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Abstract

After a book is adapted into a film, it is not unlikely that a new audience will discover the source text, and that the audience that already existed will also be influenced by the adaptation. This thesis studied the influence of film and stage adaptations on the symbolic and economic capital of the source text. Three case studies on the *Northern Lights* trilogy by Philip Pullman, *The Hours* by Michael Cunningham and *Twelfth Night* by William Shakespeare are discussed. Bourdieu’s theory on the field of cultural production is used to define the influence in symbolic and economic capital. This is researched by analyzing the book covers, film posters and the extras that are available in the book, such as the acknowledgements, the introduction and the extras on the DVD. This thesis also examines the professional and amateur reception of the source text and its adaptations. The case studies show that the influence of the film adaptation is more prominent on the source text than the influence of the source text on the adaptation. This suggests that the symbolic capital of the source text and its author become less important in adaptations. Furthermore, the adaptations influence the amateur reception and thus the symbolic capital of the source text. The adaptations positively influence the economic capital of the source text due to new publications and attracting a broader audience. Thus, the symbolic and economic capital of the source text is influenced by the adaptations in these case studies.
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Introduction

When the public talks about adaptations, the statement “the book was better” is frequently used. Fidelity – how faithful the adaptation is in comparison to the original – is one of the most used terms in the evaluation of an adaptation. Nevertheless, this statement does not express an opinion about the book or the adaptation as a work on its own. This leads to questions about the influence of the reception of the film or stage adaptation on the prestige of the source text and the way the public of the adaptation perceives the source text after watching the adaptation.

As the subtitle of Bring On the Books For Everybody (2010) suggests, Jim Collins discusses “how literary culture became popular culture”. The book examines literary culture from a non-academic perspective; although Collins’ theories are supported by academic evidence, such as Bourdieu’s theory, Collins presents his view in a more popular manner to appeal to the masses. Collins’ book will be used as a stepping-stone for this research. Collins describes how reading, which was seen as a solitary and print-based experience, has become a social activity. Collins defines the upcoming trends in the 21st century that transformed literary fiction in the last decade. Literary fiction became best-selling entertainment due to the emerging superstore bookshops, Oprah’s Book Club, film adaptations and new technological advances. The second part of the book focuses on visual culture and how novels gained more attention due to their film adaptations. Adaptations of films have been very popular and they are often nominated for the Academy Awards (Collins 118). Literary experience was changed by film adaptations, because the public might also take this film adaptation into account. With all the different adaptation possibilities, the book “has become only one of a host of interlocking literary experiences” (Collins 119). Within these interlocking literary experiences, the film can influence the novel, and the other way around. After the adaptation, the publisher often decides to republish the novel with the film poster as the new cover to attract different readers, for example the people who saw (and liked) the film. How the film was received by the public may influence the way this public sees the source text. Commercially successful Hollywood productions that were made for the masses can influence the perception of the novel, since these films often have a lower cultural status than literature.

This research will be built on Bourdieu’s field of production. Pierre Bourdieu is a French sociologist who works with the concept of a ‘field’ in which a cultural work exists. Figure 18 shows the schematic picture of Bourdieu’s theory of the field of cultural production.
When studying a work of art, the production and the reception of this work are also taken into account, and not only the intentions of the creator. A cultural work can gain various sorts of capital in its field, such as economic capital (money) or symbolic capital (prestige). An adaptation takes up a complex position in the literary field, because it is a work that is influence by another work. Henry Jenkins, an American media scholar who is specialized in comparative media and convergence culture, stated that “each medium makes its own unique contribution to the unfolding of the story” (Jenkins). Each adaptation in a different medium will also have a unique contribution to the symbolic and economic capital of the source text due to the perception of the public. The reception of the adaptation is important for its symbolic capital, because the product is also shaped by its audience. Since an adaptation can influence how the public sees the source text, it can also influence its symbolic and economic capital in Bourdieu’s field of cultural production.

The first case study is Michael Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998). From a Bourdieusian perspective, Cunningham’s novel can be seen as a consecrated novel with a considerable amount of symbolic capital. It can be seen as highbrow literature and *The Hours* won the 1999 Pulitzer Prize for Fiction and the 1999 PEN/Faulkner Prize for Fiction. The narrative deals with three generation of women who are affected by Virginia Woolf. Woolf’s work is an example of highbrow literature; it is highly valued by critics and often discussed at universities. *The Hours* (1998) echoes Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway*. Although Cunningham never directly retells or rewrites the events of Woolf’s novel, their presence is everywhere in his novel. He created “a work that exists in symbiotic interplay with Woolf’s fiction and nonfiction” (Sanders 116). Thus Woolf’s influence is clearly present in *The Hours* (1998). This means Woolf brought in symbolic capital in Cunningham’s novel due to intertextuality. However, this thesis does not research how Woolf’s symbolic capital has influenced Cunningham’s novel, since this is a different kind of adaptation influence. *The Hours* (1998) has been adapted once; it was made into an Oscar-winning film in 2002, starring the actresses Meryl Streep, Nicole Kidman and Julianne Moore. The popularity of the film means that from a Bourdiesian perspective, the novel made a shift in his field of cultural production. Instead of the intellectual audience for the novel, the film gained a mass audience, which influenced the symbolic capital of the source text. The film also gained a considerable amount of economic capital: worldwide it profited $108.846.072. After the success of the film, the publisher arranged a new edition of the novel with the film poster used for the cover.
The second case study is on Philip Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy. This trilogy is aimed at children and has been adapted into a film, stage play, video game and more. Children’s literature is generally not considered as highbrow literature by the critics; it is not in the selection for literary prizes, is usually not included in the literary canon and is hardly discussed in the established media. Pullman’s work has been revolutionary in his field; it is stated that his work “dramatized the closing gap between children’s literature and the established canon when his *The Amber Spyglass* (2001) won the Whitbread Prize”, which was the first time a children’s book won the prize (Black). Pullman also won the prestigious Astrid Lindgren Memorial Award, which is “the largest international children’s and young adult literature award in the world” (“About Us”). The award is worth SEK five million, which is approximately 760.000 USD or 570.000 EUR. The purpose of the award is “to strengthen and increase interest in children’s and young adult literature around the world” (“About Us”). Pullman won the award in 2005, and winning such a prestigious award indicates that his work is important in the field of children’s and young adult literature. These prizes suggests that Pullman’s work can be considered as highbrow children’s and young adult literature.

Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* series have been adapted into a film, stage play, audio book, and a graphic novel. The *BBC* has announced a miniseries as well. For this research, I will compare, contrast and analyse reviews and articles about the film and stage adaptations and examine if there are references to the original source text and how the source text is treated by critics. The *His Dark Materials* trilogy is perceived as children’s literature; the film is a children’s film, but the stage play, written by Nicholas Wright, was performed at the National Theatre. Taking into account that most of the shows were in the evening, the play was also aimed at a more mature audience. On Pullman’s website, he claimed that the stage play aimed “to create an experience as meaningful for 12 year olds as for adults” (“Stage, film and TV”). This suggests that the intended audience for the stage play is different from the intended audience of the source text. From a Bourdieusian perspective, stage plays are more consecrated: they are generally not created for a mass audience, and often discussed by critics in the media. In Bourdieu’s field of cultural production, stage plays have more symbolic capital. So the stage adaptation could have influenced the symbolic capital of the original trilogy.

Bourdieu’s field of cultural production does not solely focus on symbolic capital: a cultural production can also gain economic capital. This economic capital is usually important for the film industry, where the box office numbers are used to show how popular a film was. Pullman’s trilogy consists of three novels, but the film does not have any sequels. This might
be a consequence of the box office, since Pullman states on his website that “if [the people who have seen the film] are very interested, they'll probably have read about how the film didn't do as well as the studio had hoped at the American box office. They might also have read that the film did very well in the rest of the world, but that despite that, the studio isn't likely to make the sequels” (Pullman). The box office of the film was $372,234,864, thus it gained a considerable amount of economic capital. The film also won an Academy Award, which can influence the symbolic capital of the film adaptation. Despite this, no sequels of the film were made. Nevertheless, the BBC recently announced that they have decided to make a series based on the novels. They were not discouraged by the supposedly disappointing results of economic capital that the film gained in America. The hypothesis is that, in its afterlife, the *Dark Materials* series mostly gained economic capital through the film and gained symbolic capital by the stage production and the BBC series.

The third case study is Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (1623). This play is believed to have been written around 1601 as part of the Twelfth’s Night entertainment. The text first appeared in the First Folio of 1623 (Shakespeare 23). The plot revolves around mistaken identities and love. Overall, Shakespeare has got a high degree of consecration. His works can be seen as prestigious and in Bourdieusian terms, Shakespeare can be seen as a playwright with a high amount of symbolic capital. His prestige reflects on his works, but according to Cartmell it also reflects on the adaptations of his works: “Shakespeare on film seems to have established itself as an area in its own right, with little or no heed for the wider context of studies in adaptations” (Cartmell 28). Shakespeare has been adapted very often due to his great popularity: “Shakespeare is so frequently adapted in part because he is a major author” (Fischlin and Fortier qtd. in Sanders 48). This thesis will focus on Shakespeare’s scripted text in his First Folio (1623), the staged play *Twelfth Night* (2013) directed by Tim Carroll, the film adaptation *Twelfth Night* (1996) by Trevor Nunn and the film adaptation *She’s the Man* (2006) by Andy Fickman.

This thesis will research if and how the symbolic and economic capital changed due to the adaptations, and evaluates if the screen and stage adaptations made the novels gain or lose symbolic and economic capital. In the case of Pullman’s *Dark Materials* series, the adaptations could have facilitated the novel to gain more symbolic capital. Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) might have lost symbolic capital due to the popularity of the film. This thesis will research if adaptations influence the symbolic capital of the source text (the novel) by elaborating what Collins has stated in his book and combining it with Bourdieu’s theory on the field of cultural studies. In the case of Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (1623), the source text
is highly consecrated, so the adaptations might use this high level of consecration to gain symbolic capital, except the high school adaptation *She’s the Man* (2006). Adaptations have an effect on the source text; not only does it draw more attention to the source text, but there is often also a new edition with the film cover published. This thesis considers what the influence of these adaptations is on the perception of the original novel by examining the covers of the source text and the adaptations, thus the presentation of the cultural product, and the reviews of the source text and the adaptations. The influence of adaptations on the economic capital will also be studied. When more people are familiar with the film, they will probably also become familiar the book, which is a positive opportunity for the source text to gain more economic capital due to reprints. So this thesis investigates how the adaptations and the reception of these adaptations affect the symbolic and economic capital in the afterlife of the source text. It will centre on the three case studies of Cunningham’s *The Hours*, Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy and Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*.

The hypothesis of this research is that adaptations have an effect on the symbolic and economic capital of the source text. Highbrow literature, such as Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998), will most likely gain economic capital due to the box office numbers of the film and the new film edition of the novel. The popularity of the film will also affect the symbolic capital of Cunningham’s novel, since the film has a lower level of consecration. There will be a shift in audience: the novel mostly had an intellectual audience, but the film appeals to a mass audience. This mass audience might read the novel as well, and this shift in audience will cause a shift in Bourdieu’s field. Popular or middlebrow literature, such as Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy, will also gain economic capital due to the box office of the film and the new film-edition of the novel. Symbolic capital can be gained by adaptations with a high level of symbolic capital, such as stage plays or the BBC series. In the case of Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (1623), the stage adaptations will most likely contribute to the symbolic capital of the source text, but the film adaptations are made for the mass audience. *She’s the Man* (2006) will affect the symbolic capital of Shakespeare’s source text in a negative manner due to the popular treatment of the high school adaptation, and it will most likely hardly affect the economic capital of Shakespeare’s source text.
Theoretical and Methodological Framework

This research evaluates whether adaptations have an influence on the symbolic and economic capital of the source text. Adaptations are works that are adapted from another piece, without merely copying its source: “a derivation that is not derivative – a work that is second without being secondary” (Hutcheon 9). Adapting is “borrowing, stealing, appropriating, inheriting, assimilating, being influenced, in spired, dependent, indepted, haunted, possessed, homage, mimicry, travesty, echo, allusion, and intertextuality” (Poole qtd. in Sanders 3). Adaptation studies are an interdisciplinary field caught between literature studies and film studies. An adaptation can be useful for the popularity of the original work, since it is “not vampiric: it does not draw the life-blood from its source and leave it dying or dead”, but it can keep it alive “in giving an afterlife it would never have had otherwise” (Hutcheon 176). Adaptations can add to the original work because of the new possibilities of the adaptation. There are three types of adaptations: a transposition, a commentary and an analogy (Cho). A transposition is faithful to the source text, in a commentary the director puts its distinctive stamp on the style of the film adaptation and in an analogy the elements are radically changed.

Adaptations can be so close to the original that they have an influence on the source, so they might also influence the symbolic and economic value of the source text. Deborah Cartmell, one of the founders of the Association of Adaptation Studies, argues that “the study of adaptations directly contributed to the emergence of film studies in the academy” (11). Adaptations are often haunted by their source text, but it also works the other way around: the source text can be influenced by the adaptation. One medium will influence the other: “no one medium can operate as an island” (Lord 96). Sometimes, the adaptation becomes more well-known or more popular than the original text, and then this adaptation will inhabit and imprint itself upon the original (Cartmell 11). Adaptations are sometimes seen as threats to the literary texts they are based on, because the public might see the adaptation as the original, but Cartmell disagrees: “These [adaptations] in no way pose any threat to the literary texts they are based on. The real fear is that an adaptation will, as the ambition of Walt Disney, usurp its literary source, becoming ‘the original’ in the minds of its audience” (Cartmell 46). This is what happened with several Disney films: the public forgets that they were based on another source and the Disney film becomes the original in the mind of the audience. The adaptation should not replace the original, but add to the richness of the spoken word and influence it since “every retelling alters the story told” (Herman 53). It can re-envision the narrative for a new audience in a new cultural environment, and this new audience will develop a different
relationship with ‘the original’. If the audience does not know the original yet, it will become more familiar with the adaptation, hence experiencing the adaptation “through the lenses of the adapted work” (Cartmell, 23-26). The audience will notice these influences of the adaptation on the source text.

The reception of adaptations mostly focus on the fidelity of the adaptation, which means that these critics assess how faithful the adaptation is to the original (Hutcheon). The Guardian recently wrote an article about “badaptations” in which they discussed adaptations that did not follow the source text and made major changes to the plot lines. Some critics will point out interdisciplinary connections and shifting positions between the original and the adaptation. These connections can be important for the symbolic capital that is attributed to the adaptation. According to Cartmell, ‘bad adaptations’ have more coverage than ‘good adaptations’, because “they fulfil the prophecies of those who wish to see only artlessness in such a process and because there is little interest in the fate of the popular or middlebrow in writing on screen” (3). This is the case for the adaptation of the His Dark Materials trilogy: most of the reception of the film was negative, and these negative reviews were often discussed in the press. The reception of She’s the Man (2006) was also mostly negative in the established press, but this analogy did not have a major influence on the source text. This negative view on adaptations is not new, since Woolf in her essay “The Cinema” already stated that “films were degrading, with readers being replaced with ‘savages of the twentieth century watching the pictures’” (qtd. in Cartmell 2). This division in high culture and popular culture is important in Jim Collins’ theory.

The theoretical framework that supports this research consists of Jim Collins’ Bring on the Books for Everybody about “how literary culture became popular culture” and Bourdieu’s theory about the field of production. Collins is a Professor of Film and Television and English at the University Of Notre Dame and he is specialized in film and television theory, postmodern studies, and digital culture. Collins’ book examines literary culture by describing how reading has become a social activity. Literary culture is substantiated by academic theories, but the information in the book is presented in a popular manner. Bring on the Books for Everybody explores the reasons for this shift from literary culture to popular culture, such as the growing popularity of book clubs, but also the rise of television.

