Tarbiat Modares University

The International Journal of Humanities

Received: 5 April 2020
Accepted: 28 November 2020
Published: 1 July 2021

[1] PhD in English at the Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran (Corresponding Author).
E-mail: m.javidshad@gmail.com

[2] Professor of Comparative Literature at Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.
E-mail: anushir@shirazu.ac.ir

How to cite this article: Javidshad, Mahdi, , Alireza Anushiravani. (2021). The Ideological Working of Fidelity Criticism in Dramatic and Cinematic Adaptation Studies, *The International Journal of Humanities* (2021) Vol. 28 (3): (55-74).

http://eijh.modares.ac.ir/article-27-41855-en.html

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Ideological Working of Fidelity Criticism in Dramatic and Cinematic Adaptation Studies

Mahdi Javidshad[1], **Alireza Anushiravani**[2]

Abstract: The present research explores the reasons why contemporary theoreticians of adaptation studies spurn "fidelity criticism." With an increase in the production of adaptation with the advent of the cinema, there appeared a critical approach known as "fidelity criticism" in which the extent of the fidelity of the adapter to the adapted was investigated. Since this approach considers the adapted as a touchstone to evaluate the adapter and since it implicitly acknowledges the superiority of the former over the latter, postmodern critics, who frequently advocate alternative views and readings, struggle to release the adapter from being overshadowed by the adapted in order to let them express their unique message in the modern era. By referring to contemporary theories, the present research explores the whyness of the necessity for avoiding "fidelity criticism" as a touchstone for the evaluation of adaptation. To this end, the question of adaptation is expounded in the light of canon, logocentrism, and minor literature in order to study the likelihood of the ideological working of "fidelity criticism" as an apparatus in the hands of power. While the fact that "fidelity criticism" cannot be an appropriate criterion for the evaluation of adaptation has been frequently pointed out, the howness of its contribution to power discourse is an issue that has not been investigated in a coherent research, an attempt that can lead to a better understanding of the whyness of the rejection of "fidelity criticism."

Keywords: Adaptation; Fidelity Criticism; Ideology; Canon; Logocentrism; Minor Literature.

Introduction

In *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006), Linda Hutcheon, a professor of comparative literature, theorist, and postmodern literary critic of University of Toronto tries to change literary critics' outlook on adaptation. The transitive verb "to adapt" refers to the alteration of something to suit a new need or purpose which is different from its original.Not being a new phenomenon, adaptation has a long history. But, in modern times, the adaptation process refers to the changes that a text undergoes when moving from a genre to another genre or another medium. Hutcheon argues that adaptation goes beyond it and covers videogames, theme parks, operas, ballets, musicals, and radio plays (2006: xiv).

In practicing adaptation, there are essentially two texts in its broad sense: primary text and secondary text. Since there is a relationship between an adapted text and preceding text or texts, adaptation studies are frequently considered as comparative studies (Ibid: xiv). In *A Theory of Adaptation*, Hutcheon tries to explore and answer two challenges in literary studies. First, in modern visual culture, inte-rmedia adaptation studies are an indispensable part of literary and interdisciplinary departments; second, the analysis of inter-media adaptations of literary works is in need ofa methodological theory and practice. She spurns the ideas of those theoreticians who regard adaptation as "secondary" and inferior and tries to show that adaptation is a creative and critical attempt. The dominant outlook on adaptation that Hutcheon tries to change belongs to those traditional researchers who believe that "fidelity criticism" is the method for the evaluation of artistic and cinematic adaptations of literary works (Leitch, 2017: 3). To oppose "fidelity criticism," Robert Stam argues that the word "fidelity" has moral connotation and if adaptation is not faithful to the source text, disappointment would follow for the critic or audience due to the adapter's failure to achieve a true reflection of it (2000:54). Hutcheon points to the fact that in line with the outlook originating from "fidelity," academic criticism and journalistic

reviewing, consider contemporary adaptations as "secondary, derivative, 'belated, middlebrow, or culturally inferior'" (2006:2). Thus, a faithful approach to adaptation contains a valuational standpoint that sees the maximum proximity to the "original" work as an undisputable touchstone to evaluate adaptation.

The publication of *Novels into Film* in 1957 heralded the weakening of the place of "fidelity criticism." The writer George Bluestone adopts a medium-specific approach to argue that due to the fundamental differences between the modes of communication in novel and film, it is impossible to compare the two media:"The film becomes a different thing in the same sense that a historical painting becomes a different thing from the historical event which it illustrates" (1957:5).Brian McFarlane considers commitment to fidelity as an obstacle in the development of adaptation studies (1996:194), giving centrality to the issues of context and intertextuality: "The critic who fails adequately to address the [adaptation's intertextuality] is guilty of undervaluing the film's cultural autonomy as well as failing to understand the processes by which the novel has been transposed to film" (Ibid:200). Stam propounds a more important issue: "The question of fidelity ignores the wider question: Fidelity to what?" He then refers to structuralist and poststructuralist discussions on semiotics to conclude that "A film adaptation […] would not necessarily be inferior to the novel as the 'original'" (2000: 57–58). Hutcheon emphasizes that "there are many and varied motives behind adaptation and few involve faithfulness" (2006: xiii). In fact, all these critics collectively give centrality to the adapted work to investigate its cultural significance and function in the context it is received. Since postmodern critical theories have generally reacted negatively to "fidelity criticism, "one can realize its authoritative discursive stance. In order to dismantle this authoritative approach, it is incumbent on us to expose the ideological functions of "fidelity criticism" and how it contributes to the conservative discourse of power, or what Louis Althusser terms as Ideological State Apparatuses.

