* (*Heathcliff’s Tale*), Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* (*Adele*) and Thomas Hardy’s *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* (*Tess*). Pugh observes that:

“In Austen fanfic, characters whose physical appearances were never described in detail by the author, are beginning to acquire the features of actors who played them in film...or on TV” (ibid: 42).

This clearly establishes a dialogic link between texts, and the 2005 filmed adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice* was not only released with two different endings, but also contained several direct references to the 1995 BBC version - a text that was rewired, along with the 1980 BBC version - in particular the famous lake sequence referred to by Pugh. Jenkins, in a position similar vein to Barthes’ (1974) notion of ‘writerly’ texts, proposes:

“...an alternative conception of fans as readers who appropriate popular texts and re-read them in a fashion that serves different interests, as spectators who transform the experience of watching television into a rich and complex participatory culture” (1992: 23).

Although Jenkins here focuses on fanfic mainly generated around televisual texts, like Stam

(1989) he sees a heteroglossic potential in media:

“The writer is already confronting a history of previous authorship...Each word the writer chooses from the cultural lexicon also bears previous associations and meanings” (ibid: 224).

However, unlike Forster (2000), Jenkins does not see all authors writing together in one room, but recognises, as does Cardwell (2002) this history and lineage of texts. Giddings agrees, stating:

“Inevitably film versions of classic novels have much to tell us about the historic moment of their making” (2000: 32).

David Bell further argues that:

“Jenkins’ work on television fans shows us how these progresses are interrupted and rewired by groups of fans who have evolved their own cultural work” (2001: 167).

According to Pugh (2005) fanfic began when fans of Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories began writing their own, after the author had prematurely killed-off his eponymous hero.

However, the true origins of fanfic, as a genre, begin in the late 1960s, following the exhibition of the first series of *Star Trek*. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, a fan fic community began writing ‘episodes’ for *The Professionals*, *Miami Vice*, *Starsky & Hutch* and *Blakes 7*[8]. It is perhaps interesting to note here, that both *Starsky & Hutch* and *Miami Vice* have been the subject of filmed adaptations, and perhaps the longevity of their appeal is the result of constant dialogic revision. The internet has allowed for a far more dialogical process between reader/viewer/user and author:

“Significantly, the publishing and networking capabilities of the internet have enabled more viewers to participate in activities usually associated with long-term, committed fandom, such as writing fan fiction” (Pullen, 2004: 80).

Fanfic seems to have become a perfect example of Barthes’ “readerly text” (1974: 4) as the very act of creating new versions, adaptations and sequels renders any original sources as open to dialogical interpretation and re-working, a process that rewires those original source texts. This is something that Fiske recognises:

“Fan texts have to be ‘producerly’...in that they have to be open, to contain gaps, irresolutions, contradictions, which both allow and invite fan productivity” (1992: 42).

Pullen broadly echoes this sentiment:

“Producerly texts contain internal contradictions and ambiguities, providing opportunities for fans to fill in the gaps and make their own meaning” (2004: 54).

In short, I would argue that this suggests that adaptation in the digital heteroglossia is not meant to be ‘faithful’ to a vague idea of a ‘supreme’ source text/author.

Fanfic, or the *process* of fanfic, has also fundamentally altered adaptation in more ‘traditional’ media, and also changed the way in which these texts are exhibited and received by audiences. For example, the website www.lcfanfic.com – at the time of writing – contains 2,642 episodes of *Lois and Clark: The New Adventures of Superman*, all written by fans of the 1990s *Superman* television spin-off. The ‘News’ page of the website also contains information about forthcoming DVD releases of *Lois and Clark*, and links to other sites, about other areas of the *Superman* narrative. No doubt, the television series *Smallville* – discussed in Part III – and the 2006 film *Superman Returns*, have rewired *Lois and Clark* and precipitated their ongoing exhibition on a several digital platforms, including digital television.

These *Lois and Clark* fanfic episodes are submitted to an editorial team, who suggest

improvements before the episodes are posted on the site. In addition, a discussion forum allows readers to comment upon, critique and rate the quality of the submitted episodes. This fanfic site began in 1994, a year after the TV series was exhibited, and episodes were submitted by fans during transmission of the four seasons. So, the texts the website frames, existed in a dialogical parallel with a referenced source from the start. Readers are encouraged to email the authors direct, with their comments. However, in terms of comparative approaches to adaptation, it seems that this methodology is employed in a way, by users of the site, free from any notions of fidelity. Indeed, many readers delight in an episode's dialogical link to an area of the *Lois and Clark* series, no matter how small, as a mark of its authenticity and value. For example fanfic episode, *It Happened One Dark and Stormy Night*, by Anna Botsakou, makes explicit reference to a 'real' episode of the TV series.

Most of the submitted episodes also refer back to the source material the series is based on, namely the comic books' use of parallel universes, something not explored in the *Lois and Clark* TV series. *Gateway - Infinity Plus One* (2005), by Philip Mogul is described as an episode where:

"Descendents of Lois and Clark journey between different dimensions (island universes) and are marooned in a parallel cosmos. The civilization they eventually encounter on their world of isolation is comparable to their home planet of 12,000 years ago. On this new planet, they further discover an isochronal Lois Lane Kent, her husband, Clark, and their children – all with super abilities"
(<http://www.lcfanfic.com/stories/2005/gateway.txt>).

Despite the series ending in 1997, this fanfic site has still kept the text in cultural circulation, by adapting elements of it for a new, more interactive, purpose. <http://slayerfanfic.com> is a similar site, and has been in existence since 1997, the year of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer's* exhibition on television, again highlighting the dialogical relay established by the digital heteroglossia. These types of sites are not exclusively confined to the sci-fi/fantasy genre, or 'cult' television shows, for example <http://www.britslash.co.uk/fictionlinks.htm>, contains links to more 'mainstream' fanfic based on UK television shows such as *Goodnight Sweetheart* and *The Bill*, as well as soaps such as *EastEnders*. However the sf/fantasy genre in the pre-internet, literary guise, has always had a fanfic following, with Mark Gatiss (a writer of the 2005 and 2006 *Doctor Who* series) admitting to writing *Doctor Who* fanfic, and showing them at conventions when he was a teenager. This eventually led to his professional career, which can happen with good fanfic writers, something Tulloch and Jenkins recognise:

"Amateur writing and publishing is seen as a training ground for professional work" (1995: 11).

Fanfic, and other fan generated material, are especially popular with children on the net, with many sites dedicated to *Harry Potter* and other texts aimed at younger audiences. Influences from 'outside' can impinge upon these texts, currently in a fairly limited way, which are not confined to the already established diegesis. In August 2005, the BBC childrens' television programme *Blue Peter* ran a competition to for its audience to design a monster for the next series of *Doctor Who*. Short-listed entries seem to reflect the concerns of young people, as one entry was a monster made entirely from footballs, and one seven year old's entry was named 'Sad Tony,' – a creature that resembled the UK's Prime Minister. William Grantham aged nine, won the competition with his entry, an Abzorbaloff. This alien absorbs its victims in its huge body, a detail that is interesting considering that childhood diet and obesity had dominated the news headlines in 2005.

In fact Jenkins goes further and suggests that “many important science fiction writers came from fandom” (1995: 187). Lawrence Lessig cites this phenomenon, as a new emerging form of ‘amateur culture’ whereby:

“If you think of the 20th Century as this period of professionalising creativity - you’ve got the film and recording industries which become the professional creators, separating and stifling in many ways the popular culture...I do not think you are going to see the elimination of the professional creators but you are going to see it complemented by a much wider range of amateur culture in the original sense of the word amateur - in that people do it purely for the love of creating” (Lessig, 2005).

For Lessig, amateur culture is a move towards a more participatory mode, whereby he sees a great deal of postmodern and dialogic potential:

“Imagine you are Channel 4 and you have a new series to be released. What you do is each week put the latest episode online and invite people to remix it. So you create this huge community of people remixing your content and you create this huge community of people watching your programme each week” (2005).

Fanfic certainly has marketing potential. In 2003 the author J. K Rowling officially sanctioned fanfic by children based on her own *Harry Potter* novels, at the time of writing www.harrypotterfanfic.com contains over 16, 000 *Harry Potter* stories, all dialogically linked to the ongoing publication of the novels, and the filmed adaptations. Indeed, the *Harry Potter* stories can be read as a direct response to the kinetic process of adaptation between the novels and the films, and the discussion forums include conversations about this. So, in this example, three strands of variants exist in a dialogic parallel. Pugh even goes as far to argue that:

“When a series of books is filmed, as with *Harry Potter*, it is possible for the adaptation to influence the original – several reviewers of *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* suggested that the once-villainous character of Snape had been subtly modified to accommodate the fact that readers who have seen the films now ‘see’ him as the charismatic Alan Rickman” (2005: 221).

As I have shown, adaptation theorists have written about cinema’s impact on literature, and vice-versa, and I have used Franz Kafka as an example of this. However, the *Harry Potter* adaptations are fairly unique as not only is the author influenced by other writers (particularly C.S Lewis) and cinema, she is also being potentially influenced by the adaptations of her own novels as she writes them.

However, as had been mentioned, fanfic and other forms of participation are mainly confined to niche areas of cultural production, such as sci-fi and fantasy. In addition, no fanfic episode has currently been produced for either film or television, although the 2005 episode of *Doctor Who*, ‘Dalek’ was written by Rob Shearman and based on his fanfic. However, the affordability of digital acquisition and production technologies, means that fanfic is no longer confined to a textual adaptation of a ‘cult’ TV show or film.

In 2003, Chris Strompos, Eric Zala and Jayson Lamb exhibited their *Raiders of the Lost Ark: The Adaptation*, a shot-for-shot remake of *Raiders of the Lost Ark* (Spielberg, 1982). The film has become a cult hit on the film festival circuit, with audiences delighting in how this ‘low-fi’ remake compares to the original, again signifying the pleasure now gained by comparative approaches, unfettered to notions of fidelity. It is unlikely, for copyright reasons, that the film will be granted a full cinematic release, despite the blessing of the original film’s creators. However the story of the adaptation’s twenty-one year gestation is itself to be the subject of a film that will no doubt heavily reference the original and the ‘adaptation’ of *Raiders of the Lost Ark*, as it is to be made by Spielberg’s Dreamworks studio.

The closest film to the fanfic phenomena to date, is perhaps Shane Felux's *Star Wars: Revelations* (2005), a 40-minute film based on the *Star Wars* franchise, but featuring new characters and a new plot, connected to the original *Star Wars* films. *Star Wars Revelations* boasts impressive special effects, due to the high technical standard of 'off-the-shelf' computer graphics packages. Felux, invoking comparative approaches as a mark of authenticity, states that:

"We are Lucasfilm's biggest fans, cheerleaders and supporters. We didn't want to do anything that would hurt their product. Being fans, we know how fans are. We wanted to make sure it fits within the *Star Wars* universe so that when you watch it you know it's *Star Wars*" (Felux cited in Waters, 2005).

As with Smith and Matthews' (2004) appraisal of Peter Jackson's filmed *Lord of the Rings* trilogy, Pugh argues that many fanfic writers seek to improve upon their source texts, arguing that "people wrote fanfic because they wanted either 'more of' their source material or 'more from' it" (2005: 1).

As well as improving and rewriting their source material – which as I have argued leads to a process of rewiring those sources – fanfic writers often deliberately subvert their source material, and in doing so, alter the meaning of pre-existing versions of a text. As with much of the subversive content on the web, such as *Popbitch* and *Holy Moly*, there is a great deal of fanfic which seeks to add sexual content to television shows, where it was largely non-existent. This genre of fanfic, is known as 'slash/fic' and often these writers often 're-imagine' sexual encounters between main protagonists such as the characters of *Star Trek*. These imagined encounters are often homoerotic and can feature relationships between Kirk and Spock in *Star Trek*, and particularly between Buffy Summers and other female characters from *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Tulloch and Jenkins argue: "Fan-writing now welcomed much bolder breaks with the series concept" (1995: 18).

I will further argue in Part III, that as well as adaptation now 'filling the gaps' in transmedia texts, adaptation can be deliberately subversive, which again, problematises McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell's (2002) shift away from comparative approaches.

Convergence and Remediation revisited.

It is clear from media history that digital media – and subsequent forms such as fan fiction - are not quite the new phenomena, as perhaps Bolter and Grusin (2000) suggest. In fact high-definition television (HD-TV) has been around since 1969 (Winston, 2000), but it is only coming into early adoption now, with Lucas Arts announcing high definition DVD (HD-DVD) which has implications for convergence, and ultimately, the digital heteroglossia:

"There was a time not so long ago when the film world and the video world were two completely separate worlds...The technology we are dealing with now means they are very much conjoined...The film that we see in theatres is coming from the same digital file [from which] we take the home video master" (Dean, cited in Twist, 2005).

Undoubtedly digital media has facilitated a more fluid relationship between otherwise perceived distinct media, which has led to a 'boom' on online fanfic, but this has taken time. Levinson's (1999 & 2001) Darwinist theory of media evolution is most useful in understanding the genesis and genealogy of digital media, as a technology that has led to the creation of new media, but has

also allowed other media to 'switch on' to digital. Levinson's idea of remedial media, does go against the grain of a gradual convergence, with either television, or digital media, at its centre. Bolter and Grusin's (2000) position of an aggressive remediation on the part of digital media, is problematic in this light. Convergence, as a basic value, would suggest that all media would eventually coalesce and 'collapse' in on a particular medium, and I would suggest that these relationships are usually temporary. If full convergence ever does come to fruition, which is doubtful, then it will not be for a very long time.

As noted in Part I, similar to Cardwell's (2002) and Smith and Matthew's (2005) view that adaptation can 'improve' source material, Levinson (1999 & 2001) argues that remedial media improves existing technology, such as television, and this more measured idea has more currency in the context of this thesis. It is the improvement of media technologies that has improved adaptation. It is unlikely however that some media will eventually be 'replaced' through a process of convergence:

"Recalling that media seem to evolve to modes that increasingly replicate patterns of human communication (while continuing to expand across space and time)...we should find the survival of radio and the demise of silent formats to be no surprise after all" (1999: 100).

For Levinson, the internet is just another medium, one that has the same relationship with all the other media, as they have had with each other since their inception. He sees the process of remediation as a more subtle mode of natural evolution. It is clear from the example outlined earlier, that the internet is having an impact on other media, particularly the popular press, fanfic and subsequently adaptation. In the UK since the late 1990s, many magazines have ceased publication, such as *Select*, *Neon*, *Sky*, *Dazed* and *Confused*, *I.D.*, *Jockey Slut* and *The Face*. The monthly 'lads-mag' boom of the 1990s seems also to be over, with declining sales for *Loaded*, *Front*, *GQ*, *FHM* and *Maxim*. However, this is not necessarily because of new media, more than likely it signifies a shift in the cultural landscape and a change in reading habits for magazine consumers, signalled perhaps by a rise in weekly publications. As online journalist Jonathan Carter argues:

"I think that some magazines/periodicals can and will co-exist with the web. When I worked for the academic journal publisher, SAGE, in the 90s, there was panic about how academic journals would not exist in print form by 2000. They were obsessed with the electronic delivery of their journals, and there was much debate. The Marketing Director used to call the web 'CB Radio for the 90s'. All the panic was unjustified of course - although there was never actually any proof of its likelihood in the first place - but then journals are like books, which will never die. I believe that the closer a mag is to a book (ie, serious reference/statement), the more it is likely to survive. Indeed, sites like lulu.com are offering the chance to publish your own book - in old-fashioned print form" (Carter, 2004 interview - see Appendix D).

For every magazine that has ceased publication in the UK, another has appeared to replace it, although the 'new' stable of magazines are cheaper, generally weekly - rather than monthly - and tend to focus more on celebrity (or celetooid) stories; titles such as *Zoo*, *Nuts*, *Heat*, *Closer*, *TV Quick* and *Now*. These smaller publications, however, could be an example of Thompson's (cited in Greenslade 2004) view of a more 'scrolling' readership strategy. The UK magazine market is largely dominated by IPC Magazines and EMAP, and is almost, therefore, a duopoly. However many of the 'new' magazines, are produced by the same companies that produce the older more expensive monthly titles. So it is clear that the economies of scale are in operation - as they

always have been in media history – and shifts are being made to accommodate new reading and lifestyle patterns. Indeed, many of the production staff of these newer publications, have been shifted from the older, or no longer existing, titles.

Undoubtedly the internet has had an impact, although I would argue that the recent ‘compact’ (tabloid) versions of UK broadsheets has as much to do with the changing nature of magazines, as with new media. The Express Newspaper Group even publishes its own celebrity focused title, *OK!*. *The Guardian* newspaper announced in 2005, a move towards the ‘Berliner,’ – a smaller version, but not as small as *The Times/The Independent’s* ‘compact’ format. However, in this instance, *The Guardian* is merely appropriating a format that has been popular on continental Europe, for some time. Indeed, Carter argues that this change is:

“Much better. I can’t believe it’s an issue with some people (no pun intended). Those old broadsheets were very annoying, having originated from a British tax-per-page system in the 1700s. Do you think people are pissed off that they now can’t be spotted as “clever ’uns” from 50 paces?” (2004 interview – see Appendix D).

The Sun’s website (www.thesun.co.uk) markedly reduced its content, for fear of impacting newspaper sales, and makes explicit reference to the newspaper version, by suggesting that readers buy it, to read the ‘full story.’ *The Guardian* has also moved towards a free to register password service for its website, whilst *The Daily Mail* and *The Telegraph* websites require a subscription. Alongside this, *The Evening Standard* still produces its free *Metro* newspaper, the content of which is assimilated entirely from the *Evening Standard*. I would argue that these changes are a natural progression, or evolution, from offering free services in the early days of adoption, and the early days of ‘old’ media perceiving new media as a threat.

Indeed, as I have shown, these hierarchies are appearing on the web also, as many open discussion forums are now becoming password protected, and are even considering a subscription service; *Popbitch*, previously trading on its anarchic ‘free’ appeal, introduced a £10 fee for new message board contributors in 2003, and a even classified advertisement scrollbar, which costs £15 per ad. *Holy Moly* is considering similar options, with the anonymous owner declaring that:

“Sponsors are understandably nervous about associating themselves...And there is no robust online business model for selling newsletters to a mass audience – but there are ways to make money” (cited in Delaney, 2004).

On Monday July 18th 2005, the *Media Guardian* put ‘Mr Holy Moly’ at 99 in their ‘Top 100’ influential people in the media.

This example highlights an initial remediation between the internet and the UK’s popular press, but this process is fairly short and eventually evens out, as the new media is ‘accommodated’ by the old media. This has always been the case, with cinema, radio and television, etc. However, the difference here is that new digital media are emerging, and older media are ‘switching on’ to digital, which is simply a natural evolution - or ‘remedial’ media improving the older media - but the driving force for these changes, as Bolter and Grusin (2000) and Winston (2000) suggest, does seem to be new media. Even Levinson admits that:

“The entire evolution of media can be seen as remedial. And the internet, with its improvement of newspapers, books, radio, television et al, can be seen as the remedial medium, of remedial media” (2001: 179).

This suggests a form of convergence centring on the internet, but I would argue that it is the gradual digital ‘switching-on’ of perceived distinct media, that has created a digital heteroglossia, which, for Klopfenstein:

“...implies the digitalisation of media content that allows previously distinct forms of media to use indistinguishable means of transmission for communication” (2001).

In the digital heteroglossia, convergence isn’t a prime mode in terms of a gradual trend towards coalescence; however, as we have seen in this thesis, there are increasingly mutual, and often temporary, relationships or ‘convergencies’ of exchange between distinct media.

For Bolter and Grusin, convergence is a term misunderstood, and for them it stands for a more plural form of remediation, and, like Levinson (1999 & 2001) they admit that “no one technology is likely to eliminate the others” (2000: 225). Conglomeration is part of this process, but even then “the activities of media firms need not be confined to a single sub-sector of the industry; frequently they span several of these” (Doyle: 2002: 66).

As I have already suggested, it will be a considerable time before convergence of *all* media will happen, if at all, and this paradoxically goes against the grain of conglomeration and the economies of scale, something recognised by the 1998 Green Paper:

“The fact that technologies are converging does not mean that the markets which employ them become indistinguishable. Virtually all broadcast entertainment and information services are still consumed on radios and televisions. It may be sometime before most households have digital television...even then consumers may not readily regard their TVs, radios and computers as interchangeable for all purposes...It therefore seems likely that a spectrum of distinct elements of provision, reflecting established patterns of consumption, will persist for some considerable time” (DIT, 1998).

Many, such as Molyneux however, disagree with this position, stating that,

“One of the most significant factors is the increasing use by different sectors of the same technologies...These currently separate groups of services will merge into one another, substantially blurring the previously clear distinctions between them” (1999: 4).

This discussion has highlighted the fact that different media *never* were clearly distinct from one another, and the move into a more stable digital heteroglossia has illuminated already existing relationships of exchange, which, as we have seen, digitalisation has made more fluid and instantaneous.

VCR Revisited.

No doubt Winston (2000) would view the new generation of digital domestic video players and recorders as a ‘spin-off’ of television, or the VCR, whereas Levinson’s (1999 and 2001) position would be that such technologies not only improve television but the VCR as well. Maybe, as Corrigan (1999) suggests, the VCR has even improved the reception of adaptations. There are three DVD recorder formats, however this does not mirror the VHS, Betamax and Video 2000 ‘war’ in the 1980s, as the acquisition format is universal. In addition, a new generation of digital, *non-linear* formats has been introduced into the UK market.

TiVo and Sky+ employ the computer's hard-disc technology – as do DVD recorders with a hard-disc – to record television programmes from digital television. However, this is not a convergence with computing technology, it's an 'improvement' of the television and VCR. TiVo and Sky+ are able to record different programmes *simultaneously*. These technologies also allow for the rewinding and re-viewing of programmes in the actual moment of recording, without any loss of recording. Levinson (1999 & 2001) argues that the VCR provided the television with the navigational tools it lacked, and now TiVo and Sky+ improve upon this by providing another layer of time-shifting that can be accessed during the actual recording process itself, without disrupting the recording process, with was the prime function of the VCR. So in the digital heteroglossia, the emphasis is on *texts* and not providers, with television channels functioning often like digital acquisition formats.

Increasingly, as we shall see in Part III, broadcasters are referring to televisual texts as 'brands,' and this approach to transmission is one facilitated by TiVo and Sky+. If the new generation of non-linear digital recording technologies are set to record a particular text, it is not technologically fettered to a channel as the 'source' for recording, in the same ways the analogue VCRs currently are.

In the digital television heteroglossia, there are more channels but not necessarily more texts in proportion to that growth in provision. Many texts can be viewed simultaneously on different channels, such as *Smallville*, with repeats of those texts occurring on others. Many texts imported from the US and transmitted on UK terrestrial channels also exist in the digital spectrum, at the same time, and can be accessed as such. For example, *The Simpsons* occurs frequently on Sky One, Sky Plus, Ch4 and E4. Texts can also shift from one transmission provider, to another, as the US imported series, *24*, was screened on BBC2 for its first two seasons, before switching to Sky One.

Ellis (2000) proposes that in, what he terms the 'era of plenty,' long established terrestrial channels will maintain their power through the *schedule*, and therefore will manage to keep the majority of the television audience, who may 'dip' into the digital spectrum for more specialised programming. Echoing Giddens (1997) and Eriksen (1997), Ellis argues that UK audiences now have too much choice, and are suffering from 'time fatigue' and 'time famine': too much to view, and not enough time to view it all. Ellis sees this as the reason why traditional broadcast television will maintain its dominance, even in a era of digital provision, because the:

“...core aspect of broadcast television lies in its ability to provide a voluntary point of social cohesion, of being-together while being apart. Most of the models of interactivity and choice [provided by digital television] imply a lone consumer, making choices in isolation. The limited arena of television's scheduling provides the basis on which households can negotiate more collective choices” (2000: 176).

I would argue here, that this view is quite limiting, and unfeasible in the digital heteroglossia. Indeed, technologies such as TiVo/Sky+ seem to offer an antidote to Ellis' concerns, in that they can record multiples of texts in the digital heteroglossia. Also, Ellis assumes that the growth of channels in the digital spectrum has led to a proportional growth in content. It clearly has not, and just as with internet websites and discussion forums, some digital channels have more prestige than others, and can co-exist with traditional terrestrial television, in a fairly comfortable accommodation; an accommodation that can lead to relationships of exchange and mutual

dialogism.

For Ellis, the power of television lies in the schedule, but technologies such as TiVo/Sky+, coupled with an increasing digitalisation of the UK TV network – which began regionally from 2005 – surely undermines this power. The new generation of non-linear digital recording technologies only recognise texts, or brands, and they record those texts wherever they appear on the digital spectrum. The new digital video recorders will also record previously transmitted texts, or repeats, and subsidiary/satellite texts associated with a particular ‘meta-text.’ For instance, TiVo/Sky+ would automatically record texts associated with *Big Brother*, that appear on C4 and E4, such as *Big Brother’s Little Brother* and *Big Brother’s Big Mouth*. Therefore, the channel as provider no longer has the status it once had in the analogue spectrum.

For example, in April 2005, the BBC broadcast a live adaptation of Nigel Neale’s *The Quatermass Experiment*, originally broadcast in 1953. It was adapted for US television audiences in 1955, as the *The Quatermass Xperiment*, (see Winston 2000; Jacobs 2000 and Crisell, 2002). The 2005 version was based on Neale’s original scripts and adapted by Richard Fell. It was broadcast on the BBC’s digital channel, BBC3, and was preceded by a documentary about Neale, which, as a text, framed utterances of the original broadcast. As has been argued in Part I, Mazdon’s (2000) assertion that a remake ‘denies’ the existence of the original is clearly limited in this example as the original was clearly positioned as ‘source,’ by the documentary.

In short, BBC3 framed all variants of *The Quatermass Experiment*, in a single evening’s viewing. The 2005 remake of *The Quatermass Experiment* allows for the original to gain an ‘afterlife’ as it is given the currency to exist alongside the remake, in parallel. The inclusion of a documentary, points the way to a ‘cluster’ of dialogically related and rewired texts, existing simultaneously. Indeed, the BBC3 *Quatermass* night framed texts in the same way that a DVD release would; including the main texts, and a collection of related subsidiary texts, such as documentary. In the digital heteroglossia, with new exhibition technologies such as TiVo, Sky+ and iMP, ‘original’ versions of texts, gain currency through the very act of adaptation. If the BBC archive were digitalised, it is possible that a non-linear digital recording device, such as Sky+, would capture and rewire the 2005 remake, as well as including the 1953 version. Technologies such as iMP, would allow for access to all related *Quatermass* texts.

In recent years, retail websites, such as Amazon.co.uk/com, Sendit.com etc, have gradually built profiles of customers, over periods of time, generally based on their purchasing power, and choices. The longer a customer stays with a particular online retailer, the more accurate and comprehensive these profiles become. These profiles are based on databases, which are cross-referenced to see what other customers purchased, in addition to a particular product. These profiles are then presented to the returning customer, to try and entice him/her to purchase products that would suit their profile. It has been an effective marketing strategy, and does provide an extra added value of entertainment for the consumer, who can check if the profile is accurate and consider suggestions of other products they ‘may also enjoy.’

TiVo/Sky+ have appropriated this technique, to build profiles of viewers, or households – which undermines Ellis’ (2000) assertion that digital television is the preserve of the ‘lone consumer’ – over time. These profiles are built-up, based on viewing patterns in a household, so that the

TiVo/Sky+ system will eventually *automatically* record texts, which suit that household profile. For example if texts such as *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* are selected by the TiVo/Sky+ user for recording, 'spin-off' or parallel texts such as *Angel* will also be recorded, as well as similar texts, such as *Charmed* and *Firefly*. Similarly, viewers with a penchant for old episodes of *Doctor Who*, would also get any text that is *Doctor Who* related – including the two Peter Cushing films – documentaries, as well as more recent variants. In addition, the TiVo/Sky+ system would perhaps also record other UK science fiction drama such as *Blakes 7*, *The Tomorrow People* and *Logan's Run*.

Towards instantaneous adaptation?

Technological changes over time, such as those outlined here, could possibly have large implications for adaptation, and latterly, due to the emergence of a digital heteroglossia, will create new types of adaptation such as *Smallville* - this will be explored further in Part III. Reynolds (1993), Cardwell (2002) and Smith and Matthews (2004) are correct in recognising how adaptations build upon previous versions and variants. In addition, Cardwell's assertion that adaptation 'reconfigures' the source material is useful. However, in the digital heteroglossia, it is clear that adaptations 'rewire' a range of source material; previous forgotten variants are intertextually referenced and summoned back into being, gaining a semblance of afterlife through, and because of, the process of adaptation. Adaptations such as the 2005 filmed version of *Pride and Prejudice*, successfully rewired a series of related texts including a new tie-in version of the novel and the 1980 and 1995 BBC television adaptations, which were released on DVD. Adaptations therefore causes related texts to be rewired through the heteroglossia, and then referenced and accessed by new versions, which act as dialogical interfaces, as I have similarly argued with the Almereyda version of *Hamlet*. No longer do adaptations or remakes attempt to deny their, often broad, range of source material, but are now more overtly engaging in a range of source texts.

Comparative positions have some value here, but crucially in a way that is not fettered to outmoded notions of fidelity. Audiences of adaptations in the digital heteroglossia – and as we shall see for transmedia events – can gain pleasure by the constant re-referencing, rewiring and repetition throughout the heteroglossia, as Corrigan (1999) suggests. As I shall explore, texts such as *Smallville* play many postmodern 'jokes' but it is still clearly a version of the *Superman* narrative, despite its departures from previous versions.

This constant process of revision and repetition is inexhaustible and is the very reason why some texts, and their authors, have gained cultural kudos. The revision and reconfiguration of Jane Austen's seven novels is precisely the reason why she still has a great deal of authorial status. The 2005 cinema adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice* explicitly references the 1995 Andrew Davies BBC adaptation, and comes just a year after *Bride and Prejudice* (Chada, 2004), a Bollywood adaptation. The 2005 *Pride and Prejudice* will rewired all other versions by the use of an inter-textual relay which audiences will enjoy, as well as a marked respect for the source novel and Austen's literary cachet. In addition, films such as *Clueless* (Heckerling 1995), *Sense and Sensibility* (Ang, 1995), *Emma*, (McGrath, 1996), *Bridget Jones's Diary* (Maguire, 2001) and *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason* (Kidron, 2004) will all be rewired in the digital heteroglossia, and will gain an afterlife through dialogical repetition on television exhibition and DVD re-release

formats.

Audiences, therefore, will inevitably gain pleasure from this repetition and rewiring, as comparisons between Matthew MacFadyen and Colin Firth's Mr Darcy and Jennifer Ehle and Keira Knightley's Elizabeth Bennet were made by film critics. So, comparative approaches to adaptation still have value – as audiences, critics and theorists make these comparisons between the adaptations, as well as the novels - but are seemingly no longer fettered to the fidelity position of a single supreme text/author. Austen's authorial status will not be diminished, as fidelity theorists would have it, as her reputation will be further enhanced by this dialogical process and she does indeed become, in Foucault's (1991) term, the 'vehicle' through which these texts function.

In addition, as we shall see in Part III new recording technologies, such as TiVo/Sky+ would automatically record those variants of the *Superman* narrative that occur elsewhere in the digital heteroglossia, such as the Christopher Reeve films, and the 1990s *Lois & Clark* series.

I have argued that these dialogic relationships have always been apparent in some form, since cinematic adaptation began in the early 1900s. The process of adaptation is now more instantaneous, *but* adaptation has always called into being other texts so it is not a new dynamic, just a more instantaneous and more apparent process.

Returning to Levinson's (1999 and 2001) view of a natural and Darwinist evolution of remedial media improving old media, we can see that the digital 'switching on' of that aforementioned old media, is a slow process, and one that is continuing and which is ultimately inexhaustible. New forms of digital media, such as the internet have added further impetus for digitalisation, and at the moment *seems* to be aggressively remediating (Bolter & Grusin 2000) aspects of the media heteroglossia, but I would argue that this mode is temporary, as I have argued in the light of the internet remediating the UK popular press. As will be outlined in Part III, an equilibrium between media will form in the digital heteroglossia eventually, as is forming now between the internet and the UK popular press and magazine markets. During this process, Caughie's (2000) otherwise stable and situated utterances, such as television, become unstable, until eventually becoming stable again, as the new media is accommodated.

It is this study's assertion that a total convergence of media will not happen in the foreseeable future. In fact, the digitalisation of older media seems to be a process of revision and reversal, rather than an aggressive and progressive force of remediation:

“The internet and our current digital age that it embodies, demonstrates, facilitates, and leads is a remedial medium writ large – a *reversal* [my italics] of inadequacies of television, books, newspapers, education, work patterns, and almost every medium and its effect that came before” (Levinson, 2001: 202).

The gradual 'switching on' of digital media, the subsequent rewiring of media texts and the effects that these medias will have on each other, will, and are, creating a digital heteroglossia. These relationships will be more apparent and more fluid, in terms of relationships of exchange, in the digital heteroglossia, and this will lead to new types of texts, adaptation and translation, and a move towards a more transmedia mode. The world wide web, and more interactive forms of media, will also allow for audiences and consumers of media to engage dialogically themselves in

the process of adaptation, as texts are created by audiences, which themselves are remakes, spin-offs and, in some cases completely new versions, as we increasingly move toward the very 'plurality of voices' of which Barthes (1974 & 1977) and Bakhtin (1994) envisaged. These emerging phenomena, and mutual temporary moments of convergence, and the texts that come out of those relationships will be examined further in Part III.

Rewiring the Text – Part III.

Parallel Texts.

Chapter 3.1: Parallel and Hypermediate Texts.

Introduction.