In Bring on the Books for Everybody, Collins explains how adaptation films contributed to the popularization and relocation of literary culture and he states that watching television may have a positive effect on literary reading (15). This positive effect on literary
reading can be initiated by authors who give interviews, or initiatives such as Oprah’s Book Club. Some books gain more popularity after they are adapted. Literary adaptations have been around for years, but became more popular in the past decade. The adaptation films are often rewarded with Academy Awards (Collins). These films are often still connected to the novel: on the DVD’s there is often the commentary from the author of the novel, or the websites link to both the novel and the film, which is the case for Atonement (Collins). Collins states that in that case “literary prose and movie star face were completely imbedded one within the other, each elevating the other in a hybrid cultural entertainment that was dependent on the words as it was on the glamorous image” (Collins 119). It was stated that there “is no longer such a thing as writings; there are only rewritings which reorganise previous cultural discourse and it is the function of intertextuality to analyse the relationships between the new product and the old codes” (Onega 9). The film adaptation and the source text are intertwined and influence each other. Collins calls this “cine-literary culture”, where “the book has become only one of a host of interlocking literary experiences” (Collins 119). This enthusiasm for adaptations intensified in the nineties and has been growing ever since. Collins states that the adaptation film is more than a well-upholstered, pseudo-literariness for a niche audience and examines the phenomenon of adaptations elaborately in Bring on the Books for Everybody.

Collins presents an overview of how adaptations became more popular and for which audiences in the chapter “The Movie was Better”. In the 1910’s, the promotion of the adaptations reflected “a complicated interplay between financial and cultural capital” (124). High culture was to be preserved and kept out of the realm of the market place. Although there were not many adaptations produced, they still had a prestigious status during the First World War. In the thirties there was a renewed emphasis on literary adaptations. Cinephilea cooled and became popular again in the sixties, when heritage films were the most popular adaptations, and in the eighties, when the adaptation films were “some kind of encyclopaedia for a college-educated audience for whom viewing becomes a process of education” (Collins 137). This attitude changed again in the nineties: the approach towards literary classics changed and film studies and adaptations became legitimatized to study in universities. According to Collins, this could not have been accomplished “without challenging the literary as the international gold standard of cultural capital” (138). The popularization of tastefulness made that the adaptation film is no longer for a niche audience, but rather a mass audience. From a Bourdieusian perspective, the adaptation film became less consecrated. Adaptation
films became part of the entertainment industry, which is mostly led by commercial successes and less by the prestige of the source texts.

Collins states that “the adaptation films that have dominated the Academy Awards have been winners of Man Booker, PEN Faulkner, and Pulitzer Prizes” (17). This means that the films profit from the status of these novels, but it also works the other way around. When the film is in the cinema, the new edition of the book is often published with the film poster as cover. The influence of the film on the book can be seen in the sales and in the amount of republications of the books. When these books gain popularity, they might lose symbolic capital. Where the literary books were first seen as high culture, mainly for an intellectual or bourgeois audience, they become available for the mass audience. Literary books are written from “the solitary efforts of the individual to express their distinct vision, untrammelled by concerns about the commercial value of the product which is deemed subsidiary to aesthetic value” (Bluestone qtd. in Whelehan 6). A Hollywood film is produced with a different agenda: to become a commercial success. This means that the film was produced for a mass audience as well, so it is less consecrated in Bourdieusian terms. Collins also states that Bourdieu’s account of the ways “in which traditional literary culture distinguished itself from what he calls the public at large provides an extremely useful template that can be modified to account for hybridization of those categories within popular literary culture” (32).

Collin’s theory will be combined with the academic theory of Bourdieu’s field of production. In Collins’ *Bring on the Books for Everybody*, he refers to Bourdieu by stating that:

> Popular literary culture depends on the development of another field between restricted and large-scale production, in which the delivery systems for literary experiences become increasingly large-scale […]. The increases in scale secured by conglomeration allow for an unprecedented interdependency of the publishing, film, and television industries, which can read that ‘public at large’ wherever it may be with ever greater proficiency, but that culture also has its own ‘agents of legitimation’, its own authorities, which consecrate the buying of books and the viewing of film and television adaptations as a genuinely literary experience distinct from mere consumer experience (33).

This indicates that Collins uses Bourdieu to support his theory that literary culture is dependent on the field of cultural production and the admiration of society that revolves...
around literary reading. The field of production is a system of objective relationships between persons and institutions. Bourdieu’s model can be used to see the shifts of the original works in the field. His theory suggests that society is classified in ‘fields’ and the cultural products and producers are located within this field. In his book *The Field of Cultural Production* (1993), he stated that “the structured set of the manifestations of the social agents involved in the field – literary or artistic works, of course, but also political acts or pronouncements, manifestos or polemics, etc. – is inseparable from the space of literary or artistic positions defined by possession of a determinate quantity of specific capital (recognition) and, at the same time, by occupation of a determinate position in the structure of the distribution of this specific capital” (Bourdieu 30). A work of art does not solely exist in a vacuum; it must be situated in its field. In the field, ‘actors’ are present who can influence the capital of the cultural work, and the product is shaped by the expectations of the audience. A cultural product such as a novel is not only created by the author, but also by the field of cultural production. Bourdieu rejects the duality of internal versus external readings of a work of art; we can approach it from both perspectives.

In Bourdieu’s field, ‘capital’ is one of the main terms. He identified four forms of capital in his book *In the Forms of Capital* (1986): social capital, cultural capital, economic capital. He later added symbolic capital to this. This thesis will focus on only the economic and symbolic capital. Symbolic capital is shaped by the resources available on the basis of prestige, and it serves as value that one has within a culture. Economic capital is the command over economic resources, so the money that is available. The capital is shaped by the success in the field, such as “book sales, number of theatrical performances, etc. or honours, appointments, etc.” (Bourdieu 38). A power in this field can be ‘heteronomous’, which is related to the amount of symbolic capital it has. The cultural products with the least symbolic capital can offer the least resistance to external demands, as Bourdieu states: “the artists and writers who are richest in specific capital and most concerned for their autonomy are considerably weakened by the fact that some of their competitors identify their interests with the dominant principles of hierarchization and seek to impose them even within the field, with the support of temporal powers” (Bourdieu 41). The adaptation and its source text both had different actors that were involved in their production, they operate in a different cultural field, and are made for a different public. The source text and adaptation have a different place in in Bourdieu’s field of cultural production. The adaptation and its source text can influence each other’s symbolic capital because the adaptation has an influence on its source.
Method

This theoretical framework will be applied to three different case studies: Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998), Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy, and Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (1623). For *The Hours* (1998), the reviews of the novel and the film (directed by Stephen Daldry) will be examined. For the *His Dark Materials* trilogy, reviews of the novels, the film *The Golden Compass* (2007) (directed by Chris Weitz), and the stage adaptations will be used. The announcements for the BBC series will also be examined. For Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*, the written stage play, the 2012 stage adaptation, the film *Twelfth Night* (1996) directed by Trevor Nunn and the high school adaptation *She’s the Man* (2006) will be examined.

To determine the symbolic capital, this research will focus on the covers of the cultural work, and the reception. Symbolic capital cannot be measured because Bourdieu’s field of production consists of invisible processes. Therefore, the reviews will be examined for if and how they treat the source text. This research will observe in which newspapers and by whom the reviews were written. Some mediums have more prestige, so if the review has appeared in a more established journal or newspaper, it might positively influence the symbolic capital. The author of the review is also relevant, since some critics have more status and can attribute more symbolic capital to the adaptation. References to the source text are made in the film and stage reviews. These will be examined in how these references are made. Do they make statements about the importance of the novel’s author? Or do they make statements about the prizes the novel won? And are the novel and the adaptation compared in the review?

This thesis will also look at which Bourdieusian actors, such as agents or producers, might influence the symbolic capital. Cartmell states that “‘Star discourse’ is another increasingly popular mode of intervention into adaptation in recognition that stars affect the circulation of film properties as much when adaptations are made as when they fail to be made, and reading the adaptation through the other performances of a star or stars generate new possibilities in adaptation studies” (Cartmell 19). For instance on the cover of the DVD of *The Hours* (2002), the actresses are introduced as “a trio of the screen’s best actresses”, followed by the awards these actresses have won. This can also be the case in reviews about the films. Such statements indicate that the actors involved in the production of the adaptation can also add symbolic capital to the adaptation.

The economic value will be measured by the amount of republications of the book with the film cover, the box office numbers of the film and the amount of time that the stage play was in production. These numbers indicate whether or not there was a peak in the popularity of the novel after the publication of the adaptation, and how popular the adaptation
itself was. Furthermore, a payment must be made to the publisher or agent before the a film or stage adaptation is released.

This thesis will show how the influence of adaptations on the source text is treated in adaptation studies by using Collins’ *Bring on the Books for Everybody* as well as Bourdieu’s theory on the field of cultural production. The first chapter will focus on the first case study, of Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998). The case study will compare the reception of the film to the reception of the novel and will analyse the influence of the adaptation on the afterlife of the source text. The second chapter will focus on Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* case study. The reception of the novels, the film and stage adaptation will be examined, and there will be a brief overview of the other adaptations and their relationship to the source text. The last case study that will be examined is Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*. The scripted text, Carroll’s stage adaptation (2012), Trevor Nunn’s film adaptation *Twelfth Night* (1996) and Andy Fickman’s *She’s the Man* (2006) will be examined.
Chapter 1 – Case Study The Hours

*The Hours* was published in 1998 and won the 1999 Pulitzer Prize for Fiction, the 1999 PEN/Faulkner Award for Fiction and the 1999 Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Book Award (which is now called the Stonewall Book Award). The novel was written by Michael Cunningham, an American author and screenwriter. In 2002, Miramax adapted the novel into a film which starred the renowned actors Meryl Streep, Julianne Moore and Nicole Kidman. Simone Murray, university lecturer, director of The Centre for the Book and author of *The Adaptation Industry: The Cultural Economy of Contemporary Literary Adaptation*, called *The Hours* (2002) a film with “impeccable literary credentials” and these literary credentials add to the symbolic capital of the film (Murray 179). Collins states that it becomes clear in the ‘Special Features’ of the DVD that “one of the chief goals of the film version of *The Hours* was to turn viewers of the film into readers of *Mrs. Dalloway*” (Collins 117). Cunningham himself stated in a reader Q&A that he was satisfied with the adaptation, explaining that “[he] may be the only living author who’s been happy with the film adaptation of his novel. It helped, of course, that the cast included some of the greatest living actors. As it did that the adaptation was done by the brilliant English playwright, David Hare” (Cunningham). This chapter examines if and how the book and the film of *The Hours* influenced each other’s symbolic and economic capital.

1.1 The Novel: Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998)

Some covers of the novel after the 2002 film have references towards the symbolic capital of the film and vice versa (Figure 2, Figure 3). These references can be found by comparing the cover of the novel before the film adaptation, after the film adaptation and the cover of the film. The book covers of *The Hours* (1998) before the 2002 film came out logically do not refer to the film adaptation (Figure 1). The covers refer to the prizes won the novel won, however they only refer to the 1999 Pulitzer Prize for Fiction and the 1999 PEN/Faulkner Award for Fiction. The 1999 Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Book Award was not mentioned on any of the covers. The book covers after the film adaptation usually do refer to the film (Figure 3). Sometimes, the film poster or a shot from the film is used for the cover. In other cases, the covers refer to the adaptation by stating that it is “a major motion picture now” or include the names of the actresses or references to the awards that the film won. This
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indicates that the film has got an influence on the source text, and thus the film contributes to the symbolic capital of the novel.

In the acknowledgements of the first editions of the novel, Cunningham did not express any interest in having his novel adapted into a film. Nevertheless, in an interview with *BOMB*, he stated that, as he was working on the novel, he periodically said to his agent: “remember, don’t be looking for a movie deal on this one!” (Spring). Cunningham did not explicitly state his interest in an adaptation, but he possibility did cross his mind. Despite Cunningham’s resistance, the film was made in 2002. In the editions of the novel that were published after the film had been released, Cunningham did not add a preface about the adaptation. After the release of the film, Cunningham expressed his satisfaction with it by stating that “[he] may be the only living author who’s been happy with the film adaptation of his novel” (Cunningham). In an interview with *The Tech*, Cunningham stated that he is very satisfied with the results (Lewis). Nevertheless, no explicit statements by Cunningham were included in the editions of the novel that appeared after the film. Cunningham’s attitude towards being adapted can be a result of his intended symbolic capital. A film adaptation attracts a mass audience and can influence the consecration of the source text. Therefore, the symbolic capital of Cunningham’s novel might decline due to the film adaptation.

Before the film was released, the novel was reviewed by established media such as *The New York Times Book Review, The Los Angeles Times Book Review* and *The Washington Post Book World*. The reviews were written by experts in their fields, for instance Michael Wood from *The New York Times Book Review*, who is Professor Emeritus of English and Comparative Literature at Princeton. This review refers to Woolf’s symbolic capital, but also states that “Cunningham follows Woolf's cadences too closely” (Wood). Nevertheless, Wood states that it is not necessary to read Woolf’s text before reading Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998). The reviewer can only give this statement if he is familiar with Woolf’s text, thus he tries to establish his own symbolic capital by referring to the novel by Woolf. Wood does not make any references towards the possibility of adapting Cunningham’s source text. *The Los Angeles Times* also reviewed Cunningham’s novel. The review was written by Richard Eder, who won the 1987 Pulitzer Prize for his *The Los Angeles Times* book reviews (Colker). He opens his review with references towards Virginia Woolf, instead of focussing on Cunningham’s novel. Eder compares the two authors and their approach to their characters, after which he concludes that “Cunningham employs echoes and contrasts with Woolf's protagonist to suggest the frontiers, perilously mined, between art and life” (Eder). The critic
even uses this review to recommend readers to read Woolf’s novel. Although Eder does seem to prefer Woolf’s text over Cunningham, he does praise the latter for his “beautifully and touchingly” writing (Eder). Also Eder does not refer to the possibility of adapting the novel.

The review in *The Washington Post Book World* was written by Jameson Currier, an author who wrote many stories about AIDS. Currier also refers to Woolf: “‘The Hours’ was Woolf’s original title for "Mrs. Dalloway," and Cunningham's use of it causes the reader to wonder if he is going to achieve his effects merely by mimicking Woolf's voice, plot and point of view” (Currier). Currier shows his awareness of the symbolic capital brought in by Woolf with this statement. Nevertheless, Currier calls Cunningham’s work original, and “his most mature and masterful work” (Currier). This statement indicates that Currier is familiar with the other pieces written by Cunningham as well. He establishes his own position as a credible critic with these references. In the review, no statements were made towards adapting Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998). The review in *CNN’s Salon* already refers to Woolf in the title: “Virginia Woolf's 'Mrs. Dalloway' moves to modern Manhattan”. Nevertheless, the critic calls Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) “neither an homage nor a sequel to "Mrs. Dalloway."” (Jones-Davies). The review was written by Jones-Davies, a poet, literary reporter, sub-editor, book review editor and book reviewer (Jones). She can be seen as an established critic. Jones-Davies is positive on Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) and calls it a “clever literary accomplishment” (Jones-Davies).

Most reviews refer in established media to Virginia Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* and compare Cunningham’s work with her novel. This suggests that the critics in the recognised media want to establish their position by demonstrating their knowledge of the established piece of literature. The critics that reviewed Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) were all established critics, which suggests that *The Hours* (1998) is a prestigious novel. Therefore, the source text can be seen as a novel with a high level of consecration, and the reviews by established critics in established media contribute to this level of consecration.

Despite Cunningham’s reputation as an established writer, *The Guardian* did not review Cunningham’s novel before the film came out. In February 2003, after the film was released, the newspaper published a sequel of three articles on Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) in which John Mullan “deconstructed [sic] Michael Cunningham’s *The Hours*” (Mullan). Mullan wrote another three articles on Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) in 2011. The film adaptation *The Hours* (2002) was never mentioned in any of these articles, although they were all written after its release. Nevertheless, the dates of these articles suggest that the film adaptation might have been the cause for the articles. Since the articles were focussed on
the novel, the level of consecration of the source text might be higher. The first three articles were written shortly after the success of the film, nevertheless the adaptation was not mentioned and the articles focus solely on the novel.