According to Althusser, the ruling class applies a set of ideological apparatuses to reproducethe unjust relations of production in capitalist societies. In his classifications of the "ideological state apparatuses," Althusser considers literature and the media as the means that propagate ideological discourses, ultimately maintaining the status quo through their conservative approach (Ferretter, 2007: 83–84). Likewise, Michel Foucault by propounding the notion of "power-knowledge" maintains that the ruling class makes an institutional use of knowledge for furthering its particular interests (Olssen, 2016: 23). Such arguments shed light on the fact that the authoritative discourse of fidelity turns to literary works and figures to institutionally solidify the cultural apparatus of the ruling class. By the strategic selection of literary figures and the induction of specific approaches to read them, power maintains the status quo and inhibits the conception or propagation of alternative, resisting discourses. To analytically expose how "fidelity criticism" in adaptation studies is a contributing factor to the ideological discourse of the ruling class in society, the present study makes references to the theories of poststructuralism, cultural materialism, and minor literature as defined by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari.

Fidelity Discourse and Canon

When discussing fidelity in studying adaptation, one should ask "fidelity to what or who?" The answer to it is clear: fidelity to the original work or author. Here, a more important question may be proposed: How has the work or author in question obtained its prominence and reputation? Cultural materialists believe that the process of literary canonization is strategically carried out under the surveillance of power and its dominant ideological apparatuses. A historical survey of the cinema indicates that the destiny of cinema and canonical works is entwined, the most important reason of which is undoubtedly economic matters. Considering the fact that "Where a novel can sell 20,000 volumes and make a substantial profit, the film must reach millions" Bluestone concludes that the film industry for making a profit has

no other way than pleasing consumers (1957:34). Thus, sheltering in the canon, which has stood the test of time, has always been an adequate margin of safety for film investors.

1992 statistics reveal that adaptations have devoted themselves 85 percent of all Oscar-winning Best Pictures, 95 percent of all the miniseries, and 70 percent of all the TV movies winning Emmy Awards (Hutcheon, 2006: 4). This indicates the charms of adaptation for producers and investors, the audience, examiners, and critics. It seems that in the early years of exercising adaptation, the consumers could best be pleased through faithful representation of the adapted works. Sarah Cardwell believes that not only does the great stature of such canonical writers as Shakespeare and Austen in "hierarchy of texts" brings them respect and faithfulness, but faithfulness is one of the best ways to represent "a stylised past" (2002: 135).The sanctity given to a canonical writer like Austen, and the past associated with her, is rooted in the fact that the author"is not so much a literary author, but a meeting ground, an affinity space, a textual as well as contextual, cultural and social universe" (Voigts-Virchow, 2012: 38).This is why the advertisementsfor adaptations are rife with the claim of "proximity" to a given original text or author. For instance, the WebPages for *Titus Andronicus* directed by Christopher Dunne confidently claimed that the production was faithful to Shakespeare's genuine intentions. Or, Kenneth Branagh regarding his *Hamlet* (1996) promised "more Shakespeare for your money" (Walker, 2006:9). Thus, the roughly fifty-year dominance of fidelity discourse in adaptation studies (Newell, 2010:78), was somehow rooted in the attempts of filmmaking companies to faithfully represent the canon.

But when Cardwell quoting Deborah Cartmell refers to a "hierarchy of texts" (see, Cartmell, 1999: 27), what is the significance of the top position of authors within it and who authorizes it? Is this position solely determined through aesthetic principles, or is it associated with power-based apparatuses? Doesn't fidelity discourse in adaptation studies refer to faithfulness to the "hierarchy

of texts"?These questions can be answered within the theoretical framework of cultural materialism. Cultural materialism, in the words of Graham Holderness, is a "politicized form of historiography" and Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield regard "textual analysis" as one of its four characteristics (Barry, 2002:182). Therefore, one of most important concerns of this theoretical framework is the investigation of the processes by which power-run structures disseminate the ruling class's values.