Part I of this project looked at adaptation, and problematised the fidelity approach as a methodological tool in examining the process of adaptation. The fidelity approach's emphasis on a supreme 'source' text that is then translated into an inferior 'target' text has always been a limited dichotomy. However, in terms of the adaptation of 'classic' texts, into films or television programmes the fidelity approach has had the most currency. I have argued that as media such as the cinema and television were technologically improved, and therefore adaptation was also improved as a consequence and became far more heteroglossic, reflecting the emergence of a new universal digital spectrum.

As Corrigan (1999) has noted, the reception of adaptations have been perhaps shaped by exhibition technologies such as the VCR. I agree, but would add that the very process of adaptation has been fundamentally altered in addition. This project is primarily concerned with a time period beginning in the mid-to-late 1990s, although I have shown that even during the adaptation of more classic texts in the pre-digital period, a range of source material can be rewired by the process of adaptation, gaining an afterlife: *The English Patient's* rewiring of Herodotus' *The Histories* for example. In this section I hope to further plot the emergence of new forms of adaptation that illuminate a changing relationship between perceived distinct media forms, which in turn leads to new types of texts, which exist in parallel and engage dialogically with each other; a move towards a simultaneous deployment of a text, or elements of a text, over several media. Also, this final part of this thesis will examine industry conditions for adaptation, and how broadcasters are annexing new forms facilitated by emerging digital media.

Part II plotted the emergence of a digital heteroglossia, which began in the 1970s (coupled with the ongoing trend in media conglomeration). It is clear that the history of media technology is evolutionary, with new technologies improving older ones (Levinson, 1999 and 2001). Ideas of convergence and remediation are limiting in this light, although the latter is an instrumental critical tool in the context of this discussion. In particular, Bolter and Grusin's (2000) assertion that new media is at the centre of remediation is problematic. In Part II, I argued that remediation is temporary and similarly convergencies are temporary, and based on mutual benefit. It is unlikely that a media form will be completely replaced by another – as Levinson (1999 and 2001) and Bolter and Grusin (2000) recognise – and it is more likely that a new media will eventually 'settle,' and the digital heteroglossia will be 'reshuffled' to accommodate the new media form as a distinct medium in its own right. This happened in the analogue heteroglossia with cinema in the early 1900s, and as Ellis (2000) posits, with television from the 1970s. However, a key trend here, in all respects, is adaptation. As has been outlined in Part I, both early cinema and television almost *depended* on adaptation as a source to fuel content for these new media, whether novels, plays, comic books, and later their own content.

Despite the fact that cinema and television both gained their own conventions and established themselves quickly as distinct media forms, adaptation has continued and is still a significant mode of both film and television. I have argued that the relationships outlined in Parts I and II, between different media, have always been in existence, but the coming of a universal digital

platform that accommodates all distinct media and binds them into a dialogic relationship, immediately banishes the conflicting age of competing and incompatible analogue forms, and what follows is a close examination of the types of texts that are the result of this process.

As I have outlined in Part II, these relationships - because of the fluid nature of all utterances in the digital heteroglossia - have led to new and emerging types of adaptation. Firstly, because of the digital nature of the heteroglossia, texts now exist in parallel with one another, and engage dialogically with a host of 'source' texts, and other influences, including other adaptations and variants. As we have also seen in Part I, the 'target' texts themselves can become a 'source' text for a range of 'target' texts, which all are dialogically linked, across a complex matrix of adaptation. Adaptation theorists have recognised this potential in the relationship between an adaptation and a referent source material, forming, what Boyum calls a "necessary grid" where:

"One text becomes part of another text, with the fullest knowledge of the one depending on the extent of one's knowledge of the other" (1985: 67).

Here Boyum is writing about the linear relationship between a novel and its filmic adaptation. In this section however, I will broaden this position to look at a range of texts deployed across several media. Boyum's main point is still a pertinent one in this context as many such transmedia texts do depend on an audience's knowledge of other texts, often simultaneously deployed, and this is a problem with the transmedia text.

Part II also explored the speed of such translations which has increased, with a now instantaneous deployment of narratives and texts which exist simultaneously across the digital heteroglossia, framed by the different utterances of film, television, radio, the web and computer games, as well as literature and other forms of print media. In the digital heteroglossia, older variants of texts can be summoned back into life, 'rewired' and can subsequently gain an 'afterlife' (Benjamin, 1999) through this process, as we have seen with adaptations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

New digital acquisition and exhibition formats, such as DVD, have accelerated this trend, with many older texts being reissued, and reintroduced to audiences - often new audiences - which have discovered these older texts through their dialogical engagement with newer versions and variants, as we shall see with the *Superman* 'adaptation' *Smallville* later in this section. Winston (2000) argues that new acquisition formats are part of what he terms the 'law of suppression' and are very often initiated to close down, or open up new markets and to establish new profit strands. However it is clear that the DVD constitutes a new text in its own right, which has been instrumental in the emergence of the digital heteroglossia and new types of texts. As I have shown, different versions of the same texts can be framed simultaneously by DVD, such as the 2005 filmed version of *Pride and Prejudice*. As we have seen in media history, a new format will always allow for the re-issuing of texts - this has happened with the compact disc (CD), the various competing VCR formats (Video 2000, Betamax and VHS), Digital Audio Tape (DAT) and mini-disc (MD).

As we have seen, in Part II, the 'gaps' between the production of texts and their subsequent adaptation and translation have collapsed in the digital heteroglossia, so time and space no longer have value. For example the DVD release of *The Wicker Man* (Robin Hardy, 1973) contains the original theatrical release, in its entirety, as well as a 'restored' digitally remastered version, including 'cut scenes.' This could be considered to be a technological adaptation, or a remake, similar to George Lucas' constant updating of his original *Star Wars* Films, and Alfred

Hitchcock's remaking of his own film, *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (1934 & 1956). Both versions of *The Wicker Man* exist in parallel with each other, and engage with each other dialogically, despite the time lapse between versions. The restored version was created specifically for DVD, and has never been cinematically exhibited, and along with the 'extras' including documentary and commentary, forms a 'cluster' or collage of texts, dialogically linked and framed by the utterance of DVD.

On the 19th April, 2005 the actor Bill Nighy was interviewed on BBC1's BBC Breakfast programme, about his role as Slartibartfast in the movie adaptation of Douglas Adams' *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* novel. The screenplay was written by Adams himself – adapted from his own novel, which were in turn based on scripts for a 1978 BBC radio play - an example of how an adaptation can summon the author of the 'original.' During the interview, clips were exhibited from the 2005 film version (directed by Garth Jennings), and the 1981 BBC television adaptation. Direct comparisons between scenes and castings in the two texts were made by the interviewers, Bill Turnbull and Natasha Kaplinsky. The 1981 BBC television version was re-issued on DVD on April 18th, 2005. This was a strategy in anticipation of the filmed version's release, a few weeks later. Douglas Adams was an early advocate of the internet, and his website based on his novels, h2g2, began in April 1999, before being taken over by the BBC in February 2001; (www.bbc.co.uk/dna/h2g2). This website is now an 'encyclopaedic' community based forum, where the users write all of the content. Significant coverage of the 2005 filmed version of *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*, was exhibited on the h2g2 website throughout 2004 and 2005. In addition, the BBC produced another radio adaptation of Adams' later novels in May 2005, starring Christian Slater. The filmed version of *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* (Jennings, 2005) contained references to the 1980s television series, for example in featuring a cameo appearance of the original depressed robot, Marvin. The film adaptation therefore, summons back into being other variants, that exist in other forms - increasingly digital forms - such as DVD, which makes the process far more dialogic, and instantaneous, something that Eco recognises as a prime mode of postmodernity:

“Differences have been reduced or erased; but along with the differences, temporal relationships have been distorted, the lines of reproduction, the before and the after” (1998: 147).

This phenomenon has significant potential for adaptation and the simultaneous deployment of narratives, framed by different and distinct unstable utterances in the digital heteroglossia. The digital heteroglossia, as I will further argue, means the collapse of 'traditional' adaptation. New versions and variants will always summon previously produced variants into being, as we have seen in Part I, and therefore, the purpose of a 'faithful' re-rendering is null and void. As more cross-platform texts emerge, the reasons for 'authentic' adaptations of 'classic' texts will diminish, as the heteroglossia contains the plurality of all voices, framed by *all* utterances simultaneously.

In the digital heteroglossia, this process is becoming faster and more expedient and the problems of incompatibility – which defined the analogue heteroglossia – seem no longer to apply. With the digitalisation of music, and the emerging trend of 'downloading' it does not matter which digital music player you have, you can still gain access to digital music. Apple's iTunes digital music repository is available to anyone with a digital music platform, of any variation. The iTunes service is not tied into Apple's own iPod digital music player.

The 1990s home computer market was a virtual re-run of the Betamax/VHS wars, between Apple's Macintosh Computer and the PC. It could be argued that the trend towards universal compatibility began here, as both operating systems were incompatible originally. The PC was invented by IBM, although, like the Lumière brothers with cinema, it was an innovation that the American corporation saw no future in. Subsequently IBM did not patent the PC's architecture and commissioned Intel to produce the microprocessor and Microsoft to provide the operating system. This led the way for a host of manufacturers to produce PCs and 'buy in' Intel's chips and Microsoft software. The Apple Macintosh, was the preserve of a niche user-ship, which was not compatible with the PC. Now, Macs and PCs have much more compatibility and a document written on a PC can usually be accessed by a Mac.

In addition there are no competing video formats, although the DVD is split into regional codings and the PAL and NTSC systems, similar to VHS. Even in the recordable DVD market the competing formats can all be used by a conventional DVD player, so there will not be a re-run of the Betamax/VHS 'war.' Similarly, both the competing TiVo and Sky+ digital video recording systems allow for texts to be 'burned' onto conventional DVD, if you have the correct technology.

This is the backdrop to an increased fluidity between media platforms and an increased instantaneity of narrative deployment. Part III of this thesis will largely be based on case-study material centring on the BBC's approach to the digital heteroglossia. The 2004 Graf report (a government commissioned independent report into the BBC's online provision) states clearly that the BBC's internet presence constitutes the BBC's "third medium" alongside television and radio. This seems to support my assertion (in Part II) that Bolter and Grusin's (2000) positioning of new media at the centre of remediation is no longer viable, as the digital heteroglossia 'reshuffles' to accommodate new medias, which, after a short process of remediation exist in parallel with other media forms, coming together to form temporary convergencies from time to time.

As seen in Part II, the world wide web is a haven for celebrity (or celetoïd) gossip and scandal, and there has been a boom in celebrity fixated websites, fan sites, and subsequently fan-fiction (fanfic), whereby internet users adapt and provide new versions of texts which are usually exhibited on 'traditional' media platforms. As I have shown, in recent years, there has been a growing area of fanfic on the web, which is almost exclusively confined to the science-fiction and fantasy genres, and certain areas of 'cult' media, such as *Superman*. Lessig (2004 and 2005), politically perhaps, calls this 'free culture' or 'amateur culture,' while Pugh (2005) terms this new form the 'democratic genre.' I will argue here that new media technologies, such as the web and the BBC's iMP, will increasingly allow audiences (and users) to 'rewire' their own source material, and adapt, remake or create variants of texts, which gain an authenticity by virtue of a dialogical connectedness to source materials.

As I shall show, many 'DIY' adaptations have gained a great deal of cultural acceptance and in some cases have bestowed an 'afterlife' on largely forgotten source texts. In addition, I will posit that many decades of fanfic writing have fundamentally altered the process of adaptation, and recent adaptation can be read as 'filling in the gaps' left by writers of previous versions and as a strategy of exploring multiple narrative possibilities, scenarios and relationships, as well as often mirroring the narrative strategies of fanfic, and 'mainstreaming' the more subversive elements of fan writing.

Screening Superman.

On October the 16th 2001, the pilot for the Warner Bros television series *Smallville* was aired in the US - it was the latest in a long-line of adaptations, or versions, of the *Superman* narrative. What began as a comic strip designed for newspapers in January 1933 has gained, what Walter Benjamin (1999) calls an “afterlife” through its many versions and ‘translations,’ as “[*Superman*’s] influence spread throughout all known media as he became a star of animated cartoons, radio recordings, books, motion pictures and television” (Daniels, 2004: 11).

It is quite clear that *Smallville* is *not* an ‘adaptation’ – in the accepted definition of the term (see Part I) - of the *Superman* narrative, and that the *Superman* narrative is, in many ways, a heteroglossic text, and always has been; shot through with the ‘voices’ of the many artists, writers and ‘adaptors’ of the original comic strips with each new version becoming, as I shall argue, a rather unstable ‘utterance.’

However *Smallville* poses an interesting dilemma, as it is a text - like Almereyda’s adaptation of *Hamlet* - that is playfully disruptive, visually and narratively, yet constantly referencing its vast range of sources (including other adaptations), but as a text it still manages to maintain integrity and, assembles a structure of fidelity to the *Superman* narrative. In essence, *Smallville* functions very much like the fanfic produced in the 1990s, surrounding another *Superman* variant, *Lois and Clark*. In short *Smallville* is an ambivalent text, that contains opposing strategies of fidelity, constantly in motion, and it is this which marks out the show as an example of an increasing trend in contemporary television adaptation. This is not *just* in a postmodern sense of nostalgia and recycling, but as an ‘interface’ or ‘window’ - that *connects* with other elements of the *Superman* narrative, in the same way that *Chimes at Midnight* connected with a range of Shakespeare’s plays. *Smallville*’s innovative eschewing of fidelity, in a traditional sense, is its strength. *Smallville* represents a new type of television text that has been freed from notions of fidelity - as this is clearly viewed as an impossible endeavour - but not from comparative approaches altogether. *Smallville* can be playful with its own heritage, whilst maintaining integrity to the *Superman* narrative, and it would not exist - or have been as successful - if it not for the way it appropriated the strategy of *Lois and Clark* fanfic.

In the UK, the series was aired on E4 and C4, but with an added subtitle in the TV listings, as well as E4/C4’s promotional material, so that the series was billed as *Smallville: Superman The Early Years*, for UK TV audiences. A repeat of Season 1 in the US was called *Smallville Beginnings*. This was the latest instalment of the *Superman* narrative to be deployed on television – the first being *The Adventures of Superman*, starring George Reeves as the eponymous superhero, in 1951. This TV series ran for 104 episodes and was regularly repeated by US networks for 40 years.

Superman: From text to screen.

Any form of ‘adaptation’ almost always raises questions of fidelity, but not in this instance. The main problems with this approach, as we have seen in Part 1, are its assumptions of a single ‘source’ text, and a single ‘target’ text. The source text is viewed as the dominant text, and the target is always inferior, and unsatisfying. Even critics of comparative approaches assume that somewhere, there is a single source, as Cartmell says “a text could be adapted by fundamentally

changing the *original* [my italics]" (1999: 145).

The linear binary trajectory between an assumed 'source' and an assumed 'target' text existing in a sealed fidelity universe also assumes a single and 'supreme' author, whose vision is always mangled in the adaptation process. As we have seen, fidelity theory has usually (but by no means exclusively) concerned itself with the adaptation of novels, into films; the literary into the visual. Many critics of the fidelity approach (such as McFarlane 1996 and Cardwell 2002) often cite the translation between a literary and a visual medium, and state that therefore "it is questionable whether strict fidelity is even possible" (Stam, 2004: 3). Each medium has its own rules and conventions, therefore a 'pure' adaptation will never be possible, and if Richard's (1969) notion of xerography *were* achievable, I would argue it would not be desirable.

With comic book 'adaptation' there is already movement between visual mediums, so in a sense, this is why the fidelity approach has no currency as a methodological tool here. Most novels do not contain visual elements (apart from words, and these have been effectively integrated into films, see *Prospero's Books* and *The Pillow Book* (Greenaway, 1991 and 1995) and *Memento* (Nolan, 2000)). However, with comic book 'adaptation' the audience already has a well established visual referent - the comics themselves - and in *Smallville's* case, a lineage of television and film versions. Indeed, the aesthetic generated by the 'source' could act as a storyboard for any film or television version; Frank Miller's comic *The Dark Knight Returns* was cited, as a kind of source by Tim Burton for his 1989 *Batman* movie. This is not the case with more traditional forms of adaptation, which usually begin with a literary source, such as Olivier, Branagh and Almereyda's adaptations of *Hamlet*. In fact, comic book 'adaptation' along with theatre dramatisation (and latterly videogames and remakes) are forms that have a established visual referent; even original screenplays begin with words as the source for visual texts.

Superman was the first 'superhero.' Batman (created by Bob Kane) started slightly later in 1939, but he was a mortal, and not possessed of superhuman powers. *Superman* is a far more formalist text, and it could be suggested, has its title's origins in Nietzsche's *Übermensch*; indeed in the pilot episode of *Smallville*, Clark Kent is seen with a Nietzsche text, and is asked by Lana Lang "So what are you? Man or Superman?"

The first version of Superman, portrayed him as a villain named Bill Dunn, who was later revised (the first of many such revisions of Superman) to into a 'good guy' for more popular appeal. The two creators, Jerry Siegel and Joe Shuster, originally envisaged Superman as featuring in a syndicated newspaper strip, which eventually ran from 16th January 1939, until May 1966, before being revived between 1977 and 1983. Arguably "it was the newspaper strip that began Superman's existence as a franchise" (Daniels, 2004: 41).

However, Superman really came of age with the boom in 'dedicated' comic books from the early 30s onwards. By the summer of 1939, Superman had his own comic book, followed by a fan club. The first filmed version was an animation voiced by Ray Middleton in 1939, followed by the long-running radio series, *The Adventures of Superman*, from 1940, voiced by Clayton 'Bud' Collyer. By 1941, Superman was appearing in 3 comics (*Action Comics*, *Superman* and *New York World's Fair Comics*), as well as other in stories with Batman and Robin in *Detective Comics*. The first 'novelisation' appeared in 1942, written by George Lowther. The 1951 George Reeves TV series

led to an appearance by Reeves (as Superman) in a 1956 edition of the popular *I Love Lucy* TV show. In the late 50s and 60s TV spin-off variants were attempted, and pilots filmed, notably an quickly aborted *The Adventures of Superpup* (1957) – about Superman’s dog – and a progeny of *Smallville*, *The Adventures of Superboy* (1961) – for which only a pilot was made, although 12 scripts were written - starring John Rockwell.

According to Daniels, this era (late 50s, early 60s), in comic book terms, “was the start of the idea of an interlocking universe composed of many comics; rather than offering independent stories that were accessible to the reader” (2004: 103). However, I would suggest that this ‘cross-platform’ approach illuminated, and perhaps facilitated the otherwise opaque heteroglossic nature of the *Superman* narrative.

Siegel and Shuster lost all rights to Superman in 1948 - although they continue to be credited as ‘creators’ in all versions of *Superman* - and the narrative was so vast, that many writers and adaptors were now working on *Superman*. Characters such as Perry White, Jimmy Olsen and Clark Kent’s parents were introduced by other writers, as Siegel and Shuster’s Superman had originally grown up in an orphanage. Jimmy Olsen even had his own comic book from September 1954 where he acquired temporary superpowers that allowed him to change into Elastic Lad, in a comic book series that ran for nearly 20 years. This was soon followed by a comic book dedicated to Lois Lane, from March 1958, which ran for 16 years.

An unsuccessful Broadway musical, *It’s a bird, it’s a plane, it’s Superman!* was staged in 1966, which was scripted by Robert Benton and David Newman, who as well as writing the screenplay for *Bonnie and Clyde* (Penn, 1967), would later contribute to the first Christopher Reeve *Superman* film (Donner, 1978). New animated versions appeared on TV in the 60s, before Alexander and Ilya Salkind began production on *Superman*. The *Superman* narrative, in a sense, is the perfect embodiment of Barthes’ “writerly text” (1974: 4) as not only is it open to interpretation by readers and audiences, but by professional and fan writers as well; many of whom had grown up with the strip, and were self confessed ‘fans.’ The comic books alone contain many contradictory and oppositional elements that are overtly established; *Superman*’s origins have been re-visited by writers throughout *Superman*’s history, suggesting that *Superman* is a ‘revisionist’ narrative, constantly revisited and updated by new writers, which is a common occurrence in comic books. Writers even began to explore other scenarios in alternative and parallel universes, as Daniels observes:

“From the 60s, stories broke off into ‘imaginary stories’ in which writers would explore alternate realities that might have radically changed, or ended the series” (Daniels, 2004: 109).

As the ‘source’ text was actually a range of dialogically connected texts, all containing oppositional narrative strands from the beginning of the narrative, *Superman*, as a narrative could, paradoxically, be either ‘faithful’ or ‘unfaithful’ to itself. So, for example, in a remarkable ‘having your cake and eating it’ strategy, Lex Luthor (Superman’s arch-enemy) was both a ‘mad scientist’ and a ruthless tycoon; in November 1970, Lois Lane appeared as a black woman and Superman himself was killed by Lex Luthor in November 1961, was destroyed in 1986, and killed *again* in January 1993. In many ways, the heteroglossic nature of the narrative was established long before the television and filmed versions. This, in a sense is why Superman has been so popular to adaptors, and the contradictory and ambivalent nature of the narrative is the one element that *Smallville* contains *within* its text. Also, as the narrative is constantly revised and

refreshed, and more source texts are rewired, more 'gaps' appear, as Jenkins (1992 and 1995), Giddens (1997) Benjamin (1999) Eriksen (2001) and Clerc (2001) have all observed. Whereas all the other Superman texts connect dialogically with various other Superman texts at different times, *Smallville*, as Cardwell (2000) suggests, rewrites, re-views, re-activates and reconfigures the source text, but also goes further and refashions, or 're-imagines' all elements of the narrative that have gone before: previous versions are not 're-written' but exist in a accommodative dialogic parallel with *Smallville*.

The names of Siegel and Shuster were retained by all the versions of the *Superman* narrative, despite the fact they had little, or no input from the 50s onwards. As has been established in Part I, in a Foucaultian (1991) sense, this highlights the authors' separation from time, and the gaining of permanence, or an 'afterlife'. For Foucault, the author is a vehicle, and the 'function' of their name is to sell texts. The fidelity approach to adaptation almost demands a supreme author of the text, but here, Siegel and Shuster were used as 'brands,' even being positioned by the opening credits of *Smallville* as the creators. This is not unusual in comic book adaptation, as Bob Kane, creator of *Batman* – who had even less to do with his character than Siegel and Shuster did with theirs, as he couldn't draw very well – still has his name associated with all the versions of the *Batman* narrative (Brooker, 1999). *Superman* on film.

The heteroglossic and evolutionary nature of *Superman* was somewhat stymied with the 1978 filmed version. By 1971, new censorship laws, increasing conglomeration and a drive to modernise the character, now saw Clark Kent in the comic story fired from the *Daily Planet* by new owner Morgan Edge and working as a TV reporter for WGBS-TV[9]. He now wore more modern clothes, was less clumsy and awkward and *Superman's* powers had been scaled back with the eradication of Kryptonite from the world. Again, highlighting the flexible revisionist nature of the *Superman* narrative, the Salkinds insisted that for the 1978 film, they wanted Clark Kent *back* at the *Daily Planet*, so by 1974, the imminent film had forced the character back to its roots in the comic books: here one utterance affects and reshapes another completely, a good example of Cardwell's (2002) assertion that the adaptation re-writes the source.

The screenplay was originally written by *Godfather* author Mario Puzo, with Benton and Newman being brought back for re-writes. The film was a high-budget lavish affair, with the then unknown Christopher Reeve as Superman, Marlon Brando as Superman's father, Jor-El, and Terrence Stamp as supervillain, General Zod. The first film is notable for the fact that the Kents are portrayed as an elderly couple who 'adopt' Superman as a child, when he falls from the sky in his Spaceship. The first part of the film is set in Smallville, - the 'domestic space' of *Superman* - but temporally, the *mise-en-scène* is firmly 1950s. In fact, when Clark Kent is an adult, he wears a 50s suit, complete with Trilby hat, despite working in 'modern' 1980s Metropolis. Here, the film manages to be both spatially and temporally specific, with the 1950s suit signifying Clark Kent's 'backwardness' and positioning him as 'other.' The 1978 film, is therefore attempting to be faithful to an element of an already contradictory narrative. In a sense, the film is perhaps *forcing* the notion of 'source' onto an element of the *Superman* narrative, or as Bolter and Grusin (2000) would have it, the film is aggressively *remediating* the comic books.

Terrence Stamp returns as Zod in *Superman II* (Lester, 1980) and in *Superman III* (Lester, 1983)

again starring Reeve, *Superman* ‘splits’ into good and evil sides, and fights himself. This device further entrenches the oppositional identity theme, which is fore-grounded in the comics’ alternate universe device. Also in *Superman III*, Superman is faced by a giant supercomputer. As a narrative, Superman has always absorbed temporally specific elements of its own culture; in the 1940s Superman fought the Nazis. In 1949, the supervillain Toyman, created a giant computer, ‘Superbrain’; a direct reference to giant computers such as the UK’s Colossus built in December 1943 and ENIAC in 1946 (see Levinson, 1999). By 1983, there were 250 types of home computers in the US and UK domestic markets, a period that was hailed as a ‘boom’ for computing (Ceruzzi, 1998). *Superman III* is most notable for its return to Smallville, and the introduction of Clark Kent’s high-school sweetheart, Lana Lang, played by the red-headed Annette O’Toole.

In *Superman IV: The Quest for Peace* (Furie, 1987) the franchise had somewhat run out of steam, despite Christopher Reeve’s contribution to the story. The film dealt with more environmental themes, and the cold war, as Superman intervenes to prevent the nuclear arms race; 1987 also marked the beginning of the end for Thatcherite and Reaganite politics, and the shelving of the latter’s ‘Star Wars’ defence plan. The film also features Superman being cloned, again adding to the character’s almost permanent identity crisis. The film’s lack of success led to the character being losing his powers in the comics and settling down to live a mortal life with his wife Lois Lane, with a ‘time-warp’ device being employed to allow all the DC stable of comic characters to start again from scratch.

Supergirl (Szwarc, 1984) was another Salkind produced film, to add to the franchise. Supergirl first appeared in the Jimmy Olsen comic in 1958, and by 1959 was making regular appearances in DC comics. Supergirl was Kara, another refugee from Krypton, Superman’s home planet. In the 1984 film, she was played by Helen Slater, and in a neat moment of intertextuality, she has a ‘pin-up’ picture of Christopher Reeve as Superman on her bedroom wall; a character intertextually framed by another text, in an attempt at faithfulness to an emerging franchise. The film was a critical and commercial disaster, and so in the comics, the character was slaughtered in *Crisis on Infinite Earths #7* in the 1986 cull, never to be resurrected, *although* a Kara does appear in episode 22, season 3 of *Smallville* (the season finale) although she is soon unmasked as not being from Krypton.

Superman on television, and the origins of *Smallville*.

In the post-1986 comics *Superman* was younger, his parents were also younger and still alive, and Lex Luthor was now a ruthless business tycoon. Lois Lane had also been transformed into a kick-boxing feminist, similar to Lana Lang in *Smallville*. In 1988, the series *Superboy* aired on US television. The origins of this version of Superman went as far back as 1941, when Siegel planned a comic based on the character’s teenage years. His idea was for an unruly and troublemaking superhero. Superman’s ‘early years’ seemed to have more currency on television, and in 1945, Don Cameron played him and:

“Within a year, the character made a transition to adolescence, and was featured in a series deeply rooted in the idyllic town of Smallville and the home of his foster parents, the Kents” (Daniels, 2004: 69).

Again highlighting the revisionist heteroglossic narrative, the constant revisiting and revising of texts, and the filling in of Giddens (1997) and Eriksen's (2001) 'gaps' – as well as a deployment dialogically across different media - *Superboy* began on TV, before starring in comics from 1946, and getting his own comic from March 1949. The 1988 series of *Superboy* was very popular, and was produced by the Salkinds. The show included Lex Luthor, still in his mogul mode, and a red-headed Lana Lang, played by Stacy Haiduk. In the comics, meanwhile, Superman was gearing-up to marry Lois Lane (who had suddenly become a red-head) and was planning to reveal his true identity.

Again, foregrounding the dialogic connection across different media, TV series *Lois and Clark*, aired in the US in 1993, a year after Tim Berners-Lee invented the 'world wide web'. Almost immediately, the sudden popularity of the internet coincided with fanfic shifting from small 'hard-copy' publications, to the web. The original US title was replaced by 'The New Adventures of Superman' for UK audiences. This very successful series starred Teri Hatcher and Dean Cain as Lois and Clark, and was centred on Lois' complicated feelings for Clark Kent and Superman. Eventually Lois and Clark fall in love, and plan to wed, with Clark preparing to reveal his secret. This narrative, appropriated from the comic books, had to be sustained over a long series, and so the comic books had to 'hold-off' from marrying their two characters. Instead, in an issue that sold 6m copies, *Superman* was killed-off (again) in January 1993, but was fortuitously resurrected in October 1993, just in time for the TV marriage; again revealing the subtle influence that all *Superman's* 'utterances' have on each other within the heteroglossic narrative.

A year later, in 1994, www.lcfanfic.com began, an online forum dedicated to Lois and Clark fan writing. Its popularity had more longevity than the series on which it was 'based' and at the time of writing the site contains 2,642 fan-written episodes of the series.

The comics, and subsequent 'translations' into other media forms, have been overtly revisionist and contradictory. *Lois and Clark's* basic adherence to an element of the *Superman* narrative - like the Salkind's films – suggests a view by the producers of all texts, for sustaining narrative themes and events over several platforms simultaneously, whereas contradictory and ambivalent texts were - before *Lois and Clark* - allowed to exist in parallel with each other. However, what Stam describes as the "fundamental narrative, thematic and aesthetic features" (2004: 3) have usually been retained by all the versions of the *Superman* narrative, and this is what *Smallville* perfectly endorses, whilst maintaining many disrupting narrative devices, and deliberately and overtly referencing a range of elements from both the entire *Superman* narrative, and many of the versions of that narrative that have gone before.

In *Lois and Clark* the mise-en-scène was very contemporary. There were no attempts locate the storylines in the 1950s, in fact, the series was a modern romance tale, with added elements of the superhuman. Clark Kent was no longer shy and awkward, and Lois Lane was a modern 90s woman. Also, Lex Luthor had a full head of hair. Superman's arch-nemesis first appeared in the comics, in 1939. Then he had a full-head of red hair, before becoming bald by 1941. He was a 'mad scientist' in these early versions, and by 1945 he was living permanently in space.

In October 1996, Lois and Clark married, but the TV series had lost its unrequited love theme, and the ratings fell, and eventually the series ended. The marriage seemed more successful and

popular in comic book form, and by 1996 a new animated TV series was aired, featuring many of the elements established by the *Lois and Clark* series. However in the seven years between *Lois and Clark* and *Smallville*, the *Lois and Clark* fanfic boomed, as fans attempted to keep their favourite show in cultural currency, by continually adding to it, filling in 'gaps' and *subverting* characters and plots.

Smallville: The hypermediate text.

In writing about fan writing, Jenkins (1992) usefully provides ten categories of fanfic, which are worth exploring here in detail. The first is 'Recontextualisation' where fan writers provide 'missing scenes,' essentially filling in the gaps left by other writers. The second category is 'Expanding Series Timeline,' where a continuation, or back-story is provided by fan writers, outside and beyond the diegesis established by the source material. 'Refocalisation' is the focus on secondary characters, and 'Moral Realignment' is where the 'moral universe' is inverted, a more subversive mode. 'Genre-shifting' moves the story into other generic spheres, and 'Cross-overs' allow for different and hitherto separate texts to be merged. 'Character Dislocation' changes the historical context, and 'Personalisation' put the creator in the diegesis. 'Emotional Intensification' explores emotional relationships in more detail, and finally 'Eroticisation' allows for more sexually explicit themes to develop (1992: 162-165). In my view, *Smallville* - mainly because of the *Lois and Clark* fanfic - functions almost as a single piece of fanfic text, almost adhering to all of Jenkins' categories. In short, *Smallville* represents a 'mainstreaming' of fanfic strategies, and is therefore not a 'straight' adaptation, but a text that seeks to frame all previous elements of the *Superman* narrative, establishing Boyum's "necessary grid" (1985: 67) as well as 'filling in the gaps,' left by those pre-existing variants.

The listings title change from *Smallville*, to *Smallville: Superman the Early Years* for UK audiences suggests that US audiences would immediately equate Superman's adoptive home with the superhero. Title changes are not unusual when texts are exhibited outside the norms of their own specific cultural and historical contexts, for example *The Madness of King George* (Hytner, 1994) was a version of Alan Bennett's play *The Madness of King George III*. The name change came with a regard to non-UK audiences thinking that the film was the third part of a trilogy. *Smallville*'s title change suggests a similar concern for audience confusion by E4 and C4.

In the pilot episode of *Smallville* (2001) many of the contradictory and oppositional narrative strands that run throughout the series are established quickly and, I would argue, in a deliberate and provocative manner. The series is both temporally and spatially specific, beginning with a meteor shower in October 1989, which heralds Superman's arrival on earth as a small boy and in Episode 5 a reference is made to the contemporary band Radiohead. *Smallville* is essentially a prequel, and if the text was attempting fidelity to the comic books and the filmed versions, should be set in the 1950s: in fact, at one point in Season 2, Clark does travel back in time to the 1950s, and meets his grandfather, an example of Jenkins' (1992) 'Character Dislocation.' However, like with *Lois and Clark*, there is no fruitless attempt to be 'faithful' to the *Superman* chronotope, but unlike *Lois and Clark*, *Smallville* is quite 'faithful' at the same time. In other 'prequels' such as with the *Star Wars* films and *The Young Sherlock Holmes* (Levinson, 1985) attempts are made to firmly situate the text *before* the already established narrative, in chronological terms, to create a 'sealed' and logical diegesis.