The online magazine *January Review* reviewed Cunningham’s novel after the release of the film and compared the adaptation to its original. Critic Margaret Gunning claims that “the gripping and exquisitely sensitive movie version of *The Hours* is the best thing that ever happened to Michael Cunningham” (Gunning). This positive influence might be the case for the economic capital and the public awareness of the novel: the film adaptation can appeal to a much bigger audience, and this audience might want to look into the source text as well. However, she does state that the novel “goes so much deeper” and “the film version, superb as it is, is like a jar of preserves compared to the luscious fruit of the novel” (Gunning).

Gunning seems to prefer the novel over the film version and merely calls the film a great opportunity for Cunningham’s novel to get into the picture again. Furthermore, her statement suggests that the source text is more consecrated than the film adaptation, since she states that the “jar of preserves” is merely a far cry from the “luscious fruit of the novel” (Gunning).

The blog *Curled Up With a Good Book* reviewed Cunningham’s novel after the publication of the film as well, but they did not compare the adaptation to the source text. The critic does refer to the film cover of the novel by stating that “Streep plays Clarissa in the movie version of *The Hours* and appears on the cover of the softcover edition” (Galt). Nevertheless, she does not express her opinion on the film adaptation or the film cover. The magazine *Kirkus Review* also reviewed Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998). Their review was written in 1998, but posted online in 2010, after the publication of the film. It is very positive about Cunningham’s novel. The *Kirkus Review* did not alter the review or add a response to the film after they posted it online.

Reviews of Cunningham’s novel after the publication of the film are scarce, since most media already reviewed the novel when it was published. Nevertheless, reviews of Cunningham’s other novels often refer to his prizewinning *The Hours* (1998). In a review in *The Independent* on Cunningham’s *A Wild Swan and Other Tales*, the critic Guy Pewsey states about *The Hours* (1998) that “the novel, which won a Pulitzer Prize and was made into an Oscar-winning film starring Nicole Kidman and Meryl Streep, was an intelligent, affecting re-imagining, so it is no wonder that Cunningham seems so comfortable interpreting pre-existing stories” (Pewsey). This statement refers to the source text and the adaptation, which suggests that winning a Pulitzer Prize and being adapted into an Oscar-winning film with big names might both contribute to the symbolic capital of the novel *The Hours* (1998).
Cunningham’s novel and its prizes were also mentioned in a review of Cunningham’s *Specimen Days*, but there are no references towards the 2002 film (Bowman). Most reviews of Cunningham’s later work refer to *The Hours* (1998), but they usually only refer to it briefly or introduce it as his prize-winning work. References to the 2002 film are rare. This shows that the afterlife of Cunningham’s first novel was influenced more by the prizes it won than by the 2002 film, which suggests that the symbolic capital of the prizes is more important for the afterlife of Cunningham’s work than the symbolic capital of a Hollywood film does.

Amateur reviews on book blogs and reviewing websites such as Goodreads are also taken into account. Laura Musings wrote on her blog *Musings* that “this is one of those books I suspect “everybody” has read by now, as it won the 1999 Pulitzer Prize for Fiction, and was made into a popular movie in 2002” (Musings). Angel Daniel Matos also reviewed *The Hours* (1998) on his book blog *Angelmatus*, where he states that the novel was “not only the winner of the 1999 Pulitzer Prize for fiction, but it is also the source of the Oscar-winning 2002 movie of the same name” (Matos). These statements suggest that both the 1999 Pulitzer Prize for Fiction and the 2002 film are of equal importance to the reputation of Cunningham’s novel. This may indicate that the symbolic capital of both the 1999 Pulitzer Prize and of the 2002 film contribute to the symbolic capital of the afterlife of *The Hours* (1998). Matos also refers to Collins’ statements on adaptations, stating “fortunately, I had not seen the movie and I knew very little of the novel’s plot, so I was able to enjoy the narrative in its purest, with no spoilers or outlandish expectations (with the exception of the ideas discussed by Jim Collins in his discussion of the movie adaptation)” (Matos). Matos is aware of the status and implications of adaptations, but there seems to be an underlying implication that it is better to read the novel without having seen the film adaptation. The reviewer on *Isserleylovesbooks* also refers to her experience with Cunningham’s novel, stating that she first read it after seeing the movie, which was a “horrible mistake” (Isserleylovesbooks). This suggests that the film was a motivation for her to read the book for the first time, but the review hints towards a preference for the source text. She states that the film was excellent, but she does not elaborate or compare the film to its source text (Isserleylovesbooks). The book blogger Sandy P. from *Saying It Out Loud* also states that luckily she did not remember the details of the film, since she thinks it “would have taken something from reading the book” (P.). Most of the online book reviews have in common that they briefly refer to the film. This suggests that the symbolic capital of the film adaptation influenced how the reviewers see the source text. The reviewers most often to the character of Meryl Streep in the 2002 film, since she was mentioned in Cunningham's novel as well: “it was Meryl Streep, definitely Meryl Streep”
(Cunningham 50). Cunningham himself commented on this in one of his Goodreads Q&A’s: “Wouldn’t it be great if you could mention a movie star in a novel, and somehow cause that star to be in the film version” (Cunningham). Thus the star discourse of Streep influences the level of consecration of the film adaptation.

In the comment sections of book blogs, readers often respond and refer to the film. For example, the commenter ‘Savidgereads’ states that “Sometimes I curse myself for not having read the book before I saw the film as I will have Streep, Kidman and Moore in my head whilst reading the book. Maybe once the movie fades a little in my mind that will be the time to try and read it!” in the comment section of the book blog Things Mean a Lot (Savidgereads qtd. in S.). Thus the film adaptation influenced this reader’s opinion of the source text. Furthermore, the commenter refers to the three stars of the film adaptation, which suggests that its symbolic capital is important of the level of consecration of the film adaptation. Another commenter, ‘Jenners’, stated that “[he] saw the movie "The Hours" but it didn't strike [him] as a book [he] would want to read” (Jenners qtd. in S.). Commenter ‘Dreamybee’ stated: “This was one of the few instances where I think I liked the movie better than the book”, which suggests that the commenter thinks highly of the film adaptation (qtd. in S.). These comments indicate that the film is important for the afterlife of Cunningham’s The Hours (1998), since many remarks are made on the relationship between the novel and its adaptation.

On online reviewing websites such as Goodreads and in the comment section on Amazon, the reviews are often shorter than the reviews placed in newspapers or on book blogs. On Goodreads, the reviewer ‘minervasowl’ states that she read the book after she heard about it on Oprah and saw the film: “I'm a little ashamed to admit that I read this book because Oprah told me to. Actually Oprah, Meryl Streep, Julianne Moore and Nicole Kidman told me to”. This suggests that the symbolic capital of Oprah and the actresses from the film influenced the decision of this reader to pick up the source text. So in this case, the film adaptation (and its promotion) seem to have influenced the economic capital of the source text. ‘Helen the Bookowl’ was also quite positive on the novel, giving it four out of five stars. She states that “even though [she has] watched the movie starring three of my favourite actresses, [she thinks] that the books gives you SO much more of an insight into these hidden gems and connections” (Goodreads). Just like Gunning in the January Review, this reviewer suggests that the book has got more to offer than the film adaptation. This influences the level of consecration of the source text. Other reviewers simply indicate that they have seen the movie, and sometimes state that this helped in their understanding of the novel. For instance
‘Madalena’ stated: “plot wise, [she has] had seen the film before [she] read it, and although [she] didn’t really remember much details, [she thinks] that helped [her] not getting confused about the characters, names, relationships, etc” (Goodreads). The film adaptation was merely a good way to remember the overall plotline. In the customer reviews on Amazon, reviewers often refer to the 2002 film as well. Customer ‘Bertietrouble’ states that the novel is “a wonderful piece of writing. To be read before or after seeing the film, which this edition has a great film still off on the cover” (Amazon). ‘DalyRae’ stated that she read the book in university, an indication that the novel has got enough symbolic capital to be discussed at universities, and she states that “most people in the class couldn't get through the film let alone the book, but I think it's brilliant and moving” (Amazon). This suggests that the film was made for an intellectual audience in Bourdieusian terms, and not for the mass market. Nevertheless, the symbolic capital of the source text is higher. Most Amazon reviewers do not refer to the film in their reviews, or only briefly mention it, for instance by calling the novel “the book of the film” (Barbara C. qtd. on Amazon). However, although the reviews are always about the novel and do not compare the source text with the film, most of the reviewers do point out that they have seen the film or are aware of its existence. So the film plays an important role in the online reviews of the afterlife of Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998).

The economic capital of the novel cannot be exactly measured since the exact sales numbers are not available. However, the novel has won some prestigious prizes that come with prize money. Winners of the Pulitzer Prize receive a 10,000 dollar cash award, winners of the PEN/Faulkner Award for fiction receive $15,000 cash and winners of the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Book Award receive $1,000 cash, so Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) already received $26,000. Furthermore, the novel was republished several times due to its popularity, which also positively influences the economic capital of the novel. After the publication of the film, new editions with the film cover were published. The public of the film might be inclined to buy and read the novel after seeing the 2002 film, so the adaptation most likely contributed towards the economic capital of the novel.

1.2 The Film: Daldry’s *The Hours* (2002)

The film covers of *The Hours* (2002) do not include any references to either Cunningham or the source text (Figure 2). These covers do not suggest that the film *The Hours* (2002) is an adaptation and merely include the prizes and/or nominations of the film adaptation. Thus the
film cover does not show any sign of influence by the novel on the symbolic capital of the film.

References from the source text to the adaptation and vice versa are visible in the extras of the DVD. Although the DVD cover of *The Hours* (2002) does not mention source text, the DVD does include audio commentary by Stephen Daldry, the director, and Michael Cunningham, the author of the source text. Collins states that such inclusions “blur the line between what is intended for amateur and professionalized readers since it converts the DVD edition of *The Hours* into something resembling a Norton Critical Edition of literary masterpieces used for decades in college English classes” (13). The DVD includes more information on the source text and the film adaptation. The DVD also includes “Audio Commentary with the Director and Screenwriter”, but the audio commentary does not feature screenwriter David Hare, but the author of the novel Cunningham. David Hare’s printed version of the screenplay refers to both Cunningham’s novel and the film. It also includes an introduction by Hare in which he discusses his view on Cunningham’s novel and states that “a film of *The Hours* was not going overly to resemble anything which had gone before” (Hare viii). Hare applauds Cunningham for his masterpiece and his trust in Hare’s abilities. Furthermore, Cunningham himself stated about the adaptation that he encouraged Hare “to transport it not only into another medium but re-tell it in his own way” (Cunningham). These statements suggest that the symbolic capital of the source text does influence the film adaptation. The mass audience usually does not watch all the extras of the DVD, so these extras are mostly interesting for the audience that is aware of the film’s status as an adaptation. In the afterlife of Cunningham’s source text, he did influence the film adaptation.

In Bourdieu’s field of cultural studies, the actors that are involved in creating a piece of art, in this case the 2002 film *The Hours* also influenced its symbolic capital. Cunningham’s novel already gained status by winning prestigious prizes and the intertextuality with Virginia Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway*. Nevertheless, this quality concept was further improved by the film because it included important names such as Philip Glass, David Hare, and Stephen Daldry, who are all Academy Award winners. Stephen Daldry was known for directing stage productions and had won a BAFTA, a Tony Award and an Academy award before he directed *The Hours* (2002). Playwright Sir David Hare was known for his stage work, and had won multiple prizes such as the BAFTA Award. He is seen as “the UK’s most esteemed living playwright and a major figure within Britain’s cultural establishment” (Murray 179). Since stage productions are seen as more consecrated in Bourdieu’s field of...
production, and the producers had already won prestigious prizes, Daldry and Hare added symbolic capital to the film production. Philip Glass was seen as one of the most influential people in classical and dance music, thus he also might have added symbolic capital to the film (“The Most Influential People in Classical and Dance”). The actresses in the film can be seen as established actresses: “Meryl Streep and Julianne Moore having already achieved ‘fine actor’ status, joined by an acknowledged movie star, Nicole Kidman”, thus they might have contributed to the symbolic capital of the adaptation (Collins 169-170). The names of these award-winning actresses (including the prices they won) are often placed on the film poster, cover of the DVD and post-film book covers. This “star discourse”, the mode of intervention for adaptations to achieve recognition through the performances of a star, is clearly used for the promotion of The Hours (2002) (Cartmell 19).

On the cover of the DVD, actresses Meryl Streep, Nicole Kidman and Julianne Moore are introduced as “a trio of the screen’s best actresses”. Not only the prizes that the actresses won before The Hours (2002) influenced the symbolic capital of the film, but also the nominations and awards won by the film itself influenced the film adaptation, and therefore also the afterlife of Cunningham’s novel. The film was nominated for nine Academy Awards: Best Picture, Best Director, Best Adapted Screenplay, Best Actress, Best Supporting Actress, Best Supporting Actor, Best Editing, Best Costume Design and Best Original Score, but it only won the award of Best Actress in a Leading Role. An Academy Award positively influences the symbolic capital, and it was also stressed on the cover of the DVD. The Hours (2002) was also nominated for several BAFTA’s, Golden Globes, and a Grammy. In total, the film was nominated for 82 different awards and it has won 24 awards. These nominations and prizes are important actors in Bourdieu’s field of cultural production, thus they bring in symbolic capital. The symbolic capital of the film adaptation gained by these prestigious prizes influences the symbolic capital of the source text.

Miramax has got a great influence on the symbolic capital of The Hours (2002) as well, since the entertainment company is mainly known for its adaptation projects. They produced a wide variety of genres, but their success in the awards mainly depended on their
adaptations and literature-inspired projects (Collins 142). Miramax claims that their “unrivaled library of more than 700 titles has received 278 Academy Award® nominations and 68 Oscars” (“About Miramax”). Miramax was once considered an established name in art house film culture, but became more commercial and started to gain a great amount of economic capital. Miramax became a well-known and a prestigious name in the film industry by realizing a cinematic platform for the passion of literary culture. This was managed by “making the love of literature into one of its stable products – products paradoxically made profitable through the use of strategies developed within the world of high-concept filmmaking, formerly considered to be the virtual antithesis of all things truly literary” (Collins 142). Since Miramax was involved in the production of The Hours (2002), the symbolic capital of the entertainment company influenced the symbolic capital of the film overall.

The film adaptation The Hours (2002) was praised widely. On IMDB, the internet movie database of information related to films, television programmes and video games, The Hours (2002) is rated with a 7.6 out of ten (IMDB). On Rotten Tomatoes, another online database for “measurement of quality for movies and television”, the film got a rating of 81%. The professional reviews of the film The Hours (2002) were found in leading journals and on web blogs. The reviews were mostly positive, only Horvat was extremely negative due to the rejected morals and the superiority of the lesbian characters. Holden even states that The Hours (2002) celebrates “timelessness of great literature” (Holden).

The film was reviewed by The New York Times and The Guardian, but other established journals such as The Los Angeles Times and The Washington Post did not write an article on the adaptation. The authors of the reviews are often important in their field: for instance Stephen Holden from The New York Times is the leading theatre and film critic and studied English at Yale, The Guardian critic Peter Bradshaw has got a PhD in English, studied at Cambridge, and has been working for The Guardian as a film critic for many years. Roger Ebert won the Pulitzer Prize for Criticism and got a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame (Rousseau). Thus the film is mostly reviewed by important critics. The reviews on online blogs were sometimes written by critics who have got lots of experience in writing reviews and a background in film, such as Gonzales in Slant Magazine and Phipps in AV Club, but others such as Brussat and Horvat do not.