Cultural materialism considers the ways the "hierarchy of texts" are fashioned through power structures. This approach takes it as an axiom that power, through appropriating canonical figures, turns them into ideological apparatuses to keep the unjust status quo going (Brannigan, 1998: 10). For example, "the fetishistic role of Shakespeare as a conservative icon within British culture" is frequently undermined by cultural materialists (Barry, 2002:184). By clinging to timelessness discourse, power relations turn Shakespeare, whose works significantly contribute to the maintenance of hierarchy, into a universal poet with eternal values to oppose culturally social changes through this cultural icon (Sinfield, 1994: 162). Since the induction of conservative approaches to authors like Shakespeare is one of the manipulations exerted by power relations, "dissident readings" becomes an important politics in cultural materialism (Bertens, 2001:187). Sinfield remarks: "If you want to think about gender politics in *King Lear*, you might find the play conservative. If you are concerned with God and atheism, you might find it radical" (2006: 18). Thus, the contrast between cultural materialism and cultural apparatuses of power can be assumed in terms of the contrast between "deconstructive" and "conservative" standpoints.

The key point in such a conflict is the issue of authorial intent which has historical roots.The late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century literary criticism was primarily obsessed with the idea of the authorial intent. This approach that is known with such designations as "Old Historicism" and "biographical criticism" vigorously applied biographical and contextual

information, aiming "to understand the works from the life" (see, Maynard, 2009:34). But since the history attributed was a fabrication of power relations, the "authorial intent" has always been a construct that does not completely overlap with the original author's intention. Even E. D. Hirsch, Jr., one of the contemporary advocates of referring to the authorial intent, is aware of it. Distinguishing between "what an author intends" and "what an author intended," Hirsch considers the author's intention as a postulated entity, ultimately defining meaning as "a stipulative not an ontological entity" (see, Hirsch, 1983:745–747). But, the nineteenth-century version of the authorial intent assumes Hirsch's differentiation to be the same, and by naturalizing the author's intention, turn meaning and history from contractual entities into natural and incontrovertible truths (for "naturalization" see, Barthes, 1972:127–130).

The promises of faithfulness to the author's intention in the advertisements of Shakespearean adaptations in the closing years of the twentieth century can indicate the discursive power of conservative criticism. Since the power-run cultural apparatuses have endowed Shakespeare such a sanctity that even the presumption of altering his plays is seen as a cultural taboo (Fischlin and Fortier, 2014:1), some of the Shakespearean adaptations require themselves to emphasize their faithfulness. Even when some distanced themselves from the "original" Shakespeare, they felt it was incumbent on them to justify their deviation and to insist on their relative faithfulness. For instance, David Nicholls, the author of a modernized adaptation of *Much Ado about Nothing*, remarks in an interview, "I think Shakespeare, more than any other writer, is loved and revered and held to be untouchable in a way, so the idea of changing even one word seems sacrilegious, but there is a great long tradition of adapting Shakespeare, so we've made a huge number of changes but also hopefully kept some of the spirit of the original" (Pittman, 2011:142). Such instances indicate that adapters are well-aware of the top place of faithful- and intention-centered discourse in their audience's mind. Besides, they know that there is a touchstone called "fidelity criticism" that assesses their heresy.

Thus, even when the adapters consciously, and with some certain intentions, deviate from the source text, they know that they at least need to refer to the question of fidelity. This suggests the hegemonic dominancy of "fidelity" discourse in the process of adaptation and its critical studies.

A review of the long history of film adaptation indicates that many adaptations have aimed at upholding the "hierarchy of texts" in the canon. Branagh's *Hamlet* (1996) is a prime example that, running for around four hours, almost meticulously follows the plot of Shakespeare's play and contains every word of the source text. Roman Polanski's *Oliver Twist* (2005) is considered to be a faithful adaptation of the Dickens's novel of the same title. And Chris Columbus's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* (2001) is described as being "really faithful" to J. K. Rowling's 1997 novel of the same name (Linder, 2016: "Screenwriter Kloves"). The director was so sensitive about the issue of faithfulness that he was "very careful to work with author J.K. Rowling to get the little details right when translating her book to film" (Linder, 2016: "Davis Confirms").Sometimes, the reason for such faithfulness lies in the drive for recreating the nostalgic past, and sometimes it needs to be searched out in the pressure coming from the audience. Columbus, explaining the reason for his faithfulness, remarked: "People would have crucified me if I hadn't been faithful to the books" (Quoted in Hutcheon, 2006: 123). Whatever the reason, the very attempt at reconstructing the author's intent furthers the "hierarchy of texts," and "fidelity criticism" as a theoretical approach sheds light on such furtherance.

In contrast, there have been many adaptations that disregard the conventional "hierarchy of texts" and challenge the established canon in order to fashion new discourses and express topical concerns. Tom Stoppard's *Dogg's Hamlet* depicts three schoolchildren who are being prepared to perform *Hamlet*, but soon deviates from the concern for Shakespeare to emphasize the arbitrary nature of language through an alternate language, called Dogg,that is made in the play. The arbitrariness in question is

demonstrated by the use of ordinary English words that come to signify completely different from the meanings that are generally given them. Another prominent instance is Stoppard's *Cahoot's Macbeth* that revolves around the performance of another Shakespearean play, but now *Macbeth*. Concerned with the hardships Czechoslovakian playwright Pavel Kohout and his fellow actors experienced as a result of the artistic censorship imposed by a communist government, *Cahoot's Macbeth* is about Kohout's underground performance of a seventy-five-minute *Macbeth* in a living-room. Stoppard simultaneously seriously and wittily trans-contextualizes *Macbeth* under the title *Cahoot's Macbeth* to discuss both the significance of the Shakespearean text and the subversive motivations behind Kohout's appropriation in a suppressive atmosphere (Camati, 2005: 343). A fidelity approach to these two plays, which is unavoidably accompanied by the emphasis on the timelessness of the source texts, marginalizes the topical messages of the adaptations and the resisting discourse they produce.