Furthering the limited scope of fidelity-based comparative positions, in *Smallville*, Clark Kent is significantly older than the child version in the 1978 film, when discovered by Martha and Jonathan Kent. His eventual adoptive parents are also much younger than their counterparts in the 1978 film; likewise Lex Luthor is seen as a small boy with red-hair, before losing it all after the meteor strikes the town. So, clearly, *Smallville* is not attempting to be faithful to any screen versions of the *Superman* narrative but neither is it attempting to distance itself from this range of source material, including other popular culture texts. From the start, references are assembled and used to invoke *The Wizard of Oz* (Fleming, 1939). The comic books had already established this link, with the ‘mad scientist’ version of Lex Luthor and the giant ‘Superbrain’ computer in 1949. Cinematically, *Superman III* came closest with the giant super-computer hidden in mountain complex. However, in *Smallville*, *The Wizard of Oz* is overtly referenced, and we learn that the town is in fact in Kansas; phrases like “he’s not from Kansas” appear frequently, and in Episode 3, Chloe says “I just want to click my heels and get back to reality.” Also in the pilot episode, Clark is seen tied to a cross in a field, with ‘S’ painted across his chest, invoking both biblical discourses, and the *Superman* narrative. Daniels (2004) posits that Clark Kent’s genesis is based on Moses and Jesus from the Old and New Testaments (Martha Kent was originally *Mary Kent*) with the alter-ego of Superman taken from the Douglas Fairbank’s *Zorro* films, which, as Brooker (2004) argues is the exact blueprint for *Batman* as well.

However, despite *Smallville*’s obvious distancing from previous screen versions, in all five seasons of *Smallville* produced to date, constant references are made to the *Superman* narrative. In the pilot episode, Lex asks Clark about flying. It is interesting to note that Clark does not have fully developed ‘powers’ initially and these gradually develop through the seasons, which can be viewed as a ‘loose’ link to puberty and impending ‘manhood’; this device is employed in many horror films such as *The Exorcist* (Friedkin, 1973), *Carrie* (De Palma, 1976) and *Damien – Omen II* (Taylor, 1978) although usually, and interestingly, with female characters. The main superhuman power that Superman is known for is his ability to fly, and in *Smallville*, Clark Kent is not yet possessed of this particular ‘gift,’ but it is alluded to frequently, most obviously in the slogan of the school football team “Fly to Victory!” Certain camera shots and sequences invoke flying, and phrases like “flying solo” are used to denote Clark’s single status. Directly referencing both the comic books and the Christopher Reeve films in Episode 3, Lex Luthor tells Clark “I promise I’m not a criminal mastermind”; in Episode 5 Clark is asked “What are you? From an ice planet?” and Chloe tells Clark, “Blue’s a good colour on you.” Clark even describes his barn as his, “fortress of solitude” which Eco interestingly explains:

“For Superman the fortress is a museum of memories: everything that has happened in his adventurous life is recorded here in perfect copies, or pre-served in a miniaturized form of the original” (1998: 4-5).

This view could stand as a metaphor for *Smallville*, which playfully accesses and reworks all elements of the *Superman* narrative, including previous adaptations and versions.

The mise-en-scène throughout the series is overtly playing with notions of faithfulness to an idea of a source in the TV audience’s mind, with the continuous occurrence of the colours red and blue; Clark is often seen wearing clothes of either or both colours; the Kent farm mailbox is red and blue, Clark is seen wrapped in a red blanket in Episode 2 and in Episode 7 Martha Kent irons a blue shirt and then flourishes it like a cape.

John Caughie argues that character is the centre of all television drama, and this “centrality of

character demands an organisation of time and space which will allow the materiality and complexity of characters to emerge in all their idiosyncrasy” (2000: 135). If this is the case, then *Smallville* is extremely problematic. If time and space is organised around character, then the contradictory elements of *Smallville* must undermine the narrative, in some way, although not if you are viewing *Smallville* as a single sealed text. Clark Kent is clearly positioned as a creature of modernity; he is always seen on the farm working with his hands, he does not have a car or a mobile phone and if he uses a computer it is always at the offices of *The Torch* school newspaper, under the supervision of Chloe. Clark Kent rarely engages with ‘modern’ technology, as he himself embodies technology and is technological through his ‘powers’ whilst being positioned as a rural ‘farm boy’ and therefore ‘other.’ The character of Clark Kent in *Smallville* is an anomaly; he is located in a specific spatial context, but temporally he is the 1950s Clark Kent trying to exist in a contemporary setting.

The characters of Chloe and Lex are the most ‘modern.’ Lex drives a Porsche, uses mobile phones and computers, and regularly drinks spirits. Chloe drives a new ‘postmodern’ VW Beetle and is usually seen surrounded by iMac computers and is overtly ‘modern.’ In fact, the Chloe character is essentially Lois Lane; feminist, journalist etc. She is editor of *The Torch* school newspaper (Joe Shuster began his comic book career, drawing and writing cartoon strips, for his high-school newspaper, *The Glenville Torch*) and dreams about moving to Metropolis to work on the *Daily Planet*. In Season 3, we discover that Lois Lane is in fact Chloe’s cousin, and Chloe uses her cousin’s name as a pseudonym for her articles for *The Daily Planet*. Lois, we are told, has no intentions of ever becoming a journalist: for Jenkins (1992) this is an example of a ‘Refocalisation,’ a focus on secondary characters. The character of Lois Lane eventually makes a brief appearance in Season 4, which would contradict Clark Kent’s introduction to her as an adult in the Salkinds’ *Superman* film, if *Smallville* was adopting a fidelity position to the films. The two characters of Lex and Chloe are deliberately contemporary, whereas Clark is deliberately not quite. These contradictions ensure the positioning of Clark as ‘other’ throughout the series. Writing about television-to-film adaptation, Ina Rae Hark argues that:

“The chief tasks facing the filmmakers involve embodying the characters in actors whose material attributes do not offer a violent contradiction to the images generated in the typical reader’s mind and repackaging the literary work’s diegesis to fit the limitations of the filmic medium” (Hark, 1999: 172).

But *Smallville* does exactly that. In probably one of the most playful elements of the series, Annette O’Toole stars as Clark’s mother, Martha Kent, when she has already played Lana Lang (Clark’s love-interest in *Smallville*) in *Superman III*. This is surely *Smallville*’s acknowledgement of a source, or variant. It displays a dialogic engagement, but without framing the *Superman* films as ‘full’ source texts. If Hark is correct then Annette O’Toole would probably have to play Lana’s mother or her Aunt Nell, which would single-out a source text and therefore give grounds, and perhaps credence, to a fidelity approach assessment of *Smallville*. However *Smallville* serves to overtly eschew fidelity to any such source and playfully disrupt any misguided attempt at fidelity to the *Superman* narrative.

In addition, in Episode 17 of Season 2, Christopher Reeve first appears as Dr. Virgil Swann, a reclusive scientist who has discovered the origins of Clark Kent. In this short, and memorable scene, Reeve is heralded by the non-diegetic score of the *Superman* films in which he starred.

Terrence Stamp, General Zod in *Superman*, and *Superman II*, plays the disembodied voice of Jor-El, Clark Kent's natural father, in seasons 2 and 3 of *Smallville* – although it is possible he will turn out to be General Zod after all. Reeve played Dr. Virgil Swann intermittently throughout Season 3, until his death. His role, that of a scientist who knows Clark's secret, was replaced by the character Bridgett Crosby in season 4, and played by Margot Kidder. Kidder starred as Lois Lane in the 1980s *Superman* films, bolstering *Smallville's* deliberate acknowledgement of dialogues with other utterances, without framing source texts explicitly. So, the powerplay for Clark's affections are redoubled here, as the characters of Lois Lane and Lana Lang in the 1983 film *Superman III* are mirrored by the rivalry of Lois Lane and Lana Lang in *Smallville*, but also by the actors Margot Kidder and Annette O'Toole in *Smallville*, who played those roles in *Superman III*. This serves to add Jenkins' (1992) emotional 'Emotional Intensification' to the narrative. This strategy is similar to the Almereyda adaptation of *Hamlet* referencing the Olivier version and *Rebel Without a Cause*: summoning a text, but not explicitly framing it as a source but giving it a permanence, or 'afterlife' so that it exists in a dialogic parallel with new variants.

This is not an altogether unique phenomenon in the sci/fi fantasy genre, which sometimes revisions and 're-imagines' its own narrative; Richard Hatch, Apollo in the 1970s *Battlestar Gallactica* TV series and film, appears as an entirely different character in the 2003 'adaptation' where, in addition the formerly *male* Starbuck character is now played by a woman, Katee Sackhoff. The original Starbuck actor, Dirk Benedict, also appeared in the pilot episode. So, these types of cameo roles are not unusual in the sf/fantasy television genre, but what is unusual is having actors from previous versions, playing substantial and different high-profile roles in newer versions. Hark suggests that:

"The appeal of a television show lies less in its narratives than its continuing characters and general situation" (1999: 172).

This, as Caughie (2000) also argues, is probably true, but the deliberate disruption of character in *Smallville* makes the series one that frames an utterance of the *Superman* narrative that contains many oppositional forces making for an open and contradictory text. If *Smallville* had adhered to a fruitless quest for fidelity to even just one, or more, of the already existing *Superman* texts, then it would have failed as a text itself. *Smallville's* playful acknowledgment and disruption of already established elements of the *Superman* narrative, and its appropriation of fanfic techniques, is its success. *Smallville* is *deliberately* disruptive and overtly postmodern and once this 'adaptation' of the *Superman* narrative eschewed any sense of fidelity, it has allowed for the text to be free from constraint. *Smallville* would perhaps be confusing in a fidelity sense but it remains logically nostalgic in a postmodern one.

Shuster and Siegel both based Superman on elements of culture that influenced them, from the bible, *Zorro* films and more directly taking the title of the dystopian city from *Metropolis* (Lang, 1926). In a dialogic sense this is true of any creative undertaking, but especially so in popular culture genres, such as comic books, as Brooker writing about *Batman* adaptations, seemingly adopting Cardwell's (2002) position on 'versions' argues:

"None of the films can strictly be called an 'adaptation' of the comic book – of whatever period – in anything but the loosest sense [they are] free interpretations built around a basic framework, rather than adaptation as we currently understand the term. All of [the films]...owe at least as much with regard to visual style, characterisation and theme to their surrounding cultural context" (1999: 186).

However, I would suggest that if *Smallville* is a version, it is one that functions to provide material to fill in the gaps left by other versions, and in doing so opens up the texts and provides more 'gaps' of its own. In 'mainstreaming' fanfic strategies, *Smallville* even manages to accommodate the more subversive elements of slash/fic, framed by the relatively benign utterance of television; in *Smallville*, Red Kryptonite causes Clark to become transgressive, as his deviant 'back region' is exposed, and he becomes a far more sexually aggressive character. The episodes that frame these types of plot can explore what Jenkins (1992) calls the 'Emotional Intensification' and 'Eroticisation' inherent in many fanfic texts.

Smallville is not only 'based' on the *Superman* narratives but its multiple sources also could include other television 'teen' drama, such as *Dawson's Creek*, as well as science fiction TV series, most notably *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *The X-Files* as well as films like *Final Destination* (Wong, 2000). Changes are *always* made in *any* television or film adaptation, and these changes often impact dialogically upon the heteroglossic narrative as we have seen: in Colin Dexter's novels, *Inspector Morse* is a chain-smoking man, who has an unhealthy interest in pornography; Ian Fleming's *James Bond* is a cruel misogynist, and Conan Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes* never said "Elementary my dear Watson!"

However *Smallville* does 'go beyond' a new interpretation of a narrative, in that it deliberately cross-references other elements of the *Superman* narrative heteroglossia in its use of the actors playing the roles. *Smallville* acts as an interface, or a 'window' of hypermedia (Bolter and Grusin, 2000), through which other versions of the *Superman* narrative can be accessed through other 'windows,' - and on and on. These 'summoned' versions, however, are not 're-written' but are perhaps 'reconfigured' and rewired in the digital heteroglossia. *Smallville* combines and blends all the unique contradictory and re-visionary elements of the comic books and subsequent versions; it plays upon the way in which different versions, produced at different times *and* simultaneously, interact and counteract with each other dialogically in what Stam (1989), writing about heteroglossia, describes as a simultaneous embrace of the textual, intertextual and the contextual. In a sense, *Smallville* summons into being forgotten and ignored elements of the narrative, and these narratives gain an 'afterlife' through, and because of *Smallville*, as they are in constant play within *Smallville*; the text itself is able to frame all Superman utterances and can subvert the narrative. *Smallville* is perhaps paradoxically, deliberately unfaithful and a successful 'adaptation.' It is clearly an effective translation of the *Superman* narrative, maintaining many of the elements of the narrative, but countering that fidelity with overt intertextuality.

I have outlined in Part I, the comparative positions of single 'source' does not work in any genre where there are many sources and many targets, which in turn become sources: there are many 'novelisations' of the *Smallville* stories, and now even tie-in comics. However, perhaps comparative positions can be opened-up to encompass a range of texts, a dynamic dialogism between them engaging in a constant mode of revision and repetition. *Smallville*, based on a narrative that was always undergoing a constant process of revision and remediation, is perhaps an example of a new breed of television series that seems to not be fettered by notions of being faithful to an idea of a source text in the audience's mind. The target audience for *Smallville* would probably not remember the exhibition of the 1980's Superman films, starring Christopher Reeve. They are available on DVD however and are regularly screened on TV, giving the films an 'afterlife' which is gained *through*, and accessed *by Smallville*, as

Smallville summons them into being. *Smallville*, exists through, and *because* of the heteroglossic nature of the *Superman* narrative. As a text, *Smallville* manages to effectively access and contain the coexistence of a plurality of utterances that do not fuse into a single whole, but exist in different media, in different registers, and in different ways which *Smallville* engages with in a strategy of dialogical playfulness. Unlike adaptations of ‘classic’ novels, *Smallville* does not suppress the overt presence and referencing of source texts, additionally, unlike Mazdon’s (2000) position regarding remakes, *Smallville* does not try and deny the existence of any versions or variants that have gone before:

“This kind of borrowing is fundamental not only to film and painting, but also to literature...In fact, this is the one kind of refashioning that literary critics, film critics, and art historians have acknowledged and studied with enthusiasm, for it does not violate the presumed sanctity of the medium, a sanctity that was important to critics earlier in this century, although it is less so now. Refashioning within the medium is a special case of remediation, and it proceeds from the same ambiguous motives of homage and rivalry...as do other remediations...[R]efashioning one’s predecessors is key to understanding representation in earlier media” (Bolter and Grusin, 2000: 49).

Interactive Television revisited.

Interactive television allows for a re-positioning of television that perhaps could facilitate more audience involvement in texts, similar to, but more immediate than fan writing on the internet. Interactive television (iTV) has become a ‘catch-all’ term used to describe the new ways in which television can connect with its audience through the ‘red button.’ Interactivity is a difficult term to define, and to a certain extent television, indeed all media, are interactive in some way. However, for the purposes of this discussion, I will mainly focus on the ways in which digital television allows for purposeful engagement with texts by audiences.

Ellis (2000) segregates the history of television into three distinct eras. The first he calls the ‘era of scarcity.’ As we have seen, early experimentation with television began in the 1930s. This era, as Ellis would have it, spans the 1930s experimental years, right up until the late 1970s, and is the longest of his three eras. This era was defined by a minimal amount of choice, as there was only one channel until 1955 (BBC1), and then only two channels (BBC1 & ITV) until 1966, with the advent of BBC2. Ellis argues that this era is defined by commercial television (therefore competition) and growing ‘Americanisation.’

Again illustrating Giddens (1997) and Erikson’s (2001) observation that time and space have become eroded, Ellis’ second ‘era of availability’ is relatively short-lived, and spans the late 1970s up until the early 1980s and the period in which Giddings and Selby (2001) note the almost simultaneous framing of three Jane Austen adaptations by the BBC. This era then is defined by more choice, increased deregulation, the ‘take-up’ of what Levinson (1999 & 2001) terms ‘improving’ technologies such as the VCR and the introduction of satellite broadcasting, a point that Seiter also recognises:

“Since its widespread and rapid adoption as a domestic technology in the 1950s, broadcast television has weathered the introduction of several significant technological ‘add-ons’: remote controls, cable, video games and the videocassette recorder” (Seiter, 2003: 34).

As has been noted, Corrigan (1999) places particular significance on the VCR in particular, and the way it had the potential to foster comparative positions in the reception of adaptations by audiences, but comparative positions unhindered by notions of single preferred meanings or

fidelity.

Ellis argues that this was the period when television was obsessed with style and branding, in terms of channel identity and scheduling. This, I have argued in Part II, is of diminished importance in the digital heteroglossia, as new digital recording devices, such as TiVo and Sky+ recognise *texts* as brands, not channels: this is a prime mode in the televisual landscape in the digital heteroglossia.

Ellis' third 'era of plenty' began in the late 1980s, and I would argue here, is the origins of a digital heteroglossia, although Ellis is primarily concerned with just one of its utterances, namely television. This era is defined by the emergence of universal digital platforms, acquisition and exhibition formats. It is the era of 'pay-per-view' niche-casting, and a redefining of public service broadcasting, which will be all be examined later in this section.

Ellis also cites the work of John Caldwell (1995) and in particular his term 'Televisuality' in looking at television in the 1980s. Television, in a postmodern sense, constantly reworks and recycles the images that it creates. Ellis firmly positions Caldwell's 'Televisuality' in the era of availability. In the 1980s, technologies such as the JANET computer, and software such as Quantel's Paintbox, accelerated this postmodern process and both were digital technologies. For the first time, images could now be manipulated in a digital space, not in the physical world. Televisuality, as Caldwell (1995) and Ellis (2000) argue, is the process whereby television constantly refers to itself as a medium, or as Bolter and Grusin (2000) suggest, this is television's hypermediacy. This, argues Caldwell, is in direct contrast to cinema, which deploys the same techniques, but to, "simulate realities and extend the range of its illusionism" (Ellis, 2000: 92). Manovich concurs, stating that:

"Cinema works hard to erase any traces of its own production process, including any indication that the images that we see could have been constructed, rather than simply recorded" (2001: 298).

So, as Caldwell and Ellis put it, television has been a, "transmutable object" since the 1980s (2000: 92).

The new range of digital technologies available to television producers, allowed for television to move ways from cinematic conventions, and a later generation of digital technologies, such as Avid, have made the television screen like a blank piece of paper, waiting to be written on. Television's self-reflexivity can be overtly seen in television news, which has in the last decade employed an array of visual techniques and made full use of graphics and scrolling text:

"As the internet develops from a research-oriented tool of elites to a commercial mass medium, resemblances between websites and television programming increase" (Seiter, 2003: 35).

Indeed, Bolter and Grusin (2000) use television news as a prime mode of remediation, however, for them, it is an example of television appropriating the conventions of new media as:

"Television has enthusiastically received computer graphics and digital editing and is deploying them in the service of both transparency and hypermediacy" (2000: 188).

However, Caldwell and Ellis both suggest that television's 'remediation' began in the 1980s, which was the beginning of the home computer 'boom'. The computers of the 1980s, such as the Sinclair Spectrum, Amstrad and Commodore families were mainly used for game playing, and still depended on analogue technologies such as tape recording for 'loading' software. Indeed, at an institutional level, it is perhaps pertinent to note that the BBC entered into the home computer market with its BBC Micro and subsequent Acorn 'clones.' The 'look' of the BBC Micro/Acorn

was indeed similar to the BBC's interactive television service, Ceefax, as discussed in Part II. The Graf report's assertion that the BBC's online provision is its "third medium," seems to have its origins here.

As has been outlined in Part II, when a new media emerges, it tends to appropriate the conventions of existing media. Early cinema was highly theatrical and depended on plays and novels for content. It was the same for television in the 1940s. Remediation however, would suggest that the 'older,' more established media also borrow from and appropriate the conventions of the new media. Many postmodern television texts, such as *24* with occasional multiscreen presentation of narrative and the news channels of CNN, Sky and BBC, seem to suggest this is true. In addition films such as *Robocop* (Verhoeven, 1987) and *Starship Troopers* (Verhoeven, 1997) borrow from television and new media. Indeed, the latter makes use of both Pathé Newsreel conventions, and the 'point and click' graphical user interface of new media, in the opening few minutes. Texts like the television series *24* (2001 – present), and the film *Timecode* (Figgis, 2000) employ a 'window' aesthetic to display more than one narrative simultaneously, rather like using multiple applications through a computer interface. However that this is more a natural evolution of improving media, which has moved into the 'era of plenty' and the transtextual nature of media is more overt and fluid due to an emerging universal digital platform. In terms of television news, Caldwell and Ellis seem to suggest that channels such as CNN want to be *better* than television and *more* than television, as it becomes increasingly obsessed with its own style and hypermediacy, but television has always been like this, however interactive television and its facilitator, digital television, have made this more apparent.

Bolter and Grusin (2000) argue that the prime target of television's remediation has been cinema. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the main genres of televisual content were similar to that of cinema, namely Westerns, Romances, Thrillers etc. Now we have interactive television (iTV). Interactivity is a problematic term, as there are many different types and levels of interactivity, in terms of new media forms, such as computer games and hypertext fiction. iTV does suggest more of a responsive two-way relationship between audiences and broadcasters. It also tantalising offers a limited element of authorship on the part of the viewer/user of iTV, which is largely unsustainable presently. Bolter and Grusin (2000) clearly elucidate remediation as a defensive strategy on the part of television providers, and Seiter also takes this view, positioning new media as a 'threat':

"Despite...overlapping contents, the television industry has felt severely threatened by internet and email as a competitor for viewers' leisure time...Television companies have sought to join with new media to cushion themselves against predictions that old entertainment media are dead" (Seiter, 2003: 35).

It could be argued that remediation does take place during the adoptive phase of a new media technology, but, as outlined in Part II, this process is temporary. The close relationships between perceived distinct media are now more overt because of digitalisation, but all media is made from the content of all other media as McLuhan (1998) argues, and the 'reshuffling' of the digital heteroglossia to accommodate new media, is the same as television's introduction into the analogue heteroglossia in the 1950s, where it was predicted it would 'finish-off' cinema; an argument that was resurrected in the late 1970s and 1980s in response to the *relatively* immediate adoption of domestic video technologies. All media continuously appropriates from all media, and paradoxically perhaps, *responds* to all media. Interactive television is just another stage of this

constant 'improving' and evolution. As even Ellis (2000) predicts, traditional broadcast television will survive in the 'era of plenty' and as Levinson (1999, 2001) and Bolter and Grusin (2000) recognise, it is *unlikely* that a new media will completely replace an older one. In fact, new media was once termed 'multimedia' because the very form itself seemed to offer the *potential* of combining many elements of the existing media, a potential that is only recently beginning to be realised, with innovations such as the BBC's Interactive Media Player (iMP) project – outlined later in this section - and Sony's Playstation 3, which will be a fully integrated CD, DVD, digital television and games platform.

Interactive television is still very much in its infancy, indeed I would argue that it is in its 'attraction' stage, like early cinema in the 1880s. Therefore it would be unhelpful to denounce its obvious limitations. In addition, iTV is *not* a new media form, but an example of what Levinson (1999 & 2001) would call the 'improvement' of an older one, namely television. At a basic level, much of iTV is just an advanced version of text-based services such as the BBC's Ceefax, indeed, as we have seen in Part II, BBC News Online and the Ceefax news providers were combined in 2004. So in a sense, iTV could be 'improving' these text-based services. The 'point and click' nature of iTV, could also be an example of television's remediation, however, I would suggest caution, in that any such remediation will be temporary.

An early pioneer of iTV was Sky Sports Active in the late 1990s. From October 1998, Sky began broadcasting on a digital platform (Sky Digital) and subscribers to Sky Sports could access iTV. The service was fairly advanced, and seemed to appropriate a 'windows' based interface from computing, as viewers could choose from a series of screens; during the transmission of tennis tournaments they could select a different court, and during the transmission of a football match, the audience could even decide to follow a particular player, in effect, choosing the camera themselves, similar to the three dimensional videogames later discussed in this section. This level of interactivity did not perhaps suggest a strategy of authorship, even a limited one, on the part of the viewing audience; the actual text cannot be changed or altered, only the *way* in which can be viewed. In a sense, iTV of this type just provides an interface for viewing. So as yet, iTV cannot be counted among new more democratic forms, such as fanfic, but it does perhaps have the potential do so in the future.

Interactivity in the areas of hypertext, or videogames, depends on the audience/user to initiate content and progression and in some instances to actually provide content, by adding links and text to existing hypertext documents or providing new pages entirely, such as those contained in the vast Wikipedia suppository (www.wikipedia.org). In short, interactive media, such as hypertext and computer games, depend on the audience/user to 'complete' the text, in the same way Ellis (1982) argues that a celebrity needs to exist textually to be 'complete.' iTV however, is not a 'full' interactive medium as few texts depend on an audience/user as much as hypertext and computer games. Hypertext and computer games are 'stand alone' forms, whereas iTV is an adjunct to the uninterrupted 'flow' of television, which Williams describes as:

“What is being offered is not, in older terms, a programme of discrete units with particular insertions, but a planned flow, in which the true series is not the published sequence of programme items but this sequence transformed by the inclusion of another kind of sequence, so that these sequences together compose the real flow, the real 'broadcasting'” (Williams, 1992: 90).

Therefore iTV cannot be a new distinct form, although technologies such as TiVo and Sky+, as

delineated in Part II, offer the potential of transgressing this 'flow.' Like Corrigan (1999) Cardwell in her medium specific approach to adaptation, sees potential in the new generation of domestic video recorders:

“The development of more advanced home video recorders, and the advent and wider dissemination of new media, however, encourage viewers to perceive television images as on a continuum...The television images themselves, far from being understood as 'present,' become detached from their regular temporal flow and take on a more uncertain temporality: they appear tenseless” (Cardwell, 2002: 84).

So, for Cardwell, some forms of digital media acquisition collapse the moment of production, and this is a prime mode of the digital heteroglossia, as temporal distances between adaptations and versions become meaningless.

But, in a textual sense, iTV is not particularly advanced. However, as a concept, iTV's level of interactivity seems on par with that of defined interactive media, such as the computer game where “the element of control and choice it seems to offer is revealed as illusionary” (Darley, 2000: 157). Poole goes further and suggests:

“Pending some future computational revolution, then, in which a machine might be programmed to simulate a real human author, with a real author's consciousness, creativity and life experiences, truly interactive narrative is going to be out of reach...But this should not be surprising, or even disappointing. Because stories will always be things that people want to be told. If everyone wanted to make up their own story, why would they buy so many novels and cinema tickets? We like stories in general because they're *not* [original italics] interactive” (2000: 122).

This seems to be the main hindrance to further development of a 'purer' form of interactive television. A cross platform approach to broadcasting, and deploying texts simultaneously over different digital platforms, is something that iTV facilitates to a certain extent.

Chapter 3.2: iMP, *The Matrix* and Transmedia.

The BBC and Interactive Television.

At the BBC's Centre House in London on 17th July, 2003, a meeting was held to discuss a possible interactive episode of the BBC1 drama, *Casualty*.^[10] Those present included Neil Pleasants (Senior Producer Interactive Drama and Entertainment); Ben Evans (Senior Producer Fiction Lab); Sarah Brandice (Senior Producer Drama Commissioning) and Anne Mensah (Senior Producer Drama Development).

At the meeting, Pleasants pitched the idea of an Interactive episode of *Casualty* to Brandice and Mensah. They were shown a model of an interactive *Casualty*, based on an enhanced version of an old episode. Pleasants firmly linked the concept to an overall idea of pushing the boundaries of television drama. Brandice and Mensah had already spoken to Jane Tranter, Head of Drama Commissioning, and it seems that she was keen on the idea.

In the discussion that followed, the group considered an entire series of *Casualty* that was

interactive, and whether or not *Casualty* was the right 'brand' for such an endeavour; another BBC drama, *Spooks* was considered. Pleasants felt that an entire interactive series would be too ambitious and expensive at that time, and the rest of the group agreed. It was also felt that as *Casualty* was a fairly established 'brand,' and that it could be good to innovate this series further, as the brand has a history of trying out new ideas.

The idea of a 'one-off stunt' was then discussed. Pleasants proposed his idea of a branch narrative, with either control over a character, or a location. He argued that it would be like running four dramas simultaneously, and therefore the audience would therefore miss chunks – or 'gaps' - of the story. Pleasants proposed that BBC1 & BBC3 could be involved, both channels broadcasting different versions of the same episode –this, however, is *not*, of course, an example of a narrative being deployed over several media platforms simultaneously, as both versions would be televisual. Pleasants suggested that audiences would feel empowered by the interactivity of the episode and would feel like they were 'taking a journey.'

Brandice introduced recent audience research into the discussion, which suggested that Soap audiences have favourite characters and are often disappointed in an episode, if their favourite character is not featured; again, this view seems to support Jenkins (1992 and 1995), Giddens (1997) Benjamin (1999) Eriksen (2001) and Clerc's (2001) view of 'gaps' left in texts and narratives. Therefore, she argued, an interactive episode, based on following particular characters, would allow audiences to stick with their favourite characters, rather like Sky Sports Active's interactive football coverage. The research showed that it is characters that *lead* soaps and Brandice described *Casualty* as a 'soap in the widest sense.'

In terms of 'missing out' aspects of the narrative, as outlined by Pleasants, Brandice and Mensah countered that if audiences do miss chunks of story due to the branch narrative, then this wouldn't be a problem and would add further realism into the story. Pleasants and Evan then discussed the practicalities, such as the relative long-term nature of the project – it would take eighteen months to bring to fruition - and how expensive it would be. They argued that the interface design was of paramount importance, as the television screen must not be 'cluttered.' Both seemed aware that imposing too much new media onto television, would perhaps disrupt and undermine the text.

Brandice and Mensah then discussed the positive aspects of the proposed project, which they argued that the story would be leading the technology, not the other way around – eschewing a technologically deterministic stance. Both were keen to stress the Public Service value of this project in that it would add 'accessibility' to one of the BBC's most popular brands and would 'enrich the pact between viewer and broadcaster,' in that the BBC 'gives' to the viewer, and this type of programming would facilitate a more two-way process. The BBC has a strong commitment to help create a universal digital broadcast platform, and Brandice argued that this project would promote that. Their concerns included the distinctiveness of the proposal and peoples' 'fear' of technology. The proposed transmission date was set for September 2004, as it would be the 18th anniversary of *Casualty*'s first episode being broadcast.

As an example of temporary remediation, this example is interesting, as Pleasants' role was as part of the BBC's online provision, BBCi. The year 2004 marked a gradual change in the BBC's approach to new media and the BBCi elements of News, Sport, Childrens' and Entertainment content were being merged with their broadcast counterparts. So, initially new media was treated

separately by the corporation, and was indeed mainly housed in central London at Bush House. In 2004, BBCi moved to Centre House, and various elements were subsumed into television and radio, as Matt Walton, Content Producer for Drama and Entertainment explains:

“In 2001 they reorganised so that the website sat within the various different content areas, so for instance *Eastenders* went to drama and entertainment, along with the film sites. And then factual and learning got Gardening and Science and all those sorts of things. Basically the content went out to different areas, new media became the kind of hub – so they dealt with all the standards and managed the home page and stuff that’s centrally managed - and there’s now New Media Corporate there, which deals with all the money and financing and they’ve got marketing people and lawyers, etc” (2004 Interview – see Appendix E).

This points to a reorganisation of the digital heteroglossia, with elements of BBC New Media being reorganised into television and radio, which, I would suggest, somewhat dilutes Bolter and Grusin’s (2000) assertion that new media is at the centre of remediation.

The idea of an interactive episode of *Casualty* was quickly abandoned after consultation, and was replaced with a transtextual simultaneous broadcast of *Casualty* and *Holby City*, its sister programme, on two different channels. However, this too was abandoned for the foreseeable future, and instead, in December 2004, BBC1 viewers were treated to *Casualty@Holby City*, one text that contained elements of both programmes. This was not particularly innovative as the first episode of *Holby City* in 1999 contained cast members of the *Casualty* text. However on the 27th August 2005, an interactive edition of *Casualty* was broadcast on BBC1, although this episode only contained two narrative strands, rather than the four proposed by Neil Pleasants.

It is questionable if the interactive episode of *Casualty* was successful, for the reasons outlined earlier by Darley (2000) and Poole (2000). The interactive episode of *Casualty* as proposed at the meeting, did constitute a televisual text, and was not perhaps received as a new media text, such as computer games, or interactive films like *Tender Loving Care* (Landeros & Wheeler, 1997). This example, starring John Hurt, was produced exclusively for DVD and is highly ‘game-like’ in construction, and therefore is not a film in any real sense of the term. However, the *Casualty* project, and subsequent institutional changes at the BBC, perhaps do highlight a move towards producing narratives that can exist in a dialogic parallel with each other, on different platforms. The type of iTV proposed at the meeting would only work as a ‘one-off’ event and will not become a new genre of programme in the digital heteroglossia, as it is a text that is too disruptive of the ‘flow’ of broadcasting.

There are some texts however, that do depend on an audience to initiate and author content, mainly in the gameshow genre. E4/Ch4’s ironic gameshow, *Banzai*, allows viewers to play along by ‘betting’ on various outcomes. The ITV2 version of *Who Wants to be a Millionaire*, also allows for this type of engagement. But again, the text is never disrupted and the ‘flow’ (Williams 1990) is never interrupted. In the digital television spectrum, away from the ‘traditional’ broadcast television, some channels, not texts, are heavily dependent on iTV. Avago is a games channel that broadcasts live twenty-four hour interactive bingo. The channel is an almost interruptible ‘flow’ of a single text, rooted firmly in the game show genre. Avago is a channel in the ‘era of plenty’ that appropriates the liveness and immediacy of television in the 1930s, 40s and 50s, whilst also utilising and appropriating the hypermediacy of new and interactive media.

This is not that new though, and as has been discussed earlier in this project, these relationships

have always existed between perceived distinct media and have become more apparent, overt and responsive in the digital heteroglossia. British television has always been interactive to a certain extent (as has all media). Many programmes depend on audiences to initiate and provide content, such as BBC's *Watchdog*. The current trend for reality television and lifestyle programming depends totally on audience participation, particularly confessional talkshows, where subjects are usually 'ordinary people.' Childrens' programming has always been on the cutting edge of the technological 'improvement' of television, with many shows, such as BBC's *Blue Peter*, encouraging content from audiences. This used to take the form of letters; now it is email and SMS messaging. The faster technology of the digital heteroglossia has replaced the slower communicative tools of the analogue heteroglossia, which has increased, as Eriksen (2001) notes, the speed of media and information deployment and engagement.