The reviews on the film always refer to Cunningham, but he is mostly mentioned in the introduction, as the writer of the novel. The Guardian states that the plot was “taken from
Michael Cunningham’s novel” and the film is often introduced as “adapted from Michael Cunningham’s […] novel” (Bradshaw, Gonzales). None of the reviews give any information about Cunningham, except referring to on his role as the author of the source text. Cunningham’s symbolic capital is stressed by these statements, which suggests that it might influence the film adaptation. There is an exception in the The New York Times, where they praise Cunningham’s “intuitive channelling” and his “homage to Woolf’s first great novel” (Holden). The Guardian does compliment the director on persuading the audience that the stories of the three women are atemporal and that they exist in parallel instead of in sequence (Bradshaw). Despite the high level of fidelity, Cunningham does not get recognition for the quality of the plot. Phipps does recognize that Cunningham’s parallel, but also credits the director Daldry for his skills in carrying it out: “translating Cunningham's parallel lives gracefully would be a challenge for any director, but Daldry approaches it with little restraint” (Phipps). Also the prizes the novel won were hardly mentioned, only when the novel is introduced it is called a “Pulitzer Prize-winning novel” by Ebert, Horvat and Gonzales. Interestingly, the PEN/Faulkner Award and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Book Award were never mentioned. Woolf and her works are more often mentioned in the reviews than Cunningham. The Guardian states that there is a trend of film adaptations of female writers: “Hollywood is a little in love right now with literary Dead White Females” (Bradshaw). Furthermore, another critic calls Woolf a “great novelist” and even elaborates on her other work (Ebert). So Woolf’s name has often been mentioned in the reviews of the novel, which can be the case because her life and works were the source text for Cunningham’s The Hours (1998). Nevertheless, Woolf is praised for her works in the film reviews and Cunningham is not. Overall, Cunningham’s symbolic capital or the symbolic capital of his literary prizes hardly had an influence on the film reviews. It was mostly the symbolic capital that was brought in by Virginia Woolf that impressed the critics, who might have referred to her influence to establish their own positions.

The director and the actors were praised in the film reviews. Daldry and Hare were applauded for making an “amazingly faithful screen adaptation of a novel that would seem an unlikely candidate for a movie” (Holden). As stated earlier, this faithfulness has been proven to be an important factor in the reception of adaptations. The critics gave their opinions on the work of the director Daldry and the impressive cast, and in comparison to the references about Cunningham, the statements about Daldry and the cast were more prominent in the review.
This suggests that their symbolic capital appears to be more important for the prestige of the film adaptation.

Collins stated that “the boom in adaptation films in Hollywood in the nineties depended on a complicated interplay between aesthetic pleasure and commercial interest” (180). This commercial interest can be seen in the economic capital gained by the film adaptation of *The Hours* (2002). With a budget of only 25 million dollars, the box office numbers of the film were sky high. The film was in the cinemas for slightly less than five months but gained more than 108.8 million dollars in its box office. *The Hours* (2002) was the 47th highest grossing film of 2002. Thus the film gained a considerable amount of economic capital.


When comparing the covers of the novel *The Hours* (1998) and the film *The Hours* (2002), the influence of the film on the novel seems more prominent than the influence of the novel on the film. The film posters and cover of the DVD hardly refer to Cunningham and his symbolic capital, but the book covers of the novel after the release of the film do refer to the 2002 film and its prizewinning actresses. This suggests that the symbolic capital of the novel hardly influenced the symbolic capital of the film, but the symbolic capital of the film does influence the afterlife of Cunningham’s novel.

However, the symbolic capital of the film did not influence the addition of a prologue to the novel after the release of the 2002 film. The extras on the DVD do include audio commentary by Michael Cunningham, but this is not specified on the cover. In the introduction of David Hare’s screenplay, he also refers to Cunningham and his status. Cunningham’s symbolic capital does influence some of the symbolic capital of the film, but not explicitly. This suggests that for the mass audience, Cunningham’s symbolic capital does not influence the level of consecration of the film adaptation, but it might be important for the audience that has knowledge of Cunningham’s symbolic capital.

In the reception of Cunningham’s novel before the release of the film, no statements were issued towards the filmic qualities of the text or whether the novel should be adapted. Cunningham did press his agent not to look for a movie deal, which suggests that the possibility of adaptation did not appeal to Cunningham (Spring). This might be the case because film adaptations can also negatively influence the symbolic capital of his source text. The reviews of the film were written by established critics and published in established newspapers, indicating that the 2002 film had a recognizable amount of symbolic capital. The
film reviews always refer to Cunningham, but they only mention his name and do not compare the film with the novel. Cunningham’s symbolic capital and the symbolic capital of his literary prizes hardly had an influence on the film reviews. The director and the cast were more often praised for their contribution, so their symbolic capital appears to be more important for the prestige of the film. The book reviews after the film often do refer to the 2002 film, especially the amateur reviews. After the release of the film, *The Guardian* even devoted a book club discussion to Cunningham’s novel by publishing a sequel of articles. Despite the timing, these articles do not refer to the film adaptation. Book bloggers refer to the film as an inspiration to read the novel, and they often refer to the character of Meryl Streep since her name was featured in Cunningham’s novel. The comments on book reviews and the short reviews on Goodreads and Amazon often discuss the 2002 film, one of the Amazon reviewers even called the source text “the book of the film” (Barbara C. qtd. on Amazon). This indicates that in the afterlife of Cunningham’s novel, the 2002 film was very important to the audience. So the symbolic capital of Daldry’s *The Hours* (2002) influences the symbolic capital of the source text. This is mostly the case for the amateur reception.

Overall, the influence of the film adaptation on the source text can be seen in the book covers after the film and in the reception of the book after the film. The influence of the source text on the adaptation is less visible on the surface, since the reception of the 2002 film hardly refers to Cunningham and his symbolic capital. This suggests that the symbolic capital of the 2002 film influenced Cunningham’s novel mostly by raising the public’s awareness of the novel, and the symbolic capital of Cunningham’s novel hardly influenced the reception of the 2002 film. The amateur reception suggests that the film adaptation did influence the mass market, since the film adaptation made them aware of the source text.
Chapter 2 - Case Study *His Dark Materials*

Philip Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy consists of the three volumes *Northern Lights* (1995), *The Subtle Knife* (1997) and *The Amber Spyglass* (2000). The trilogy is written by Philip Pullman, an English writer who studied at Oxford. The first book in the trilogy, *Northern Lights* (1995), was published under the title *The Golden Compass* (2007) in the United States. In an interview for the BBC, Pullman stated that he did not mind the name change, since the title of the novel was already translated to *The Golden Compass* (2007) in many countries (Mzimba). The third volume of his trilogy, *The Amber Spyglass* (2000), won the 2001 Whitbread Book of the Year prize, making it the first novel in children’s literature that won this prize. Pullman also received the Astrid Lindgren Memorial Award for children’s and youth literature in 2005, and in 2007, *Northern Lights* (1995) was selected as one of the ten most important children’s novels of the previous 70 years by the judges of the CILIP Carnegie Medal for children’s literature (The CILIP Carnegie & Kate Greenway Children’s Book Awards). The trilogy can be seen as prestigious children’s literature. Children’s literature can be discussed in universities, but it is always outside of the standard literature curriculum or in separate courses. The full trilogy was adapted by Nicholas Wright for the theatre. The stage adaptation was produced by the National Theatre in 2003 and revived in 2004. The first novel of the trilogy was adapted in 2007 by Chris Weitz into the film *The Golden Compass* (2007). The same year, a video game was produced that was partly an adaptation of the film and partly of the novel. In 2015, the BBC announced that they will create a *His Dark Materials* miniseries. This chapter studies if and how the book, the film and the theatre play of *His Dark Materials* influenced each other’s symbolic and economic capital. It will also briefly examine other adaptations, such as the novellas, the announced BBC adaptation, the video game and books about the film adaptation. These other adaptations will be examined because they show that the afterlife of the source text reaches much further than just a film or a stage adaptation, for instance when the film adaptation is adapted into a video game. This analysis also illustrates how Bourdieu’s theory of cultural studies works in the field.

The influence on the symbolic capital will be analysed by looking at the covers of the book or DVD, the Bourdieusian actors in the field of production, the reception of the work in established press and online media, interviews with the author. The corpus of the reception will include reviews by established media such as *The Times, The Guardian, Publishers*
Weekly and others. The online reception will include the reception on the fanmade websites, Goodreads and Amazon.


All three volumes of *His Dark Materials* were published before the film. This means that the book covers of the *His Dark Materials* trilogy before the film cannot have any references towards the film (Figure 4). Interestingly enough, the covers between 2003 and 2006 do not refer to the stage adaptation of *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004) (Figure 5). The symbolic capital of the stage adaptation was not used to influence the symbolic capital of the source text. The covers of Pullman’s novel after the publication of the film do refer to the film. They have a sticker “a major movie picture” or the film poster is used for the book cover (Figure 6). One of the book covers clearly emphasizes on the film adaptation with the statement “Now a major movie starring Nicole Kidman and Daniel Craig. Filmed as *The Golden Compass*”, which is more prominent on the cover than the original title (Figure 6). The 20th anniversary edition of the novel, published in 2015, does not have any references towards the adaptations. The book covers also do not mention the prestigious prizes that Pullman won with this trilogy. This indicates the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation does not influence the afterlife of Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy, but the symbolic capital of the 2007 film does. This suggests that the symbolic capital of the film *The Golden Compass* (2007) had a significant influence on the afterlife of the source text, even though a film is less consecrated in Bourdieusian terms.

Although there are versions of the first novel in Pullman’s trilogy that have the title of the film instead of the original title, these versions do not refer to the adaptation in any other way. On Pullman’s website, the part “About the author” elaborates on the prizes Pullman won with his novel, but the film edition or stage play are not mentioned, despite Pullman’s involvement in the production. In an interview in *The Guardian* in 2004, Pullman’s stage adaptation and the announcement of the film adaptation were mentioned, but the interviewer did not include any response by Pullman on these adaptations. The interviewer merely concluded that these adaptations meant that “Pullman is finally starting to put together some thoughts about *The Book of Dust*, the final instalment in what will eventually be the quartet” (Lane, par. 14). Overall, Pullman did not explicitly state his desire to be adapted before his book was made into a stage play and film. After the adaptations, Pullman gave interviews about his thoughts on the stage play and film adaptation. There is a YouTube channel named
“The Golden Compass Author Interviews”, which consists of five videos in which Philip Pullman is in conversation with author Donna Freitas. These interviews were all uploaded in November 2007, after the adaptations were realised. Although Pullman was being interviewed in front of a film poster of The Golden Compass (2007), the authors did not discuss the adaptation, but merely focussed on the plot and themes of the trilogy. This suggests that the film adaptation is of importance for Pullman, even though he did not discuss the adaptation. The symbolic capital of the film adaptation is used to influence the status of Pullman as a writer.

In 2007, the BBC interviewed Pullman on his thoughts about his books being adapted into movies. This interview took place in Oxford, where the His Dark Materials trilogy is partly situated. Pullman gave the BBC’s Lizo Mzimba a tour through Oxford and he pointed out a room that had been his room when he was a student; the room that Pullman supposedly gave Lyra in the story. Pullman explained that one could climb to the roof from that room, and in the film there is a shot of that exact position where Lyra is balancing on the roof in between the chimneys. He also explained that he was approached by film companies after the book was published in 1995, because they were interested in adapting his novel. Pullman stated that “but that was when the first book was published and of course there are two other books in the trilogy”, so the producers had to wait until all three books were out, before “the size of the story” was clear (Pullman qtd. in Mzimba). Therefore, it took a while before the books were adapted. Pullman did not give any statements about how this might have influenced his writing of the second and third novel. Mzimba asked Pullman whether he was worried about the adaptations, but Pullman stated that he was not, since he knows that films and books are really different. The story had already been told on the stage, the radio and audio books, thus Pullman concluded that “if the story had survived those adaptations, it would probably survive a film as well” (Pullman qtd. in Mzimba). In many other interviews with Pullman, the adaptations are hardly mentioned, and most interviews focus on his writing and storytelling. Thus the symbolic capital of the film does not influence how Pullman is being depicted in interviews; they focus mostly on the symbolic capital of the novels.

Pullman’s Northern Lights (1995) has won many prizes and is nowadays perceived as a significant novel by established critics. However, many established newspapers, such as The Independent, did not publish a review of the novel until it was nominated for important prizes. In an article about the top prizes in children’s books, Pullman’s trilogy was mentioned. The Independent stated that “rarely, if ever, have readers been offered such a rich casket of wonders” (Hardyment). The novel spoils reviews by The Scotsman, The Telegraph, The
The publisher explicitly placed the reviews of these established newspapers to display the symbolic capital of these newspapers. The symbolic capital of these established newspapers influences the symbolic capital of Pullman’s *Northern Lights* (1995). The reviews were written by established journalists, such as Christina Hardyment for *The Independent*, who is a journalist and author who studied at Cambridge. Another article on the twenty greatest children’s books ever was written by Lucinda Everett, a freelance journalist who studied English Literature at the University of Leeds and writes for established newspapers such as the *Stella, Telegraph Magazine, Telegraph Review, Telegraph Daily Arts Pages, Telegraph Living, Whatsonstage, Country Life, The London Magazine* and *Saga magazine*.

*The New York Times* only reviewed the second and third book of Pullman’s trilogy. The review of *The Subtle Knife*, the second instalment in the trilogy, was written by Gregory Maguire, novelist and occasional critic for *The New York Times*. With a BA in English and Art, an MA in Children’s Literature and a PhD in English and American Literature, Maguire can be seen as an established critic with great knowledge of the genre. The review refers to the first book several times and Maguire states that “the first installment, "The Golden Compass," was received with hallelujahs and literary prizes, including Britain's Carnegie Medal”, so he suggests that the book has acquired prestige by winning this prize (Maguire). He also refers to Pullman’s references towards Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, a work of high-brow literature. By referring to this epic, the critic Maguire shows that he has knowledge of the background of Pullman’s trilogy. Maguire uses the symbolic capital of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* to establish his position as an recognised critic. The review of the third instalment was written by Brian Alderson, author, translator, critic and children’s book historian. The review also refers to the other books in the trilogy by explaining what happened before *The Amber Spyglass*. The prizes won for the first and second book were not mentioned by Alderson, but he also refers to Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and its connection with the *His Dark Materials* trilogy. This shows that Alderson, like Maguire, tried to stress his position as an established critic with knowledge of the classical established literature, and therefore influencing his own symbolic capital.

*Publishers Weekly* also reviewed *The Golden Compass* (1995), stating that “this first volume of a fantasy trilogy it is nothing short of breathtaking” (“The Golden Compass”). The review does not refer to Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, but it does refer to the next book in Pullman’s series by stating that “this glittering gem will leave readers of all ages eagerly awaiting the next installment of Lyra's adventures” (“The Golden Compass”). In the second
instalment’s review, the books are compared: “more than fulfilling the promise of *The Golden Compass*, this second volume in the *His Dark Materials* trilogy starts off at a heart-thumping pace and never slows down” (“The Subtle Knife”). The review of the third volume, the “much-anticipated conclusion to the His Dark Materials trilogy” is also positive, but does not refer to Pullman’s symbolic capital (“The Subtle Knife”). The reviews in *Publishers Weekly* do not refer to Pullman’s literary prizes or the possibility of adapting the trilogy. Furthermore, the fact that Pullman was inspired by Milton’s *Paradise Lost* is also not mentioned. This indicates that the review by *Publishers Weekly* solely focusses on the quality of the novel and not on the symbolic capital it had gained by the adaptations or prizes.