While "fidelity criticism" upholds the "hierarchy of texts" and caters for the timelessness of the canon, cultural materialism seeks out those narratives in literary works that undermine or defy the ruling ideologies. Those who produce faithful adaptations of canonical works, as well as their devoted audience, are most probably interested in literature and the canon as aesthetic phenomena and are predominantly politically passive. In contrast, writers like Stoppard who ignore the sanctity of the canon and see it as a pretext to open up new concerns address an audience that regard literature and adaptation as sociopolitical phenomena. The result of the former approach is the maintenance of the status quo, while that of the latter is the defiance of the cultural apparatuses that solidify the state of affairs. In this process, "fidelity criticism" and cultural materialism are in their own ways able to critically assist the two conflicting approaches in carrying out their missions.

Fidelity Discourse and Logocentrism

While discussing "hierarchy of texts," Logocentrism, which has constituted the foundation of Western metaphysics for centuries, may come to mind. A Derridean coinage (Enos, 2010:408), the term refers to a historical desire in Western philosophy for a center, and a privileging of presence (speech) over absence (writing), meaning that what Jacques Derrida calls phonocentrism in Western philosophy regards writing as a contaminated manifestation of speech as speech is seemingly more immediately associated with originating though (Selden, 1993:145). Fixation on the binary speech / writing and privileging the former over the latter has established what Derrida calls a "violent hierarchy" (Ibid).

According to Derrida, Plato's philosophical writings can be regarded as the origin of speech / writing binary. Plato's privileging of speech over writing due to the immediate presence of understanding, wisdom, and truth in it has led to the presence / absence binary. Such a structural mindset is seen in such other dichotomies as man / woman, mind / matter, and West / East, in Western thinking (Walton, 2012: 99). This traditional, privileged-based mode of thought that has grafted the history of the West with patriarchy and racism (McQuillan, 2001:12) has also targeted literary adaptations. Considering this tradition, Stam remarks:

> Much of the discussion of film adaptation quietly reinscribes the axiomatic superiority of literary art to film, an assumption derived from a number of superimposed prejudices: *seniority*, the assumption that older arts are necessarily better arts; *iconophobia*, the culturally rooted prejudice (traceable to the Judaic-Muslim-Protestant prohibitions on "graven images" and to the Platonic and Neoplatonic depreciation of the world of phenomenal appearance) that visual arts are necessarily inferior to the verbal arts; and *logophilia*, the converse valorization, characteristic of the "religions of the book," of the "sacred word" of holy texts. (2000:58)

The prejudices that Stam enumerates are grounded in some dichotomies that privilege one over the other. This mode of thinking has an authoritative dichotomy called "original" and "copy," which is domineering in adaptation studies. Stam, by referring to

Derridean deconstruction that undermine "original" and "copy" hierarchy, concludes "A film adaptation seen as a 'copy,' by analogy, would not necessarily be inferior to the novel as the 'original'" (Ibid). Similarly, Hutcheon, having refuted this valuational analogy, argues that "[r]ecognition and remembrance are part of the pleasure (and risk) of experiencing an adaptation; so too is change" (2006: 24).Having mentioned the critics who write against fidelity criticism, Simone Murray remarks that "rejecting the idea of film adaptation as a necessarily inferior imitation of literary fiction's allegedly singular artistic achievement was an essential critical maneuver if adaptation studies was to gain entry to the academy" (2012: 8). Such arguments oppose Logocentrism in adaptation studies in order to deconstruct original / copy binary.

Similar to speech / writing binary, the original / copy binary gives valuational identity to what it describes through presence / absence binary, meaning that *being* original or *not being* original becomes a touchstone for considering productions as superior or inferior. Since "*seniority*" gives quality and authenticity to the canon and since its binary, i.e. "posteriority," characterizes literary adaptations as inferior and unauthentic, the emphasis on the idea of "original," which is the foundation of "fidelity criticism," has an ideological overtone that in the final analysis maintains the status quo and marginalizes resisting discourses. Hence, the term "original" can be regarded as the manifestation of logos in adaptation studies whose prime objective is to block the signifying system, thus thwarting the creation of new notions in the midst of prewritten, hierarchical constructs (for the definition of logos, see Habib, 2008:650).