Medium Specific Adaptation.

Television's postmodern features are often questionable, with theorists concerned with the nature of television, and specific texts themselves. For Jameson:

"The logic of the simulacrum with its transformation of older realities into television images, does more than merely replicate the logic of late capitalism; it reinforces and intensifies it...which by transforming past visual images, stereotypes or texts, effectively abolishes any practical sense of the future and of the collective project, thereby abandoning the thinking of future changes to fantasies of catastrophe and inexplicable cataclysm" (2000: 225).

Jameson's pessimistic views suggest that cultural innovation is now impossible, and television is in part to blame for that. Neil Postman (1986) adopted a similar position in the 'era of availability' as he argued that television was responsible for the decline of reason, as people succumbed to the culture of the visual image. However, Abercrombie is sceptical of television being a postmodern form at all, arguing that:

"Cultural forms have always been self-referential and boundary breaking...and...that television is more prone to have these characteristics, it is more likely to be due to the increasing sophistication and skill of the audience" (1996: 40).

In terms of adaptation it does now seem that television is increasingly drawing from itself for content. Not only is television obsessed with itself, as Caldwell (1995) and Ellis (2000) suggest, the medium is increasingly becoming hypermediate in the digital heteroglossia, as Bolter and Grusin (2000) also recognise. Again, this is not a new mode, as we have seen that many postmodern televisual texts, such as *Smallville*, do draw on other televisual variants for content. The emergence of a universal digital platform, however, has made this process far more instantaneous, and the 'time-delay' in adaptation, between a 'source' text, and its eventual 'target' text, has now 'collapsed' into near instantaneity, rendering time almost insignificant, as Giddens (1997) and Eriksen (2001) point out. Television is now harnessing its own content, and recycling it elsewhere as content.

In writing about time and the television coverage of the 1991 war in the Persian Gulf, Baudrillard argues:

“Thus ‘real time’ information loses itself in a completely unreal space, finally furnishing the images of pure, useless, instantaneous television where its primordial function irrupts, namely that of filling a vacuum, blocking up the screen hole, through which escapes the substance of events” (1995: 31).

In the digital heteroglossia, or in Ellis’ (2000) ‘era of plenty,’ the proliferation of digital television channels has exacerbated the need for content, to fuel the continuous and uninterrupted ‘flow’ of television. As we have seen in Part II, for Stam (1989), Caughie (2000) and Winston (2000) television is a relatively stable utterance, however, I would argue that in the digital heteroglossia, television has become an unstable utterance, along with all other media. Television is drawing on itself for content as a response to this instability. For Baudrillard, the television coverage of the 1991 War in the Persian Gulf, bore no relation to anything except itself, as Woods suggests:

“Baudrillard’s position offers reality which is wholly constructed by signs and images, with no outside referent” (1999: 196).

This view is somewhat problematic regarding television, as even Baudrillard recognises that television references other media as well as itself. However, in the digital heteroglossia, television’s intertextual relationship with itself is far more overt. As we have seen earlier in this section, some televisual texts, such as *Smallville*, clearly are postmodern.

Other texts such as *The League of Gentlemen*, and *Spaced*, are postmodern in that they constantly reference and re-work other texts, shaping them into new forms.

The League of Gentlemen (BBC2), takes its title from the 1959 British heist movie of the same name directed by Basil Dearden. It borrows heavily, and overtly, from British cinema, particularly horror films such as *The Witchfinder General* (Reeves, 1968), *The Wicker Man* (Hardy, 1973) and American Horror films such as *Don’t Look Now* (Roeg, 1973), *The Exorcist* (Friedkin, 1973) and *The Shining* (Stanley Kubrick, 1980). The comedy series *Spaced* borrows from anything, and everything, including *The Shining*, but also *2001: A Space Odyssey* (Stanley Kubrick, 1960) and even from cultural theory, with an episode featuring a dog called ‘Gramsci.’ So, television’s *relentless* intertextuality, borrowing from other genres, fragmentation, pastiche and nostalgia, are prime conditions of postmodernity.

In the digital heteroglossia, television is increasingly using itself as a ‘source text.’ This process however, is increasingly instantaneous and therefore serves to highlight the increasing currency of televisual texts as ‘brands.’ It also points to the decline of the schedule. Ellis states that:

“Scheduling is the point where the activity of the past and the hopes of the present become the strategy of for the future. It is the point where television’s everydayness encounters its competitive nature. The sum total of schedules, locked in their competitive struggle, defines the character of a particular broadcasting market...For television is always specific, however much it may be amenable to generalisations” (2000: 145).

For Ellis, the schedule is where the power lies in television. This was certainly the case in the ‘era of availability,’ however I would suggest that this model no longer has such value. As we have seen, broadcasters are beginning to focus on texts as brands. In the digital heteroglossia television texts are more fluid, appear more frequently and there is certainly a *trans-channel* mode at play,

with texts being framed by disparate television channels. For example, *Smallville* is exhibited on Ch4 and E4. The series *24* began on BBC2, and then moved to Sky One and Sky Two and Three.

In some cases, slightly different variants of the same text appear on different channels. In April 2005, the chat show host, Trisha Goddard, featured on ITV and five, every weekday. Television channels in the digital heteroglossia, are often 'time-lag' versions of themselves, such as Living+1 (which is exactly the same Living channel, but broadcast an hour behind). Repeats of old shows, such as *Friends*, occur regularly in the digital televisual spectrum, and it could be argued that repeats of shows still broadcast, are dialogically engaged with the 'newer' variant, such as *Have I Got News For You's* older episodes exhibited on UK Gold, dialogically engaging with the latest episodes on BBC2, as they often run concurrently, and would no doubt be recorded by a TiVo/Sky+ system. Some texts, such as ITV's *Footballer's Wives*, have their own 'spin-off' variants, elsewhere in the digital television spectrum, such as ITV2's *Footballers Wives TV* and *Footballers Wives Extra Time*. This trend is increasingly evident in the reality TV genre, with many such shows, such as ITV's *Pop Idol*, having a dialogical link with variants that follow the original broadcast, such as *Pop Idol Extra* on ITV2. This suggests new mode of translation and fluid trans-channel instantaneity in the digital heteroglossia. This phenomena is not exclusive to the digital television spectrum however, with even the mainstream terrestrial channels now mirroring this approach. For example on Saturday 25th March 2006, BBC2 exhibited two episodes of *The Rockford Files* at 12.50-1.35pm and 1.35-2.25pm, whilst ITV1 screened a different episode of same programme at 2.20-3.20pm. This 'clash' probably would never have happened in the 'era of availability' and is even used as a deliberate 'spoiler' as Monday 27th March saw the Ch4 debut of the weekly chatshow, *The New Paul O'Grady Show*, at 5pm, the same time that ITV1 was screening repeats of the *Paul O'Grady Show*.

New digital recording technologies, such as TiVo and Sky+, accelerate this process, due to their non-linearity and recognition of texts as 'brands'. So Ellis' (2000) assertion that the power of television lies in the schedule is not sustainable in the digital television landscape. Televisual texts re-occur on other platforms continuously. Again, this is not a new phenomenon and it did occur in the analogue heteroglossia; *The Morcambe and Wise Show* (1968-1977) moved from the BBC to ITV and then back again, *The Goodies* (1970-1981) moved from the BBC to ITV and in the 1990s the situation comedy *Men Behaving Badly* switched from ITV to BBC1.

The emergence of a universal digital platform accelerates this process, a mode that is substantially supported by a new generation of recording technologies. As we shall see, this has created the conditions for a more trans-channel approach to broadcasting. In the digital heteroglossia, televisual texts will not only continue to circulate freely and dialogically in the digital television spectrum, but will also exist, and be accessed by other media such as the BBC's Interactive Media Player (iMP), explored later in this section.

Flipside TV is a programme that began on Sky One in 2003, and then moved to the Paramount Comedy channel. As a text, *Flipside TV* acts almost as a human version of an electronic programme guide (EPG), rather like TiVo and Sky+. The show features studio-based participants, usually drawn from the "celetoid" (Rojek, 2001; 18) arena, who watch live digital television, and comment on the programmes. Again, the texts are paramount here, and not the channels that frame them. *Flipside TV* itself is broadcast live, so audiences can 'flip' channels to view the

programmes being discussed. Each participant in *Flipside TV* is positioned in front of a large television screen, so as a text, *Flipside TV* often frames several other utterances of television simultaneously. Often, *Flipside TV* will present a text under discussion, in full-screen, which in effect, doubles the broadcast potential and reach of a single text. So, *Flipside TV* constitutes a new type of postmodern text, which references its own utterance instantaneously and in simultaneous parallel with other televisual texts. As with Baudrillard's (1995) position on the television coverage of the 1991 war in the Persian Gulf, television, in this sense, has no reference to anything, except itself. The source material of *Flipside TV* is dialogically engaged with at the *moment* of broadcast.

This is an unusual occurrence and one that will not define broadcasting in the digital heteroglossia, and again, it is not a new mode of television. In the early 1990s, in the analogue heteroglossia, the LWT programme, *Dial Midnight* (1993), was broadcast live on ITV, at the same time as Ch4's programme, *The Word* (1990-1995), also broadcast live. The various presenters of *Dial Midnight* would view *The Word* on an unseen monitor, and comment on the programme, in a strategy to deter audiences from changing channel to view *The Word* instead. However, in *Flipside TV's* case, the content of the programme is completely made from other televisual texts, with a light-hearted studio-based discussion 'wrapped' around those texts. Other digital television channels, such as Reality TV, re-exhibit texts from a particular television genre that have previously been broadcast elsewhere in the digital television spectrum. So, in a sense, new versions or variants of texts, in terms of adaptation, can be seen to rewire a range of source material, which can co-exist with the new version.

Other media are also being used, to provide television with *virtually* all its content. The shortlived Soundtrack Channel (2004-5) drew all its content from cinema, but exhibited selected scenes from films during playback of diegetic and non-diegetic music from the selected film's soundtrack. *Gamer TV* (Bravo) is a text that uses computer games as source, even going as far as exhibiting full-screen game-play, in real time, and often broadcast live. The viewing experience, of this text, is akin to spectating on - but not participating in - game-play on a television-based games platform such as Sony's Playstation 2 or Microsoft's Xbox. All these texts and channels are constantly dialogically engaged with their 'sources' which exist in parallel outside the digital television arena, and that is why, as I have argued, all utterances are unstable in the digital heteroglossia, as there are leaks and slippages between media, and a constant recycling and reworking of content and form.

These examples *could* constitute remediations, but they do not, as the content of all media is bound-up in the content of all other media, as McLuhan (1998) suggested in the 1960s. Bolter and Grusin's (2000) assertion that new media is at the centre of remediation, is clearly too limiting. Remediation is nothing more, therefore, than a more obvious and apparent relationship of exchange, between parallel texts and forms, in the digital heteroglossia. If remediation does take place in the way elucidated by Bolter and Grusin, it is a temporary process, because new and interactive media are digital, and other media are *becoming* digital. Remediation therefore is a temporary mode, and once more entertainment forms of media move towards digital production, acquisition and exhibition, it will no longer have currency as a theoretical tool.

In many respects, television is the perfect postmodern media. Television, as Caldwell (1995) and Ellis (2000) posit, constantly reworks and recycles its own content. It is a medium that constantly reaffirms and draws attention to itself. Television, as Bolter and Grusin (2000) argue, borrows the conventions of other media and refashions those conventions into something new, which in turn refashions, or 'remediates,' other media. Television also collapses the boundaries between high and low culture by exhibiting literary adaptations, plays, opera and 'serious' documentary, against soap opera, reality TV and game shows. However, in the digital heteroglossia television could reinforce those hierarchies by segregating texts and even by providing niche 'high culture' channels, such as BBC4, and 'serious programming' such as the National Geographic and History channels, although televisual texts are increasingly becoming autonomous 'brands,' freed from the schedule of the 'era of availability.'

The BBC and the Graf Report.

On the 28th October, 1998, the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, granted approval: "...for the BBC's licence fee funded Online service to be put on a permanent footing as a core public service [and] that sums from the licence revenue may be applied to the Online service" (Kroll cited in Graf 2004).

So began a proliferation of online content provided by the BBC. Initially, the corporation established what the Graf report would later define as 'broadcast content' websites, namely content that was initiated and served by existing television and radio texts. In addition BBC Online (later BBCi) would provide substantial 'online content'; that is content not linked to texts elsewhere in the BBC's television and radio portfolio. Many of the BBC's most popular television and radio texts have some form of online presence where content is predominantly generated by the television text. So in sense, these types of sites, such as the *EastEnders* website, support the television version – admittedly without impinging upon the narrative of the televisual version - and can be read as a new type of text. These types of websites are imaginative examples of narratives being deployed over more than one platform. This could be a type of remediation, however, as earlier outlined in this discussion, any such remediation was temporary as the BBC's online provision expanded.

By 2004 the BBC's online content amounted to two million web pages in thirty-four categories,

which contained almost five-hundred sub-categories (Graf, 2004). As part of a wider review of public service broadcasting, leading-up to the 2006 charter renewal, the UK government commissioned an independent report into the corporation's online provision, headed by the former newspaper executive, Philip Graf. The report was delivered on Monday, 5th July 2004 and the BBC's response was swift. By Tuesday 6th July 2004, several BBC websites had been shut-down, including the *What's On* events site, *Fantasy Football*, *The Games Portal* and *Pure Soap*; a website that depended upon television soap operas to provide its content, similar to gossip and listings magazines, such as *TV Quick* and *Inside Soap*. However, *Pure Soap* was also a televisual text, exhibited on BBC3, displaying the duel logic of dialogism.

The case of *Pure Soap* is interesting, as it was a text that existed online, but was 'adapted' for television, as Walton explains:

"Pure Soap was a website for fans of soap operas, so as well as covering BBC output, such as *Eastenders*, *Neighbours* and so on, it also had gossip and news and stuff like that on *Doctors* and *Coronation Street*. And it was moving towards being a community website really, for people who liked soap. In fact there were plans - before the rug was pulled from under them - to give users the tools to create their own web pages and their own mini fan sites, in effect. But, when Graf came out, there had to be a few sacrificial lambs, one of which was *Fantasy Football* - which is kind of fair enough - and also the surfing portal (which I never knew we did!) and the other main one, was the *Pure Soap* site" (Walton, 2004 Interview - see Appendix E).

The fact that the BBC was planning a greater amount of user initiated content, does suggest here that the corporation was moving into the web specific sphere of fan sites, and possibly the 'democratic genre' (Pugh, 2005) of fanfic, discussed in Part II.

In terms of the television 'adaptation' of *Pure Soap*, Walton adds: "That was almost what the Holy Grail in web production is, in that, we produce a website, and it becomes a TV programme." About both versions *Pure Soap* failing, he argues that:

"I don't think it worked terribly well, because of the way things are geared-up, in that basically television is seen as the be-all-and-end-all in the BBC. If you're in the web, you're quite small-fry really. So TV took the idea and went off and did whatever they wanted with it, with very little input from the web team. And so I think that there's not many stand-alone brands on the web anymore because it's quite hard to get them commissioned because of the Graf report, and also, you have to get enough people looking at it, and the BBC's not really geared-up to market web brands" (Walton, 2004 Interview - see Appendix E).

These institutional changes were part of an ongoing review of the BBC's provision and workforce, initiated by the then new Chairman, Michael Grade, and Director General, Mark Thompson. The UK and other European media concentrated on these aspects of the report, however the report makes other observations which would be pertinent to examine here, in terms of adaptation, digital heteroglossia and a cross-platform approach to media provision.

The Graf report was the second independent report on the BBC's role, the first being Richard Lambert's review of BBC News 24, delivered in December 2002. Unlike the 1998 Green paper (see Part II) the report makes no *clear* reference to convergence, and certainly does not foreground television as the locus for any such convergence, or remediation. The most interesting aspects of the report, for this discussion, concern the relationship between new media and the BBC's other mediums, radio and television, and how new texts will come out of that relationship.

At the start of the report, defining the parameters of the discussion, Graf immediately takes a cross-platform approach in defining what the BBC's online provision actually is:

"A review of an online service, in isolation from its cross media 'parent' is intrinsically a difficult task, as barriers between media have become increasingly indistinct. For the purposes of this review, it is considered that all services funded by the licence fee, delivered via the Internet, by the BBC's public service site, www.bbc.co.uk, and accessed by any device (PC, PDA or mobile) are relevant to the review's findings...Even the public service 'interactive' brand, 'BBCi', includes some services, such as interactive television and digital text, which are excluded from the review, as they are accounted for under different consents and are not 'online' services" (Graf, 2004: 5).

The Graf report is very clear in making distinctions between media, and even treats iTV as a separate concern. This, I would argue, marks a shift in institutional thinking and policy-making regarding convergence. Indeed, Graf's refusal to place new media at the centre of the BBC's provision also negates the potential of remediation in this context. In short, Graf firmly locates the BBC's online provision as the corporation's "third medium" (ibid: 78). This is a significant observation, and a clear recognition of an emerging digital heteroglossia, containing a:

"...coexistence...of a plurality of voices that do not fuse into a single consciousness, but exist on different registers, generating dialogical dynamism among themselves" (Stam, 1989: 222).

For Graf, any convergence centres on the improvement of technology, as:

"Enhancements in bandwidth and compression technology will mean that the quality of audio and video content converges towards broadcast quality, whilst technology-enabling community content (content created by users and shared amongst them) will become much more widely available" (2004: 59).

This is an example of Levinson's (1999 and 2001) notion of improving 'remedial' media (see Part II).

In another nod to the plurality of voices in the digital heteroglossia, the review states that the BBC's downloadable Radio Player – available from the website to enable access to radio produced content – has, "boosted radio listeners numbers" (ibid: 12). However, the report is unclear to whether this means an increase in the radio audience, or an increase in accessing radio content online. It seems clear that Graf views radio content accessed online as *radio*, and *not* a new media type of text. It doesn't matter how it is accessed, and what platform a text is exhibited or broadcast on, textually, it is still radio content. Graf sees this as an important development, and goes on to suggest that:

"The BBC might encourage more users to access rich audio/visual content by the use of alternative streaming products, such as Window Player [sic]" (Graf, 2004: 59).

This does point towards a plurality of framed utterances in the digital heteroglossia, something that will be further facilitated by the BBC's Interactive Media Player (iMP) – discussed later in this section. The report also claims that 7% of the BBC audience have been encouraged to go online because of the BBC's marketing of its web provision (ibid: 28).

One aspect of the report, which was discussed by the UK and European media, is particularly significant. Firstly, Graf states that the Public Service requirements of BBC's online provision should be the same as television and radio. In 1977, the Annan report into a fourth terrestrial channel - which resulted in Channel 4 going on air on 2nd November 1982 – created the notion of a 'publisher broadcaster.' Channel 4's PSB remit stated that it must commission all of its content from independent production companies (see Catterall et al, 1998, Ellis, 2000 & Crisell, 2002).

This policy led to the rapid growth of the independent sector in the 1980s and 90s. The 1986 Peacock report into the future of the BBC stated that a proportion of the BBC's provision should be commissioned from outside the corporation. This proposal was adopted, and both the BBC and ITV were committed to commissioning 25% of their content from outside providers (see Scannell 2000; Winston 2000; Crisell 2002).

The BBC's web provision is largely generated in its entirety from within the corporation. BBCi was located at Bush House, but is now housed at Centre House with many divisions been subsumed into television and radio, as we have seen. Walton observes:

"I do think that new media has definitely matured as a business over the last few years. When I started [in 2001] there was 400 people working for new media, and it has expanded to 1100 people, within the BBC" (2004 interview – see Appendix E).

However, Graf states that:

"The BBC should continue to develop a 'new relationship' with users through more extensive engagement in continuity/user-generated content, which would further deploy the capacity of the medium to provide opportunities for interaction between users and producers" (2004: 13).

This view is similar to Brandice and Mensah's position on the motivation for an interactive episode of *Casualty*, discussed earlier. Highlighting a potential reorganisation of the digital heteroglossia, the report suggests that:

"BBC Online should aim to outsource, at least 25% of its non-news output. The BBC should work with the independent sector to produce an agreement similar to that for independent TV production. I found no reason why this target should not be met by the 2006-2007 financial year. [BBC Online's] operational structure reflects the relationship of New Media to the BBC's Television and Radio divisions" (Graf, 2004: 13).

This, as Walton explains, is a policy not without its pitfalls:

"25% is what you're aiming to hit, but if can do more, then do more. It's interesting because up until now, if the BBC uses outside people, it's always agency work and so you go outside to get a website built, you pay designers and you pay coders and you say, 'Right, this is what we want, you go off and do it,' and they make the thing and deliver it, but it's always been run by internal staff.

The interesting bit will be that, now the quota of what we commission from outside is more, it's probably not possible to hit that percentage, without actually putting editorial stuff outside, so I think that maybe, in the next year or so, you might start to see editorial work going outside the BBC. And how that's managed, will be a very interesting one really, because with a TV programme its easier, in that you say, 'Right, go and make this half-hour documentary on X, Y and Z,' and then you see the final product and say, 'Yes, that covers the brief, you can have you're money, we'll broadcast it.'

With a website, it's a bit harder, and again, in terms of production, closer to radio, because you do get some radio programmes that go out on a daily basis which are produced outside. But again, it's still a very definite thing that you're looking at. Whereas with a website, you could have loads of pages and it could be interactive, so it's a much harder thing to do, I think. But certainly for places like the radio division to hit their independent quota, I think you might see, for instance, one of the radio stations being put outside to tender" (Walton, 2004 interview – see Appendix E).

Graf's position is clear here however, in that new media is the BBC's 'third medium' and has equal status in the emerging digital heteroglossia, *alongside* television and radio. Therefore any remediations are temporary, and a universal digital platform will establish a plurality of unstable

utterances, a convergence of interests. As I have previously discussed, temporary convergences may occur, but the fluidity between media, that has always existed in part, will now become more apparent, overt and *instantaneous*. The Graf report is the most significant sign yet that a digital heteroglossia is forming, and that previously held axioms, such as a fully technological convergence, and latterly remediation, no longer have currency as medium-to-long-term trends.

The Graf report also makes significant observations regarding cross-platform texts, at an institutional level. At a personnel level, many BBC employees work across many different platforms. I have already highlighted the relationship between the BBC's television text service, Ceefax, and the corporation's online division, BBCi. In terms of factual content, it does seem that a cross-platform approach is becoming a more dominant trend in the digital heteroglossia, the review states that:

“Another indicator of the service's efficiency could be staffing levels over the period review, however the BBC do not account for staff who work online only, as many work across medias, for example, online journalists who also provide copy for Ceefax, and interactive TV” (Graf: 2004: 20).

In writing about web production for journalists, Whittaker takes a similar view:

“Web designers...share similarities with art directors and production staff on a magazine, while content providers creating animation, audio and video for a site may possess some of the same skills as broadcasters for television and radio...[W]ith the convergence of digital technology in more traditional forms of publishing and broadcasting there is considerable scope for crossover” (2002: 3).

The Graf report does not recognise such convergences, but it does highlight the cross-platform nature of the digital heteroglossia.

Increasingly, content generated by the BBC is finding its way onto other digital platforms. For example, the BBC's website *Collective* interviewed Harvey Pekar about *American Splendor* (Shari Springer Berman & Robert Pulcini, 2003), a film made about his life. The video of the interview was (and is) available to view at the BBC's *Collective* website, but it also formed part of the 'extras' on the 2004 DVD release of *American Splendor*. Graf's review recognises this continuing trend and it is worth quoting at length:

“[Technological] developments will make the Internet a genuine potential 'third broadcaster' for BBC content and services. BBC Online already provides live and archived (from the previous week) access to all of the BBC's radio services, which can be consumed via a narrowband (at a tolerable sound quality) or broadband connection. Over the next two to three years, it will also become perfectly possible for many Internet users to stream or download full-length BBC television programmes (as opposed to just video clips); within the next five years, the majority of mobile devices will be capable of receiving and storing live and archived BBC radio (e.g. the Chart Show) and limited television (e.g. news bulletins; comedy clips) services” (Graf, 2004: 60).

In a sense, the BBC has exceeded this remit already. The 2005 version of *Doctor Who* was supported by a significant web presence. After the television exhibition of *Doctor Who*, a companion programme, *Doctor Who Confidential* was broadcast immediately on BBC3, and in a parallel web-cast from the BBC's *Doctor Who Website*: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/doctorwho/>.^[11] In 2006, to accompany the second series of the revived *Doctor Who* franchise, episodes called 'Tardisodes' were released for exhibition on mobile phones.

It certainly *seems* as if the Graf is placing new media at the centre of the digital revolution, similar to Bolter and Grusin's (2000) position, but the report does clearly recognise a more plural cross-

platform relationship between distinct media:

“As devices (e.g. PCs, TVs, mobile handsets) become increasingly capable of playing and storing different types of content (e.g. linear video, audio content, interactive group chat, gaming applications), it is also becoming easier for consumers to transfer content from one device to another via personal local networks (either via fixed connections, such as USB cables, or via wireless connections, such as Bluetooth). Content delivered to the home via (broadband) fixed connections to the PC will, as a result, be easily transferable to other devices (e.g. TV, mobile) for later consumption” (Graf, 2004: 60).

In this light, the report also seems to suggest that, in terms of television, the schedule is losing the power that Ellis (2000) claimed it wielded at the end of the 20th century. The Graf report seems to suggest that some television viewers will be able to watch television in a non-linear, cross-platform way, where the televisual texts themselves become ‘brands.’ In effect, the BBC’s downloadable devices will produce a service that will rival TiVo and Sky+, as:

“The Internet will, therefore, offer another means, in addition to analogue and digital terrestrial broadcast networks, for the BBC (or any broadcaster or content provider) to reach the television audience with its content; similarly, the fixed Internet represents an additional means (over and above mobile networks) for distributing content to mobile devices” (Graf, 2004: 60).

The Graf report constantly compares the BBC’s online provision to television and radio, particularly in terms of genre. The report breaks down the BBC’s website into the BBC’s own institutional generic categories of Drama and Entertainment, Factual and Learning, Education, Kids, Nations and Regions, Radio and Music, News, Sport and Weather (2004: 35). These are virtually the same generic categories employed by television and radio providers, and the report states that the BBC’s online provision should “complement and promote” the corporation’s television and radio output (Graf, 2004: 70). Walton already recognises this, particularly between radio and web content:

“It’s changed in that when I first started, it [web content] was very much led by, certainly by TV. Radio was slightly different because the websites for radio actually sat with the radio station. So, it worked quite well together, certainly Radio 1 does, because it’s got, I suppose, the people on air are slightly more ‘hip and groovy’ and understood what the web was at the time, whereas it was harder for places like Radio 2 and Radio 4. But they were kind of pretty much small autonomous units” (Walton, 2004 interview – see Appendix E).

As has been mentioned, the report separates the BBC’s online provision into ‘online content’ and ‘broadcast’ content. The latter – websites that are perhaps more obviously dialogically linked to television and radio texts – should “be based entirely or primarily on the content broadcast in the original programme and should not extend to significant amounts of incremental, related material” (Graf, 2004: 71). Walton explains this change of position, to a much more collaborative relationship between television and online provision:

“The commissioning process still isn’t right. There has been a movement, in that, websites are much more involved earlier on, when it comes to producing content for TV programmes. When I first started working here [in 2001], it was absolutely insane, like, ‘It’s [the television programme] going out next week, can you turn something around?’ That happened quite regularly and that sort of thing doesn’t happen now and I think new media has got to the stage where, if people do say that, we can tell them to piss off.

And then things like interactive TV; interactive TV was a department in Bush House when it was kind of a fledgling developing thing, but it’s now been moved into television, and so

there's much more close relationships there, than there were" (2004 interview – see Appendix E).

The Graf report even goes as far as invoking the language of the television schedule, in its use of the word 'hammocking':

"The 'gossip' and chat services provided on the teens site could be considered as 'hammocking' content, helping to attract users to the site with the result that they, then, consume other (e.g. educational) service types" (Graf, 2004: 71).

The term 'hammocking' is usually deployed to describe the technique of placing a new, or unpopular radio or television programme between two more popular texts in the schedule, therefore inheriting the potential audience for both texts. In the digital television spectrum, as we have seen, the schedule will eventually decline in importance, however the Graf report clearly takes the view that 'hammocking' can occur *across* the digital heteroglossia, spanning several different media platforms.

The report reaffirms this position in its concluding remarks, and points clearly towards an era of texts that are deployed across different media simultaneously and that are dialogically linked. The report uses the term '360° content' to define the simultaneous deployment of texts and services across the digital heteroglossia:

"Such content may be originated by BBC Online, but aims to exploit the potential of content which spans and links multiple media, thereby increasing the reach and impact of the BBC's services, as a whole" (Graf, 2004: 79).

In some regards, the BBC has already attempted this. The BBC's *Celebdaq* website (www.bbc.co.uk/celebdaq), a website that encourages users to 'trade' celebrity profiles, which go up and down in value due to their profile in that week's news, was launched in July 2002, and adapted for television in February 2003 on BBC3. It was broadcast weekly until March 2004. In the commercial sector, *Guardian* TV critic, Charlie Brooker's website (www.tvgohome.co.uk) - a 'spoof' television listings magazine running since 1999 - was adapted for television in 2001. *TV Go Home* was exhibited on Channel 4's subsidiary digital channel E4, for only one series. A book based both on the website and the series was also published in 2001, and in February 2005, the television series *Nathan Barley* aired on Ch4/E4, again based on a character from the *tvgohome* website. In the series, the eponymous character worked as a web designer, and, in true digital heteroglossia fashion, the 'fictitious' websites www.sugarape.co.uk and www.trashbat.co.uk actually existed online, and at the time of writing, still do. In 2006 the BBC adapted Brooker's *Guardian* columns for the television review programme, *Charlie Brooker's Screen Wipe*, exhibited on BBC4.

The BBC2 series *Attachments* (2000-2002) also featured fictional web designers, and their website - www.seethru.co.uk - which is framed by the utterance of 'fictional' television, also existed online, in turn framed by utterance of the internet during the transmission of the programme, and you could even email the 'characters.' *Attachments* only ran for two series. At the time of writing the website still exists, an example of Benjamin's (1999) notion of 'afterlife' perhaps. *Attachments* featured a group of web designers and journalists, working on writing articles and producing music.

So now texts discussed and created in the fictional arena of the televisual text can be accessed

online, collapsing the gaps between space and time; the virtual and the real. This is what Whittaker calls “leveraging” as these websites “work to leverage...content in a new context, providing bulletin boards, additional background context for stories or [television] programmes, and repurposing material in a fashion that is easier to use on screen” (2002: 22).

The BBC’s Interactive Media Player.

In January 2005, the BBC began a trial run of its Interactive Media Player (iMP), with a view to a full launch at the end of 2005. Trials did take place throughout 2005, but in March 2006 the release date was eventually put back to late 2006. The technology is similar to the BBC Radio Player and the BBC News Player, both of which have been very successful in allowing access to content produced by radio and news, via the BBC’s website. The software is free at the point of access, and users can download it. The BBC Radio Player, as we have seen, was singled out in the Graf report for increasing the numbers of radio listeners. It allows the user to listen to any BBC radio programme, a week after transmission, for free. The BBC News Player is similar, and allows users to watch short clips of streamed video of news events, via the BBC’s website.

The iMP project was initiated by Ben Lavender, a software developer at the BBC, and the motivation for such an endeavour was that:

“The BBC doesn’t want to be in the position that the music industry is in at the moment, in that it embraced new technology too late, and to be fair to the BBC, despite the size that it is, it’s always been there first with new technology. I mean, the BBC website is a prime example; hats off to [BBC Director General 1992-2000] John Birt for putting the investment in and doing the political talking that was needed at the time to do it. And the same with [the radio frequency] FM, and all of those things. They were developments that the BBC pushed, and interactive TV and digital radio and the list goes on” (Walton, 2004 interview – see Appendix E).

However, the iMP project is the corporation’s most significant technology yet, and will have far-reaching implications. Essentially, the software refashions the standard desktop, or laptop computer into a television receiving and exhibition device. Previously, with software such as Quicktime and Real Player, streamed video could be exhibited online, albeit in a limited way. The screen size was often quite small, and the quality was not comparable with broadcast television. In essence, these technologies allowed for the discrete ‘framing’ of elements of television, or movie clips, essentially representing one medium in another. However the ‘utterance’ of the internet took precedence and overrode much of the filmic or televisual aspirations of such texts. The streamed video clips, were presented as windows, alongside other windows, which temporarily accessed the content of other media. This is certainly close to Bolter and Grusin’s vision of new media’s hypermediacy, as we have seen, a mode where: “representation is conceived of not as a window on the world, but...[full of] windows that open into other representations [and] or other media” (2000: 33-34).

It is Bolter and Grusin’s assertion that new media is at the centre of this process, and acts as an interface to gain access to all these ‘windows’ that I want to challenge here. At first glimpse, it does seem if iMP offers this potential. As Walton describes:

“The latest development is this thing called iMP, which I think has the potential to change the ways television is viewed really. The idea is that, like the BBC Radio Player, you can watch what you want, on demand, for a week’s window, after broadcast” (Walton, 2004 interview – see Appendix

E).

Essentially, the technology will allow the *full-screen* broadcast of television texts, in near *broadcast* quality, although this does depend on end-user connection and bandwidth. As with the BBC Radio Player, texts could be viewed for free, a week after transmission, and then a fee could be charged for further viewings, or downloading rights. As always, with such devices, copyright protection becomes an issue, but:

“The way the broadcast version of iMP works, is that it uses something called Digital Rights Management Software, and basically you have a player that you download, and your computer and the player and the file that you download each has a separate number, and the three numbers will only work together. So if you download a file, you can’t send it on to your mate, because it won’t work.