Many reviews that are featured in the novel, such as from *The Scotsman* and *The Telegraph*, cannot be found online. On the website of *The Telegraph*, articles that were written before 2000 cannot be accessed. *The Telegraph* praised *Northern Lights* (1995), stating that “Pullman’s inventiveness for character, plot and logic makes one envy his grey matter” (Pullman). His series is also featured in a list of the 20 greatest children’s books ever, comparing the series of novels with Tolkien and J.K. Rowling (Everett). Pullman’s novel is often discussed in the media, but most articles either refer to the controversy of *His Dark Materials* or the adaptations. Papers such as the *The Guardian, The Times*, and *The Independent* published articles about the announcement of the film adaptation and the BBC adaptation. In Bourdieusian terms, a stage adaptation is a prestigious cultural phenomenon and it has a high degree of consecration. The reviews after the stage adaptation do not mention the theatrical version of *Northern Lights*, thus the high degree of the stage adaptation’s consecration does not seem to reflect on the source text and its symbolic capital.

Online reviews tend to focus on other elements of the trilogy. On Goodreads there are 13.530 reviews of *Northern Lights* (1995). A sample of 200 randomly chosen reviews were examined, these will be seen as representative for the Goodreads reviewers. The reviews had to be longer than 100 words due to the amount of reviewers that only express their opinion by one or two adjectives. They also had to be written in English, and written by a Goodreads reviewer who gave stars to the review and read at least more than three books. The online reviews on Goodreads mostly refer to the (non)Christian elements of the trilogy, 28 percent of the reviewers referred to the Christian elements and or the discussion around the trilogy. 32 percent of the Goodreads reviewers refer to other children’s classics, most comparisons are to *Harry Potter, The Chronicles of Narnia* and *Lord of the Rings*. One of the reviewers even stated that “I do wish people would stop comparing these books to the Harry Potter series, or Tolkien, or other fantasy authors” (Parthena qtd. on Goodreads). Goodreads reviewers
sometimes referred to the adaptations of Pullman’s trilogy, 21 percent of the Goodreads reviewers referred to the film adaptation. Also the use of GIF’s from the film used to express the reviewer’s opinion on the book or to refer to characters is not uncommon. Some reviewers only briefly mentioned the adaptation, for instance the reviewer Alex Telander stated that “And with a move [sic] adaptation of The Golden Compass set for release on December 7th, now is the perfect time to read this magical series for the first time, or simply to reread it again” (Goodreads). The reviewer “J.” focussed on the film in her review, despite Goodreads status as a book reviewing website:

The movie was just ok. I thought the lead kid did a good job playing Lyra, and Nicole Kidman made a very menacing Ann Coulter. But my very favorites were Daniel Craig as the zealot Lord Asriel and Eva Green as badass witch Serafina Pekkala (J.).

She commented on the actors and the film, but her review did not comment on Pullman’s source text. Even though her review was written on a website designed for book reviews, J.’s focus is on the adaptation. Another reviewer started his review with an elaborate critical view on the film and why he did not want to read Pullman’s novel, until his friends told him to do so: “I've heard from about a dozen friends that the book is soooooo much better than the movie, and I finally gave in and picked it up” (Eric Allen qtd. on Goodreads). The Goodreads reviewer “Seth” was fairly critical on Pullman’s work and also compared it to the adaptation, stating that “the movie makes some interesting changes, btw, some of which are more successful than the book” (Goodreads). The reviewer Oceana2602 called Pullman’s style “like a videogame” but he did not mention the video game adaptation *The Golden Compass*. Interestingly, eight percent of the reviewers referred to the audio book and its cast: “The audiobook has a great full cast too, so if you're curious, I would recommend going that route” (Maxwell qtd. on Goodreads). This can be a result of the way Goodreads operates: one can review books, e-books and audio books. One of the reviewers on Goodreads stated that the new adult cover editions “can still trick your fellow commuters into believing that you are absorbed in a high brow classic” (Shovelmonkey1 qtd. on Goodreads). This suggests that the cover has a large influence on the consecration of the trilogy. Another reviewer stated that “as an English major I felt a responsibility to finally cross this trilogy of my to-be read list” (Lina qtd. on Goodreads). This indicates that this Goodreads reviewer saw Pullman’s trilogy as a new classic: one that should be read by English majors. Another reviewer also states “I finally read this book. It's like a classic, come on!” (Cait (Paper Fury) qtd. on Goodreads). Three percent of the Goodreads reviewers called *His Dark Materials* a classic. The majority of reviewers on Goodreads did not refer to any of the adaptations. If they referred to the
adaptations, they either referred to the film adaptation, or they had listened to the audio book. The stage adaptation is not mentioned in these reviews. Thus the symbolic capital of the film does not seem to influence the Goodreads reviews. Furthermore, only four percent of the Goodreads reviewers mentioned Milton’s influence on Pullman. This suggests that the symbolic capital of Milton’s epic hardly influenced the online reviews on Goodreads.

On Amazon, there are 956 customer reviews. A sample of 100 randomly chosen reviews were examined, these will be seen as representative for the Amazon reviewers. The reviews had to be longer than 50 words and written in English. The Amazon customer reviews are somewhat similar to the reviews on Goodreads: most just focus on the novel and 28 percent of the Amazon customers compare the trilogy to Harry Potter, Narnia and Lord of the Rings. Eleven percent of the reviewers refer to the film adaptation; the reviewer beesleydavid@yahoo.com reviewed Northern Lights (1995) in 2001 and stated “I only wish there was a film of this novel” (qtd. on Amazon). The user A. Heaver states “I just hope the up-coming film does Pullman justice” (Amazon). The Amazon reviewer Siobhan did not think the film was a success: “the movie adaptation failed to capture what it was all about” (qtd. on Amazon). Another Amazon customer states “Excellent reading well written brilliant story line no wonder the catholic church got up tight about the books must have been too close to the truth pity the film makers took any notice and dif [sic] not make the other two films as well worth a read (the golden compass)”, probably meaning that he or she was disappointed that the second film never came out due to the heavily critique by the catholic church (Amazon customer (anonymous) qtd. on Amazon). Some of the Amazon reviewers see Pullman’s Northern Lights (1995) as a classic, for instance “toni_senior@yahoo.com” calls it “one of the greatest literary creations of all time” and Dan Thompson calls it “an epic classic” (qtd. on Amazon). Four percent of the Amazon reviewers recognize Pullman as a classic.

On Amazon, less reviewers refer to the religious discussion surrounding Pullman’s trilogy; only eleven percent of the reviewers mention it. Even less reviewers mention Milton’s influence on His Dark Materials; only two percent mentioned it in their reviews. In conclusion, the majority of Amazon users do not refer to the adaptations, so the symbolic capital of the adaptations do not influence these reviews. Furthermore, professional reviewers seem to be more aware of the influence of Milton on Pullman’s work, or they are more inclined to mention this fact, since the symbolic capital of Milton’s epic influences their reputation as a critic. This is not the case for the mostly anonymous Goodreads and Amazon reviewers; they are not recognized critics so they would have no reason to try to establish their position as critics.
The economic capital of the novel cannot be exactly measured, since there are no sales numbers available. The *His Dark Materials* trilogy has been translated in 37 languages and has sold over 16 million books worldwide (Weitz). However, first editions of Pullman’s *Northern Lights* (1995) are highly demanded and one can pay over a hundred pounds for them. An antiques collector stated in an article by the *BBC* that a first edition of Pullman’s *Northern Lights* (1995) can be worth 2,000 pounds, depending on the condition (Martin qtd. in Hampsheir). There are no numbers available on how many copies have been sold in total, but Goodreads states that there are 270 different editions. The book is a huge bestseller and gained a lot of economic capital for Pullman. He stated that one of the things that inspire him is money, because “I do this for a living. If I don’t write well, I won’t earn enough money to pay the bills” (Pullman qtd. by Eby). However, Pullman does not need to worry about his economic capital: the prizes he won with *His Dark Materials* are worth a considerable amount of economic capital. The Whitbread Book of the Year award is worth 25,000 pounds, and for the CILIP Carnegie Medal for children’s literature the winner receives a golden medal and 500 pounds worth of books to donate to a library of their choice, which was less lucrative for Pullman himself. Nevertheless, the amount of economic capital gained by the *His Dark Materials* series should not be underestimated and might also influence the amount of adaptations.

2.2 The Stage Play: Wright’s *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004)

The *National Theatre* produced the stage adaptation of *His Dark Materials* in 2003. The *His Dark Materials* work pack states that the adaptation for the National Theatre was decided “well before Pullman was awarded the Whitbread Prize for Literature” (Gamble 4). Thus apparently the symbolic capital of the Whitbread Prize for Literature did not influence the decision whether *His Dark Materials* would be adapted or not. The stage adaptation was written by Nicholas Wright and premiered in the Royal National Theatre’s Olivier Theatre in London. It ran from 20 December 2003 until 27 March 2004, and there was a revival from 20 November 2004 until 2 April 2005 due to its success.

The poster of the stage adaptation states this is “Philip Pullman’s *His Dark Materials*”, based on the novels by Philip Pullman and adapted by Nicholas Wright (figure 7). Pullman is named twice on the poster, indicating that he is important for this adaptation. The symbolic capital of the author Pullman and that this is a stage adaptation of his trilogy is stressed on the poster. From a Bourdieusian perspective, stage plays are generally more consecrated than
novels, so it is interesting that they chose to stress the fact that it is an adaptation of a novel. The prizes Pullman won with his series were not included on the poster of the stage adaptation. Thus the symbolic capital of the book does influence the stage adaptation, but the symbolic capital gained by the prizes is not stressed.

The actors in Bourdieu’s field of cultural studies also contributed to the symbolic capital of the work of art, in this case the stage adaptation. The stage play was written by Nicholas Wright, playwright and British dramatist. He won a Tony Award for Best Play in 2003 and started working at the Royal Court in 1965, where he worked his way up to associate director. He can be seen as an established playwright, so his symbolic capital might have contributed to the stage adaptation. Wright stated that Pullman was very supportive. In the introduction of the written version of the screen play, he stated:

Philip Pullman has been supportive at every stage, from the moment that Nick Hytner and I first met him. It must be strange to see your writing being taken over to fit the demands of a different medium. But Philip has always been first to say, ‘Don’t worry! The books are one thing, and this is another.’ And his advice has always led us closer towards a piece of theatre that stands up in its own right, not as a shadow of his stupendous novels (Wright).

Pullman approved of the adaptation and encouraged Wright and Hytner to adapt his novels with their own personal touch. This way, the adaptation could become a work on its own and not just a shadow of the source text. The production was directed by Nicholas Hytner, who was a theatre director, film director and film producer. Hytner was knighted on the 2010 New Years Honour for his services to Drama (“New Year Honours—United Kingdom”). Other actors involved in the original production were Timothy Dalton as Lord Asriel, Patricia Hodge as Mrs. Coulter, and Anna Maxwell Martin, who was nominated for the Olivier Award for Best Actress for her role of Lyra. Dalton was known as James Bond in amongst others The Living Daylights (1987) and Licence To Kill (1989). Patricia Hodge was also an established actress who had been nominated for several prestigious awards. So the cast who was involved in the production of the original stage play also brought symbolic capital to the stage adaptation.

The stage adaptation was reviewed by several established newspapers, such as The Guardian, The Telegraph, The Evening Standard, and The Independent. This suggests that the stage play was prestigious enough to be reviewed by these newspapers. Michael Billington
had been a theatre critic for *The Guardian* for over forty years and rated the stage play with three stars. He reviewed the adaptation on its fidelity towards the source text, an approach that has been critiqued often (Hutcheon 6). Billington called the stage adaptation “a clipped hedge compared to Pullman’s forest” due to the cuts that were necessary to make the three books into one stage adaptation (Billington). He also critiqued the stage adaptation for its inability to handle the intertextuality that Pullman included in his novel. Billington’s review was mostly based on the fact that the stage play is an adaptation, and the review is mostly a comparison between the stage adaptation and the source text. This shows that the source text is very important for Billington: it is the standard of the source text that the adaptation must equal or surpass. The stage adaptation was clearly handled as an adaptation by Billington. Nicholas Wright, who wrote the stage play, was only named three times, whereas Pullman’s name was mentioned fourteen times in the article. Billington continued his review with his opinion on the acting and the production. Overall, he was quite positive, calling the stage adaptation “the ultimate example of a literary project that achieves its fullest life at the point where the author's vision meets the reader's imagination” (Billington). Billington ended his review by questioning the adaptability: “What I question is the adaptability of Pullman's trilogy, be it into theatre, radio or film” (Billington). Since this review, which was written in January 2004, the Pullman’s trilogy has been adapted into theatre, radio and film, thus the adaptability is something that others probably disagree on.

The review in *The Telegraph* was also written by an important critic, Charles Spencer. He was the chief drama critic of *The Daily Telegraph* from 1991 to 2014, after which he retired. He was named critic of the year at the *British Press Awards* twice and was called “one of the country’s most respected theatre reviewers” (Singh). Spencer also started his review on the stage adaptation by mentioning the novels: “Whenever I see adults reading Harry Potter on the train, I feel like tapping them politely on the shoulder and saying: "Come on, you're old enough to graduate to Philip Pullman now”” (Spencer). He used this to introduce the novels that he has read and to express his enthusiasm for the stage adaptation: “I've raced through the books twice now […] and to say I was looking forward to the National Theatre's stage adaptation would be an understatement” (Spencer). The entire first half of Spencer’s review is about Pullman’s novels. The symbolic capital of Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* is important for the stage adaptation as it is discussed elaborately. Spencer was quite negative about the stage adaptation, calling it an “honourable failure”, critiquing the cuts that were made, calling the designs “disappointing” and more. He compares the stage adaptation to its source text and
ends his review with the statement “this stage version never quite matches the sense of wonder, awe and delight created by Pullman in his superb sequence of novels”. This statement shows that Spencer does acknowledge Pullman’s symbolic capital. Nevertheless, the symbolic capital of the source text does not influence the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation.

Alan Bird from the London Theatre also reviewed His Dark Materials on stage. Bird had earlier reviewed Shakespeare adaptations and other prestigious stage plays. His review of His Dark Materials did not focus on the comparison between Pullman’s series and the stage adaptation, but treated the stage adaptation as a work on its own. Nevertheless, he did refer to it as Pullman’s story based on his novels. Bird stated that this adaptation “proves that the theatre is able to nourish the imagination in the same way as the written word”, so the question of fidelity was in mind but not stressed (Bird). The symbolic capital that Pullman brings in is influencing this review, but less than the reviews in The Guardian and The Telegraph.

The Evening Standard also wrote a review about the stage adaptation. This review was written by Nicholas de Jongh, theatre critic who wrote for The Evening Standard and The Guardian and playwright. De Jongh did not refer to Pullman’s version of the story at all, but does refer to the fact that it was adapted, calling the stage play a “compellingly transferred from 1,600 pages of text to six hours' remarkable performance-time on stage” (De Jongh). In general, he was much more positive about the stage adaptation, calling it a “dark and fantastic epic” (De Jongh). He did not reflect on Pullman and his symbolic capital, thus in this case the symbolic capital that Pullman brought to the stage adaptation was not stressed in the review. Susan Elkin wrote a review on the stage adaptation for The Stage. Elkin is a journalist specializing in training and education, and not a fulltime theatre critic such as the other reviewers of Pullman’s stage adaptation. Just as De Jongh, Elkin did not compare the stage adaptation to its source text and she hardly mentioned Pullman’s influence in her adaption. This indicates that Pullman’s symbolic capital is of less importance for her as the stage adaptation itself.