As Derridean deconstruction attacks Logocentrism and its ideological dominancy over language and meaning, contemporary adaptation theoreticians are concerned with deconstructing originalism in traditional adaptation studies. For example, Cartmell explicitly states,

> Perhaps the search for an 'original' or for a single author is no longer relevant in a postmodern world where a belief in a single meaning is seen to be a fruitless quest. Instead

> of worrying about whether a film is 'faithful' to the original literary text (founded in a logocentric belief that there is a single meaning), we read adaptations for their generation of a plurality of meanings. Thus the intertextuality of the adaptation is our primary concern. (1999:28)

What can be concluded from Cartmell's ideas is that intertextuality can be seen as an anti-ideological strategy against Logocentrism in adaptation studies. Intertextuality informs us that eminent writers' words are not characterized by that transcendental, unattainable authenticity power relations have allotted them; rather, the canonized figures who carry with themselves features of timelessness and authenticity are among greatest adapters themselves. Thus, intertextuality "abandons notions of the original and godlike authorial control and instead make the radical suggestion to regard texts as 'an *intersection of textual surfaces* rather than a *point* (a fixed meaning)'" (Emig, 2012: 15).

Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier believe that Shakespeare himself wrote theatrical adaptations, but paradoxically "originality" criterion has made theatrical adaptation continue to be "a relatively marginalized and under-theorized activity" (2014: 4). Thus, why should the film *"O"* directed by Tim Blake Nelson who takes *Othello* to an American high school be studied in the light of "fidelity criticism" with an implied emphasis on Shakespearean originality, while Shakespeare's *Othello* is most probably an adaptation of Giraldi's "A Moorish Captain" (1565) which is itself based on a real incident happening in Venice around 1508? (for the source of Shakespeare's *Othello* see, Muir, 2013: 122–3) Overshadowing Nelson's film by the "authenticity" of *Othello* through "fidelity criticism" marginalizes contemporary discussions that the film is concerned with. As Julie Sanders points out, through the Shakespearean tragedy, Nelson reveals his contemporary concerns regarding the class conflicts and the implicit racism in the US education system (2006:53). Thus, the logocentric presence of Shakespeare and his play in studying the film overshadows the

reflection of social realities, thwarts any change, and maintains the status quo.

Fidelity Discourse and Minor Literature

As it was pointed out, discourses of "fidelity" and "originalism" can be taken to be aligned with conservative criticism. When Hutcheon, for instance, emphasizes that the vey source text may be the result of a succession of changes "from the real to the fictional, from a historical account or biography to a fictionalized narrative or drama" (2006: 8), she as a postmodernist consciously opposes originalism. It should be borne in mind that originalism discourse is rooted in the inclination of power relations to produce coherent narratives, a mechanism which is reflected in the methodology of Old Historicism and New Historicism. While Old Historicism refers to historical documents to present a coherent narrative of history and, through its totalizing approach to history and culture, marginalizes dissenting elements, New Historicism seeks out those unorthodox elements that undermine constructs in order to underline the cracks in the dominant discourse (Carroll, 1995: 37).Based on such conflicting methodologies, it can be argued that discourses of "fidelity" and "originalism" preserve and solidify coherent constructs of power, marginalizing the minor literature that is produced in discursive cracks.

In order to highlight the dissenting narratives in adaptations, it is necessary to look at adaptation studies differently. Turning away from fidelity discourse, Sanders makes use of the term "appropriation," making the dominating nature of the word serve the recalcitrant and toppling nature of adaptation(2006: 6). Hutcheon quotes Edward Said's definition of literature and relates it to the question of adaptation. Said regard literature as "an order of repetition, not of originality—but an eccentric order of repetition, not one of sameness." Referring to this definition, Hutcheon remarks, "[d]espite being temporally second, [adaptation] is both an interpretive and a creative act; it is storytelling as both rereading and rerelating" (2006:111). Christy Desmet argues that "[s]omething happens when Shakespeare is appropriated, and both the subject (author)

and object (Shakespeare) are changed in the process" (2002: 4). Rejecting "an essentialist notion of adaptation as adaptation *per se*," Regina Schober argues that "[a]daptation processes always entail a creative and interpretive act of (re)combination, since as soon as an adaptation has been created, it is automatically emancipated and disconnected from its source medium" (2013: 89). Such arguments associate literature and adaptation with features of repetition and change, an association that is best reflected in Deleuze and Guattari's definition of minor literature.

The term "minority literature" may bring to mind the writings produced by racial, linguistic, or religious minorities. Though such an implication is one of the current definitions of minority literature, Deleuze and Guattari give a new signification to the term: "that 'minor' no longer characterizes certain literatures, but describes the revolutionary conditions of any literature within what we call the great (or established)" (1983:18). By presenting the binary of "major literature" and "minor literature," Deleuze and Guattari emphasize the recalcitrant and centrifugal tendencies of literary writings in order to expose those conflicting voices that look for ways to be heard among coherent narratives. They argue that a practitioner of minor literature produces in the backdrop a major literature, yet keeps some distance from it from the beginning. Such estrangement keeps minor literature away from the transcendental signification of major literature (Barnett, 1987: 552). Thus, for Deleuze and Guattari, the three main features of minority literature include the deterritorialization of major language, an absolutely political nature, and serious consideration of collective values (1983: 16–17).