You can also then say it only works for a certain number of viewings, or a certain amount of time and then the file self-destructs, and deletes itself. So, it’s quite an interesting thing, and obviously it’s a piece of software that is robust, because some of the big Hollywood studios are already using it in a kind of blockbuster way, in that you download your film when you watch it, and watch it for two nights, or whatever, and then it deletes itself” (Walton, 2004 interview – see Appendix E).

Like adaptation in the digital heteroglossia, this technology has the potential to summon other texts into being, rewiring them and giving them an ‘afterlife’ through mechanical reproduction, translation and adaptation. In time, the BBC could offer a digital version of its entire television and radio archive to be accessed in this way. Walton recognises this potential of the iMP project:

“That’s when it [digitalising the archive] becomes commercial. There’s discussions happening with BBC Worldwide, about – and there this termed used, the ‘public service window’ – and the public service window is seen basically, that you can show stuff on the website that has been broadcast on TV, for a week after transmission. After that, it becomes kind of commercial property, so BBC Worldwide - the BBC’s commercial arm - can exploit it to whatever degree, so it would be like selling a DVD.

There’s a lot of work being done at the moment to see what the relationship is between iMP – the broadcast player – and a commercial one. So [for example you could] watch this week’s episode of *Spooks*, but if you want to go back and watch last week’s then you can do it for a fee, and you can download it to use for four months for a certain amount of money.

[iMP is] very much like TiVo and Sky+, and you will probably find that all of these technologies are going to converge and you’ll probably find that actually Sky’s main competitor becomes Microsoft and [television] gets delivered by broadband, and not a satellite” (Walton, 2004 interview – see Appendix E).

Murray also envisioned this scenario, and also sees it as an example of convergence,

“Probably the first steps towards a new *hyperserial* [original italics] format will be the close integration of a digital archive, such as a web site, with a broadcast television program. Unlike the web sites currently associated with conventional television programs, which are merely fancy publicity releases, an integrated digital archive would present virtual artefacts from the fictional world of the series” (1999: 254-255).

In the seven years since Murray wrote the above, the BBC has provided a form of ‘hyperserial’ with significant websites dialogically linked to television programmes, such as *Doctor Who*. The BBC’s iMP can only improve and build upon this.

So, in this scenario, the whole television infrastructure would ‘shift’ onto a universal digital

platform, one platform that delivers content in a similar way to that which the internet currently offers. This is certainly not remediation or convergence, because the content would still clearly be television, but it would further increase the dialogic potential of different media:

“Putting broadcast television into digital form would also allow producers to make previously aired episodes available on demand. A hyperserial site would offer a complete digital library of the series, and these episodes, unlike the same content stored on a VCR tape, would be searchable by content” (Murray, 1999: 256).

What Murray is describing here has been partly met by DVD, and websites such as the BBC’s *Doctor Who* site, but in the digital heteroglossia, previous variants of a narrative, adaptations and remakes, could also be accessed ‘on demand.’ Radio can already be accessed via the internet, not just in an archived form, but live, as it is being broadcast. However, it is still clearly radio, and the same could happen for television within the next decade. Television would therefore become one of many utterances that frame elements of the digital heteroglossia.

In many respects the internet is a digital delivery platform, and nothing else, and in that sense, can be seen to be heteroglossic, as it contains many environments, however the most used is the World Wide Web. As a form, the web frames textual utterances such as web pages, weblogs, games and other types of interactive texts. In recent years, there has been an increase in the number of academic online journals on the web, such as www.criticalstudiesintelelevision.com. These texts are clearly still academic journals in the purest sense, but their increasing existence in the digital heteroglossia will mean that they will have more dialogical power than previous ‘hard-copy’ formats. Online journals will now be able to link to specific texts in the heteroglossia, which can be accessed instantly. These texts can take the form of other writings, or televisual, radio and filmic texts. As increasing digitalisation occurs, and technologies such as iMP allow access to archives, these types of academic writings will be able to instantly summon into being other texts in the digital heteroglossia, and cross-reference them dialogically in a more overt and explicit way. No longer will the researcher have to search other media for texts referenced in journals, they can be summoned instantaneously and will exist in a dialogic parallel with the critical work presented in the journal.

As Graf (2004) argues, radio content delivered online is still radio, and does not constitute a textual refashioning, or remediation. In the same way, the iMP technology will allow for the exhibition of television content online, but those texts will still be television, they will just be framed in an alternative way. In the digital heteroglossia, any adaptation, translation or remake will summon into being previously produced, or performed, variants that will exist in a dialogic parallel. This has the potential for the clustering of texts, or what Jameson calls ‘collage,’ where the:

“...postmodern viewer...is called upon to do the impossible, namely to see all the screens at once, in their radical and random difference...and to rise somehow to a level at which the vivid perception of radical difference is in and of itself a new mode of grasping what used to be called relationship: something for which the word *collage* [original italics] is still only a very feeble name” (Jameson, 2000: 214).

Videogame Adaptation.

The technological changes and innovations - particularly in new media – outlined earlier will have, and are having, a significant impact on the translation of a text from one media to another.

Another element of new media - although often not termed as such – is the videogame. Critically, videogames have been treated as a separate and distinct cultural form by writers and theorists, although in recent years many (such as Poole, 2000; Darley, 2000; Atkins 2003 & Rehak, 2003) have pointed towards the similarities between cinema and videogames, observations made possible by the technological ‘improvement’ of both media. So, aesthetically, there are similarities between the two, however, videogames and cinema are becoming increasingly dialogically linked. Videogames have been in existence since the 1960s, but the level of purposeful interactivity they facilitate, and their dialogical link with other media, perhaps points towards the types of new relationships and texts that new technologies such as the BBC’s iMP project could potentially provide in the future.

Many videogames are ‘based’ on films, although very often they are released the exhibition of the supposed source text, providing a great deal of marketing cachet. Increasingly, videogames are created by the same company/corporation, that created the film – another example of the economies of scale. The cinema-to-videogame trajectory has mirrored the novel-to-film trajectory, however the increasingly fluid relationship of exchange facilitated by technology, has now led to a videogame-to-cinema trajectory. I will argue here that videogames dialogically linked to cinema allow users a brief, but supreme moment of instantaneous and temporary adaptation.

As a medium, cinema has always drawn from other media, as we have seen in Part I. So, if it could be argued that cinema has always been ready to embrace new technology, new processes and new media. Caldwell (1995) and Ellis (2000) argue that television has been a ‘transmutable’ object since the 1980s, and the same can be said for cinema, as it gradually becomes digital. Many blockbuster feature films are now shot completely with digital video, such as *28 Days Later* (Danny Boyle 2002) and *Star Wars Episode III: The Return of the Sith* (George Lucas, 2005). The sphere of post-production has been digital since the mid-1990s, in both television and cinema. Indeed, the span of cinema is so great, that it seems somewhat of an anomaly that 21st century production techniques are still being ‘adapted’ into a 19th century exhibition format for audiences. The acquisition format of cinema is now digital, but most films are still exhibited on 35mm film. This will change as cinemas replace their film projectors with digital ones.

In terms of production, cinema therefore is squarely in the digital heteroglossia, and this move from analogue to digital has allowed cinema to integrate (or transmute) with other digital media. As I have outlined in Part II, this is nothing new, to an extent cinema has always had this relationship with other media, but this relationship is now more fluid, overt and instantaneous. Cinema is a ‘multimedia’ in that it is made up of photography, literature, theatre, sound etc, in the same way that the internet has become a combination of the telephone, computing, television, radio etc. As I have argued earlier in this section, this is the same for television, which has also embraced the Graphical User Interface aesthetic as branches of content ‘split’ into interactive television.

Similarly, in terms of adaptation, the history of videogames is clearly parallel with that of cinema, outlined in Part I, and its position regarding adaptation also has similarities. The first recognised videogame is widely regarded to be *Spacewar* (1962). There had been videogames before this, such as simple noughts-and-crosses programs, but it was MIT PhD student Steve Russell who created the first distinct videogame. The game was a very primitive monochrome cross between

the later *Asteroids*, and *Space Invaders*: two players would navigate two spaceships around the screen, whilst trying to shoot each other by firing missiles. In addition a huge star would try and pull the spaceships towards it, by exerting its gravitational pull. In 1971, the first 'coin-op' arcade game was released, *Computer Space*, which was clearly based on *Spacewar* (Herz, 1997; Burnham 2001; King, 2002).

It could be suggested that just as with early cinema's appropriation and adaptation of pre-existing popular genres and texts – such as the 'western' *The Great Train Robbery* (Porter, 1903) – was mirrored by early videogames' adaptation of cinematic science-fiction and televisual sport stylistics. So it seems that an early fundamental stage of a new media, is the adaptation of genres, before then moving onto specific texts, as Jenkins and Squire note:

“Games draw inspiration from sports (contests over goals or field position) and board games (Contests won and lost according to movements around the game board); they also tap literary and cinematic genres that climax with spatial contests (the shootout in a western, the space battles in science fiction)” (2002: 65).

It is only the technological improvement of media that allows for this to happen.

In 1972, Nolan Bushnell, working at Atari, invented the first graphic-based videogame. Up until then, all games had been made up of keyboard characters, already available to programmers. Bushnell was the first person to write graphic code for videogames. His game was *Pong* (1972) and was a simple tennis based game. This text was significant because the arcade version was a huge success and was quickly followed by the more advanced, *Pong Breakout*. More importantly, Ingersol manufactured a device in that same year which could be plugged straight into television, to enable *Pong* to be played in a more domestic space. This, therefore, was the first games console (see Wolf, Perron & Winter: 2003).

Winston (2000) would argue that this technology is a 'spin-off' of television, whereas Levinson (1999 and 2001) would argue that this is an example of a remedial media improving itself. However, these positions are limiting, as it is clear that videogames were a distinct media form, and that television acted as an agent for exhibition. There was never a textual convergence between television and videogames, both existed alongside each other in *parallel*, and were completely different experiences and forms. As a medium, television's part in the history and development of videogames allowed it to 'frame' the two competing utterances of televisual and videogame texts, a juxtaposition (or 'collage') of disparate texts. Videogames therefore, did not become the content of television, rather television – technologically – acted as an interface which allowed access to computer game texts, in the same way the BBC's iMP project allows for the exhibition of televisual texts on a computer; this is *still* television.

As with cinema, and television, videogames soon looked to other media for inspiration, after its initial period of 'attraction.' When cinema broke free from its fairground roots, and began to develop as a narrative form, it looked to literature and theatre for content, as we have seen in Part I. At that time literature was the dominant cultural form. However, by the 1960s and 1970s, cinema – despite the 'threat' from television – was now in the ascendant. Critically, cinema was considered to be a low cultural form, in the early stages of its development. As Bourdieu explains:

“It is certain that the 'high' aesthetic, both that which is engaged in a practical form in legitimate works and that which is expressed in writings intended to make it explicit and present it formally, is fundamentally constituted...namely the indivisibility of taste, the unity of the most 'pure' and most purified, the most sublime and most sublimated tastes, and the most 'impure' and 'coarse', ordinary

and primitive tastes” (1984: 485).

Cinema has certainly suffered from this, being positioned by elite critics at the bottom of a conceived hierarchy of art and aesthetics. As we have seen in Part I, regarding the comparative fidelity approaches to adaptation, cinema is perceived as an inferior media to that of literature, or theatre. In a sense, the fidelity approach is founded on this dichotomy, as cinematic adaptation is seen to diminish the cultural value of literature and theatre. As I have also argued, this is perhaps the reason why cinema turned to literature, particularly ‘classic’ texts, as a strategy of gaining high cultural capital. In short, cinema strived for status, and adaptation was one way of attaining it.

Videogames, also, have exploited the conventions of established media. As cinema and videogames both exist in the clumsily sketched sphere of ‘popular culture’ this hierarchy could seemingly not apply, however, I would argue that by this time, cinema had gained ground as an important cultural form from the writings of the *Cahier du Cinema* group of the 1950s and 1960s. In terms of adaptation, this further undermines the fidelity approach. However, I have argued that the digital heteroglossia will contain a ‘plurality of voices’ in Part II, but this clearly isn’t currently the case, as cinema is the one dominant form which renders any such heteroglossic potential null. In short, a videogame based on a filmic text depends on cinema for its success; no one will buy the game if the film is a failure. However, it could be that even these established hierarchies are collapsing in the digital heteroglossia, as texts align themselves in parallel with one another, *framed* by a variety of utterances, and *framing* a collage of influences.

So, it was inevitable, for the reasons outlined, that videogames would turn to cinema for source material and inspiration. However, this did not result, and will not result, in a convergence although, as Poole (2000) recognises, cinema does embody the aesthetic that videogames strive for, namely a coherent plot and narrative. *Space Invaders* (1978) was the first videogame to take direct inspiration from cinema, borrowing from the science fiction genre. Textually, it was similar to *Pong*, *Breakout*, and the earlier *Spacewar*, in that you had to shoot soldiers as they moved across the screen. The Japanese videogames company, Taito, later insisted that the soldiers be changed to aliens (Herz, 1997; Burnham 2001; King, 2002).

As Ellis (2000) points out, television in the 1950s and 1960s appropriated cinematic genres, and videogames continue to follow this trend. Videogames borrowed heavily from cinema’s established cache of genres, whilst cinema is simulated the “hyperkinetic grammar” of videogames (Poole, 2000: 77). The advent of a universal digital platform, and an emerging digital heteroglossia, has allowed for a symbolic exchange between cinema and videogames. As we have seen, this is accelerated by the trend for conglomeration and vertical integration, which began in the 1970s. Videogames have relatively small production costs – compared with cinema - and is now, as a form, more profitable than film, and according to a Price-Waterhouse-Coopers report, will outstrip revenue from sales of music in 2006 (2004). This perhaps points towards a reorganisation of the digital heteroglossia, and a move towards plurality and instantaneity.

In the 1980s, videogames were trapped in their ‘era of scarcity’ and began to adapt films. The initial steps towards this were videogames featuring characters. The first was *Pac-Man* (1980), designed by Namco’s Tohru Iwantani, who was inspired by a pizza with a slice missing. The

game involved the player moving Pac-Man around a maze full of dots, which had to be eaten. The player had to negotiate the maze and eat all the dots to complete the level. However, the player also had to avoid the four ghosts who would try to eat Pac-Man. The arcade version sold 100,000 machines around the world, and it was a staple of the emerging home computer market, with the game being released in a multitude of formats (Herz, 1997; Burnham 2001; King, 2002). So, *Pac-Man* began to be exhibited on new platforms entirely. This is a significant point, as it highlights videogames' distinct difference with televisual texts. The use of a character driven game, had a important impact, in terms of adaptation, as an animated television series of *Pac-Man* was commissioned and ran from 1982-1984, making it a text that existed alongside and in *parallel* with its source. Both variants therefore, were exhibited instantaneously (although the game came first) on different platforms, and were clearly dialogically linked.

The next significant development was *Donkey Kong* (1981). This videogame was invented by Nintendo's Shigeru Miyamoto. *Donkey Kong* was the first ever videogame that featured objects that the character had to negotiate by jumping over. As a text, it is one continuous two-dimensional overall perspective, similar to a film. This text also featured Mario - who in the original was just called 'Jumpman' and he was named after the landlord of Nintendo's office building, Mario Segali. As the technology developed and new versions of the game were released, Mario gained a moustache and blue overalls (Herz, 1997; Burnham 2001; King, 2002).

Mario became an endearing character to gamers, and starred in an eponymously titled series of games before making the transition to the big screen, where he was played by Bob Hoskins in the first ever filmed adaptation of a videogame, *Super Mario Brothers* (Rocky Morton, 1993) which also starred Dennis Hopper as a lizard-like villain. Unlike Pac-Man, it took Mario over a decade to be adapted into a different medium, but this was largely due to the character's relatively slow evolution, and again, the filmic text existed alongside its computer-based source. In terms of adaptation, this marked a significant leap forward, and the parallels with literature and cinema were becoming further apparent with a new generation of three dimensional videogames, because "before videogames had characters, there was no need for them to have stories" (Herz, 1997: 139).

Three dimensional videogames, such as *Quake III Gold* (2001) presented a fully realised diegesis, which the player could explore. As Poole explains:

"In a seemingly robust analogy with film, [three dimensional videogames] are known as player controlled 'cameras'" (Poole, 2000: 78).

Theorists now started noticing that these games were clearly appropriating and employing, "Scorsesian camera angles" (Herz, 1997: 27) with Johns going as far to suggest that:

"It's common to see such films as...Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon employing swooping overhead and player point-of-view shots long familiar to video games" (Johns, 2001).

I would argue here, however, that equally, videogame players were seeing cinematic conventions in games. As videogames came to fruition in the middle of cinema's life-span, as a form, it would always borrow from cinema, and in a process of temporary remediation (Bolter and Grusin, 2000), cinema was now appropriating conventions from videogames, as Rehak explains:

"Video games *remediate* (original italics) cinema; this is, they demonstrate the propensity of emerging media forms to pattern themselves on the characteristic behaviors and tendencies of their predecessors" (2003: 104).

In a sense, cinema was re-appropriating its own conventions, and therefore, the remediation model is too limiting here. All media have a relationship of exchange with all other media and this is just another example, although it differs from traditional adaptation, as the 'source' is more dialogically linked to its target text. For example, the *Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers* (2001) videogame was released before its filmic counterpart, and even included the 'Prologue' from the *Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring* (Jackson, 2002). In fact, this opening prologue is almost a shot-for-shot remake, of the film's prologue, but with added interactivity on the part of the game-play. As Hawkins argues:

"As games continue to grow in popularity, they must meet the demands of the more general audience that is used to the conventions of films" (2002: 40).

This demonstrates cinema and videogames' dialogical parallel. In a sense - mainly due to vertical integration and conglomeration - cinema and videogames exist in a partnership. This is not convergence, but a remedial evolution (Levinson 1999 and 2001). Many videogames, adapted from cinema, employ 'cut-scenes' which are very often short sequences from the cinematic text, usually deployed after completing a particular level or on completion of a particular task. These techniques serve to give a "movie-like experience" to the player, whilst at the same time signifying videogames difference to cinema (Rouse, 2001: 222).

Games based on films often use actors' voices from the film, and this symbolic exchange has even led to the *Internet Movie Database* (www.imdb.com) listing films alongside their videogame variants, complete with 'cast' listings. In a sense, literature, cinema and videogames require readers, audiences and players to identify with a character. This explains the appeal of the *Lara Croft* and *Resident Evil* multi-platform franchise. All entertainment media has this condition:

"In a game like *Indiana Jones*, the character is far less articulated than in the movie, functioning as a sort of digital action figure that allows the player to imagine himself - or herself - as Indy" (Pearce, 2002: 118).

Videogames, therefore, are no longer an 'add-on' to cinema, but are closely forged in a dialogical parallel with film. There are two distinct forms that share the same dialogical symbolic exchange, as Herz argues:

"If movies are supposed to generate a willing suspension of disbelief, cinematic conventions in an explanatory adventure game to exactly the opposite. They make everything seem like a set" (1997: 154-155).

As with fanfic, videogames based on films allow for the user to 'fill in the gaps' of the filmic text. However, as Poole (2002) points out, videogames offer little in the way of interactivity and manipulation of the synchronic narrative will not impact upon the diachronic narrative. In a sense, the 'gaps' inherent in filmic texts (in *all* texts) are mapped-out by designers and creators of the videogames. Therefore, videogame adaptation is still in its fidelity period; attempting to be authentic and faithful to a supreme 'source' text. As technology improves, videogames may move beyond this and become more like fanfic, for currently videogames only allow for the temporary 'filling in of gaps.' So, just as with many areas of new media, videogames present a loss of permanence in terms of adaptation. However, even if users' 'adaptations' are wiped as soon as game play is suspended, videogames do offer unlimited and continuous revision of filmic texts; in Cardwell's (2002) terms, an endless process of rewriting and recontextualisation.

Returning to Boyum (1985) and McFarlane's (1996) – as outlined in Part I - response to using the comparative approach as a criterion with which to judge adaptation, literature and cinema are two mediums with different plot strategies, and the same can be said for cinema and videogames. However, this dichotomy doesn't account for the obvious dialogic parallels media have in the digital heteroglossia. Some videogames have created celebrities, beginning with Pac-Man and Mario, and continuing through Lara Croft. These celebrities have successfully been adapted into film. In the same way that film genres are hybrid (see Neale, 2000), videogames plunder cinema's hybridity for source material. Games such as *Robocop Vs. Terminator* (1993) take two iconic cinematic characters and frame them within the utterance of the videogame. The videogame *Alien vs. Predator* (1994) framed characters from two separate cinematic texts and this utterance was later 'reframed' by cinema for the *AVP: Alien Vs. Predator* (Anderson, 2004) film.

Again, this is not a new phenomenon, as we have seen in earlier in this section with the many variants of *Superman*. The origins of these types of hybridity can be found in comic books, with Superman first featuring in a story with Batman in 1940. *Superman* and *Batman* were both produced (and still are) by rival comic book houses, DC and Marvel respectively. From 1945, Superman and Batman appeared together on radio. In 1976, the two superheroes appeared in their own dedicated comic book, and again in 1981 (Daniels, 2004).

The comic book form, is the most obvious visual referent for computer games, particularly the anime and manga genres. However, these texts are all dialogically linked, but there is still a chronological line of adaptation. The videogame *Enter the Matrix* marked perhaps the most significant indicator yet of instantaneity, and videogames' shift away from the fidelity strategy that cinema and television has only recently begun to free itself from.

The Matrix: The Transmedia Text.

As we have seen, texts such as *Smallville* attempt to frame disparate sources and influences, and more importantly, 'fill in gaps' between those source elements, and therefore provide a new type of adaptation. The next development of this model sees a range of texts dialogically linked at their instantaneous moment of exhibition, in an attempt at a moment of total plurality. As Corrigan (1999) and Cardwell (2002) note, all adaptations – indeed *all* texts - are based on pre-existing versions and variants, to an extent, but what happens when adaptation is not centred on one binary translation of a text into another form, but moves towards transmedia, a moment where the temporal lag between versions collapses? This is where a range of utterances are framed simultaneously, by several different and distinct media, so in the digital heteroglossia, adaptation moves towards 'collage.' Collage is a prime condition of postmodernity which Stam defines as:

“The prime mode of collage derives from its capacity to bring into close and intensely meaningful association apparently unrelated objects and images and texts, all reframed within the new space of a refashioned creative totality” (2004: 213).

This mode goes somewhat against the grain of heteroglossia, where all voices are dialogically linked; however, it is pertinent here to make some observations about this phenomenon. For Harvey, collage is “the juxtaposition of diverse and seemingly incongruous elements” (1994: 338). In terms of cinema, the work of the Russian formalists, particularly Sergei Eisenstein, used collage as a powerful emotive tool, as seen in the 'Odessa Steps' sequence of *The Battleship Potemkin* (Eisenstein, 1925) where disparate images are juxtaposed and framed by the filmic text,

to create meaning. Eisenstein (2000) himself acknowledged the debt he owed to the films of D.W. Griffith and the novels of Charles Dickens. As I have shown, in the digital heteroglossia, texts are dialogically engaged and framed by the utterances of different media, themselves dialogically linked. However, in a cross platform strategy, and *instantaneous* adaptation and deployment of narratives over several seemingly distinct media, it seems new types of collage are forming, that, paradoxically perhaps, are 'diverse and incongruous' but at the same time, can coalesce into collage texts.

As discussed in Part I, the first *Matrix* film was released in 1999 followed by *The Matrix Reloaded* and *The Matrix Revolutions*, both released in 2003. That year also saw the release of the videogame, *Enter the Matrix*, and a series of animated short films, *The Animatrix*. The two sequels were in fact shot at the same time, as well as elements of *Enter the Matrix's* 'cut-scenes.' This in itself is not unusual as the two sequels to *Back to the Future* (Zemeckis, 1985) were filmed simultaneously, and released in 1989 and 1990 respectively. Richard Lester's *The Three Musketeers* (1973) and *The Return of the Three Musketeers* (1974) were filmed simultaneously, as were the two sequels to *The Pirates of the Caribbean: The Curse of the Black Pearl* (Verbinski, 2003). As has been previously discussed, Peter Jackson's adaptation of *Lord of the Rings* trilogy was also shot in its entirety.

The Matrix, the first film in the trilogy, makes its intertextuality explicit from the very beginning, in a similar way that *Smallville* does. This, however, is certainly intertextuality, and not an overt dialogic expression of influences and sources. Within the opening few minutes of *The Matrix*, an array of intertextual references are assembled. For example, Neo's apartment number is '101,' a reference to George Orwell's dystopian novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1948). The number '101' occurs frequently in the films; it is the floor of the tower block and the number of a highway in *The Matrix Reloaded*.

The Matrix also references critical theory – as well as giving clues to the film's theme – by having Neo keep an illegal computer programme inside a hollowed-out copy of Baudrillard's *Simulacra and Simulation* (2000). In addition, many of the characters have names that mobilise religious discourses, such as Trinity. The character of Morpheus could be based both on Neil Gaiman's *Sandman* comics (the name is a pseudonym of the eponymous hero) and the Greek God of dreams; a fitting reference considering the themes of reality explored in the three films. In *The Matrix*, much of the action takes place on the ship, Nebuchadnezzar. This again, could be another biblical reference, this time to the King in the Book of Daniel. The Book of Daniel is more explicitly referenced when Morpheus uses the phrase, "I have dreamed a dream, but now that dream has gone from me." According to Kapell and Doty (2004), this quotation is widely attributed to King Nebuchadnezzar, and could also be a reference to Dr. Martin Luther King.

The Matrix also references similar texts to that of *Smallville*, particularly *The Wizard of Oz*, as well as the 'White Rabbit' from Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* novels. The most obvious parallel is with William Gibson's novel, *Neuromancer* (1984) as both this novel and *The Matrix* feature a city/colony called Zion, a reference to an ancient fortress in the Old Testament. It was Gibson's novel that coined the term 'cyberspace,' and defined the 'cyberpunk' genre of science fiction literature and cinema, of which the *Matrix* films are part. In Gibson's fictional world, cyberspace is presented thus:

“The Matrix has its roots in primitive arcade games,’ said the voiceover, ‘in early graphics programs and military experimentation with cranial jacks.’ On the Sony, a two-dimensional space war faded behind a forest of mathematically generated ferns, demonstrating the spacial possibilities of logarithmic spirals; cold blue military footage burned through, lab animals wired into text systems, helmets feeding into fire control circuits of tanks and war planes. ‘Cyberspace. A consensual hallucination experienced daily by billions of legitimate operators, in every nation, by children being taught mathematical concepts...A graphic representation of data abstracted from the banks of every computer in the human system. Unthinkable complexity. Lines of light ranged in the nonspace of the mind, clusters and constellations of data. Like city lights, receding...’ (Gibson, 1984: 67).

Gibson’s cyberspace is a place where disembodied human identities can exist, and it is a space that people can ‘jack-in’ to, for a full immersive experience. In the *Matrix* films, cyberspace/the matrix is represented on screen, either on computer screens in the film, or in full screen shots. The phrase ‘jack-in’ is also used in the films, to describe going into the Matrix. So, despite the fact that *The Matrix* narrative is not an adaptation of Gibson’s seminal novel, it does reference it as a source, along with many other sources from the Bible, postmodern theory and Socrates; the axiom ‘*Temet Nosce*’ (Know Thyself) is on a plaque above the door of the Oracle’s kitchen. In addition, many critics have highlighted Neo’s Messianic properties (see Issacs and Troust, 2004). Popular culture is intertextually referenced also, with Link declaring in *The Matrix Reloaded*: “He’s [Neo] is doing his *Superman* thing,” this clearly references a text that, as we have seen in earlier in this section, is itself self-referential.

So, in short, *The Matrix* narrative, unlike *Smallville*, is not based on previous variants, although as a text, it does assemble a collage of influences, what Harvey describes as:

“...different effects out of different times...and spaces...could be superimposed to create a simultaneous effect” (1994: 21).

It references and juxtaposes a variety of texts that would not otherwise be dialogically linked. Textually, *The Matrix* narrative frames the many utterances of clearly positioned and cited sources, Although, the closest ‘source’ is probably Gibson’s *Neuromancer*, *The Matrix* is certainly not an adaptation, not even in an ‘allegoric’ (Wagner, 1975) mode, like Francis Ford Coppola’s loose interpretation of Joseph Conrad’s novella, *Heart of Darkness*, filmed as *Apocalypse Now* (1979). In a sense, the closest source referent that *The Matrix* narrative has is itself, namely the 1999 filmed version, which culminated in a variety of variants being exhibited, on a range of different platforms, in 2003. *The Matrix* narrative therefore has no formal former version of variant, and as such, it goes beyond its own intertextual collage, narratively, as Kapell puts it:

“*The Matrix* phenomenon has done its extra-filmic franchising in a far different manner. Now, rather than just producing products that let the buyer re-live the filmed experience, *the products themselves* (original italics) have become part of the story” (2004: 184).

As we have seen in earlier in this section, some television texts, act as a meta-text, surrounded by an array of subsidiary satellite texts, which in part owe their existence to the meta-text, and are dialogically bound to it, such as *Big Brother’s Little Brother’s* relationship to *Big Brother* (Ch4 and E4). However, with *The Matrix* narrative, these relationships are far more complex, and go beyond the creation and deployment of subsidiary texts in the digital heteroglossia.

The Matrix narrative then, is an example of the Graf (2004) report’s notion of ‘360° content,’ that

is content that is deployed and exhibited in a variety of different forms. In 2003, the imminent release of two sequels in a year was also bolstered by a series of nine animated films, *The Animatrix*. These films sought to elucidate the diachronic narrative of the three films. The first *Animatrix*, *Final Flight of the Osiris*, bridges the gap between *The Matrix Reloaded* and *The Matrix Revolutions*, but is also a sub-plot to that established narrative as the animation explains what happened to the Osiris ship, which is alluded to have been destroyed in *The Matrix Revolutions*. The following two shorts in *The Animatrix* series, *The Second Renaissance: Part I & Part II*, explain the background and the origins of the war between humans and machines, which is the backdrop to all three films. In *Kid's Story*, a teenager is rescued from the Matrix by Neo, and this character appears as 'The Kid' in *The Matrix Revolutions*, where he attempts to repay Neo for saving his life. In *Program*, two martial artists fight each other in a simulated training programme, where one betrays his colleagues and attempts to re-enter the Matrix, preferring the hallucination to the reality of the 'real' world. This plotline almost runs in exact parallel to *The Matrix*, where Cypher attempts to re-enter the Matrix, for broadly the same reasons. In *World Record*, a sprinter manages to break out of the Matrix, in *Beyond*, a woman searching for a lost cat, finds a glitch in the Matrix's computer program, and contacts the 'ghosts' of 'real' people outside the Matrix. One of the films' main characters, Trinity, is featured in *A Detective Story*, as she is tracked down for 'hacking' and - again in a reference to Lewis Carroll - is contacted through the 'looking glass.' And in the final short animation, *Matriculated*, a group of humans in the 'real' world have their revenge on the machines, by inserting a robot-scout into the Matrix itself. *The Matrix* narrative was originally conceived as being like an animated film:

"When *The Matrix* was originally devised, it was pitched as a 'live action anime.' [In commissioning *The Animatrix*] the Wachowskis decided to reference their multiple source material by encouraging anime directors to provide animated simulations of an original copy" (Aoun, 2003).

Textually, the components of *The Animatrix* are stylistically different, because of this, although it is clear that the first film, *The Matrix*, is positioned as a clear aesthetic source text, and the Wachowski brothers wrote the screenplays for all of *The Animatrix* films.

The Animatrix films were released in chronological order from *The Matrix* website (www.whatisthematrix.warnerbros.com) in the months leading up to the release of *The Matrix Reloaded*. In addition, once all the animated films were in circulation, *The Animatrix* collection was exhibited, in its entirety, over consecutive nights on the UK's terrestrial channel, five, in the two weeks before the film's UK release and later released on DVD.

In addition to *The Animatrix*, a videogame, *Enter the Matrix* was also released in 2003. This game revisited many of the elements of *The Matrix* narrative, including the sub-plot of 'The Kid' briefly explained in *The Matrix Revolutions*, and explored further in the short animation, *Kid's Story*. *Enter the Matrix* also provided more diachronic material in support of the narrative's overall diegesis.

Enter the Matrix incorporates many elements of the three filmed variants, as you would expect. The game follows the sub-plot alluded to in *The Matrix Reloaded*, focusing on Niobe and Ghost, two characters who feature in the filmed variants, as well as *The Animatrix* shorts. The cut-scenes were filmed in tandem with the two 2003 filmed sequels, and these scenes allow for a more overt bisecting of the overall *Matrix* narrative, and therefore makes the abundant parallels more obvious and convincing. *Enter the Matrix* provides yet more diachronic material, and the films provide more diachronic sources for the videogame. However, the 1999 film aside, *The Matrix* narrative, unlike that of *Superman*, does not provide an overriding meta-text, so *Enter the Matrix* cannot be

read as a straightforward adaptation. Although cinema is perceived as the dominant cultural form - although this, as I have argued, is collapsing - the videogame does exist in parallel with the filmed versions, and was deployed simultaneously alongside them. The diegesis of the *Matrix* spans almost the entire digital heteroglossia, with the utterances of cinema, television, videogames and the web, framing different elements of the narrative. However, all these elements are dialogically linked, and they themselves frame a collage of influences, further undermining comparative notions of a single 'supreme' source text.

Many of the CGI battle-scenes in the films, have clear dialogic aesthetic parallels with videogames, as Poole notes when writing about George Lucas' *Star Wars* franchise, the games took "certain battle scenes in the film and turned them into simple game objectives" (2000: 75).

However, I would argue that it is possible that the films were constructed with a view to producing videogame variants. This is clearly the case with *The Matrix* narrative. George Lucas was one of the first filmmakers to start his own videogames company, LucasArts. This somewhat undoes the hierarchy that is perceived to exist between cinema and videogames. Videogames were (and are) used to promote the film, as the novelisations (outlined in Part I) sought to do. However, videogames are becoming part of the experience, and are more embedded into the digital heteroglossia, alongside cinema.