The website bridgetothestars.net is a fan website about Pullman’s His Dark Material trilogy. It features reviews by the website’s professionals and fan reviews of Pullman’s work and the adaptations. The official review was written by members of their staff, Nick and Siobhan. It is not specified who they are or if they have written reviews before. This review also referred to the source text and was elaborate on the adaptation; it discussed all actors and
referred to multiple scenes in comparison to Pullman’s novels. The review stated that “the main aspect every fan will want to know about is how true the stage play is to the books” (Nick and Siobhan). It only focussed on the fidelity of the stage adaptation and not on the adaptation as a separate production. The fan reviews on the website bridgettothestars.net also focussed on the comparison with the novel. For example the fan ‘Liam’ states that “I first read His Dark Materials a few years ago […] it profoundly changed my life. The stage play want [sic] even further” (bridgettothestars.net). The thirteen fan reviews explained why the books were important to them, even though they are reviewing the stage adaptation. Six of the thirteen fan reviews compared the stage adaptation to the book, and two of the fan reviews mentioned the Lord of the Rings trilogy. None of these reviews refer to Milton’s influence on Pullman’s source text. Thus the reviews on this website, both the ‘professional’ and the ‘fan’ reviews, mostly focus on the fidelity. They discussed the value of the source text, thus the symbolic capital of the source text reflects on the stage adaptation.

The stage adaptation was reviewed by established critics in established newspapers, but it was not well received by all of them. Other reviews about the stage adaptation His Dark Materials were published in The Independent, written by John Taylor, and Benedict Nightingale for The Times. These reviews are not available online anymore, nevertheless the fact that these established newspapers all wrote a review on this stage adaptation can be seen as an indicator for its high symbolic capital, mostly gained by Pullman’s original trilogy. The professional reviews were positive and negative. Overall, Spencer was, just as Billington, quite negative about the stage adaptation, but they both respected the source text and express this in their reviews. Thus the symbolic capital of the source text influences the review of the adaptation. Bird focussed more on the stage adaptation but still compared it to the source text, while De Jongh and Elkin focussed solely on the stage play. The less the reviewer focussed on the fidelity of the adaptation, the more positive they were about the stage adaptation. The reviews that compared it to Pullman’s novel use his symbolic capital to express their love for the source text, but they emphasize that the adaptation cannot match the quality of the source text. The symbolic capital of the source text probably influenced the critics’ positive attitude towards the stage adaptation that they wrote down. The reviewers that did not focus on the comparison towards the source text were generally more positive towards the adaptation, because they did not have to express the value of the source text. The amateur reviews such as on the website bridgettothestars.net also compared the stage adaptation to the source text, but they are overall more positive about the stage play.
The economic capital of the stage adaptation cannot be calculated exactly, but despite the negative reviews in the established newspapers, there was a revival of the stage adaptation. This revival indicates that there was still a public for the stage adaptation. Since the public pays for seeing the stage play, they influence the economic capital of the stage adaptation. The prizes of the tickets are not available anymore, but the average ticket in the Olivier Theatre of the National Theatre is about 15 to 50 pounds, depending on the day, time and show. The stage plays that are based on novels are generally more expensive than the original stage plays. This suggests that the symbolic capital of a source text influences the economic capital of the adaptation. Overall, the stage adaptation gained economic capital, but there was no indication that this economic capital influenced the economic capital of the source text.

2.3 The Film: Weitz’ *The Golden Compass* (2007)

The film posters or DVD covers of *The Golden Compass* (2007) often refer to the source text of the adaption, so this suggests that the symbolic capital of the source text can influence the adaptation. The film posters of *The Golden Compass* (2007) do not refer to Pullman or *His Dark Materials* trilogy, which suggests that Pullman’s involvement in the film does not influence the symbolic capital of *The Golden Compass* (2007) (figure 9). The names of the actors in the film are displayed, which suggests that their symbolic capital does influence the symbolic capital of the film adaptation. The front of the covers of the English DVD also never mention Pullman or his novels, it focusses solely on the film and sometimes the names of the actors as well. The back of the DVD covers sometimes indicate that the film is an adaptation by stating that it is “the first movie based on the bestselling Philip Pullman novels”, or “based on author Philip Pullman’s bestselling and award-winning novel, *The Golden Compass* tells the first story in Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy” (figure 8). Out of the three English DVD covers, only two mention Pullman’s symbolic capital, and they are more likely to discuss the fact that his awards were bestsellers, than the fact that the novels have won awards. This indicates that the economic capital gained by Pullman is more important than his symbolic capital gained by the prizes won by his trilogy.

The extended disc edition of *The Golden Compass* (2007) DVD includes the directors commentary by Chris Weitz, but no commentary from Philip Pullman. The second disc includes documentaries about Daemons, The Alethiometer, the Costumes and more. There is a documentary ‘About the Novel’, that includes an interview with Pullman, in which he
claims that he wants to be “physically engaged with the world” (Pullman qtd. in Weitz). The director and producer comment on Pullman’s source text and praise Pullman for his work. Weitz claims that Pullman has “a very fine sense of storytelling”, while producer Deborah Forte called The Golden Compass (2007) Pullman’s “coming out party” (qtd. in Weitz). The rest of this documentary focuses on the “commercial and intellectual success” of the series, which stressed Pullman’s symbolic and economic capital (Weitz). Daniel Craig claimed he was a big fan of the books, and Dakota Blue Richards even refers to the stage adaptation, which she has visited (qtd. in Weitz). There are many references towards the stage adaptation in this documentary, thus the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation reflects on the symbolic capital of the source text. Winning the Whitbread Book of the Year Prize in 2001 made it easier for Hollywood to acknowledge the importance of adapting the trilogy (Weitz). Thus the symbolic capital of the prizes on also influenced the production of the adaptation. Another documentary ‘About the Adaptation’, Weitz explains how he got in touch with the His Dark Materials trilogy, that he wanted to direct the film immediately. Nevertheless, the producers interviewed many other, more renowned, directors before picking Weitz. This documentary focusses on how the film The Golden Compass (2007) was made and does not make any references towards Pullman’s source text or other adaptations. Thus the extras of the film do refer to Pullman and his symbolic capital. The extras are only featured on the second disc of the extended disc edition, which suggests that the symbolic capital of the source text and the stage adaptation does not influence the film adaptation very much.

As stated, other actors can contribute to the symbolic capital of the cultural product as well. The film adaptation was directed by Chris Weitz, who had been nominated for an Academy Award for Best Adapted Screenplay in 2002. Nevertheless, Weitz was called “an unlikely choice” for the film adaptation of The Golden Compass (2007) (Gordon). When Weitz was interviewed by bridgetothestars.net in 2004, he gained a lot of criticism on the religious critique in Pullman’s novels, which made him re-evaluate his decision to direct the film. Nevertheless, in 2007 Weitz decided to direct the film anyway after some persuasion by Pullman (Gordon). Since Academy Awards can be seen as consecrated in Bourdieu’s field of production, Weitz added symbolic capital to the film production when he decided to direct The Golden Compass (2007). Nicole Kidman, who played Mrs. Coulter, was already an established actress when she joined the film production. Pullman wanted her to play Mrs. Coulter, stating that “he always envisioned Kidman playing Mrs. Coulter and wrote her a note saying so” (Gordon). Kidman had already been nominated for the Academy Award for Best Actress in a Leading Role for her role in Moulin Rouge! (2001), and won the award for her
performance in *The Hours* (2002). Kidman had been nominated for three AACTA’s, three BAFTA’s, four Critic Choice Movie Awards, five Empire Awards, seven Golden Globes and many more prizes (IMDB). Since Kidman is an established actress, her symbolic capital influenced the film adaptation’s symbolic capital in a positive manner. Daniel Craig, one of the other lead actors in the film, had been trained at the National Youth Theatre and graduated from the Guildhall School of Music and Drama in 1991. This education added to the symbolic capital that Craig brought to the film adaptation, just as the international fame he gained when he took on the role of James Bond in *Casino Royale* (2006). Before *The Golden Compass* (2007) was released, Craig had been nominated for the BIFA Award for Best Performance by an Actor in a British Independent Film, won an Ashland Independent Film Award, and was nominated for many other international film awards (IMDB). After Craig starred as James Bond, he won many more awards in 2007, when *The Golden Compass* (2007) was released as well. The symbolic capital of these awards and the media attention on these awards may have influenced the symbolic capital of *The Golden Compass* (2007) as well. Another actor that has brought great symbolic capital to the film adaptation is Sir Ian McKellen, who had been appointed Commander of the Order of the British Empire in 1979, was knighted by Elizabeth II in 1991 for his services to the performing arts and he was made a Companion of Honour for services to drama and equality in 2008 (“Ian McKellen's Personal Biography through 1998”). McKellen had won numerous awards for his performances and acted in more than a dozen stage plays. McKellen can be seen as a highly prestigious actor, bringing a great amount of symbolic capital with his performance. The lead actress of the film, Dakota Blue Richards, did not bring any symbolic capital to the film, since this was her first performance on screen. Thus the symbolic capital that the director and some actors brought to the film highly influenced the symbolic capital of the film adaptation.

The reviews of *The Golden Compass* (2007) were published in established newspapers such as *The Sun, The New York Times, The Atlantic* and *The Guardian*. Many reviews commented on the religious critique by the church. But, as Cartmell stated, “‘Bad adaptations’ receive more coverage than ‘good’ ones, partly because they fulfil the prophecies of those who wish to see only artlessness in such a process and because there is little interest in the fate of the popular or middlebrow in writing on screen” (Cartmell 3). Thus it is interesting to also include the critique about the adaptation in the review. Overall, the reviews were moderately positive, giving the film three or four stars. The review by *The Guardian* was written by Peter Bradshaw, who had also reviewed *The Hours* (2002). As stated before, this film critic and PhD had been a film critic for many years already. He called the adaptation a
“spectacular new movie version of Northern Lights, the opening episode of Philip Pullman’s fantasy series His Dark Materials” in the first paragraph already (Bradshaw). This suggests that the fact that it is a film adaptation is important: the symbolic capital of the source text influences the prestige of the adaptation. This is interesting, since Bradshaw later distanced himself from the source text by stating that he was a “non-follower of the Pullman books” (Bradshaw). He also commented on the fact that the source text had to be shortened to be adapted: “As with many adaptations of this sort, a lot of the novel's supporting background material […] has been stripped out” (Bradshaw). Bradshaw acknowledged the status of the adaptation and Pullman’s influence, but at the same time distanced himself from Pullman’s original work. This suggests that Bradshaw did not want his knowledge of Pullman’s work to influence his position as an established critic, which means that Pullman’s symbolic capital might not influence Bradshaw’s position as a critic in the Bourdieusian field.

Roger Ebert, winner of the Pulitzer Prize for Criticism, also reviewed the film adaptation (Rousseau). He gave it four stars, and compared it to other popular film adaptations by calling it a “darker, deeper fantasy epic than the "Rings" trilogy, "The Chronicles of Narnia" or the "Potter" films” (Ebert). Ebert critiqued The Golden Compass (2007) for its “murky” implications and Pullman’s representation of religion in his review. He stated that the implications were not “murky in the original 1995 novel, part of the His Dark Materials trilogy by Philip Pullman, a best seller in Britain, less so here” (Ebert). The actors involved in the production of the film adaptation are mentioned as well: “the cast is jammed with the usual roll call of stage and screen greats, some of them in person, some of them voice-over talent” (Ebert). This statement, and especially the statements “screen greats” and “voice-over talent” indicates that their symbolic capital was important for the film. Pullman was hardly mentioned in such a manner in Ebert’s review, thus the symbolic capital of the film cast seems to be more important to the screen adaptation than the symbolic capital that Pullman brought in. Although the review mostly focusses on the religious criticism, Ebert concluded his review by stating that it is “a wonderfully good-looking movie, with exciting passages and a captivating heroine” (Ebert).

The review in The New York Times was written by Manohla Dargis, one of their chief film critics. She has got a BA in Literature and MA in Cinema Studies, and worked as a critic for many established newspapers, such as The Los Angeles Times, The Village Voice and she was film editor at LA Weekly (“Film Critic Biography: Mahnola Dargis”). Dargis referred to Pullman, his novels and its success briefly and stated that The Golden Compass (2007) “has
many of the virtues of a faithful screen adaptation and many of the predictable flaws” (Dargis). Dargis compared the adaptation to its source text and judged the adaptation on its fidelity. Dargis also commented on the actors in the film adaptation, calling some of them “acting legends” (Dargis). This positive statement indicates that the symbolic capital of the actors was acknowledged by Dargis. Although Dargis’ review was not very positive, she claimed that “the sequels are a welcome idea” (Dargis).

Christopher Orr reviewed *The Golden Compass* (2007) for *The Atlantic*. Orr is a senior editor and principal film critic at *The Atlantic*, who has written reviews for *The New Republic, LA Weekly, Salon* and *The New York Sun* as well. Orr states that *The Golden Compass* (2007) as an adaptation fails at “perhaps the most crucial challenge of fantasy: creating a fully realized world, with its own internal rules and logic, in which viewers may lose themselves” (Orr). Cartmell stated on this that film adaptations are often judged on this, stating that “the films don’t fulfil the cinematic potential of the books” (Cartmell 76). Orr praises Weitz for the representation of the daemons in the film: “Weitz's digitized daemons are the film's signal success” (Orr). Most of the review is quite critical about the film adaptation, and Orr concluded his review with the statement: “the producers may question whether they got their money's worth--and viewers probably will, too” (Orr). This refers to the economic capital gained by the film adaptation, and implies that the film was not worth its high budget.

Overall, the film adaptation *The Golden Compass* (2007) was reviewed by important critics at established media. The reviews are alternating positive and negative. The negative comments were mostly about the religious aspect, or the fidelity of the film adaptation. Most reviews treated the film as an adaptation by comparing it to Pullman’s original work, but they mostly preferred the source text. The symbolic capital of Pullman and of the star-studded cast contributed to the symbolic capital of the film.

As Bluestone stated, a film is usually “produced and packaged under an office success” (Bluestone qtd. in Whelehan 6). Thus the economic capital for films is important, and this suggests it is likely to be more important than the symbolic capital. In the case of *The Golden Compass* (2007), the disappointing economic capital may have influenced the absence of sequels in film. In the *BBC* interview of Pullman and Mzimba, they discussed how the film was adapted and how the story in the film ended, and Pullman explained how he thinks the next film should start. He also stated that he certainly wants a second and third film, because he wants the entire story to be told (Pullman in Mzimba). Nevertheless, a second film in the trilogy was never realised. On Pullman’s website, he gives a statement on the absence of sequels:
People who are interested will probably have seen the film by now. If they're very interested, they'll probably have read about how the film didn't do as well as the studio had hoped at the American box office. They might also have read that the film did very well in the rest of the world, but that despite that, the studio isn't likely to make the sequels (“Stage, film and TV”, Pullman).

This statement suggests that the disappointing economic capital was a direct motive for not making any sequels. Pullman and Mzimba discuss a disappointing result, but that was mainly in the United States. The opening weekend of The Golden Compass (2007) in the United States was somewhat disappointing with only 25.8 million dollars. With a total of $302,127,136, the film adaptation was quite successful in gaining economic capital. Cartmell stated that “the economic condition of the adaptation’s production is an area that is now gaining some momentum – some scholars have always sought and/or preferred to isolate artistic rather than economic reasons for the choices made in film adaptations” (Cartmell 129). This is not the case for The Golden Compass (2007), since it was often stated that the second film was never produced due to the disappointing economic capital of the film, and not for artistic reasons.

2.4 Other Adaptations

In November 2015, the BBC announced that they will be developing a BBC series of Pullman’s His Dark Materials. The series that the BBC produces are highly valued by critics due to their high level of fidelity. According to the BBC, Pullman “has given his blessing to the project” (Jackson). Jane Tranter and Julie Gardner, who have produced the popular Dr. Who series, will be producing the series. Tranter said that “there are some pieces of literature that are wonderfully suited to film. There are some pieces of literature which are better suited to television. To my mind what is great about these trilogy of novels is we can adapt them as Philip wrote them” (Tranter qtd. in Jackson). She is clearly referring to the film The Golden Compass (2007). Tranter is not worried about criticism on the BBC series, because “it’s the job of TV to make people feel uncomfortable” (Tranter qtd. in Jackson). Writer Jack Thorne was announced in April 2016. The BBC emphasized his symbolic capital that will influence the symbolic capital of the series in the article, stating that Thorne “was recently nominated for three BAFTA TV Awards, has also written the forthcoming play Harry Potter and the Cursed Child” (“Writer Jack Thorne to adapt His Dark Materials”). By bringing in established
producers and an established writer, the symbolic capital of the BBC series is influenced before the series are being produced.