Deleuze and Guattari turn Kafka into a touchstone to elaborate on their theory because Kafka as a Czech Jew wrote in German, but in this major language and culture struggled to produce minoritarian identity (Colebrook, 2002:103).In order to expose Kafka's attempt at fashioning a new identity, Deleuze and Guattari's strategy in investigating Kafka is one of experimentation and not interpretation (Barnett, 1987:553). Since meaning is produced through "local or

community standards and criteria" from which the "situated subject" has no way out (see, Fish, 1985: 440),it is the interpretation, not experimentation, of Kafka that places him within the realm of a major literature and language, which in the final analysis makes him succumb to a realm of logocentric signification that reduces all kinds of texts to a certain pattern or structure (Barnett, 1987: 553). Well-aware of Kafka's unorthodox nature, Deleuze and Guattari maintain that Kafka did not write within the customary notion of "the people," but he is a voice representing a "people to come" (Colebrook, 2002: 104).Similar to Said, Deleuze and Guattari consider literature as a practice within the realm of tradition, a practice that is not a mere repetition, but a nonconformist one that fashions new identities. It is noteworthy that Deleuze extends his definition of "minor literature" to the cinema to investigate the way political cinema is produced (see, Alavipour, 2014: 146–147 and Yousefian Kenari & Mokhtabad, 2010: 30–33).

Applying Deleuze and Guattari's definition of "minor literature" to adaptation studies, it can be argued that though adaptation resorts to tradition, it strives to fashion novel voices and identities within it. Sanders points to the fact that the politically deployed Shakespeare is an imperialist apparatus that upholds the British imperial agenda. In reaction, postcolonial or radical texts resort to the very Shakespeare that imperialism appropriates to oppose the colonial or conservative culture. For instance, Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1623) turned into a popular work for postcolonial discussion and appropriation in the late twentieth century (Sanders 52) and its film adaptation entitled *Prospero's Books* directed by Peter Greenaway is remembered as a classic of minor literature (Colebrook, 2002:120). Giovanni Battista Cipriani's eighteenth-century portrait of Shakespeare entitled *Shakespeare Striding through a Storm-Ridden Landscape* (c. 1770) is a majoritarian representation of the playwright that was notably commissioned by Henry Dawkins, a Member of the Parliament of Great Britain, in 1766 to act as a decoration of the music room at the MP's home. The wall painting situates

Shakespeare at the heart of nature with a quill in one hand, a folio in the other, and resolute, taming eyes directed at the sky, turning him into an icon of Nature, order and decorum (see, Ritchie and Sabor, 2012: 1–2). Shakespeare, however, is represented as a social climber in Edward Bond's play *Bingo* (1973) and Andreas Höfele's 1997 novel *Der Spitzel* [The Spy] (see, Franssen, 2016: 139–140). The depiction of a bourgeois Shakespeare in these works is in fact a pretext to discuss the role of the artist in society. This means that tradition is invoked, but it becomes a point of departure for expressing the unexpressed.

The examples of the minoritarian appropriation of Shakespeare indicate that whereas adaptations are able to open up new discourses and produce a "people to come,""fidelity criticism," with its logocentric and conservative nature, not only highlights not the struggles of minoritarian voices for being heard, but also silences and marginalizes them through the moral implication that the word "fidelity" has. Thus, "fidelity criticism" guarantees the maintenance of "major literature", disregarding the attempts for deterritorializing it. The promotion and guarantee of "major literature" is a policy that what Althusser calls the "Ideological State Apparatuses" adopt. Though Althusser's enumerated apparatuses reproduce relations of production through disseminating ideological discourses, he believes that oppositional discourses are produced in them, because "Ideological State Apparatuses" are sites in which class struggle take place (Ferretter, 2007: 85). Since free adaptations fashion new identities within contemporary ideological discourses, they resort to the apparatus of culture, as a classification of the "Ideological State Apparatuses," to oppose class struggle. Thus, critical readings of such adaptations need to consider creativity within productions to investigate their real mission. This kind of reading is in sharp contrast to a fidelity approach to adaptation, the one which helps ideological discourses to be the ultimate champion in the process of the aforementioned struggle.

Conclusion

"Fidelity criticism" can be regarded as an ideological practice in that it overwhelms emerging voices in adaptations through getting them overshadowed by the overarching presence of the so-called original text. With its originalist, logocentric, and majoritarian approaches, "fidelity criticism" classifies itself as a conservative criticism and propagates faithfulness to the ideological position of canonized figures, to the logocentric constructs of power, and to majoritarian patterns and structures. Thus, a faithful reading of adaptations turns the canon and its ideological standing (which have been institutionalized by power relations through signifying constructs) into a critical touchstone to overshadow their minoritization and repress them in the end. Though "fidelity criticism" might be somehow applicable to the needs of the beginning years of the history of cinema, that isthe time when movies resorted to the canon to find quality and reliability through faithfully representing it, such a criticism, from the second half of the twentieth century, that is the time when most of literary works and film adaptations disseminate resisting discourses, merely silences new voices. Postmodern thought, which is discernible in the ideas of the aforementioned theoreticians, keeps in line with the radical atmosphere of the 1960s in opposing the naturalization of phenomena and inviting all to politicize all issues including literature and literary theory. This approach argues that literature and literary studies are not merely aesthetic practices; rather, they have close associations with conservative demands of power relations. Thus, it is inevitable to see the emergence of hostile critical reactions against the neutral and apolitical fidelity discourse in the postmodern era. Accordingly, adaptation needs to be contextualized culturally, socially, and politically and be considered as an experimental attempt. Also, critical studies need to see adaptation as minor literature that struggles to fashion new identities through major literature.

