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The subject of this well-researched and extremely engaging volume is how French literary texts have been transposed and translated in some odd yet effective ways. Given the seemingly obvious title, and the lengthy subtitle, one might well ask what in nineteenth-century France is being adapted in the five media named. The authors explain in successive chapters the specific aesthetic strategies of each medium and how adaptations must yield to and yet benefit from these differing aesthetics. Through successive case studies the authors seek to show how possible linkages between the adapted authors and adaptive strategies are evident in the respective medium; to emphasize the “intertextual dialogues at play in the best of these adaptations” (14); and to reveal within the adapted canonical texts their implicit questioning of authorship and originality, as if anticipating the legacy of adaptation that many nineteenth-century literary works would engender.

Chapter one explores the contrast between the radio medium’s emphasis on voice (and silence), specifically radio adaptations of Zola’s novel of vision, *Germinal*, aired on BBC, written by David Hopkins (1928) and Diana Griffiths (2007). Despite this apparent contrast, Kate Griffiths shows how both the panoramic vision of the external world and the confined space of the mine lend themselves to translation through spoken words, and she argues that both adaptations combine the mythical elements of Zola’s novel as well as contemporary art and reality. In chapter two, taking on the medium of silent cinema, Watts shows, first, that Balzac’s tales were a favorite of the silent era, with eighty-two silent adaptations either produced or planned between 1906 and 1927. Second, he shows that the tactic of appropriation is evident both in Balzac’s own texts and in the filmmakers’ transformations of *L’Auberge rouge* (by Jean Epstein, 1923) and *Eugénie Grandet* (by Rex Ingram, 1921). In chapter three Watts discusses two of the many written re-treatments of Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary*, particularly Posy Simmonds’s graphic novel, *Gemma Bovery* (1999), and Philippe Doumenc’s detective thriller (on Emma’s possible murder), *Contre-enquête sur la mort d’Emma Bovary* (2007).

What all three texts—Flaubert’s and those studied—share is their fascination with temporality and memory, and Watts maintains that an examination of adaptations in relation to the origin text yields a better understanding of the dynamics of the literary process.

In chapter four Watts studies *Les Misérables* at the hands of theater producers—the Boublil-Schönberg West End and Broadway musical (originally at London’s Barbican Theater, 1985) as well as José Plíya’s *Le Complexe de Thénardier* (Paris, 2001). Although both productions necessarily strip away much of the Hugo novel, Watts maintains that these plays “provide valuable case studies through which to explore the relationship between adaptation and excess” (115). Whereas the musical expresses excess via its production values and broader cultural appeal, the Parisian play examines “excess as a dramatic theme [. . .] violence, selfishness and the desire for power and control” (116). In chapter five Griffiths turns to an eight-part television anthology adapting selected Maupassant *contes* and *nouvelles* for France 2; she argues for the particular aesthetic concerns necessary to adapt fiction for television (instead of assuming that cinematographic strategies are the same for both media). Just as producers and directors found in Maupassant’s works sufficiently fragmented texts allowing for considerable creative license, these textual qualities also lend themselves to the nature of the televisual medium, such that “Chez Maupassant engages with the fractured
空间中的作者和其媒介”（147）。电影改编的朱尔斯·凡尔纳的经典《环游世界八十天》是格里菲思在第六章的重点，特别关注凡尔纳的“幽灵”（特别是，凡尔纳的）或“幽灵后生活”在后续的电影中。格里菲思认为凡尔纳的小说“考虑了其文本声音的幽灵和其自身作者身份的幽灵”（185），而迈克尔·托德1956年的改编，幽灵后生活来自于“制片人对任何特定改编的影响和其演员阵容的明星效应”（185）。至于2004年库拉齐的改编，格里菲思解释说，他并没有像凡尔纳那样改编小说，而是专注于“凡尔纳的神话形象……作为未来预言家”（197），但受到迈克尔·托德生产的影响。虽然我只能赞扬大师级的论点、深刻的分析和杰出的学术贡献，但我无法不怀疑作者及其编辑为什么没有准备一个适合盎格鲁读者的版本，通过提供引用的许多法文文本的翻译。既然这里讨论的议题如此重要，将读者局限于法语读者就限制了本章的影响力和范围。然而，格里菲斯和沃茨对于翻译在不同媒体中改编的力量所做的重要声明在当今，尤其在被认为是可读的材料面临各种形状和大小的改编威胁的时代，值得最大的认可。