There are two novellas of Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* series: *Lyra’s Oxford* (2003) and *Once Upon a Time in the North* (2008), which are both written by Philip Pullman. Pullman is also still writing *The Book of Dust*, which will be most likely the last instalment in the series. In *Lyra’s Oxford*, Pullman states that “this book contains a story and several other things. The other things might be connected with the story, or they might not; they might be connected to stories that haven't appeared yet. It's hard to tell” (Pullman). *Once Upon a Time in the North* is about the meeting of Iorek Byrnison and Lee Scoresby, two of the characters featured in the series. Pullman even teased with the idea that there will be a third novella about Will in an interview with Cittagazze. These covers of these novella’s only refer to the original *His Dark Materials* series and do not refer to the film at all (figure 10). The symbolic capital of these novellas relies on the symbolic capital of the source text.

There are also additional accompanying books about *The Golden Compass* (2007) movie, such as *The Golden Compass – The Official Movie Quiz Book* and *The Golden Compass: The Official Illustrated Movie Companion*, a movie storybook, *The Movie Poster Book* and many more. These extra books focus on the film and their covers do not refer to Philip Pullman at all. *The Golden Compass – The Official Movie Quiz Book* has questions that refer to the plot and story, but also question that one could easily answer after seeing the film, such as “What colour is Serafina Pekkala’s hair: blonde, dark or red?” (Regan 43). *The Golden Compass: The Official Illustrated Movie Companion* is a guide to the world Pullman build in his series and the making-off of the film, plus interviews with cast, director, crew and production departments. These books focus on the symbolic capital of the film and are clearly published for the viewers of the film. The covers are based on the film adaptation (figure 11). The readers of the source text will not be likely to buy this without seeing the adaptation, because these extras do not add anything to the experience of the source text and is only interesting for the public of the film. Thus the economic and symbolic capital of these books relies on the adaptation.

There is also a three-volume graphic novel adaptation of the *His Dark Materials* series: *Northern Lights Graphic Novel, Volume I* (2015), *The Golden Compass Graphic Novel, Volume 2* (2016) and *The Golden Compass Graphic Novel, Volume 3* (announced). The graphic novel is mostly based on Pullman’s version of the story, adapted by Stéphane Melchior-Durand with the artwork of Clément Cruberie. This adaptation does not refer to the
film *The Golden Compass* (2007), there are no references towards the film on the cover, thus its symbolic capital relies on the symbolic capital of the source text by Pullman.

Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* has not only been adapted on screen and stage: there is also a video game *The Golden Compass* (2007), based on the film. The video game was released in 2007 and was developed by Shiny Entertainment for PlayStation 2, PlayStation 3, PlayStation Portable, Wii, Xbox 360, Windows and Nintendo DS. The video game is an action game, and was released prior to the film. It has the film cover and includes scenes that were cut from the film (figure 12). The player can choose between the characters of Lyra, Iorek and Pan. As stated in the game manual, they all have different special abilities that can be helpful when the player wants to complete a level. The video game is based on the film and uses the same characters and actors as the film, thus the economic and symbolic capital of the video game rely on the film adaptation. The video game sold well, despite the negative reviews, so it did gain economic capital.

Another adaptation of Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* was a radio drama on BBC Radio 4. The play was broadcast in 2003 and the BBC published it on CD and cassette as well. The website of the BBC radio adaptation also includes an interview with Pullman, the voices of the characters, a message board and quizzes. This adaptation does not refer to the film adaptation, since the film adaptation was not released yet, but only at the source text (figure 13).

Overall, Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy has been adapted numerous times, and even these adaptations have been adapted. The adaptations of the film adaptation sometimes still refer to Pullman or the source text, but there are also many adaptations made that only rely on Pullman’s symbolic capital.


The covers, poster of the stage adaptation, DVD covers and film poster show that sometimes the source text influences the adaptation, and sometimes the other way around. When comparing the covers of the novels *Northern Lights* (1995), *The Subtle Knife* (1997) and *The Amber Spyglass* (2000) to the poster of the stage adaptation *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004),
it is clear that the influence of the novel on the stage adaptation is more prominent than the other way around. The poster of the stage adaptation clearly refers to Pullman’s source text, but the covers of the books after the stage adaptation do not refer to the stage adaptation. This is not the same for the influence of the film adaptation: the covers of *Northern Lights* (1995) after the film adaptation often refer to the film adaptation. This can be done with textual references, such as referring to the “a major movie picture” or by using a shot from the film as book cover. (Figure 6). The DVD covers do mention Pullman’s source text by including statements such as “the first movie based on the bestselling Philip Pullman novels” (figure 8). This suggests that in the case of Pullman’s *Northern Lights* (1995), the source text influenced the film adaptation, but the film adaptation also influenced the source text. By referring to Pullman on the film covers of *The Golden Compass* (2007), Pullman’s prestige influenced the symbolic capital of the film adaptation positively. This also worked the other way around: the references towards the actors in the films and the fact that the novel has been adapted into a major motion picture show that the symbolic capital of the film influenced the symbolic capital of the source text. For the BBC adaptation, the cover has not yet been revealed, thus no conclusions can be drawn yet. The novellas *Lyra’s Oxford* (2003) and *Once Upon a Time in the North* (2008) and the covers of the graphic novels *Northern Lights Graphic Novel, Volume I* (2015), *The Golden Compass Graphic Novel, Volume 2* (2016) do not refer to the film or stage adaptation, thus the symbolic capital of the novellas only relies on the symbolic capital of the source text. The symbolic capital of the video game *The Golden Compass* (2007) and books about the films, such as the making-off and quiz books are influenced by the symbolic capital of the film *The Golden Compass* (2007). Overall, the covers of the adaptations almost always refer to the source text, but sometimes also refer to other adaptations; in most cases the film adaptation *The Golden Compass* (2007). Thus the symbolic capital of the source text influences the adaptations, but the symbolic capital of the adaptation does not always influence the source text: this is only the case for the film adaptation. The other adaptations do not seem to influence the source text and its symbolic capital.

The editions of Pullman’s novels after the publication of the stage and film adaptation do not refer to the adaptations in the acknowledgements, nor in the sections about the author. In the introduction of the written version of the screenplay, Wright refers to Pullman’s attitude towards the stage adaptation by stating that “Philip Pullman has been supportive at every stage” (Wright). Pullman’s approval of the adaptation can influence the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation. The DVD is filled with documentaries about the daemons, the
alethiometer, Oxford and more. The documentary ‘About the Book’ refers to Pullman’s source text and the stage adaptation. The praise for Pullman’s work by director Weitz and producer Forte stressed Pullman’s symbolic capital. The references towards the important prizes he won and the stage adaptation also influenced the symbolic capital of the film adaptation *The Golden Compass* (2007).

When comparing the reception of Pullman’s trilogy *His Dark Materials* with the reception of the stage adaptation *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004) and the reception of the film adaptation *The Golden Compass* (2007), one can assume that the source text influences the reception of both adaptations, but only the film adaptation influences the amateur reception of the source text. In the reception of the stage adaptation *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004), the critics often compare the adaptation to the source text, which this leads to a more negative review than the reviews that look at the stage adaptation on its own. When comparing the stage adaptation to the source text, the source text is always superior and praised. Therefore, the symbolic capital does reflect on the source text, but it also influences the reception of the stage adaptation in a negative manner. The reviews of the film adaptation *The Golden Compass* (2007) do refer to Pullman and sometimes even acknowledge his cultural status, but they also focus on the cast members that bring in symbolic capital. The film was treated as an adaptation and often compared to the source text, which the critics seem to prefer. Thus Pullman’s symbolic capital, but also the symbolic capital of the cast contributed to the symbolic capital of the film influenced the reception of the film adaptation. Some of the amateur reviews of the source text after the two adaptations refer to the film adaptation, but the stage adaptation was not mentioned at all. The reviews about the source text focus on Pullman and the prizes the trilogy won, thus the reception of the source text was hardly influenced by the adaptations.

Overall, the symbolic capital of the source text seemed to be mildly influenced by the film adaptation *The Golden Compass* (2007), but the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004) does not seem to have an influence on Pullman’s novels at all. Both the film and the stage adaptation were influenced by Pullman’s symbolic capital: the film adaptation has references to Pullman on the DVD covers and on the documentaries of the DVD, and as stated in these documentaries, Pullman was involved in the production of the film adaptation. The stage adaptation was announced as Philip Pullman’s *His Dark Materials*, making it very clear that his symbolic capital influenced the symbolic capital of the stage
adaptation. Overall, the influence of the symbolic capital of the source text on the adaptations was bigger than the influence of the symbolic capital of the adaptations on the source text.
Chapter 3 - Case Study Twelfth Night

The third case study centres on William Shakespeare’s play *Twelfth Night*. Shakespeare can be seen as “the greatest playwright not of his age alone but of all time” (Greenblatt 11). The established playwright has gained a great amount of symbolic capital, and the public might beinclined to read his plays because of their prestigious character. Shakespeare’s plays are read in schools and universities; they have an important place in the current curriculum. The adaptations of Shakespeare’s works need a different approach than the other case studies discussed in this thesis due to his already established place in literature. His position as a playwright has been established for almost two decades, whereas the other contemporary authors did not establish their positions as well yet. Shakespeare’s established position may have already influenced the adaptations. This case study does not only examine the influence of Shakespeare’s symbolic capital on the adaptation, but also how important the source text still is for the adaptation. Shakespeare’s plays have been adapted numerous times, with some adaptations being more faithful than others. *Twelfth Night* was originally published in the First Folio in 1623, but it has been adapted frequently on stage, film, television, radio, and in songs/musical form. The appropriation of these adaptations differs; some adaptations, such as *She’s the Man* (2006), were released as if they were complete new works, and others, such as most stage adaptations, leaned on Shakespeare’s symbolic capital. This suggests that although the playwright can be seen as prestigious, his symbolic capital does not always influence the adaptation in the same manner. The focus of this case study will be on the scripted play, the stage adaptation *Twelfth Night* (2013) by Tim Carroll, the film adaptation *Twelfth Night* (1996) by Trevor Nunn and the adaptation *She’s the Man* (2006). As explained in the method, this chapter will focus on the covers, the extra’s and the reception to illustrate if and how the source text influences the adaptation.

3.1 The Scripted Play: Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (1623)

The first stage adaptations of *Twelfth Night* were performed even before Shakespeare’s play was published in his First Folio. The first recorded performance of *Twelfth Night* was in 1602 and the First Folio was published in 1623. Nevertheless, Shakespeare’s First Folio does not refer to any of the adaptations and does not have a cover like contemporary books (figure 13). The contemporary covers of Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* usually have paintings on the cover, for example *Portrait of a Young Blonde Boy* by Corregio on the Oxford World’s Classic
Paintings can be seen as prestigious art in Bourdieu’s field of cultural studies; the art business is a market of symbolic goods in which the symbolic capital of an artist highly influences the prestige of the painting. The paintings featured on the contemporary covers are by artists that can be seen as established (figure 14). Since publishers usually try to match the cover of a book to the content, the paintings on the covers might suggest that the content can be seen as prestigious as well. None of the contemporary covers refer to the adaptations, although the stage play was written to be adapted on the stage (figure 14). Overall, the influence of the adaptations cannot be seen on the contemporary book covers, which suggests that the symbolic capital of the adaptations did not influence the cover of the source text.

Most of the contemporary editions include introductions written by scholars specialized in Shakespeare. Shakespeare is often praised in these introductions, for example Ben Johnson’s declaration in the introduction of the Wordsworth Classics edition: “He was not of an age, but for all time” (qtd. in Shakespeare 20). The need for an introduction suggests that these plays are not an immediately accessible read; Twelfth Night (1623) is placed in perspective, to give the reader “insights into his culture and ours, and into the era of civilisation to which his writings have made – and continue to make – such potently influential contributions” (Watts qtd. in Shakespeare 7). The introduction in the Wordsworth classic expands on the characters and the literary modes employed, suggests further reading on Shakespeare and introduces him as a playwright. The introduction in this contemporary version of Twelfth Night (1623) stresses Shakespeare’s high level of consecration. Thus, the introductions in the contemporary versions focus on Shakespeare as an established playwright, which reflects on how the public perceives him.

This chapter focusses on the contemporary reception of Twelfth Night (1623). Amateur reviews on Goodreads and Amazon offer insights in the contemporary public reception of Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night (1623). Reviews of the original 1623 publication are not taken into account here, because they are not relevant for the contemporary reception. Established media such as The New York Times or The Guardian generally do not review texts that have been out for years, thus they did not review Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night recently. Therefore, amateur reviews on Goodreads and Amazon offer a more reliable image of the contemporary influence of the adaptations on the source text. On Goodreads and Amazon, readers have the opportunity to post their own reviews without any editorial changes, thus the reviews can be seen as their uncorrected opinions. On Goodreads, there are 2,367 amateur reviews on Twelfth Night, and 119,854 ratings. The examined reviews are a sample of a hundred randomly taken
reviews that were longer than one hundred words. Furthermore, the reviews had to be written in English, and written by a Goodreads reviewer who gave stars to the review and read more than three books. This is to ensure that the Goodreads reviewer is not merely an internet-‘troll’, and that the Goodreads reviews which are studied can be seen as a relevant cross section of all Goodreads reviews on this work. Of this selection, 37 percent of the Goodreads reviewers mentioned other Shakespeare plays, for example *Macbeth* or *Romeo and Juliet*, in their reviews. In thirty-seven reviews, the reviewers compared *Twelfth Night* to the other plays, which suggests that they are familiar with Shakespeare’s works. By referring to his other works, these reviewers show their knowledge of his works. With an average of 3.97 stars, the reviewers acknowledge his prestige and praise Shakespeare for his work: “there are people who are born for writing –and William Shakespeare is one of them” (Vane J. qtd. on Goodreads). Sometimes they referred to him in a very positive manner, such as addressing him as “the incomparable master William Shakespeare” (Henry Avila qtd. on Goodreads). This shows that the Goodreads reviewers were aware of his status. Despite the great amount of Shakespeare adaptations, most of the Goodreads reviewers did not refer to other adaptations, and only eight percent referred to their own experience while watching the stage adaptation. Usually, they did prefer to see the play performed, for example the reviewer ‘Book concierge’ stated: “I dislike reading plays. I much prefer to see them performed. When I’m reading – especially Shakespeare – I find that I lose the sense of action and can more easily get bogged down in unfamiliar terms or phrases” (Book concierge qtd. on Goodreads). The reviewers that were familiar with adaptations were more positive on watching the adaptation than reading the source text. In six percent of the reviews, the Goodreads reviewers referred to being in the play themselves. More Goodreads reviewers referred to the film adaptation *She’s the Man* (2006) than to Nunn’s adaptation. Six percent of the reviewers referred to the teen movie adaptation, mostly in a positive manner: “I read this play after watching (and loving) the movie *She’s The Man*. I know it wasn’t as much an adaptation as "inspired by" and how! It wasn't as funny as i expected it to be” (Gwen qtd. on Goodreads). Only one of them apologizes for this fact: “Don't judge. I was like 15 or 16 when it came out. I wasn't into this academic shit just yet.” (Kereesa qtd. on Goodreads). This suggests that this reviewer does not want her symbolic capital to be influenced by her watching the teenage movie adaptation. Another six percent of the reviewers referred to a film version of Shakespeare’s play, which they indicate that they have contributed to their understanding of Shakespeare’s source text: “after seeing the film, I had a better understanding on how the people acted. (Toyin qtd. on Goodreads). Only two reviewers mentioned Nunn’s film edition
explicitly. This suggests that the amateur reviewers on Goodreads are more familiar with *She’s the Man* (2006) than with Nunn’s film adaptation.