References

[1] Alavipour, S., (2014). Political Implications of Abbas Kiarostami's Cinema. *The International Journal of Humanities* 21(1): 143–164.

[2] Barnett, S., (1987). Review of Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature. *Criticism* 29(4): 552–554

[3] Barry, P., (2002). *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester UP.

[4] Barthes, R., (1972). *Mythologies*. trans. Annette Lavers. New York: The Noonday Press.

[5] Bertens, J. W., (2001). *Literary Theory: The Basics*. New York: Routledge.

[6] Bluestone, G., (1957/1968). *Novels into Film*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[7] Brannigan, J., (1998). *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

[8] Camati, A. S., (2005). Textual appropriation: totalitarian violence in Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and Tom Stoppard's *Cahoot's Macbeth*. *A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies* 49: 339–367.

[9] Cardwell, S., (2002). *Adaptation Revisited: Television and the Classic Novel*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

[10] Carroll, J., (1995). *Evolution and Literary Theory*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

[11] Cartmell, D., (1999). Introduction. In D. Cartmell & I. Whelehan (Eds), *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text* (pp. 23–28). London: Routledge.

[12] Colebrook, C., (2002). *Gilles Deleuze*. London and New York: Routledge.

[13] Deleuze, G.& Guattari, F., (1983). "What is a Minor Literature?" translated by Robert Brinkley, *Mississippi Review* 11(3): 13–33.

[14] Desmet, C., (2002). Introduction. In Ch. Desmet& R. Sawyer (Eds), *Shakespeare and Appropriation* (pp. 1–15). London and New York: Routledge.

[15] Enos, T., (2010). *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*. New York and London: Routledge.

[16] Emig, R., (2012). Adaptation in Theory. In P. Nicklas& O. Lindner (Eds), *Adaptation and Cultural Appropriation: Literature, Film, and the Arts* (pp. 14–25).Berlin:De Gruyter.

[17] Ferretter, L., (2007). *Louis Althusser*. London: Routledge.

[18]Fischlin, D.& Fortier, M.,(2014). General Introduction. In D.Fischlin&M.Fortier (Eds),*Adaptations of Shakespeare: An Anthology of Plays from the 17th Century to the Present* (pp. 1–23). London and New York: Routledge.

[19] Fish, S., (1985). "Consequences." *Critical Inquiry* 11(3): 433–458.

[20] Franssen, P., (2016). *Shakespeare's Literary Lives: The Author as Character in Fiction and Film*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[21] Habib, M. A. R., (2008). *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory: From Plato to the Present*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

[22] Hirsch, E. D., (1983). Against Theory? *Critical Inquiry* 9(4): 743–747.

[23] Hutcheon, L., (2006).*A Theory of Adaptation*. London and New York: Routledge.

[24] Leitch, T.,(2017). Introduction. In T. Leitch (Ed), *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies* (pp. 1–23).Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[25] Linder, B., (2001). Davis Confirms Potter Role.Available at https://www.ign.com/articles/2001/01/08/davis-confirms-potter-role

[26] Linder, B., (2001). Screenwriter Kloves Talks Harry Potter. Available at https://www.ign.com/articles/2001/02/06/screenwriter-kloves-talks-harry-potter

[27] Maynard, J., (2009). *Literary Intention, Literary Interpretations, and Readers*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

[28] McFarlane, B., (1996). *Novel to Film*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[29] McQuillan, M., (2001). *Deconstruction: A Reader*. New York: Routledge.

[30] Muir, K., (2013). *Shakespeare's Sources: Comedies and Tragedies*. London and New York: Routledge.

[31] Murray, S., (2012). *The Adaptation Industry: The Cultural Economy of Contemporary Literary Adaptation*. New York and London: Routledge.

[32] Newell, K., (2010). "We're Off to See the Wizard"(Again): Oz Adaptations and the Matter of Fidelity. In C. Albrecht-Crane& D. Cutchins

(Eds), *Adaptation Studies: New Approaches* (pp. 78–96).Madison:Fairleigh Dickinson Univ Press.

[33] Olssen, M., (2016). *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education*. London and New York: Routledge.

[34] Pittman, L. M., (2011). *Authorizing Shakespeare on Film and Television: Gender, Class, and Ethnicity in Adaptation*. New York: Peter Lang.