Increasingly, videogames are featuring cameo appearances by actors, and even characters from other videogames. DVDs are becoming more 'game-like' with the inclusion of 'Easter Eggs'; hidden material which the viewer has to find for themselves. Many computer games consoles are now able to exhibit DVDs. Bolter and Grusin (2000) and Levinson (1999 & 2001) - as we have seen in Part II - are sceptical of a new media replacing an older one. Rather, this is a further indicator of the fluidity and symbolic exchange that is taking place in an emerging digital heteroglossia.

As I have also explained in Part II, convergence can go against the grain of vertical integration, and, "the emergence of a new medium is a dance between the evolutionary pattern or recapitulation and the force of new creative visions" (Laurel, 2000: 193).

If a game becomes too filmic, it loses its appeal. To return to Wagner's (1975) three criteria of adaptation - as outlined in Part I - videogames based on films can be read as *analogous* adaptations. However, *Enter the Matrix* cannot not be read this way, as it was deployed simultaneously alongside the two *Matrix* sequels and *The Animatrix* shorts in 2003. The various *Matrix* texts rewire themselves simultaneously, fusing alliances with a range of defined source texts, and establishing extratextual and intertextual relays. As Kapell observes:

"Unlike the case with *Star Wars* (original italics) or any other similar franchise, the Wachowskis have shown us that it is now possible to add needed details to the entire franchise through the use of different media. We believe this makes [*The Matrix*] franchise a new form of entertainment, and one likely we will be seeing more of in the future" (Kapell, 2004: 184).

However, it is the interactivity that the videogames and other new forms of digital media offer which shifts the process of adaptation into its final ultimate dialogical phase.

In regard to the transmedia event which *The Matrix* is, *The Animatrix* animated shorts, as with *Smallville*, functioned like fanfic and provided diachronic material that filled in the 'gaps' between the three films. The fact that the Wachowski brothers allowed different animators to

interpret their own scripts for *The Animatrix* – leading to a range of different styles between the nine short films – perhaps points towards a fanfic-like strategy. However, the videogame, *Enter the Matrix*, allowed players to access more diachronic material which filled-in gaps in the diegesis, but it also allowed for a temporary supreme moment of synchronic adaptation on the part of the player. The videogame is ‘hypermediate’ (Bolter and Grusin, 2000) as it offers an interface to connect to and dialogically link with, the elements that make up *The Matrix* diegesis. Kapell observes that:

“The game, *Enter the Matrix*, fills in how Niobe and Ghost move through their volunteer mission to where they actually save Morpheus in *Reloaded*. *The Animatrix* sequence not only fills in the back-story for a number of characters (most notably Kid), it fills in the entire history of how *The Matrix* itself came into being” (2004: 183).

Again here, the game and the animated films fill in the gaps instantaneously and in parallel with the exhibition of the two filmed sequels, *The Matrix Reloaded*, and *The Matrix Revolutions*. In a sense, adaptation and the very act of creating new spin-off versions and sequels reveal gaps in the text, which can now be filled by audiences themselves, creating a college of professional and amateur contributions, surrounding a transmedia text. In support of this point, the fanfic forum, www.fanfiction.net, describes fanfic writer, The Matrix Maelstrom’s work as:

“A collection of fics that fill in the details that the Wachowski Brothers skipped: Stories that are consistent with and add to the Matrix universe. Alternate timelines and crossovers will not be found here, except in rare cases. In short, a fanfic version of something like the Animatrix.”

In the digital heteroglossia, adaptation is no longer the uneven and often clumsy attempt to reconstitute source material in another media, or initiate a new text in the same media. In short adaptation is now the filling in of gaps provided by pre-existing version, and so comparative fidelity based approaches are of no use, but more plural comparative stances are almost essential for this process to function.

It is likely that there will be more transmedia texts in the future as relationships between media become more plural, however it is unlikely that it will become a dominant form. The problem inherent in *The Matrix* event is that audiencers/players would have to experience all elements of the narrative, wherever they occur, to fully understand the narrative and diegesis. Boyum (1985) has suggested that a prior knowledge of related texts was essential to understand some types of adaptation, and regarding *The Matrix*, this is essential to make any sense of such complex and interlocking narratives. However, unlike with more traditional forms of adaptation, there are no distances between texts, in terms of years or even decades, and if there are, as with *Superman*, these distances are rendered void as newer versions rewrite and rewire their older counterparts. The very plurality that *The Matrix* event offers clearly shows that there is no ‘supreme’ or meta-text. The first *Matrix* films stands alone, whereas the others are wired into a collage of texts, that all need to be experienced. In a sense, the two sequels deliberately frame ‘gaps’ that other texts attempt to fill.

Transmedia events are likely to be more incremental, such as on DVD, or channels functioning more like DVD and framing several dialogically related texts, almost simultaneously. Television shows, such as Channel 4’s *Dubplate Drama* exhibited in December 2005, is one such example as the end of each episode presented two options for viewers to make narrative decisions, either through mobile phone text messaging, or voting on the show’s website;

<http://www.channel4.com/music/microsites/D/dubplatedrama/>

Each episode was transmitted on a Friday night, and repeated on Channel 4 and E4 over the weekend. The voting was closed on Wednesday, so the production team could film the winner solution to the dilemma presented to audiences. Audiences were kept up-to-date on the characters, with further plotlines and diachronic material being packaged, distributed and framed by mobile phone text messaging and the website. So this example, on a far smaller scale than *The Matrix*, is a near instantaneous deployment of a narrative over several media, also providing a participatory experience for the viewer to contribute to the plot. In short, *The Matrix* event, *Dubplate Drama* and the participation facilitated by the digital heteroglossia, will profoundly alter adaptation - as we have seen - and therefore offers a significant challenge to adaptation studies, specifically new medium-specific methodologies that attempt to break away from comparative positions.

Conclusion: The End of Adaptation.

Adaptation theorists such as George Bluestone (1957), Robert Richardson (1969), Geoffrey Wagner (1975) and Joy Gould Boyum (1985) have pointed out the similarities between literature and cinema:

“If we are to enjoy both forms to the full, we must see the similarities” (Wagner, 1975: 29).

These writers also acknowledged cinema’s impact on modern writing, and the system of mutual influence that exists between the two:

“Literary forms do not, by their very nature resist conversion to the screen; to the contrary, they often both invite and flourish from it – as does film from that conversion in turn” (Boyum, 1985: 242).

However, these writers, despite their protestations of pluralist intentions, still tended to view adaptation as a linear relationship between literature and cinema, a relationship, which for Bluestone (1957) and Richardson (1969) in particular, privileged the former over the latter. Indeed

Richardson was of the view that:

“Film is only an extension, but a magnificent one, of the older narrative arts” (ibid: 12).

Boyum had much praise for Orson Welles’ “major and unconventional” adaptation of Booth Tarkington’s “minor and conventional” novel, *The Magnificent Ambersons* in 1942, but only, it seems, because for her the film represents almost shot-for-shot fidelity:

“Welles has followed Tarkington’s plot, kept faith with his characterizations, and even repeated the novel’s sequence of events...there’s hardly a scene or even a line of dialogue in the film that doesn’t derive directly from the novel” (1985: 233-4).

These adaptation theorists were concerned with the relationship between literature and cinema, and were writing, broadly speaking in the ‘era of availability’ (Ellis, 2000). So, these views seem to suggest that adaptations are somehow second-hand mediated experiences, whereas reading a novel is experiencing a first-hand account. This is why authorship is fundamental to the understanding of adaptation as fidelity critics seem to want to strive for a faithfulness to an author’s *intention*. Adaptation therefore removes us further from the authorial voice. As Richardson argues, cinema ‘extends’ the distance between an adaptation and its source material.

In the ‘era of plenty’ a new generation of adaptation theorists adopted more medium specific approaches. Both McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002) focused on cinema and television respectively, and made a case for adaptation as a more generic mode. Whereas Boyum (1985) had recognised the problems of more plural approaches in the era of availability – a period marked by incompatibility between media – increasingly, I have argued, the distinctions between media were collapsing and becoming far more dialogic. In an attempt to move adaptation studies away from fidelity positions, McFarlane and Cardwell closed off the potential for viewing adaptation as heteroglossic, reflecting the increasingly heteroglossic nature of the mass media, as recognised by Stam (1989). Other writers such as Corrigan (1999), Sadlier (2000) and Naremore (2000) did acknowledge these changes to an extent, recognising that adaptation is increasingly dependent on an array of texts that span different media. In this thesis, I have attempted to broaden the types of texts taken into account when studying adaptations, and I have as Naremore suggests, tried to augment adaptation with positions of intertextuality and dialogics, facilitated by technological developments, for as even Boyum noted in the pre-digital era of availability:

“Movies themselves have changed and so have adaptations right along with them” (1985: 18).

The Future.

The Graf report’s signalling of ‘360°’ content, and its positioning of the BBC’s online provision as the corporation’s ‘third medium’ indicates that a brief period of remediation is over, and the digital heteroglossia is reorganising to contain an abundant plurality of unstable utterances, all dialogically linked, sharing the mutual symbolic exchange of content. In many ways, the BBC’s iMP project’s centring on the computer, and the online provision of televisual texts, will allow for the digital mechanical reproduction of television. Long forgotten texts will gain an ‘afterlife’ (Benjamin, 1999) and exist alongside other variants, as we have seen with *The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy* and *The Quatermass Experiment*. iMP will also accelerate the erosion of the schedule, as texts and their textual variants will act as ‘brands’ and supersede the channels that frame them. Indeed, DVD releases of television programmes have become increasingly popular over the last five years, and iMP will further entrench new ways of television reception.

iMP perhaps brings television closer to the digital democracy of the internet. The web now offers the chance for fans to adapt texts themselves, which are exhibited in a significant cultural arena. Increasingly, fans of texts are using new digital media to create their own, either in the form of straight adaptations, remakes or spin-offs. In short, the 'amateur culture' of the web is mirroring the exact processes of contemporary cultural production. Any visit to any fanfic website will show that comparative approaches to adaptation are still very much in evidence, in terms of the production of new texts, and their appraisal by the fan community. Indeed, some sites give fanfics a 'rating' – just as newspapers and magazines do with films – and even a BBFC classification, in an example of film censorship being appropriated for a primarily text based form. Cartmell suggests that:

“Once we allow screen-to-text adaptations (in addition to the more 'traditional' text-to-screen adaptation), then the door is open for a host of other forms” (1999: 144).

Technologies such as iMP will give audiences access to a range of texts, and devices such as TiVo and Sky+ will erode the power of the schedule and further fuel audiences' desire for further participation.

The adaptation of literary works into cinematic ones is as old as film itself. So in effect, we have had over a century of fidelity criticism. Many adaptation theorists have attempted to move adaptation studies away from comparative approaches, mainly fidelity positions, which has culminated in a range of new medium-specific methodologies, but here I have argued that useful as this work is, particularly that of McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002), it is too limiting as we move towards a more fluid relationship between media, and new texts that emerge from that relationship. Cardwell does examine the technology of television in her study, but does not take into account the relationship of television to cinema, and now the web – although she does recognise there is one.

Most adaptation theory has also argued that adaptation has always been undertaken by a new media, to appropriate the cultural cachet of the older, more mature medium. This does explain the fixation with 'classic' novels and texts, however, I have argued here that adaptation can be seen as part of the technological process of the improvement of a particular medium, as defined by Levinson (1999 and 2001).

'New' adaptations in the digital heteroglossia still depend on their 'source' texts to have cultural value, so that they can resonate with new versions, variants, remakes and adaptations. As I have argued, the very process of adaptation summons other texts back into life, and they are rewired by the new version and gain an 'afterlife' through, and because of, the adaptation pulling related and pre-existing texts back into play. This has always been the case, but now this process is far more instantaneous and overtly dialogical, and is reflected in the heteroglossic and hypermediate nature of adaptations in the digital heteroglossia.

The End of Temporality.

Adaptation is usually subject to a 'time-lag' between the creation of the source material and its transferral and subsequent exhibition on another media platform. This is in part due to cinema, and later television's, largely 'new-comer' status regarding literature. However, these time differences collapse in the digital heteroglossia, and increasingly the 'gaps' between the source and target texts will diminish, as adaptation focuses more on the contemporary novel, or the

simultaneous deployment of texts over media.

Novels are now being adapted *before* publication. This thesis began with Anthony Minghella's adaptation of *The English Patient*, and it ends with Minghella's adaptation of Liz Jensen's, *The Ninth Life of Louis Drax*, a novel that wasn't published until after Minghella completed production of his film, set for release sometime in 2006. So in terms of 'classic' adaptation, new printings and versions of the source are created. With contemporary adaptation, the process is similar, where related texts exist alongside each other, framed by different utterances in the digital heteroglossia. In another similar example, Jonathan Coe's 1995 novel, *What A Carve Up* – itself loosely based on the 1962 film directed by Pat Jackson – is to be the subject of a new filmed adaptation of both Coe's novel and the original film, effectively an adaptation that will frame two utterances at once.

The *Harry Potter* novels are still being written as previous novels are being adapted for cinema, a process that surely must affect the shape and content of Rowling's subsequent output. In terms of *Tomb Raider*, discussed in Part I, the films are made, while new videogames are produced. In a sense, it could be argued that cinema frames the games, or that the games frame cinema. Videogames, and their interactive capabilities, alter the scope of the transmedia event.

This offers the potential for collage texts and transmedia texts, such as those discussed in Part III. These transmedia events deploy texts instantaneously across the digital heteroglossia, based on temporary and mutually beneficial convergences.

One problem regarding temporality, is the sheer amount of media content now available on an seemingly increasing level of platforms. Both Eriksen (2001) and Ellis (2002) acknowledge this, the latter highlighting what he calls 'time-fatigue.' Ellis mounts a robust defense of traditional broadcast television from the threat of deregulation and a proliferation of digital television channels that define the 'era of plenty.' At first the sheer array of digital media can seem overwhelming, however, many of these channels come and go quite rapidly, flickering briefly in the digital spectrum. As I have argued, the digital heteroglossia will settle down and 'reshuffle' its constituent elements, as it will be texts, not channels, that will gain status and value, further facilitated by new domestic recording devices such as TiVo and Sky+.

As Levinson (1999 & 2001) argues, no one medium will be completely replaced, rather undergoing a continual process of renewal and improvement. I have demonstrated however, the digital heteroglossia's potential to alter form and content, a direct result of a more dialogic plurality. I have already discussed the UK magazine market, and the 'tabloidisation' of the UK newspaper market, in the context of dwindling readerships. It remains to be seen the impact new technologies such as iMP may have, however a precedent may have been set by websites such as www.myspace.com and www.youtube.com, now delivering music video and film/television clips alongside 'homemade' films, some of which are clearly a response to texts circulating in more mainstream media, similar to the way in which fanfic functions. Youtube even invites contributors to 'Broadcast Yourself!' These sites were in part blamed for the demise and eventual cancellation of the BBC's *Top of the Pops* programme in July 2006, after 42 years on air. These sites are just essentially a content management and delivery system, but do offer the potential for adaptation and perhaps could be the next logical step for fanfic writers. In the digital heteroglossia people will be in more control of their media, but this era will be text dominant, and the array of digital platforms

will act as a palette for people to engage with how they wish. Literature, cinema and television will continue to exist much as they have done, but they will be accessed in a variety of different ways, and joined by the web, videogames, fanfic and ultimately DIY adaptation.

Adaptation as Participation.

New media technologies have allowed for the growth and the expansion of influence of fan generated writing, DIY or 'amateur' culture and the increasingly adventurous advances of videogames. In this thesis I have tried to plot a lineage that draws upon Barthes (1977), Giddens (1997), Benjamin (1999) and Eriksen's (2001) assertion that texts have 'gaps' in them, and builds upon Jenkins (1992), Clerc (2001), Pullen (2000 and 2004) and Pugh's (2005) work that argues that more participatory experiences allow audiences and users to fill in those 'gaps' themselves. In terms of videogames based on pre-existing or co-existing material, these gaps are filled in a limited way, with subtle manipulation of diachronic material synchronically, however this will change as videogames – fast becoming a more significant form in the early 21st century – continue their technological 'improvement.'

So, in this sphere, adaptation is currently unusual in that it is adaptation without memory, as the process of reworking and reconfiguring source material, loses its permanence once gameplay has been suspended. Increasingly however, the ability to 'save' synchronic narratives constructed by the player is becoming ever more sophisticated. In addition, vast online games that can involve hundreds of players all over the world, offer the potential for more permanent synchronic narratives, that could in time result in more meaningful diachronic material being generated by players, which is exactly how fanfic evolved.

Fanfic, based on pre-existing or co-existing material, is a more permanent form. In a sense, online fanfic often outlasts the texts that it is based/adapted from, and can rewire other source material. As online archives become more prevalent, fanfic texts could possibly last for many decades, making them a particularly and durable cultural form. For Pugh (2005) fanfic began in 1899, with Sherlock Holmes fanfic being produced after Sir Arthur Conan Doyle killed his eponymous hero at the Reichenbach Falls in 1893, a strategy which resulted in the detective's hasty resurrection. For Jenkins (1995) fanfic began in 1920, with the amateur publication of science-fiction novels. However, both argue that it was the 1967 fanzine 'boom' of *Star Trek* which is the most important date. So, modern fanfic and videogames were born at the same time, and just like cinema, their duel approach to adaptation was originally one of fidelity, but has now matured into a more playful, and perhaps, more playfully *subversive* form.

New Adaptation.

A great deal of fanfic – and other content on the web – is deliberately and overtly subversive. That is essentially its *raison d'être*. But, subversion is dialectical and hegemonic, and several decades of participatory forms of adaptation have had a profound effect on the texts themselves. In the digital heteroglossia, adaptation is becoming akin to fanfic and videogames strategies, and what this study has observed and highlighted is the mainstreaming of this strategy, as adaptation moves

away from a binary translation from a source to a target text, and instead offers new interpretations, rewires pre-existing and co-existing content, and, perhaps more significantly, attempts to fill in the 'gaps' left by those texts, in turn creating more 'gaps' of their own.

Smallville functions just as a piece of fanfic would, and is a clear mainstreaming of this phenomenon. *Smallville* attempts to provide material to fill in the gaps left by other versions and variants, whilst at the same time rewiring its sources and framing a range of utterances. Similarly, *The Matrix* transmedia event of 2003 attempts to provide all the material at the same time, and to fill in all the gaps instantaneously across a range of different media. *Smallville* attempts this within the relatively stable utterance of television, as it networks the *Superman* canon, whilst *The Matrix* transmedia event creates an instant meta-text, and one which has a significant element of audience participation. In a sense, *The Matrix* is an attempt by the Wachowski brothers to provide an instant canon, similar to the one the many contributors to *Superman* took 70 years to produce.

So, adaptation is no longer the straight transferral from one media to another, or within one media; it is now a means whereby material is provided to fill in the 'gaps' left by the creators of popular, or significant, texts, and these new elements now serve to update and reconfigure, a process which rewires pre-existing and co-existing sources in dialogical parallel. New digital media has changed adaptation, possibly irreversibly, as adaptation is now the place where source materials meet new versions with the digital heteroglossia at its centre, in a constant and potentially limitless mode of revision and rewiring.

New Adaptation Studies.

At the beginning of this thesis I posed the deliberately provocative statement that the research presented here would signal the end of adaptation, or 'adaptation.' Of course, texts will always offer themselves up for adaptation, because as Benjamin (1990) rightly points out, all texts have something in them that is inherently adaptable. This structuralist approach echoes Lévi-Strauss' assertion that in mythology:

"The function of repetition is to render the structure of the myth apparent" (1963: 229).

So adaptation will of course continue, however in terms of 'classic' adaptation, it clearly moves in cycles and clusters are often created, with some authors' work being adapted at the same time, in different ways, as we have seen with Austen's novels in the 1980s and 1990s. The fidelity approach is mainly concerned with the adaptation of 'classic' novels, and most of these have now gone through their own cycle of 'classic' fidelity based adaptation, and are now perhaps moving into a sphere of re-visioning and intertextuality. New adaptations of classic texts will now not just be based on a 'supreme' source, but a range of sources, including other adaptations and versions, which are overtly and playfully referenced and later rewired. In the digital heteroglossia, fidelity based adaptations as a strategy for authenticity are declining, both as a critical discourse, and - because of McFarlane (1996), Corrigan (1999), Sadlier (2000), Naremore (2000) and Cardwell's (2002) studies - as an academic one. It is unlikely that an adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice* will ever be attempted again in for the UK for quite some time, if ever, as the BBC 1995, and the 2005 filmed versions will gain considerable longevity because of digital acquisition and exhibition platforms.

Instead, more postmodern and playful adaptations will continue to reference fidelity versions,

whilst attempting something new, and those fidelity versions will gain currency and an afterlife from this process. No doubt, the 2005 filmed version of *Pride & Prejudice* will lead to more Austen fanfic, particularly as that text offers two resolutions. Finally, the fidelity approach has no currency as a methodological or critical tool in the digital heteroglossia, although comparative positions will still apply, as audiences gain pleasure from making their own connections between texts, filling in 'the gaps' themselves, and discovering and re-discovering other versions elsewhere.

Medium specific approaches to adaptation are clearly unhelpful, as these positions limit the range of adaptation studies. Both McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell (2002) call for a severing of the connection between an adaptation and its source texts. Cardwell argues that:

“Just as adaptations have moved away from their source books, so too must the approach through which we consider them” (2002: 205).

Much contemporary adaptation theory attempts to delineate the differences between literary and visual forms, with Cardwell at pains to point out the differences between cinema and television. I would argue that these positions are limiting, and a study of adaptation, and the improving technology of adaptation and exhibition presented here, points towards much more fluidity between different media. Medium specific approaches to adaptation ignore dialogical links between different media, and new texts that are formed by these ever-closer relationships.

Looking at technology challenges the rejection of comparative approaches by contemporary adaptation theorists. As I have shown, audiences can gain pleasure from comparison, and can engage with texts by linking elements of narrative together themselves. This is especially popular with children, largely due to the *Harry Potter* and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* phenomena, and a new generation of digital media users will be comfortable with comparative approaches unfettered to notions of fidelity, and of an continuous re-visioning and rewiring of texts, in the digital heteroglossia, a process they can now, potentially, participate in. The whole point of adaptation in the digital heteroglossia is to fill 'gaps' left by previous creators, and these contributions can be extremely subversive. Therefore, similar to genres such as parody and satire, new adaptation rewires its source material for the purposes of comparison by audiences and, increasingly, contributors.

In terms of authorship, it seems that authors of previous variants or versions, are also summoned into being, alongside the newer versions; as we have seen with Siegel and Shuster's 'authorship' of *Smallville*. The 2005 comic book adaptation *Sin City* (Frank Miller & Robert Rodriguez) was even co-directed by the source text's writer (Miller), overtly positioning him as 'author' and using his cultural capital as the conceiver of the original comic books, similar to the way in which Irvine Welsh was positioned as 'author' of the *Trainspotting* adaptation, explored in Part I.

In this thesis, I have attempted to build upon McFarlane (1996) and Cardwell's (2002) work, and provide a methodology based on their ideas. Adaptation studies should clearly be non-medium specific, but text specific. There need to be new studies of texts generated by audiences of pre-existing and co-existing material, which can provide a model that contextualises adaptation as a mode of reception. This approach shows that comparative positions are still dominant, and to a certain extent the fidelity approach always plays a part in that, but this process is now far more playful, subversive and dialogic. New digital technologies provide these possibilities for re-readings and rewirings. As fanfic and videogaming become more popular, a generation of young

people will enter adulthood having a much more plural relationship to media, and therefore adaptation, as they have spent their childhoods filling in the 'gaps' of their favourite texts, and in time, mainstream adaptation in the digital heteroglossia will increasingly reflect that. In short, 'adaptation' needs to be rescued from much of 'adaptation studies' and should now be viewed as reception made bare, a position that is between exhibition and participation in the digital heteroglossia.

WORDS: 89, 800.

Bibliography.

ABERCROMBIE, N., 1996. *Television and Society*. London: Polity Press.

ADAIR, G., 1999. *Movies*. London: Penguin.

ADAMS, T., 1996. Books: Just say no. *The Observer*. 2 June.

——— 2000. Shooting From the Hip. *The Guardian*. 9 January.

AOUN, S., 2003. *Animatrix* – Review. *Metro Magazine*. June.

ARMES, R., 1988. *On Video*. London: Routledge.

ASTRUC, A., 1968. The Birth of a new Avant-garde: The Caméra-Stylo. In: Graham, P, ed, *The New Wave: Critical Landmarks*. London: Secker and Warburg.

ATKINS, B., 2003. *More than a Game: The Computer Game as Fictional Form*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

AUSLANDER, P., 1999. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*. London: Routledge.

AUSTIN, T & BARKER, M, eds., 2003. *Contemporary Hollywood Stardom*. London: Arnold.

BAKHTIN, M., 1994. Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel: A Plurality of Consciousnesses. In: Morris, P, ed, *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London: Arnold.

——— 1994a. The Dialogic Imagination. In: Morris, P, ed, *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London: Arnold.

BARTHES, R., 1974. *S/Z*. Oxford: Blackwell.

——— 1977. *Image Music Text*. London: Fontana Press.

BAUDRILLARD, J., 1995. *The Gulf War did not take place*. Sydney: Power Publications.

——— 2000. *Simulacra & Simulation*. Michigan: University of Michigan.

——— 2000a. *Fatal Strategies*. London: Pluto Press.

BAZIN, A., 1971. *What is Cinema?* (Vol II). California: University of California Press.

BELL, D & KENNEDY, B, eds., 2001. *The Cybercultures Reader*. London: Routledge.

BELL, D., 2001. *An Introduction to Cybercultures*. London: Routledge.

BELL, I., 1995. Literature: How Scotland got the write stuff. *The Observer*. 19 November.

BENJAMIN, W., 1999. *Illuminations*. London: Pimlico Press.

BLACK, S., 1997. Aims Without Frontiers. *Screen International*. 11 April.

BLUESTONE, G., 1957. *Novels into Film*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

BOLTER, J, D & GRUSIN, R., 2000. *Remediation*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.

BORDWELL, D & THOMPSON, K., 1994. *Film History: An Introduction*. London: McGraw Hill.

BORDWELL, D, STAIGER, J & THOMPSON, K., 1996. *The Classical Hollywood Cinema*. London: Routledge.

BOURDIEU, P., 1984. *Distinction*. London: Routledge.

BOYUM, J, G., 1985. *Double Exposure: Fiction into Film*. New York: Plume Books.

BROOKER, C., 2001. *TV Go Home*. London: Fourth Estate.

BROOKER, W., 1999. Batman: One life, many faces. In: Cartmell, D & Whelehan, I, eds,

- Adaptations: From text to screen, screen to text*. London: Routledge.
- BURNETT, R & MARSHALL, P., 2003. *Web Theory*. London: Routledge.
- BURNHAM, V., 2001. *A Visual History of the Videogame Age 1971-1984*. Massachusetts. MIT Press.
- CAMPBELL, J., 1988. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Palladin: London.
- CARDWELL, S., 2002. *Adaptation Revisited: Television and the Classic Novel*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- CARTMELL, D & WHELEHAN, I., 1999. *Adaptations: From text to screen, screen to text*. London: Routledge.
- CATTERALL, P, ed., 1998. *The Making of Channel 4*. London: Cassell.
- CAUGHIE, J., 2000. *Television Drama: Realism, Modernism and British Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CERUZZI, P., 1998. *A History of Modern Computing*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- CHEUNG, C (2000) A Home on the Web: Presentations of Self on Personal Homepages. In: Gauntlett, D, ed, *Web Studies*. London: Arnold.
- CLERC, S., 2001. Estrogen Brigades and 'Big Tits' threads: Media Fandom on-line and off. In: Bell, D & Kennedy, B, eds, *The Cybercultures Reader*. London: Routledge.
- COLLINS, R., 2002. *Media Identity and Contemporary Europe: Consequences of Global Convergence*. London: Intellect Books.
- COLLIS, C., 1996. Trainspotting – Review. *Select*, February.
- CORRIGAN, T., 1999. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. London: Prentice Hall.
- CRISELL, A., 2002. *An Introductory History of British Broadcasting*. London: Routledge.
- DANIELS, L., 2004. *Superman: The Complete History*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.
- DANILENKO, L., 1993. Television's Digital Future. In: Contamine, C, ed, *The Future of Television*. European Institute for the Media.
- DARLEY, A., 2000. *Visual Digital Culture*. London: Routledge.
- DAVENPORT, H., 1996. Get inspiration. Get a habit. Get a career. Join the smackerati. *The Guardian*. 1 July.

- DEBONA, G., 2000. Dickens, the Depression, and MGM's *David Copperfield*. In: Naremore, J, ed, *Film Adaptation*. London: The Athlone Press.
- DELANEY, S., 2004. Holy Moly! This new gossip website is juicier than Popbitch. *The Independent*. 29 November.
- DENTITH, S., 1995. *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY., 1998. *Regulating Communications: Approaching Convergence in the Digital Age* (Green Paper). July.
- DERRIDA, J., 1978. *Writing and Difference*. London: Routledge.
- DOVEY, J., 2000. *Freakshow: First Person Media and Factual Television*. London: Pluto Press.
- 2002. Notes Toward a Hypertextual Theory of Narrative. In: Rieser, M & Zapp, A, eds, *New Screen Media: Cinema/Art/Narrative*. London: BFI.
- DOWDY, A., 1975. *Films of the Fifties*. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- DOYLE, G., 2002. *Media Ownership*. London: Sage.
- DURING, S., 1999. *The Cultural Studies Reader* (2nd Ed). London: Routledge.
- DYER, R., 1998. *Stars*. London: BFI.
- ECO, U., 1998. *Faith in Fakes: Travels in Hyperreality*. London: Vintage.
- EISENSTEIN, S., 1999. Dickens, Griffith, and the Film Today. In: Corrigan, T, ed, *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. London: Prentice Hall.
- ELLIS, J., 1992. *Visible Fictions*. London: Routledge.
- 2000. *Seeing Things: Television in the Age of Uncertainty*. London: I. B Tauris.
- ERIKSEN, T., 2001. *Tyranny of the Moment: Fast and Slow Time in the Information Age*. London: Pluto Press.
- FISKE, J., 1992. The Cultural Economy of Fandom. In: L, A, Lewis, ed, *The Adoring Audience*. London: Routledge.
- FLANAGAN, M., 1999. Mobile Identities, Digital Stars and Post Cinematic Selves. *Wide Angle*. 21 (1).
- FLOYD, N., 2004. Lara Croft: Tomb Raider. In: Pym, J, ed, *Time Out Film Guide*. London: Penguin.

- FORREST, J & KOOS, L, R., 2002. Reviewing Remakes. In: Forrest J & Koos, L, R, eds, *Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice*. New York: State University New York Press.
- FORSTER, E, M., 2000. *Aspects of the Novel*. London: Penguin.
- FOUCAULT, M., 1991. What is an Author? In: Rabinow, ed, *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin.
- FRENCH, K., 2000. *Apocalypse Now*. London: Bloomsbury.
- FRENCH, P., 1997. Film of the week. *The Observer*. 16 March.
- 2006. DVD Club – No 29: P  p   le Moko. *The Guardian*. 23 July.
- FREUD, S., 1977. *On Sexuality*. London: Penguin.
- FUERY, P & FUERY, K., 2003. *Visual Cultures and Critical Theory*. London: Arnold.
- GAUNTLETT, D, ed., 2000. *Web Studies*. London: Edward Arnold.
- 2002. *Media, Gender & Identity*. London: Routledge.
- GAUNTLETT, D & HORSLEY, R, eds., 2004. *Web Studies* (2nd edition). London: Hodder Arnold.
- GERRARD, N., 1997. Bye-bye Baywatch. Hello Herodotus. *The Observer*. 22 June.
- GIDDENS, A., 1997. *The Consequences of Modernity*. London: Polity Press.
- GIDDINGS, R, SELBY, K & WENSLEY, C., 1990. *Screening the Novel*. London: MacMillan.
- GIDDINGS, R., 2000. *Pickwick Papers*: Beyond that Place and Time. In: Giddings, R & Sheen, E, eds, *The Classic Novel: From Page to Screen*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- GIDDINGS, R & SELBY, K., 2001. *The Classic Serial on Television and Radio*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- GLAISTER, D., 1997. Film revives a classic. *The Guardian*. 20 March.
- GLASS, C., 1996. Casualties of Amour. *Premier* (US), Vol 10, No 3, November.
- GOLDMAN, W., 1999. *Adventures in the Screen Trade: A Personal View of Hollywood*. London: Abacus.
- 2001. *Which Lie Did I Tell? More Adventures in the Screen Trade*. London: Bloomsbury.

- GRAF, P., 2004. *Independent report into BBC Online*. HMSO: Department for Media, Culture and Sport.
- GRAHAM, G., 2001. *The Internet: A Philosophical Inquiry*. London: Routledge.
- GREENSLADE, R., 2004. Why we went tabloid. *The Guardian*. 8 November.
- GRINDSTAFF, L., 2002. Pretty Woman with a Gun: La Femme Nikita and the Textual Politics of 'The Remake'. In: Forrest J & Koos, L, R, eds, *Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice*. New York: State University New York Press.
- GRIPSUD, J., 2002. *Understanding Media Culture*. London: Arnold.
- GRUNDY, G., 1996a. Chemical Brother. *Select*. January.
- 1996b. Couch Potato. *Select*. July.
- 1998. Hey! Hey! We're the Junkies! *Neon*. February.
- HALL, S., 1999. Encoding, Decoding. In: During, S, ed, *The Cultural Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- HANDEL, L, A., 1976. *Cinema Looks at its Audience*. New York: Ayers Co Publishers.
- HANSON, J., 1987. *Understanding Video: Applications, Impact and Theory*. London: Sage.
- HARCOURT, W., 2000. World Wide Women and the Web. In: Gauntlett, D, ed, *Web Studies*. London: Arnold.
- HARK, I, R., 1999. The Wrath of the Original Cast: Translating embodied television characters to other media. In: Cartmell, D & Whelehan, I, eds, *Adaptations: From text to screen, screen to text*. London: Routledge.
- HARRISON, I., 1996. Trainspotting – Soundtrack review. *Select*. February.
- HARVEY, D., 1994. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- HERRING, S., 1996. *Computer-mediated Communication : Linguistic, Social and Cross-cultural Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing.
- HERTZ, J, C., 1997. *Joystick Nation: How Videogames ate our quarters, won our hearts and rewired our minds*. Boston: Little Brown & Co.
- HILL, J & McLOONE, M., 1999. *Big Picture, Small Screen: The relations between film and television*. Luton: John Libby/University of Luton.

- HOCKLEY, L., 1996. Inter – Between: Actus – Done. *Convergence*. Vol 1 no 2.
- HODGE, J., 1996. *Trainspotting & Shallow Grave - Screenplays*. London: Faber & Faber.
- HOLQUIST, M., 2002. *Dialogism*. London: Routledge.
- HORTON, A, S & MAGRETTE, J., 1981. *Modern European Filmmakers and the Art of Adaptation*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- HUGHES, B., 2000. *Dust or Magic: Secrets of successful multimedia design*. London: Addison-Wesley.
- ISAACS, H, R., 1941. Citizen Kane And One-Man Pictures in General. *Theatre Arts*. June.
- ISAACS, B & TROUST, T, L., 2004. Story, Product, Franchise: Images of Postmodern Cinema. In: *Jacking into The Matrix Franchise: Cultural Reception and Interpretation*. Kapell, M & Doty, W, eds. New York: Continuum.
- IZOD, J., 1993. Words selling pictures. In: *Cinema and Fiction*. Orr J & Nicholson, S, eds. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- JACKSON, K, ed., 1995. *Schrader on Schrader*. London: Faber & Faber.
- JACOBS, J., 2000. *The Intimate Screen: Early British Television Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- JAGGIE, M., 1997. Books: Journey into Hollywood. *The Guardian*. 6 March.
- 1998. Speaking in Tongues. *The Guardian Weekend*. 18 July.
- JAMES, N., 1997. The English Patient – Review. *Sight and Sound*. March.
- JAMESON, F., 1992. *The Geopolitical Aesthetic*. London: BFI.
- 2000. Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. In: Hardt, M & Weeks, K, eds, *The Jameson Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- JENKINS, H., 1992. *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture*. London: Routledge.
- 1995. ‘Infinite Diversity in Infinite Combinations’: Genre and Authorship in *Star Trek*. In: Tulloch, J & Jenkins, H, eds, *Science Fiction Audiences: Watching Doctor Who and Star Trek*. London: Routledge.
- 2002. The Art of Contested Spaces. In: King, L, ed, *Game On: The History and Culture of Videogames*. New York: Universe Publishing.

- JOHNS, I., 2001. Rule of the Gamers. *The Times*. 4 June.
- JONES, P., 1997. Film revives a classic. *The Times*. 20 March.
- JORDAN, T., 1999. *Cyberpower*. London: Routledge.
- JUNG, C. J., 1990. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. London: Routledge.
- JURY, L., 2004. From the deep blue sea to the silver screen, BBC nature series rides a wave of success. *The Independent*. 10 February.
- KAPPELL, M., 2004. At the Edge of the World Again. In: Kapell, M & Doty, W, G, eds, *Jacking into The Matrix Franchise: Cultural Reception and Interpretation*. New York: Continuum.
- KAPPELL, M & DOTY, W, G., 2004. Appendix. In: Kapell, M & Doty, W, G, eds, *Jacking into The Matrix Franchise: Cultural Reception and Interpretation*. New York: Continuum.
- KEMP, P., 1996. Trainspotting – Review. In: *Sight and Sound*, February.
- KERMODE, M., 1997. *The Exorcist*. London: BFI.
- KING, G & KRZYWINSKA, T., 2002. *ScreenPlay: Cinema, Videogames, Interfaces*. London: Wallflower Press.
- KING, L, ed., 2002. *Game On: The History and Culture of Video Games*. New York: Universe.
- KLINE, T, J., 1992. *Screening the Text*. London: John Hopkins University Press.
- KLOPFENSTEIN, B., 2001. New Media: Learning from the Past to Guide the Future. *Convergence*. Vol 7. No 4.
- LANDOW, G, P., 2001. Hypertext as Collage-writing. In: Lunenfeld, P, ed, *The Digital Dialectic*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- LAUREL, B., 1999. *Computers as Theatre*. London: Addison Wesley.
- LAWSON, M., 2005. Credit where it isn't due. *The Guardian*. 17 September.
- LEAMING, B., 2004. *Orson Welles: A Biography*. New York: Limelight Editions.
- LE GRICE, M., 2001. *Experimental Cinema in the Digital Age*. London: BFI.
- LEITCH, T., 2002. Twice Told Tales: Disavowal and the Rhetoric of the Remake. In: Forrest J & Koos, L, R, eds, *Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice*. New York: State University New York Press.
- LESSIG, L., 2004. *Free Culture: The Nature and Future of Creativity*. London: Penguin.

——— 2005. Amateur Culture is set to explode.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/4685471.stm>. 18th July.

LEVINSON, P., 1999. *The Soft Edge*. London: Routledge.

——— 2001. *Digital McLuhan*. London: Routledge.

LÉVI-STRAUSS, C., 1963. *Structural Anthropology*. London: Penguin.

LISTER, M, DOVEY, J, GIDDINGS, S, GRANT, I & KELLY, K., 2003. *New Media: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge.

LUNENFELD, P, ed., 2001. *The Digital Dialectic*. Massachusetts. MIT Press.

MACNAB, G., 1996. Geoffrey MacNab talks to the team that made *Trainspotting*. *Sight & Sound*. Volume 6, Issue 2, February.

MAGILL, F, N., 1980. *The Novel into Film*. California: Salem Press.

MALCOLM, D., 1993. A Slice of Life. *The Guardian*. 17 June.

——— 1996. Just say yes (to the movie). *The Guardian*. 22 February.

MANOVICH, L., 2001. *The Language of New Media*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.

MARINETTI, F, T, CORRA, B, SETTIMELLI, E, GINNA, A, BALLA, G & CHITI., 2001. The Futurist Cinema. In: Packer, R & Jordan, K, eds, *Multimedia: From Wagner to Virtual Reality*. New York: W. W Norton & Company.

MATHEWS, T, D., 2005. *Censored: The Story of Film Censorship in Britain*. London: Chatto and Windus.

MAYNE, J., 1995. *Cinema and Spectatorship*. London: Routledge.

MAZDON, L., 2000. *Encore Hollywood: Remaking French Cinema*. London: BFI.

McBRIDE, J., 1998. *Steven Spielberg: A Biography*. London: Faber & Faber.

McLUHAN, M., 1998. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. : Massachusetts: MIT Press.

McCRUM, R., 1997. The week in reviews. *The Observer*. 9th March.

McFARLANE, B., 1996. *Novel into Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- McKAY, R., 1996. Would the real Irvine Welsh shoot up? *The Observer*. 4 February.
- McKEE, A., 2003. Fandom. In: Miller, T, ed, *Television Studies*. London: BFI.
- MESSUD, C., 1993. Paperback Digest. *The Guardian*, 31 July.
- METZ, C., 1999. The Imaginary Signifier. In: Braudy, L & Cohen, M, eds, *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MILLAR, J., 2002. Even if it's your own baby, you can't protect it. *The Guardian*. 19 April.
- MILLER, G., 1980. *Screening the Novel*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- MOLLOY, D., 1995. Scotland the brave. *The Observer*. 12 November.
- MOLYNEUX, S., 1999. Broadband Internet: Future Applications and Challenges. In: Vince, J & Earnshaw, R, eds, *Digital Convergence: The Information Revolution*. London: Springer.
- MORRIS, P, ed., 1994. *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London: Arnold.
- MORRISSETTE, B., 1985. *Novel and Film*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MORSON, G, S & EMERSON, C., 1989. *Rethinking Bakhtin: Extensions and Challenges*. Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- MURRAY, J, H., 1999. *Hamlet on the Holodeck*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- MURRAY, N., 2004. *Kafka*. London. Abacus.
- NAREMORE, J., 2000. Film and the Reign of Adaptation. In: Naremore, J, ed, *Film Adaptation*. London: The Athlone Press.
- NATHAN, I., 1997. English Patient – Review. *Empire*. April.
- NEALE, S., 2000. Questions of Genre. In: Stam, R & Miller, T, eds, *Film and Theory: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- ODDITT, S., 1999. Orlando: Coming across the divide. In: Cartmell, D & Whelehan, I, eds, *Adaptations: From text to screen, screen to text*. London: Routledge.
- ORR, J., 1993. Proust the movie. In: *Cinema & Fiction*, Orr, J & Nicholson, C, eds, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- 1993a. The Trial of Orson Welles. In: *Cinema & Fiction*, Orr, J & Nicholson, C, eds, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- O'TOOLE, L., 1998. Interview with Sam Neill. *Neon*. September.
- PACKER, R & JORDAN, K, eds., 2001. *Multimedia: From Wagner to Virtual Reality*. London: Norton.
- PAGET, D., 1999. Speaking Out: The Transformations of *Trainspotting*. In: Cartmell, D & Whelehan, I, eds, *Adaptations: From text to screen, screen to text*. London: Routledge.
- PEARCE, C., 2002. Story as Play Space: Narrative in Games. In: King, L, ed, *Game On: The History and Culture of Videogames*. New York: Universe Publishing.
- PERRY, A., 1996. Famous? *Select*, July.
- POOLE, S., 2000. *Trigger Happy: The Secret Life of Videogames*. London: Fourth Estate.
- POSTMAN, N., 1986. *Amusing Ourselves to Death : Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. London: Heinemann.
- PRICE-WATERHOUSE-COOPERS., 2004. *Global Entertainment and Media Outlook: 2005-2009*. London: Price-Waterhouse-Coopers.
- PUGH, S., 2005. *The Democratic Genre: Fan Fiction in a Literary Context*. Bridgend: Seren Books.
- PULLEN, K., 2000. I-Love-Xena.com: Creating Online Fan Communities. In: Gauntlett, D, ed *Web Studies*. London: Arnold.
- 2004. Everybody's Gotta Love Somebody, Sometime: Online Fan Community. In: Gauntlett, D & Horsley, R, eds, *Web Studies* (2nd edition). London: Arnold.
- REES, A. L., 2003. *A History of Experimental Film and Video*. London: BFI.
- REHAK, B., 2003. Playing at Being: Psychoanalysis and the Avatar. In: *The Video Game Theory Reader*, Wolf, M, J, P & Perron, B, eds. London: Routledge.
- REISER, M & ZAPP, A, eds., 2002. *New Screen Media: Cinema/Art/Narrative*. London: BFI.
- REYNOLDS, P, ed., 1993. *Novel Images: Literature in Performance*. London: Routledge.
- RICHARDSON, R., 1969. *Literature and Film*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- RITCHIE, H., 1995. Rank bad writing is not sine qua non for success. *The Observer*. 3 September.
- ROBERTS, R., 1993. Pinter irate as BBC upstages his Trial. *The Times*, 18 June.

- ROJEK, C., 2001. *Celebrity*. London: Reaktion Books.
- ROMNEY, J., 1995. Round up the usual suspects. *The Guardian*. 29 September.
- 1996. Arts: Prophets of Doom. *The Guardian*. 17 September.
- ROTHWELL, K, S., 2000. *A History of Shakespeare on Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ROUSE, R., 2001. *Game Design, Theory and Practice*. Texas: Worldwide Publishing Inc.
- RUNDLE, L., 1997. From Novel to Film – The English Patient Distorted. *Borderlines*. No 43, April.
- RUSBRIDGER, A., 1997. Classic? He saw the movie. *The Guardian*, 23 March.
- RUSH, M., 1999. *New Media in Late 20th Century Art*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- RUSHDIE, S., 1992. *The Wizard of Oz*. London: BFI.
- SADLIER, D, J., 2000. The Politics of Adaptation: *How Tasty was my Little Frenchman*. In: Naremore, J, ed, *Film Adaptation*. London: The Athlone Press.
- SALFELLNER, H., 2003. *Franz Kafka and Prague*. Prague: Vitalis.
- SAMMON, P, M., 1996. *Future Noir: The Making of Blade Runner*. London: Orion Media.
- SARRIS, A., 1999. Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962. In: Braudy, L & Cohen, M, eds, *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCANNELL, P., 2000. Public Service Broadcasting: The History of a Concept. In: Buscombe, B, ed, *British Television: A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCHOLDER, A & ZIMMERMAN, E., 2003. *Replay: Game Design and Game Culture*. New York: Peter Lang.
- SEITER, E., 1999. *Television and New Media Audiences*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 2003. New Technologies. In: Miller, T, ed, *Television Studies*. London: BFI.
- SELF, W., 1996. Carry on up the hypodermic. *The Observer*. 11 February.
- SIAPERA, E., 2004. From Couch Potatoes to Cybernauts? The expanding notion of the audience on TV channels' websites. *New Media and Society*. April.
- SLEVIN, J., 2000. *The Internet & Society*. London: Polity Press.

SMITH, J & MATTHEWS, J, C., 2004. *The Lord of the Rings: The Films, The Books, The Radio Series*. London: Virgin Books.

SNYDER, I, ed., 1998. *Page to Screen: Taking Literacy into the Electronic Era*. London: Routledge.

SPENDER, D., 1995. *Nattering on the Net: Women, Power and Cyberspace*. Melbourne: Spinifex.

SPILLER, N, ed., 2002. *Cyber Reader: Critical writings doe the digital era*. London: Phaidon Press.

STAM, R., 1989. *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism and Film*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

——— 2000. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

——— 2004. *Literature through Film: Realism, Magic and the Art of Adaptation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

STAM, R & RAENGO, A, eds., 2004. *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

THOMAS, B., 2000. 'Piecing Together a Mirage': Adapting *The English Patient* for the Screen. In: Giddings, R & Sheen, E, eds, *The Classic Novel: From Page to Screen*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

THOMAS, R., 1999. Dash it all – no more dots and dashes. *The Guardian*. 31 January.

THOMPSON, D., 1996. *Rosebud: The Story of Orson Welles*. London: Abacus.

THOMPSON, D & CHRISTIE, I, eds., 1996. *Scorsese on Scorsese*. London: Faber & Faber.

THOMPSON, J, O., 1996. Vanishing Worlds: Film Adaptation and the mystery of the original. In: *Pulping Fictions: Consuming culture across the literature/media divide*, Cartmell, D, Hunter, I, Q, Kaye, H & Whelehan, I, eds. London: Pluto Press.

TODOROV, T., 1984. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

TONKIN, B., 1995. A wee Hades. *The Observer*. 23 April.

TOOKEY, C., 1996. Trainspotting – Review. *The Daily Mail*. 23 February.

TREND, D, ed., 2001. *Reading Digital Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- TRUFFAUT, F., 1976. A certain tendency of the French Cinema. In: Nichols, B, ed, *Movies and Methods – Volume 1*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- TULLOCH, J & JENKINS, H., 1995. Beyond the *Star Trek* Phenomenon: Reconceptualizing the Science Fiction Audience. In: Tulloch, J & Jenkins, H, eds, *Science Fiction Audiences: Watching Doctor Who and Star Trek*. London: Routledge.
- TULLOCH, J., 1995. Positioning the SF Audience; *Star Trek*, *Doctor Who* and the Texts of Science Fiction. In: Tulloch, J & Jenkins, H, eds, *Science Fiction Audiences: Watching Doctor Who and Star Trek*. London: Routledge.
- 1995a. ‘But He’s a Timelord! He’s a Timelord!’ Reading Formations, Followers and Fans. In: Tulloch, J & Jenkins, H, eds, *Science Fiction Audiences: Watching Doctor Who and Star Trek*. London: Routledge.
- TWIST, J., 2005. What high definition will do to DVDs.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/technology/4210551.stm>. 31 Jan.
- VEITCH, J., 2002. *Popbitch – a Case Study*.
http://www.rathergood.com/ma/web_files/site_contents/essays/popbitch.htm
- VOGLER, J., 1996. *The Writer’s Journey: Mythic Structure for Storytellers and Screenwriters*. London: Boxtree.
- WAGNER, G., 1975. *The Novel and the Cinema*. New Jersey: Associated University Press.
- WATERS, D., 2005. Digital Citizens: The Filmmaker.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/4100284.stm>. 18 July.
- WELSH, I., 1997. City Tripper. *The Guardian*. 16 February.
- WHELEHAN, I & CARTMELL, D., 1996. Introduction. In: Cartmell, D, Hunter, I, Q, Kaye, H & Whelehan, I, eds. *Pulping Fictions: Consuming culture across the literature/media divide*. London: Pluto Press.
- WHELEHAN, I., 1999. Introduction to Part III. In: Cartmell, D & Whelehan, I, eds. *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. London: Routledge.
- WHITE, L., 1996. Ugly picture of heroes and heroin. *The Sunday Times*. 25 February.
- WHITTAKER, J., 2002. *Web Production for Writers and Journalists*. London: Routledge.
- WILKES, N., 2005. Freeview tipped to top Sky at shutdown.
<http://www.digitalspy.co.uk/article/ds22318.html>. 24 July.
- WILLIAMS, R., 1992. *Television, Technology and Cultural Form*. London: Routledge.

WINSTON, B., 2000. *Media Technology and Society*. London: Routledge.

WOLF, M, J, P, PERRON, B & WINTER, D., 2003. Home Video Game Systems: The First Thirty Years (1972-2001). In: Wolf, M, J P & Perron, B, eds. *The Video Game Theory Reader*. London: Routledge.

WOOLF, V., 1994. The Cinema. In: McNeillie, A, ed. *The Essays of Virginia Woolf – Volume IV: 1924-1928*. London: Hogarth.

WOLLEN, P., 1999. The Auteur Theory. In: Braudy, L & Cohen, M, eds. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WOODS, T., 1999. *Beginning Postmodernism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

YOUNG, E., 1993. Blood on the tracks. *The Guardian*. 14 August.

Novels, Novelisations & Screenplays.

AMIS, M., 1985. *Money*. London: Penguin.

——— 1989. *London Fields*. London: Penguin.

BULGAKOV, M., 1966. *The Master and Margarita*. London: Picador.

ECO, U., 2001. *Foucault's Pendulum*. London: Vintage.

FOWLES, J., 1969. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. London: Jonathan Cape.

——— 1977. *The Magus*. London: Vintage.

GARDNER, C, S., 1989. *Batman*. London: Futura.

GIBSON, W., 1984. *Neuromancer*. London: Voyager.

GOLDMAN, W., 1999. *The Princess Bride*. London: Bloomsbury.

HODGE, J., 1996. *Trainspotting & Shallow Grave - Screenplays*. London: Faber & Faber.

KAFKA, K., 1993. *America*. London: Minerva.

——— 1993a. *The Castle*. London: Minerva.

——— 1993b. *The Trial*. London: Minerva.

——— 1994. *Metamorphosis & Other Stories*. London: Minerva.

MILNE, L., 1984. *Ghostbusters*. London: Coronet.

MILLER, F., 1986. *The Dark Knight Returns*. New York: D.C Comics.

MINGHELLA, A., 1997. *The English Patient – Screenplay*. London: Methuen.

ONDAATJE, M., 1993. *The English Patient*. London: Picador. London.

——— 1996. *The English Patient*. London: Picador. London.

ORWELL, G., 1950. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin.

PEELEVIN, V., 2000. *Babylon*. London: Faber & Faber.

PINTER, H., 1993. *The Trial*. London: Faber & Faber.

ROBINSON, B., 1989. *Withnail & I*. London: Bloomsbury.

SHAKESPEARE, W., 1996. *Hamlet*. London: Penguin.

WELSH, I., 1994. *Trainspotting*. London: Minerva.

——— 1996. *Trainspotting*. London: Minerva.

——— 1995. *Marabou Stork Nightmares*. London: Jonathan Cape.

——— 1995. *The Acid House*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Filmography.

The Addams Family. 1991. Barry Sonnenfeld.

About a Boy. 2002. Chris Weitz & Paul Weitz.

The Acid House. 1998. Paul McGuigan.

Algiers. 1938. John Cromwell.

The Animatrix. 2003. Peter Chung, Andy Jones, Yoshiaki Kawajiri, Takeshi Koike, Mahiro Maeda, Kôji Morimoto & Shinichirô Watanabe.

Anna Karenina. 1935. Clarence Brown.

Anna Karenina. 1947. Julien Duvivier.

Anna Karenina. 1997. Bernard Rose.

Apocalypse Now. 1979. Francis Ford Coppola.

AVP: Alien Vs. Predator. 2004. Paul W. S. Anderson.

Back to the Future. 1985. Robert Zemeckis.

Back to the Future Part II. 1989. Robert Zemeckis.

Back to the Future Part III. 1990. Robert Zemeckis.

Batman. 1989. Tim Burton.

Batman Returns. 1992. Tim Burton.

Batman Forever. 1995. Joel Schumacher.

Batman and Robin. 1997. Joel Schumacher.

Batman Begins. 2005. Christopher Nolan.

The Birth of a Nation. 1915. D. W. Griffith.

Blade Runner. 1982. Ridley Scott.

Bonfire of the Vanities. 1990. Brian De Palma.

À Bout de Souffle. 1960. Jean-Luc Godard.

Brazil. 1985. Terry Gilliam.

Breathless. 1983. Jim McBride.

Bridget Jones's Diary. 2001. Sharon Maguire.

Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason. 2004. Beeban Kidron.

Bubble. 2005. Steven Soderbergh.

Buffy the Vampire Slayer. 1992. Fran Rubel Kuzui.

Cape Fear. 1962. J. Lee Thompson.

Cape Fear. 1991. Martin Scorsese.

Casbah. 1948. John Berry.

Charlie's Angels. 2000. McG.

Chimes at Midnight. 1965. Orson Welles.

Citizen Kane. 1941. Orson Welles.

City of God. 2002. Fernando Meirelles & Kátia Lund.

Clue. 1985. Jonathan Lynn.

Le Dernier Tourant. 1939. Pierre Chenal.

Doctor No. 1962. Terence Young.

Doctor Zhivago. 1965. David Lean.

Don't Look Now. 1973. Nicholas Roeg.

Emma. 1996. Douglas McGrath.

The English Patient. 1996. Anthony Minghella.

The Exorcist. 1973. William Friedkin.

Exorcist III. 1990. William Peter Blatty.

Exorcist: The Beginning. 2004. Renny Harlin.

Dominion: Prequel to The Exorcist. 2005. Paul Schrader.

Franz Kafka's It's a Wonderful Life. 1993. Peter Capaldi.

The French Lieutenant's Woman. 1981. Karel Reisz.

Ghostbusters. 1984. Ivan Reitman.

Great Expectations. 1945. David Lean.
Great Expectations. 1998. Alfonso Cuarón.
The Great Train Robbery. 1903. Edwin Porter.
Hamlet. 1948. Laurence Olivier.
Hamlet. 1996. Kenneth Branagh.
Hamlet. 2000. Michael Almereyda.
Henry V. 1944. Laurence Olivier.
Henry V. 1989. Kenneth Branagh.
The Horse Whisperer. 1998. Robert Redford.
The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy. 2005. Garth Jennings.
Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom. 1984. Steven Spielberg.
Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade. 1989. Steven Spielberg.
Jackass: The Movie. 2002. Jeff Tremaine.
Jane Eyre. 1944. Robert Stevenson.
Jane Eyre. 1970. Delbert Mann.
Jane Eyre. 1995. Franco Zeffirelli.
Kafka. 1991. Steven Soderbergh.
King Solomon's Mines. 1937. Robert Stevenson.
King Solomon's Mines. 1950. Compton Bennett & Andrew Marton.
King Solomon's Mines. 1985. J. Lee Thompson.
King Solomon's Treasure. 1978. Alvin Rakoff.
Lara Croft: Tomb Raider. 2001. Simon West.
Lara Croft Tomb Raider: Cradle of Life. 2003. Jan de Bont.
Lawrence of Arabia. 1962. David Lean.
The League of Gentlemen. 1959. Basil Dearden.
The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen. 2003. Stephen Norrington.
The Life of the American Fireman. 1903. Edwin Porter.
Looking for Richard. 1996. Al Pacino.
The Lord of the Rings. 1978. Ralph Bakshi.
The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring. 2001. Peter Jackson.
The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers. 2002. Peter Jackson.
The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King. 2003. Peter Jackson.
Madame Bovary. 1933. Jean Renoir.
Madame Bovary. 1991. Claude Chabrol.
The Magnificent Ambersons. 1942. Orson Welles.
The Madness of King George. 1994. Nicholas Hytner.
The Man Who Knew Too Much. 1956. Alfred Hitchcock.
The Matrix. 1999. Andy Wachowski & Larry Wachowski.
The Matrix Reloaded. 2003. Andy Wachowski & Larry Wachowski.
The Matrix Revolutions. 2003. Andy Wachowski & Larry Wachowski.
1984. 1956. Michael Anderson.
Nineteen Eighty-Four. 1984. Michael Radford.
Pépé le Moko. 1937. Julien Duvivier.
The Piano. 1993. Jane Campion.
Pirates of the Caribbean: The Curse of the Black Pearl. 2003. Gore Verbinski.
Pirates of the Caribbean: Dead Man's Chest. 2006. Gore Verbinski.

The Postman Always Rings Twice. 1946. Tay Garnett.
The Postman Always Rings Twice. 1981. Bob Rafelson.
Pride and Prejudice. 1940. Robert Z. Leonard.
Pride and Prejudice. 2005. Joe Wright.
The Princess Bride. 1987. Rob Reiner.
Raiders of the Lost Ark. 1981. Steven Spielberg.
Rebel Without a Cause. 1965. Nicholas Ray.
Richard III. 1955. Laurence Olivier.
Richard III. 1995. Richard Loncraine.
Robocop. 1987. Paul Verhoeven.
Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead. 1990. Tom Stoppard.
The Searchers. 1956. John Ford.
Sense and Sensibility. 1995. Ang Lee.
The Shining. 1980. Stanley Kubrick.
Starship Troopers. 1997. Paul Verhoeven.
Star Wars: Episode IV – A New Hope. 1977. George Lucas.
Star Wars: Episode V – The Empire Strikes Back. 1980. Irvin Kershner.
Star Wars: Episode VI – The Return of the Jedi. 1983. Richard Marquand.
Star Wars: Episode I – The Phantom Menace. 1999. George Lucas.
Star Wars: Episode II – The Attack of the Clones. 2002. George Lucas.
Star Wars: Episode III – The Revenge of the Sith. 2005. George Lucas.
Supergirl. 1984. Jeannot Szwarc.
Superman. 1978. Richard Donner.
Superman II. 1980. Richard Lester.
Superman III. 1983. Richard Lester.
Superman IV: The Quest for Peace. 1987. Sidney J. Furie.
Superman Returns. 2006. Bryan Singer.
Super Mario Bros. 1993. Annabel Jankel & Rocky Morton.
2001: A Space Odyssey. 1968. Stanley Kubrick.
2010. 1984. Peter Hyams.
Taxi Driver. 1976. Martin Scorsese.
Tender Loving Care. 1997. Rob Landeros & David Wheeler.
The Three Musketeers. 1973. Richard Lester.
The Return of the Three Musketeers. 1974. Richard Lester.
Timecode. 2000. Mike Figgis.
Trainspotting. 1996. Danny Boyle.
Totó le Mokó. 1949. Carlo Ludovico Bragaglia.
The Trial. 1962. Orson Welles.
The Trial. 1993. David Hugh Jones.
The Wicker Man. 1973. Robin Hardy.
The Witchfinder General. 1968. Michael Reeves.
Withnail & I. 1986. Bruce Robinson.
Wuthering Heights. 1939. William Wyler.
Wuthering Heights. 1992. Peter Kosminsky.
Young Sherlock Holmes. 1985. Barry Levinson.
The Wizard of Oz. 1939. Victor Fleming.

Videogames.

Alien vs. Predator. 1994. Activision.
Donkey Kong. 1981. Nintendo.
Enter the Matrix. 2003. Atari.
Golden Eye 007. 1997. Nintendo.
Lara Croft Tomb Raider: The Angel of Darkness. 2003. Eidos.
Lara Croft: Tomb Raider. 2005. Eidos.
Lara Croft Tomb Raider: Legend. 2005. Eidos.
The Lord of the Rings: The Battle for Middle Earth. 2004. EA Games.
The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring. 2002. EA Games.
The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King. 2003. EA Games.
The Lord of the Rings: The Third Age. 2004. EA Games.
The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers. 2002. EA Games.
The Matrix. 2005. Atari.
The Matrix Online. 2004. Sega.
The Matrix Reloaded. 2006. Atari.
Medal of Honour: Frontline. 2002. EA Games.
Pac-Man. 1981. Atari.
Resident Evil. 2002. Capcom.
Robocop Vs. Terminator. 1993. Virgin.
Saving Private Ryan. 1998. Steven Spielberg.
Sonic the Hedgehog. 1991. Sega.
Space Invaders. 1977. Taito.
Star Wars. 1992. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Battlefront. 2004. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Battlefront II. 2005. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Bounty Hunter. 2002. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Clone Wars. 2002. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Demolition. 2000. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Empire at War. 2005. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars Episode II: Attack of the Clones. 2002. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars Episode III: The Revenge of the Sith. 2005. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Galactic Battlegrounds. 2001. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: The New Droid Army. 2002. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Knights of the Old Republic. 2003. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Rebel Assault. 1994. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Rogue Leader. 1998. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: Star Fighter. 2001. Lucas Arts.
Star Wars: X-Wing. 1993. Lucas Arts.
Super Mario Brothers. 1985. Nintendo.
Tomb Raider. 1996. Eidos.
Tomb Raider II. 1997. Eidos.
Tomb Raider III: The Adventures of Lara Croft. 1998. Eidos.
Tomb Raider: Chronicles. 2000. Eidos.
Tomb Raider: The Cradle of Life. 2005. Eidos.

Tomb Raider: Gold. 1998. Eidos.
Tomb Raider: Legend. 2005. Eidos.

Television Series.

1984. 1954. Rudolph Cartier.
Attachments. 2000-2002. World Productions.
Battlestar Galactica. 1978-1979. Universal.
Battlestar Galactica. 2003 - . Sci-Fi Channel.
Casualty. 1986 - . BBC Television.
Charlie Brooker's Screen Wipe. 2006 - . Zeppotron.
City of Men. 2002-2005. Palm Pictures.
Dubplate Drama. 2005. Red Mullet.
The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy. 1981. BBC Television.
Holby City. 1999 – BBC Television.
The League of Gentlemen. 1999-2002. BBC Television.
Lois and Clark. 1993-1997. Warner Bros Television.
Mansfield Park. 1986. BBC Television.
Master i Margarita. 2005. VGTRK.
Nathan Barley. 2005. Zeppotron.
Pride & Prejudice. 1980. BBC Television.
Pride and Prejudice. 1995. BBC Television.
The Quatermass Experiment. 2005. BBC Television.
Sense and Sensibility. 1986. BBC Television.
Smallville. 2001 - . Warner Bros Television.
Spaced. 1999-2001. Paramount.
24. 2001 - . 20th Century Fox.

TV Go Home. 2001. Zeppotron.

Websites.

www.bbc.co.uk/celebdaq - The BBC's 'celebrity trading' website.
www.bbc.co.uk/collective - The BBC's entertainment and review website.
www.bbc.co.uk/doctorwho - The official *Doctor Who* website.
www.bbc.co.uk/dna/h2g2 - The *Hitchhiker's Guide* web-forum.
www.fanfiction.net - A forum for fanfic writers and readers.
www.gawker.com - US celebrity gossip website.
www.harrypotterfanfic.com - Large depository of Harry Potter fanfic.
www.holymoly.co.uk - Acerbic UK celebrity gossip website.
www.lcfanfic.com - Fanfic devoted to the *Lois and Clark* TV series.
www.imdb.com - The Internet Movie Database.
www.myspace.com - Personalised webpages, blogs and forums.
www.pemberley.com - Jane Austen fan website, including Jane Austen fanfic.
www.popbitch.com - UK celebrity gossip website.
www.seethru.co.uk - Website accompanying the BBC TV series *Attachments*.
www.thesmokinggun.com - US legal news website.
www.thesun.co.uk - *The Sun* newspaper online.
www.sugarape.co.uk - Website accompanying the CH4 TV series *Nathan Barley*.
www.throneout.com - UK anti-monarchy website.
www.trashbat.co.uk - Website accompanying the CH4 TV series *Nathan Barley*.
www.tvgohome.co.uk - Charlie Brooker's spoof TV listings.
www.whatisthematrix.warnerbros.com - Official *Matrix* website.
www.youtube.com - despository of film clips, music videos and 'homemade' films.

Appendix A – *Trainspotting* Paperback sales.

Figure 1: Top Ten UK Paperbacks. December 1995.

1. Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow – Peter Hoeg. (Flamingo £5.99).[12]

2. The Chamber – John Grisham. (Arrow £5.99).[13]
 3. Trainspotting – Irvine Welsh. Minerva (£6.99).
 4. Birdsong – Sebastian Faulks. (Vintage £5.99).
 5. Soul Music – Terry Pratchett (Corgi £4.99).[14]
 6. Writing Home – Alan Bennett. (Faber £6.99).
 7. Snow Falling on Cedars – David Guterson. (Bloomsbury £5.99).[15]
 8. The Body Farm – Patricia Cornwell. (Warner £5.99).
 9. The Glass Lake – Maeve Binchy. (Orion £5.99).
 10. The Shipping News – E. Annie Proulx. (4th Estate £5.99).[16]
- Source: The Bookseller. January 1996.

Figure 2: Top Ten UK Paperbacks. March 1996..