[35] Ritchie, F.& Sabor, P., (2012). Introduction. In F. Ritchie &P. Sabor (Eds), *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century* (pp. 1–17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[36] Sanders, J., (2006). *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London and New York: Routledge.

[37] Schober, R., (2013). Adaptation as connection – Transmediality reconsidered. In J. Bruhn, A. Gjelsvik& E. F. Hanssen (Eds), *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions* (pp. 89–113), London: Bloomsbury.

[38] Selden, R.& Widdowson, P., (1993). *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. Third Edition. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

[39] Sinfield, A., (1994). Give an account of Shakespeare and Education, showing why you think they are effective and what you have appreciated about them. Support your comments with precise references. In J.Dollimore& A. Sinfield(Eds), *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism* (pp. 158–182). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

[40] Sinfield, A., (2006). *Shakespeare, Authority, Sexuality: Unfinished Business in Cultural Materialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

[41] Stam, R., (2000). The dialogics of adaptation. In J. Naremore (Ed), *Film Adaptation* (pp. 54–76).New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

[42] Voigts-Virchow, E., (2012). Pride and Promiscuity and Zombies, or: Miss Austen Mashed Up in the Affinity Spaces of Participatory Culture. In P. Nicklas& O. Lindner (Eds), *Adaptation and Cultural Appropriation: Literature, Film, and the Arts* (pp. 34–57).Berlin: De Gruyter.

[43] Walker, E., (2006). Authorship: Getting Back to Shakespeare: Whose Film is it Anyway?. In D. E. Henderson (Ed),*A Concise Companion to Shakespeare on Screen* (pp. 8–31). Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

[44] Walton, D., (2012). *Doing Cultural Theory*. London: Sage.

[45] Yousefian Kenari, M. J.& Mokhtabad, M., (2010)."Kiarostami's Unfinished Cinema and its Postmodern Reflections." *The International Journal of Humanities* 17(2): 23–37.

The International Journal of Humanities (2021) Vol. 28 (3): (55-74)

The International Journal of Humanities

کارکرد ایدئولوژیک نقد وفاداری در مطالعات اقتباس نمایشی و سینمایی

مهدی جاویدشاد[1]، علیرضا انوشیروانی[2]

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۳۹۹/۱/۱۷
تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۳۹۹/۹/۸
تاریخ انتشار: ۱۴۰۰/۴/۱۰

[1] دکتری زبان انگلیسی، دانشکده ادبیات و علوم انسانی، دانشگاه شیراز، شیراز، ایران (نویسندهٔ مسئول).
E-mail: m.javidshad@gmail.com

[2] استاد ادبیات تطبیقی، دانشکده ادبیات و علوم انسانی، دانشگاه شیراز، شیراز، ایران.
E-mail: anushir@shirazu.ac.ir

چکیده: مقاله پیش‌رو به چرایی گذر از «نقد وفاداری» از سوی نظریه‌پردازان معاصر مطالعات اقتباس می‌پردازد. با شدت‌گرفتن تولید آثار اقتباسی با ظهور سینما، جریانی انتقادی با رویکرد میزان وفاداری اثر اقتباس‌گر به اثر اقتباس‌شونده به راه افتاد که از آن با عنوان «نقد وفاداری» یاد می‌شود. از آنجاکه این رویکرد اثر اقتباس‌شونده را معیاری برای خوانش اثر اقتباس‌گر قرار می‌دهد و به طور ضمنی برتری اثر اول را بر اثر دوم تصدیق می‌کند، منتقدان پسامدرن، که مکرراً خواستار نگاه‌ها و خوانش‌های جایگزین‌اند، تلاش می‌کنند تا اثر اقتباس‌گر را از زیر سایه اثر اقتباس‌شونده خارج سازند تا پیام منحصربه‌فرد آنها در دوران معاصر را انتقال دهند. این مقاله بر آن است تا با استناد به نظریه‌های معاصر، چرایی اجتناب از «نقد وفاداری» بهعنوان معیاری برای سنجش را مورد بررسی قرار دهد. بدین منظور، مسئلهٔ اقتباس از سه منظرِ آثار فاخر ادبی، کلام‌محوری و ادبیات اقلیت به تفصیل بحث می‌شود و امکان کارکرد ایدئولوژیک «نقد وفاداری» بهعنوان ابزاری در دستان قدرت مورد مطالعه قرار می‌گیرد. این‌که «نقد وفاداری» نمی‌تواند معیاری مناسب برای سنجش آثار اقتباسی باشد، نکته‌ای است که به کرّات بدان اشاره شده است. اما اینکه چگونه این رویکرد در خدمت گفتمان قدرت است، نکته‌ای که است در قالب یک تحقیق منسجم بدان پرداخته نشده، اقدامی که می‌تواند به درک هرچه‌بهتر چرایی تقبیح آن بپردازد.

واژه‌های کلیدی: اقتباس، نقد وفاداری، ایدئولوژی، آثار فاخر ادبی، کلام محوری، ادبیات اقلیت