1. Sophie's World – Jostein Gaarder. (Orion £6.99).[17]
 2. Behind the Scenes at the Museum – Kate Atkinson. (Black Swan £5.99).
 3. Trainspotting (film tie-in) – Irvine Welsh. Minerva (£6.99).
 4. Heart Songs – E. Annie Proulx. (Fourth Estate £5.99).
 5. Original Sin – P. D James. (Penguin £5.99).[18]
 6. Trainspotting (original) – Irvine Welsh. Minerva (£6.99).
 7. Our Game – John Le Carre. (Hodder £5.99).
 8. Sense and Sensibility – Jane Austen. (Penguin £1.99).[19]
 9. Marabou Stork Nightmares – Irvine Welsh. (Vintage £5.99).
 10. Soul Music – Terry Pratchett (Corgi £4.99).
- Source: The Bookseller. April 1996.

Appendix B – *The English Patient* Paperback sales.

Figure 3: Top Ten Paperbacks. 13th March 1997.

11. The Upstart – Catherine Cookson. (Corgi £5.99).
12. Last Orders – Graham Swift (Picador £7.99).[20]
13. The Little Book of Calm – Paul Wilson. (Penguin £1.99).
14. High Fidelity – Nick Hornby. (Indigo £5.99).[21]
15. Gardens of England and Wales: 1997 (National Gardens £3.50).
16. Notes from a Small Island – Bill Bryson. (Black Swan £6.99).[22]
17. The English Patient (film tie-in) – Michael Ondaatje. (Picador £6.99).
18. Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus – John Gray. (Thorsons £8.99).[23]
19. The English Patient (original) – Michael Ondaatje. (Picador £6.99).
20. Sophie's World – Jostein Gaarder. (Orion £6.99).[24]

Source: The Observer.

Figure 4: Top Ten UK Paperbacks 27th March 1997.

1. The English Patient (film tie-in) – Michael Ondaatje. (Picador £6.99).
2. Last Orders – Graham Swift (Picador £7.99).
3. High Fidelity – Nick Hornby. (Indigo £5.99).
4. The English Patient (original) – Michael Ondaatje. (Picador £6.99).
5. The Little Book of Calm – Paul Wilson. (Penguin £1.99).
6. Crown of Swords – Robert Jordan. (Orbit £6.99).
7. Appassionata – Jilly Cooper. (Corgi £6.99).
8. Gardens of England and Wales: 1997 (National Gardens £3.50).
9. Sophie's World – Jostein Gaarder. (Orion £6.99).
10. Notes from a Small Island – Bill Bryson. (Black Swan £6.99).

Source: The Guardian.

Figure 5: Top Ten UK Paperbacks. 10th April 1997.

1. Appassionata – Jilly Cooper. (Corgi £6.99).
2. The Runaway Jury – John Grisham. (Arrow £5.99).[25]
3. The English Patient (film tie-in) – Michael Ondaatje. (Picador £6.99).
4. The English Patient (original) – Michael Ondaatje. (Picador £6.99).
5. The Little Book of Calm – Paul Wilson. (Penguin £1.99).
6. Tales from Herodotus – Herodotus. (Penguin £1.99).
7. High Fidelity – Nick Hornby. (Indigo £5.99).
8. Last Orders – Graham Swift (Picador £7.99).
9. Fever Pitch – Nick Hornby. (Indigo £5.99).[26]
10. Notes from a Small Island – Bill Bryson. (Black Swan £6.99).

Source: The Guardian.

Appendix C: Time Warner Companies.

Time Warner Book Group:

Warner Books
The Mysterious Press
Warner Vision
Warner Business Books
Aspect

Warner Faith
Warner Treasures
TW Kids

Little, Brown and Company
Little, Brown Adult Trade
Little, Brown Books for Young Readers
Back Bay
Bulfinch Press
Time Warner Book Group UK
Time Warner Audio Books
Time Inc.

Southern Progress Corporation
Sunset Books
Oxmoor House
Leisure Arts

Time Warner – Cable:

HBO
CNN
CNN International
CNN en Espanol
CNN Headline News
CNN Airport Network
CNN fn
CNN Radio
CNN Interactive
Court TV (with Liberty Media)
Time Warner Cable
Road Runner
New York 1 News (24 hour news channel devoted only to NYC)
Kablevision (53.75% - cable television in Hungary)

Pay per view:
Metro Sports (Kansas City)
Time Warner Inc. - Film & TV

Production/Distribution:

Warner Bros.

Warner Bros. Studios

Warner Bros. Television (production)

The WB Television Network

Warner Bros. Television Animation

Hanna - Barbera Cartoons

Telepictures Production

Witt - Thomas Productions

Castle Rock Entertainment

Warner Home Video

Warner Bros. Domestic Pay - TV

Warner Bros. Domestic Television Distribution

Warner Bros. International Television Distribution

The Warner Channel (Latin America, Asia - Pacific, Australia, Germ.)

Warner Bros. International Theaters (owns/operates multiplex theaters in over 12 countries)

Time Warner Inc. – Magazines:

Time

Time Asia

Time Atlantic

Time Canada

Time Latin America

Time South Pacific

Time Money

Time For Kids

Fortune

All You

Business 2.0

Life

Sports Illustrated

Sports Illustrated International

SI for Kids

Inside Stuff

Money

Your Company

Your Future

People

Who Weekly (Australian edition)

People en Español

Teen People

Entertainment Weekly

EW Metro

The Ticket

In Style

Southern Living
Progressive Farmer
Southern Accents
Cooking Light

The Parent Group
Parenting
Baby Talk
Baby on the Way

This Old House
Sunset
Sunset Garden Guide

The Health Publishing Group
Health
Hippocrates
Coastal Living
Weight Watchers

Real Simple
Asiaweek (Asian news weekly)
President (Japanese business monthly)
Dancyu (Japanese cooking)
Wallpaper (U.K.)
Field & Stream
Freeze
Golf Magazine
Outdoor Life

Sports:
Popular Science
Salt Water Sportsman
Ski
Skiing Magazine
Skiing Trade News
SNAP
Snowboard Life
Ride BMX
Today's Homeowner
TransWorld Skateboarding
TransWorld Snowboarding
Verge
Yachting Magazine
Warp

American Express Publishing Corporation (partial ownership/management)
Travel & Leisure

Food & Wine
Your Company
Departures
SkyGuide

Magazines listed under Warner Brothers label:

DC Comics
Vertigo
Paradox
Milestone
Mad Magazine

Online Services:

CompuServe Interactive Services
AOL Instant Messenger
AOL.com portal
Digital City
AOL Europe
ICQ
The Knot, Inc. - wedding content (8 % with QVC 36% and Hummer
WinbladFunds18%)
MapQuest.com - pending regulatory approval
Spinner.com
Winamp
DrKoop.com (10%)
Legend (49% - Internet service in China)

Time Warner - Online/Other Publishing:

Road Runner
Warner Publisher Services
Time Distribution Services
American Family Publishers (50%)
Pathfinder
Africana.com

Time Warner - Merchandise/Retail:

Warner Bros. Consumer Products
Warner Brothers Recreation Enterprises (owns/operates international theme parks)
Time Warner Inc. - Turner Entertainment:

Entertainment Networks:

TBS Superstation
Turner Network Television (TNT)
Turner South
Cartoon Network

Turner Classic Movies
Cartoon Network in Europe
Cartoon Network in Latin America
TNT & Cartoon Network in Asia/Pacific

Film Production:

New Line Cinema
Fine Line Features

Other Operations:

Turner Original Productions
Atlanta Braves
Turner Learning
CNN Newsroom (daily news program for classrooms)
Turner Adventure Learning (electronic field trips
for schools)
Turner Home Satellite
Turner Network Sales

Other:

Netscape Communications
Netscape Netcenter portal
AOL MovieFone
iAmaze
Amazon.com (partial)
Quack.com
Streetmail (partial)
Switchboard (6%)

(last updated 8/11/2004) - <http://www.cjr.org/tools/owners/timewarner.asp>

Appendix D: Interview with Jonathan Carter – 15th February 2004 (by email).

Jonathan Carter is an experienced journalist, currently working for BBCi.

RB: What is the relationship between journalism and the internet, do you think?

JC: Print journalism is a stuffy parent, protecting its own interests.

Internet journalism is an annoying teenager, just starting university and believing he/she can change the world. Currently, both have their place. One, though, will soon be history.

Witness Rupert Murdoch on 13 April 05: "The next generation of people have a different set of expectations of the kind of news they will get, including when and how they will get it, and who they will get it from." (http://www.editorandpublisher.com/eandp/news/article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1000882643)

There is still a huge snobbery around print journalism, particularly around older journalists bless 'em, but I guess that's just a protective instinct. Truth is, newspapers always lag behind. Tony Blair's recent holiday destination, for example, was easily found on the internet very early on, while the papers were still playing a very old-fashioned guessing game with their readers.

RB: Is the internet having an impact on 'proper' journalism'?

JC: Definitely. See above. The problem is that, with the equality of search engines, bloglike stories stand alongside so-called "proper" news items. People love gossip/murder/misfortune, they thrive on Schadenfreude (whether they admit it or not) and they don't particularly care whether the "facts" are corroborated or not. Shame, but the papers have been lying less overtly for years anyway.

RB: What do you think of some broadsheets going 'compact'?

JC: Much better. I can't believe it's an issue with some people (no pun intended). Those old broadsheets were very annoying, having originated from a British tax-per-page system in the 1700s. Do you think people are pissed off that they now can't be spotted as "clever 'uns" from 50 pages?

RB: Has/will the growth of internet journalism impact on newspaper/magazine sales?

JC: It's already having an impact on ABCs (circulation figs), weeding out the weaker magazine/newspaper titles. However, I actually think that mags will last much longer than papers. They're less disposable. See below.

RB: Are we seeing the end of some types of magazines?

JC: I do hope so. It's been great so far, watching certain elitist trendy mags wither and die. They, by definition, are the most obvious ones to

go first.

RB: Or will magazines survive and exist along online forms of journalism?

JC: I think that some magazines/periodicals can and will co-exist with the web. When I worked for the academic journal publisher, SAGE, in the 90s, there was panic about how academic journals would not exist in print form by 2000. They were obsessed with the electronic delivery of their journals, and there was much debate. The Marketing Director used to call the web "CB Radio for the 90s". All the panic was unjustified of course - although there was never actually any proof of its likelihood in the first place - but then journals are like books, which will never die. I believe that the closer a mag is to a book (ie, serious reference/statement), the more it is likely to survive. Indeed, sites like lulu.com are offering the chance to publish your own book - in old-fashioned print form.

RB: Is the Internet the future of publishing?

JC: Sounds like the old painting vs photography question back in the 1800s. Books will certainly never die.

RB: A lot of 'online' newspapers, such as the Sun's website, is just a brief summary of the newspaper's content, with little in the way of interactivity or readership response, so in actuality, isn't online publishing quite limiting?

JC: Murdoch again: "I didn't do as much as I should have after all the [Internet] excitement of the late 1990s. I thought this thing called the digital revolution would just limp along. Well, it hasn't. It is a fast-developing reality that we should grasp to improve our journalism and expand our reach..." I think he's learned his lesson.

RB: Will online publishing get more sophisticated?

JC: Of course. Take a look at Google Earth and then add news. Good God.

Jonathan Carter's BRIEF CV:

Copy editor/proofreader (4 years)
Academic publisher, SAGE Publications

Regular freelance sub editor/contributor (2 years)
FHM, Loaded, Esquire, Maxim, GQ, Cosmopolitan, NME, Independent On Sunday

Regular TV/radio guest (1 year)

Radio: LBC (Late Show), Radio Five Live

TV: various Sci-Fi Channel culture/film shows

Staff writer/on launch team (1 year)

Hotdog

Intersection (Dazed & Confused's car magazine)

Film Editor (2 years)

Sleazenation

Intersection (Dazed & Confused's car magazine)

Broadcast Journalist/Content Producer (3 years)

BBC Collective

Appendix E: Interview with Matt Walton - 22nd October 2004 – BBC Centre House.

Matt Walton is BBC Content Producer for Interactive Drama & Entertainment.

RB: When was it that you first started working here?

MW: I've been at the BBC for just over 4 years now.

RB: So that's since 2000?

MW: Yes, since September 2000.

RB: What was the relationship between more traditional media – film television radio etc – and the web provision at the BBC in 2000?

MW: Well, I joined just before the BBCi reorganisation...

RB: Which was when?

MW: That was April 2001. And when I started it was basically 3 floors at Bush House and our floor had a number of content teams – people like the film site, gardening, home page and all those kind of things – as well as a design team and a coding team. And the floor above was software engineers and operations – who are the people that make sure the websites go live – and that was about it really. There were various other bits and pieces scattered elsewhere, there were people working in Scotland and there was the kind of local sites as well. And then in 2001 they reorganised so that the website sat within the various different content areas, so for instance *EastEnders* went to drama and entertainment, along with the film sites. And then factual and learning got gardening and science and all those sorts of things. Basically the content went out to different areas, new media became the kind of hub – so they dealt with all the standards and managed the home page and stuff that's centrally managed - and there's now there's new media corporate there, which deals with all the money and financing and they've got marketing people and lawyers, etc, etc.

RB: So what happened was, that the new media stuff, and what later became BBCi, was quite separate? OK, before 2001, the web provision was separate, it was a separate thing, all to itself, and then after that it became embedded in television and radio, it became part of those things, rather than a separate autonomous part of the BBC?

MW: That was the idea, I think, or I think that was the sort of thinking, but actually it didn't happen like that and what ended up happening really, was that you ended up with more empires really, and so rather than the Gardening team going to sit with *Gardener's World* or people who make the *Gardener's Question Time* for Radio 4, or actually having people who produce the same kind of content all sitting together, what happened is you got people who produce factual content for the web all sitting together – Gardening and Science, Homes and Motoring – all sitting together in one department and having their own coding team and design team and so on. So you ended up with lots of 'mini' departments, which in some ways is kind of better because you, on a human level, you kind of work better in small group of people. So within, for instance, Drama and Entertainment, where I work, there are 80 people, you know who the coders are, you know who the designers are, you know who project managers are, you know who to go to, to talk about finance and so on. Which makes working for such a huge place like the BBC, kind of easier. What

does happen though is it becomes very territorial and you get these little fiefdoms that kind of build up, which means that if, for instance, like the *Collective* website – that’s Drama and Entertainment – was to work with radio, it makes it kind of hard, because obviously there’s a bit of competitiveness there and a kind of, “Why are you doing music stuff? Because we do music stuff!” kind of thing goes on.

RB: Do you mean radio, or the web-based radio content?

MW: Either! (laughs). And, so you do get, and obviously in the structure of the BBC they have what they call ‘petals’ and so the petal that Drama and Entertainment is in, is ‘DEC’ which is Drama, Entertainment, Childrens’, so there is an actually a separate children’s interactive department as well, because it’s quite a specialised thing. But also within that are the radio entertainment and TV entertainment, and so they are kind of production companies who make stuff and they pitch stuff to TV and they pitch stuff to radio. So there’s much for close links with, for instance, TV entertainment shows, within Drama and Entertainment, if you see what I mean, that actually Factual and Learning is a completely different directorate, or petal.

RB: Do you think these re-organisations, and the whole ‘petal’ thing, was a new kind of structure?

MW: That was part of [former Director General] Greg Dyke’s reorganisation, which again, happened probably shortly before I arrived. I think in 1999 he reorganised [the corporation] into the ‘petal’ thing. The principle was, he’s [The Director General] in the middle and around him are, what was called the Exec Committee then, and each one was in charge of a petal, so Alan Yentob was in charge of DEC. And so there was a representative for each of the ‘petals’ on that committee. Mark Thomas [currently the BBC’s Director General] was head of television, and so on. And that still exists, pretty much, and you’ve got ‘petals’ like the World Service, and Worldwide and Resources which are like separate companies really, in effect.

RB: BBC Resources has been sold off now, hasn’t it?

MW: It has been sold-off now, yeah. And so has Technology.

RB: What would you say the relationship between ‘traditional’ media and the web content, is like now, compared to 4 years ago?

MW: It’s changed in that when I first started it was very much led by, certainly by TV. Radio was slightly different because the websites for radio actually sat with the radio station. So, it worked quite well together, certainly Radio 1 does, because it’s got, I suppose, the people on air are slightly more ‘hip and groovy’ and understood what the web was at the time, whereas it was harder for places like Radio 2 and Radio 4. But they were kind of pretty much small autonomous units. So Radio 1’s was one thing really.

RB: So, there was quite a close collaboration between the web content and the radio content for Radio 1?

MW: Yeah.

RB: But that was quite unusual in the corporation?

MW: Yeah, but that was only really true of radio and it’s because radio has quite small, close-knit brands, I suppose, that they could do that. Whereas with TV, you tended to have TV programmes

that are produced in a very different way. So, you had a website for a TV programme.

RB: Would you say that radio content lend itself better to web provision, because, economically, it's easier to stream content through a website, than television content?

MW: Yeah, I would say, in terms of mediums, that radio and the web are much more similar, in that they're much more immediate. They don't have, you don't need the same amount of resources and people that you do for TV programmes, and normally, TV programmes take a while to produce, whereas radio tends to be a daily thing, very much like a website.

It's kind of ongoing and just updating content. So in terms in which the way content is produced, I would say that [radio and the web] are much closer, and in some ways, that means it's much easier. Obviously, streaming audio is much more viable than streaming video, because of the quality you can do it in, and the amount of bandwidth you need.

RB: But there's more of a collaborative relationship, than between television and the web now, than there was 4 years ago?

MW: Well, it's a different relationship (laughs). I mean, when I first started, it was very much the agenda was led by TV, and if there was a new TV programme, right at the last minute, they'd go, "Oh, we need a website!" So, you'd have something hastily put together, to support the TV programme – a glorified 'fact sheet' in effect.

Now you've got these different content areas, it's much more, "there are the types of audiences we need to target," and 12 months ago, and just before that, the push was on 'reach' and so, for instance, Drama and Entertainment was cited as being one of the areas that could attract a teenage audience and lower social classes of people in the North of England, teenage girls, and that sort of thing. And so, there was a slight pressure on producing content for those kinds of audiences and so if television came to drama and entertainment and said, "We want you to do this," if it didn't match what we as a department were meant to do, we could quite easily say, no.

And so it became less dominated by television, and the web began to mature as a business itself and had it's own agenda. It's now changing slightly with the aftermath of the Graf report, because actually one of the 'tick boxes' - in whether we should be doing stuff – is [television] programme support, then it's legitimate for the BBC to be doing. That's in your list of things; it's distinctive, it's something the market can't provide. One of those things is, is it a BBC TV programme, because obviously you can't have somebody else producing an *Eastenders* website in the same way. And obviously the content within that website should be distinctive and should try and do all those things a commercial website couldn't do; provide community and all that sort of thing.

But actually now, being a programme support brand does immediately get you one-step further, along the commissioning process.

RB: What affect has the Graf report had? What do you think about the report's recommendations, and are they changing content?

MW: I think, broadly speaking, it's probably a good thing. It means as a producer you feel much more like you need to think why you're producing this. I think before [the Graf report] there was a lot of things produced, just because you could. And I think things like certain games and that kind of thing. And for instance, the *Pure Soap* website that our department produced isn't necessarily something that the BBC should be doing, and public money should be spent on doing something that actually the market can provide.

RB: But, that's the problems, because the BBC does have to provide services that audiences and users want, doesn't it?

MW: Yeah.

RB: So it is always going to be difficult.

MW: It is. Is always difficult. But, I think if you are distorting the market - and you could argue that things like *Fantasy Football*, and so on did that - I think that it's a good think that you're made to think about what the BBC should be doing, because there are lots of things, that I, as a BBC employee, was slightly uncomfortable about doing. Even things like BBC News providing content for the trainstations that other people were quite happy to do and the trainstations were quite happy to pay for that content, whereas the BBC waded in a did it for free and therefore pissed a lot of people off.

There's also other good things, such as the BBC's policy has been, in terms of online provision, fairly backward in its approach to linking to other external websites. If thing are overtly commercial, then you're not allowed to link to them. I remember that we weren't allowed to link to the Amazon website, which actually has a lot of interesting content, and us as producers, we always used that site to fact-check information and so on.

RB: And a lot of that content on that website [Amazon] is written by the users as well.

MW: Yeah.

RB: It's almost a community website in a way.

MW: Exactly, and it's also a very useful site, but if you followed the guidelines to the letter, you shouldn't link to it, because it's a site that sells books, DVDs and music, etc. The new way of thinking, in light if Graf, is that we can link to stuff like that, but you link to it as long as you can link to a range of things, then it's OK and that hasn't been formally said yet, but that's the way the wind is blowing.

RB: Didn't the Graf report say something about the web provision having to be run along similar lines to that of television? To takes its lead from television, and organise itself like television, in terms of commissioning, in terms of content, in terms of public service value?

MW: Yes. Something that I think is really interesting at the moment is that there's obviously a move towards having an 'indie' quota, in the same way that TV and radio have their 25% external commissioning quota. The same sort of thing is happening with online, and...

RB: Will it be a similar percentage, do you think?

MW: Yes, I think so. 25% is what you're aiming to hit, but if can do more, then do more. It's interesting because up until now, if the BBC uses outside people, it's always agency work and so you go outside to get a website built, you pay designers and you pay coders and you say, "Right, this is what we want, you go off and do it," and they make the thing and deliver it, but it's always been run by internal staff.

The interesting bit will be that, now the quota of what we commission from outside is more, it's probably not possible to hit that percentage, with actually putting editorial stuff outside, so I think that maybe, in the next year or so, you might start to see editorial working going outside the BBC. And how that's managed, will be a very interesting one really, because with a TV programme its

easier, in that you say, “Right, go and make this half-hour documentary on X, Y and Z,” and then you see the final product and say, “Yes, that covers the brief, you can have your money, we’ll broadcast it.”

With a website, it’s a bit harder, and again, in terms of production, closer to radio, because you do get some radio programmes that go out on a daily basis which are produced outside. But again, it’s still a very definite thing that you’re looking at. Whereas with a website, you could have loads of pages and it could be interactive, so it’s a much harder thing to do, I think. But certainly for places like the radio division to hit their independent quota, I think you might see, for instance, one of the radio station’s being put outside to tender.

RB: Yes, hasn’t Ch4 asked Ofcom – if the BBC’s radio division is broken up – for Radio 1’s tender?

MW: Yes, but in terms of the web, it would still be a BBC thing, but a BBC thing in the same way that Kudos produced [the television programme] *Spooks*. It’s a BBC drama, but it happens to be made by an outside company. I think that you might start to see that within new media.

I do think that new media has definitely matured as a business over the last few years. When I started there was 400 people working for new media, and it expanded to 1100 people, within the BBC. And then 18 months ago you got the first round of redundancies, and I suppose over the last year or so, because our department didn’t actually take any redundancies, our number of staff has gone down over the last year or so.

RB: Is that ‘natural wastage,’ not replacing people who leave?

MW: Yeah, that kind of thing, moving people around. And it’s possible that as more and more work is meant to go outside, you’ll see the numbers go down further, although there’s a classic BBC manoeuvre where you put one thing outside and get your head-count down, and then probably employ the same people, to produce the same thing, but they do it outside, as an outside company, and so you’ve reduced your headcount, you’ve upped your indie quota, you’ve stimulated the independent market, so it ticks all those boxes.

RB: You mentioned *Pure Soap*, earlier, what was that?

Pure Soap was a website for fans of soap operas, so as well as covering BBC output, such as *EastEnders*, *Neighbours* and so on, it also had gossip and news and stuff like that on *Doctors* and *Coronation Street*. And it was moving towards being a community website really, for people who liked soap. In fact there were plans, before the rug was pulled from under them, to give users the tools to create their own web pages and their own mini fan sites, in affect. But, when Graf came out, there had to be a few sacrificial lambs, one of which was *Fantasy Football* – which is kind of fair enough – and also the surfing portal (which I never knew we did!) and the other main one, was the *Pure Soap* site.

And they basically just closed it, because there’s lots of fan sites out there, and it is supporting some BBC content, but it is also supporting other soaps, that the market could provide/

RB: And there’s magazines as well.

MW: Yeah. And it’s not actually very worthy – dare I say it – it’s soaps!

RB: Is *Celebdaq* still going?

MW: It is, and there was an interesting one actually, that as *Pure Soap* was closing, *Celebdaq* was also developing *Sportdaq*.

RB: And they've led to TV versions, haven't they?

MW: Yeah, and *Pure Soap* was a TV programme. That was something that's almost like the Holy Grail.

RB: Was that broadcast on BBC Choice?

MW: Yeah, now BBC3. That was almost what the Holy Grail in web production is, in that, we produce a website, and it becomes a TV programme, or the other way around.

RB: Are there any more examples?

MW: No. There's been murmurings about other things, like *Collective* turned into a TV programme, but not really. And with *Celebdaq* and *Pure Soap*, I don't think it worked terribly well, because of the way things are geared-up, in that basically television is seen as the be-all-and-end-all in the BBC. If you're in the web, you're quite small-fry really. So TV took the idea and went off and did whatever they wanted with it, with very little input from the web team. And so I think that there's many stand-alone brands on the web anymore because it's quite hard to get them commissioned because of the Graf report, and also, you have to get enough people looking at it, and the BBC's not really geared-up to market web brands.

The way the BBC marketing department work, is that they market big things, it sticks billboards up, has campaigns, and it's not very good doing stuff virally or underground, or in a small way really. You're not really meant to spend your content production budget on marketing. I mean, small things you can get away with, and you have to be creative with what you do. And so, *Collective* sponsored festivals like the Big Chill where our audience were going, and we tried to do it in that sort of 'grass-roots' way, as *Collective* is quite an underground content website really. I think actually that the *Pure Soap* thing will make them think twice about shutting something in that way again.

RB: Was there a bit of a backlash then?

MW: I think so yeah. Drama and Entertainment's figures dropped dramatically when that site was closed, and as much as you tell people they can go elsewhere in the BBC – there's the *EastEnders* website – and try and get people to go elsewhere, if you shut a community website...

RB: A site that's generic and not programme specific...

MW: ...yeah, and if they've put something into that community, and they're very involved in it, and then you take it away from them, then they're going to be pissed-off and they're not going to want to go elsewhere within the BBC. So, in closing *Pure Soap*, you've lost over 100,000 users like that (Clicks fingers). And they didn't go anywhere else in the BBC, and so I think that kind of thing has done *Collective* a lot of favours, in that if they shut it, they've lost another 100,000 users, who are people, probably in a lot of cases, who don't use other parts of the BBC's web content.

RB: Do you think that the 2006 charter renewal is having an impact on some of these changes, as they do seem to be politically motivated?

MW: Yeah, I mean, in the last 12 months it's gone from feeling quite a safe place to you really don't know what's going to happen. There four major reviews going on at the moment. One is

‘Out of London,’ so you’ve got everyone thinking, “Is it my department that’s moving to Manchester? Do I want to go to Manchester?”

RB: Is there now a more collaborative relationship between different media, than there was? Is it moving towards web content going out on TV, TV content going out on the web?

MW: The commissioning process still isn’t right. There has been a movement, in that, websites are much more involved earlier on, when it comes to producing content for TV programmes. When I first started working here, it was absolutely insane, like, “It’s going out next week, can you turn something around?” That happened quite regularly and that sort of thing doesn’t happen now and I think new media has got to the stage where, if people do say that, we can tell them to piss-off.

And then things like interactive TV, interactive TV was a department in Bush House when it was kind of a fledgling developing thing, but it’s now been moved into television, and so there’s much more close relationships there, than there were.

It is quite hard to get on television’s radar, as they have totally a different agenda, and they are run very much as a different company really. We [BBC Online] are like a small company ourselves, as a department and there are resources like lawyers you can go to, who aren’t within our department, but it is very much like it’s own different company, in many ways.

RB: Tell me about the iMP Project, making television content available on the web, access via the BBC’s website.

MW: Well, basically, the BBC doesn’t want to be in the position that the music industry is in at the moment, in that it embraced new technology too late, and to be fair to the BBC, despite the size that it is, it’s always been there first with new technology. I mean, the BBC website is a prime example, hats off to [then director general] John Birt for putting the investment in and doing the political talking that was needed at the time to do it. And the same with FM, and all of those things. They were developments that the BBC, pushed, and interactive TV and digital radio and the list goes on.

RB: Video and colour television as well.

MW: Yes, that’s right, yeah. So the latest development is this thing called iMP, which I think has the potential to change the ways television is viewed really. The idea is that like the BBC Radio Player, you can watch what you want, on demand, for a week’s window, after broadcast.

RB: Is it only going to be new programmes? Are they going to make the archive available?

MW: That’s when it becomes commercial. There’s discussions happening with BBC Worldwide, about – and there this termed used, the ‘public service window – and the public service window is seen basically that you can show stuff on the website that has been broadcast on TV, for a weeks after transmission. After that, it becomes kind of commercial property, so BBC Worldwide, the BBC’s commercial arm, can exploit it to whatever degree, so it would be like selling a DVD.

There’s a lot of work being done at the moment to see what the relationship is between IMP – the broadcast player – and a commercial one. So you can watch this week’s episode of *Spooks*, but if you want to go back and watch last week’s then you can do it for a fee, and you can download it to use for 4 months for a certain amount of money.

RB: Would you be able to burn it onto DVD?

MW: Well, you never know, you might, like you do with legitimate MP3s, you buy a license in order to download it and burn it onto DVD. It's a very similar model really.

The way the broadcast version of iMP works, is that it uses something called Digital Rights Management Software, and basically you have a player that you download, and your computer and the player and the file that you download each has a separate number, and the 3 numbers will only work together, so if you download a file, you can't send it on to your mate, because it won't work.

You can also then say it only works for a certain number of viewings, or a certain amount of time and then the file self-destructs, and deletes itself. So, it's quite an interesting thing, and obviously it's a piece of software that is robust, because some of the big Hollywood studios are already using it in a kind of blockbuster way, in that you download your film when you watch it, and watch it for 2 nights, or whatever, and then it deletes itself.

RB: How does the BBC get around, or propose to get around the problems of having a full-screen image that is broadcast quality?

I think the image will be comparable with VHS, and that will improve as technology improves. There was a trial that ended in September and they tried different ways of encoding the material, and so you've got this trade-off between what people expect quality wise against what they're willing to download, how long it takes and how big those files are, etc. So, one of the things the trial looked at was where is the optimum point on that trade-off between quality and the time it takes to download.

There may be different standards and people can pay more, if they're prepared to wait longer for it to download, for a better quality version.

RB: With broadband now, people don't really worry about that kind of thing, do they?

MW: Well, that's true. You can sign up for [television] series and stuff, and things like *EastEnders*, and it downloads it overnight.

RB: It's like TiVo or Sky+.

MW: It's very much like TiVo and Sky+, yeah and you will probably find that all of these technologies are going to converge and you'll probably find that actually Sky's main competitor becomes Microsoft and it [television] gets delivered by broadband, and not a satellite.

RB: iMP is based on Microsoft's Windows Player, isn't it?

MW: The trial version was. I think currently it's going out to tender who provides the infrastructure.

RB: Microsoft are doing their own broadcast player, anyway.

MW: Yes, I believe so.

RB: That's like the BBC's relationship with Sky as joint partners in Freeview, with Sky producing its own digital television receiver.

MW: Yes.

Blank.

-
- [1] See also Morris (1994); Dentith (1995) & Holquist (2002)
- [2] Franz Kafka's novels and short stories were also published in English in the early 1960s for the first time – a writer discussed in detail later in this thesis.
- [3] In March 2006, Ashley Highfield, the head of the BBC's online provision announced the launch of the BBC's Integrated Media Player (iMP). Some press reports still called the device, the Interactive Media Player however. For the purposes of this discussion, I shall refer to the device as its original title, and as mentioned in the 2004 Graf report and interviews I conducted for this research.
- [4] *America's* original title was *The Man Who Disappeared*, but the title was changed by Kafka's executor and posthumous publisher, Max Brod.
- [5] "Give You A Clue"
- [6] "In my humble opinion."
- [7] "I claim my five pounds."
- [8] The *Blakes 7* fans prefer no apostrophe, as the original Terry Nation series title never had one.
- [9] In 1954 psychologist Fredric Wertham wrote *Seduction of the Innocent*, which attacked comic books' effects on young people. *Superman's* 'S' was even likened to the SS in Nazi Germany. This led to the establishment of the Comics Code Authority.
- [10] I attended this meeting as part of research undertaken for this thesis, where I shadowed and interviewed various BBC and BBCi employees, June 2003-September 2004.
- [11] In addition, the later episodes were supported by a website that was constructed to look like an external site, separate from the BBC's cluster of 'official' web pages;
<http://www.badwolf.org.uk/>
- [12] Adapted for cinema as *Smilla's Sense of Snow* (August, 1997).
- [13] Adapted for cinema as *The Chamber* (Foley, 1996).
- [14] Adapted for television as *Soul Music* (Flynn, 1996).
- [15] Adapted for cinema as *Snow Falling on Cedars* (Hicks, 1999).
- [16] Adapted for cinema as *The Shipping News* (Hallström, 2001).
- [17] Adapted for cinema as *Sofies Verden* (Gustavson, 1999).
- [18] Adapted for television as *Original Sin* (Grieve, 1996).
- [19] Adapted for cinema as *Sense and Sensibility* (Ang, 1995).
- [20] Adapted for cinema as *Last Orders* (Schepisi, 2001).
- [21] Adapted for cinema as *High Fidelity* (Frears, 2000).
- [22] Adapted for television as *Notes from a Small Island* (Lightbody, 1999).
- [23] Adapted for television as *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* (2000-2001).
- [24] Adapted for cinema as *Sofies Verden* (Gustavson, 1999).
- [25] Adapted for cinema as *The Runaway Jury* (Fleder, 2003).
- [26] Adapted for cinema as *Fever Pitgâi*

, %CVZsw<?-2×÷ø

04]bo}?!©¼ÉÜElvch (Evans, 1997) and as *Fever Pitch* (Farrelly & Farrelly, 2005).