This chapter also studied 108 customer reviews on Amazon. The reviews had to be longer than fifty words to make sure that the reviewer expressed his/her opinion. This lower amount of words is due to the shorter average length of Amazon reviews in comparison to the Goodreads reviews. This is a result of the difference in websites; on Goodreads, the focus is on the reviews, but on Amazon, the focus is on the web shop, whereas customer reviews serve as extra information for customers. Furthermore, the reviews had to be written in English. Since most reviews on Amazon only consisted of one or two words, only 23 reviews were examined. None of these reviews referred to the stage adaptations, and only one referred to the film adaptation: “The Globe's dvd of their recent all-male production with Mark Rylance provides a good watchable version. I re-run bits of that in my head whilst I'm reading!” (Jay qtd. on Amazon). Four of the reviews referred to other Shakespeare plays, but the Amazon reviewers mostly focussed on the reasons for buying a certain edition, such as the essence of the introduction or the presence of a glossary, and Amazon’s customer service.

The economic capital of Shakespeare’s source text cannot be measured since the text has been in circulation for about 400 years in different editions and versions. Furthermore, the play has also been distributed online, so the economic capital cannot be measured. Since Shakespeare’s original text is in the public domain, it can be re-distributed by publishers without high costs. As a result there are numerous different editions of Shakespeare’s source text, since it is not risky for publishers to republish and distribute the text: “Shakespeare was a pre-sold concept whose works were in the public domain” (Collins 124). The pre-sold concept of Shakespeare’s play will be sold to the public, because the public is aware of Shakespeare’s prestige, and willing to read his plays for this reason. Despite this pre-sold concept, publishers are not likely to gain a great mount of economic capital by publishing the play, because the works can also be found online for free since they are in the public domain. The small amount of economic capital that can be gained suggests that the publishers will most likely publish Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* to gain symbolic capital.

3.2 The Stage Adaptation: Carroll’s *Twelfth Night* (2013)

Carroll’s stage adaptation *Twelfth Night* was performed from 2012 to 2014. There was a great demand for these shows, so they were filmed and released on DVD in 2013. The DVD cover
displays one of the staged scenes and is titled “Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night” (figure 15). The name of the director and the actors in the play are not mentioned on the cover. This title and lack of naming the actors involved in the stage production suggests that the symbolic capital of Shakespeare is more important than the symbolic capital of the actors. The cover states that the all-male production was the winner of the Whatsonstage Awards, and features three reviews by established newspapers. These reviews can be important for the image of the stage adaptation, because it shows that the stage play has a certain quality. So the cover of the DVD suggests that these reviews and their sources (The Daily Telegraph, The Sunday Telegraph and The Sunday Express) influences the prestige of the stage adaptation. Therefore, the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation is influenced by the cover of the DVD.

The stage adaptation was directed by Tim Carroll, a British director and associate director of Shakespeare’s Globe. Carroll’s position as associate director of the Globe suggests that he can be seen as a prestigious director. The cast consists of well-known actors such as Paul Chaihidi (Maria), Samuel Barnett (Sebastian), Liam Brennan (Orsino), Peter Hamilton Dyer (Feste), Mark Rylance (Olivia) and Stephen Fry (Malvolio). Samuel Barnett has played in TV series and films, but also in numerous stage productions, such as the Shakespeare production Richard III (2012), and Pantalaimon in Wright’s His Dark Materials (2003/2004). Barnett’s filmography suggests that he can be seen as a valued actor. Roger Lloyd Pack, who played Sir Andrew Aguecheek, has also played in films and TV series for over thirty years. He played in other adaptations such as the TV miniseries Will Shakespeare (1978), Nineteen Eighty-Four (1984), the TV miniseries Oliver Twist (1999), Vanity Fair (2004), which suggests that he can be seen as an established actor. The Oscar winner Mark Rylance played the role of Olivia in the stage adaptation. He also played in other adaptations, such as Hamlet in The History of Hamlet (1995), King Henry V at the Globe in 1997, Leonardo Da Vinci in the TV miniseries Leonardo (2003), and King Richard II in King Richard (2003). The popular writer, actor and comedian Stephen Fry played the role of Malvolio. He had been nominated for a Golden Globe, six BAFTA’s and other awards before he played Malvolio in the stage adaptation. For this performance, he won the Whatsonstage Award for Best Supporting Actor in a Play (“2013 Results”). Before he played in Twelfth Night (2013), he had been in numerous films, TV series and plays, so he positioned himself as an established actor. The actors involved in the stage adaptation are established in their field; therefore their performances influence the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation.
Carroll’s stage adaptation had been reviewed in established papers such as *The Guardian, The New York Times, Variety, The Telegraph*, and the *Hollywood Reporter*. An embargo was enforced on the newspapers to prohibit them to review the stage adaptation before it transferred to West End (O’Connor). This was supposedly the case so Stephen Fry would not walk out of the production like he did in 1995, where he “walked out on the production after a hostile review in the Financial Times and briefly went missing” (O’Connor). The embargo on the reviews was broken by *The Independent*, who posted the first review on *Twelfth Night* (2013). Dominic Cavendish is lead critic for *The Daily Telegraph* and titled his article “Stephen Fry in Twelfth Night, Globe Theatre, first review”. The title suggests that the review is primarily about Stephen Fry, and his performance and prestige were important for the stage adaptation. Cavendish did not refer to Shakespeare in his review, suggesting that the stage adaptation is mostly influenced by one of the actors, Fry, and not by the established playwright that was responsible for the source text. The focus in this review was on Fry and his earlier performances, which suggests that the critic Cavendish is mostly interested in the symbolic capital that Fry brought to the stage adaptation, and not in the stage adaptation itself. This may indicate that Shakespeare’s source text and its symbolic capital is less important than the symbolic capital that was brought in by the actors in this contemporary adaptation. Cavendish treated the adaptation as a work on its own, thus the role of the source text had been reduced.

The review in *The Guardian*, “Stephen Fry's Twelfth Night: this all-male affair is no one-man show”, was written by culture editor for *The Guardian US* Alex Needham. The title of his review suggests the importance of Fry’s participation in the stage adaptation, which may influence the symbolic capital of the adaptation. Despite the suggestive title, the review focussed on the performance of the actors. Needham was mostly criticizing the performance of the actors in the play and did not criticize the plot. The critic praised the all-male production, but the focus of the review is on actors Mark Rylance and Stephen Fry. Needham states that “the whole cast [is] working at such a high level of accomplishment that no single actor dominates” (Needham). Needham did refer to Shakespeare in his review by stating that the World Shakespeare festival contributed to the many adaptations, but did not focus on Shakespeare’s input for the adaptation. The source text by William Shakespeare is hardly mentioned, and the review is mainly about the performances of the actors. This suggests that the symbolic capital of Shakespeare is still present, but the relationship between the source text and the adaptation is not stressed in the review. The source text of the stage adaptation is
less present in the reception, which suggests that the symbolic capital of the source text does not influence the stage adaptation.

The review in *The Independent* also focussed on Fry’s stage appearance, but did not explicitly state this in the title of the review. Paul Taylor did not refer to Shakespeare or his prestige, but focussed on the performances of the actors. The review suggests that the actors involved in the production of the adaptation can be more important than Shakespeare’s symbolic capital by focussing on the actors. Taylor’s primary focus was on Stephen Fry, which suggests that the symbolic capital of Stephen Fry can be seen as important for the prestige of the stage adaptation. Taylor stated in the review that “given that this is Fry's first stage appearance since his troubled exit from Cell Mates 17 years ago, it's hardly surprising that so much of the coverage has been focused on him” (Taylor). This statement can be relevant for the reviews in the established papers, that all tend to focus on Fry.

*The New York Times* critic Ben Brantley is an American journalist and chief theatre critic, so he can be seen as an established critic. The subtitle of *The New York Times* review “‘Twelfth Night’ and ‘Richard III’ With Mark Rylance” referred to Mark Rylance instead of Stephen Fry, which suggests that the focus on Rylance’s performance. This shift in focus also suggests that Rylance’s performance is more significant than Fry’s, thus the symbolic capital of Rylance influences the stage adaptation. Brantley recognized Rylance’s prestige by stating that the adaptation “allows Mr. Rylance to show he’s as brilliant in trousers as he is in a dress” (Brantley). Despite the focus on Rylance, Brantley criticized Fry’s role by stating that the character of Malvolio “is refreshingly embodied by Mr. Fry with the complacency and affectation of someone you might recognize from your own office” (Brantley). On the contrary to the other established media, *The New York Times* did not refer to Fry’s earlier performances. Brantley also referred to his own personal experience with Shakespeare adaptations by stating that “I can’t remember being so ridiculously happy for the entirety of a Shakespeare performance since - let me think - August 2002” (Brantley). This suggests that Brantley tries to influence his own position as an established critic by demonstrating his appreciation for Shakespeare. This way, Shakespeare’s symbolic capital can reflect on the symbolic capital of the critic Brantley.

*Variety*’s critic David Benedict also focussed on Mark Rylance’s performance, stating that his “dazzlingly watchable antics as a reproving Olivia overturned by lust in Shakespeare’s Globe’s all-male “Twelfth Night” constitute nothing short of a star turn” (Benedict). Benedict’s focus on Rylance suggests that his prestige influences the symbolic
capital of the stage adaptation. Benedict is negative about Fry’s performance, stating that he “lacks energy and emotional depth” (Benedict). The review also referred to Carroll’s influence in the stage adaptation by stating that he restored “the ethnic of the first production” (Benedict). This suggests that Benedict also recognized the symbolic capital of the director. Overall, the focus in Variety is on the actors involved in the stage adaptation, and by treating the adaptation as a work on its own the prestige of the source text becomes less evident, thus the symbolic capital of the actors involved in the adaptation is more important than Shakespeare’s symbolic capital.

Overall, all the British reviews tend to focus on Stephen Fry’s involvement in the stage play. Despite Shakespeare’s established position, the reviews focus on the stage adaptation and its actors, which suggests that the symbolic capital of the contemporary actors influences the stage adaptation. The difference in focus on Stephen Fry in British established media and Mark Rylance in American media suggests that there can be a national difference in focus on the prestigious actors. Due to cultural differences, some actors can be more popular in one country than the other, so their symbolic capital may differ in another country. Overall, the established newspapers were positive about the stage adaptation, but this was mainly due to their positive attitude towards the two actors. Shakespeare’s influence was hardly discussed in the reviews, thus the source text becomes less important in the contemporary adaptation.

The total economic capital of the stage adaptation Twelfth Night (2013) cannot be estimated, but the adaptation can be seen as successful. After playing in the Globe, the show continued in the Apollo Theatre, before it was transferred to Broadway. At the Apollo, the tickets were priced from £70, whereas the Broadway tickets began at $25. The stage adaptation played several months, drawing a large audience. The stage adaptation first played in Shakespeare’s Globe, which probably attracted an audience for the adaptation because they were aware of Shakespeare’s symbolic capital. The stage adaptation Twelfth Night (2013) was later released on DVD, which indicates how high the demand for the show was. The DVD production might gain more economic capital, because this can be sold for a longer time with a smaller amount of costs per production of a DVD. In Variety it was suggested that the show was so successful due to the casting of “author, wit and beloved Brit all-rounder Stephen Fry as Malvolio” (Benedict). This suggests that the actor did not only bring in symbolic capital, but his presence was important for the audience, thus his involvement positively influenced the economic capital.
3.3 The Film: Nunn’s *Twelfth Night* (1996)

The 1996 adaptation *Twelfth Night* was directed by Trevor Nunn. This adaptation’s title is similar to the title of the source text, but the DVD does not refer to Shakespeare, but to the director by referring to the adaptation as “a Trevor Nunn film” (figure 16). However, Shakespeare is named in the list of actors involved in the process: “Twelfth Night by William Shakespeare adapted for the screen by Trevor Nunn” (Nunn). The lack of references to Shakespeare suggest that his prestige is not significant for the film adaptation *Twelfth Night* (1996). Therefore, the original text became less important for the adaptation.

The original film trailer addresses to Shakespeare by labelling the film “William Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night” (Nunn). One of the special features on the DVD includes the filmographies of the actors, which suggests that the symbolic capital that they have gained in their career influences the film adaptation. There are no references towards Shakespeare on the DVD; the plot is mostly Shakespeare’s, but the adaptation has some significant alterations, for example in the dialogues. Overall, the film adaptation *Twelfth Night* (1996) can be seen as Nunn’s appropriation of the source text. This suggests that Shakespeare’s influence is still present, but the focus is on the adaptation as a new cultural product.

Director Trevor Nunn’s name is prominently on the cover, which suggests that his symbolic capital is important for the film adaptation. Nunn produced shows on Broadway and West End theatre before he was involved in this adaptation. He won multiple awards, for example the 1975 Drama Desk Award Unique Theatrical Experience and the 1982 Tony Award for Best Direction of a Play. He also won the Laurence Olivier Award for Best Director several times, once for the Shakespeare adaptation *The Merchant of Venice*. So Nunn can be seen as an established producer, and his symbolic capital might influence the symbolic capital of the film. The actors that are featured on the DVD cover are Helena Bonham Carter (Olivia), Richard E. Grant (Sir Andrew Aguecheek), Nigel Hawthorne (Malvolio), Ben Kingsley (Feste), Mel Smith (Sir Toby Belch) and Imogen Stubbs (Viola). The actors Toby Stephens (Duke Orsino) and Steven Macintosh (Sebastian) are not featured on the cover of the DVD. Bonham Carter has played in other film adaptations prior to her performance in *Twelfth Night* (1996), for example in *A Room with a View* (1985), *Hamlet* (1990) and *Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein* (1994). She has been nominated for over 80 prizes, amongst them two Oscars, seven Golden Globes and three Emmy’s, and has won over 40 prizes (IMDB). Bonham Carter career shows that she can be seen as an established actress, so her symbolic capital might have influenced the symbolic capital of the film adaptation. Featuring the names
on the front of the DVD cover suggests that the symbolic capital of the film cast influenced the level of consecration of the film adaptation.

The film adaptation has been reviewed by established media, such as *The New York Times*, *Variety*, and the *Rolling Stone*. The review in *The New York Times* was written by Stephen Holden, who also wrote the review of *The Hours* (2002). Holden, the leading theatre and film critic at *The New York Times*, can be seen as an established film critic with a high degree of consecration. He referred to Shakespeare almost immediately in his film review, and placed the film in the tradition of other Shakespeare adaptations: “‘Twelfth Night,' like almost every other recent movie adapted from Shakespeare, takes some broad cinematic liberties” (Holden). He recognized Shakespeare’s symbolic capital by stating that the film adaptation “fully recognizes the genius of the play “ (Holden). Thus Shakespeare gets recognition for this adaptation, despite his lack of direct involvement. This suggests that the source text is still relevant for the film adaptation. Holden also addressed the director Trevor Nunn by commenting on his treatment of Shakespeare’s source text. The quality of the actors’ performances in the film adaptation was hardly discussed, which suggests that Holden’s review was mostly influenced by the symbolic capital of Shakespeare’s source text and the director. By referring to Shakespeare and Nunn, Holden implies that both are important; the source text and the adaptation are on the same level, but the role of the original text is declining. Holden also stressed his position as an established critic by showing his knowledge of the source text in his references towards Shakespeare and Nunn.

The film adaptation gained four stars in the *Rolling Stone*. The review was written by Peter Travers, an American film critic and journalist. As a former chair of the New York Film Critics Circle and a current member of the National Society of Film Critics, Travers can be seen as an established critic (“Peter Travers”). Travers referred to Shakespeare by stating that “if you like your Shakespeare straight up, try this comedy of mistaken identity” (Travers). His immediate reference towards the playwright suggests that the source text is still relevant for the stage adaptation, and that Shakespeare’s symbolic capital influences the contemporary adaptation. Travers also recognized Nunn’s symbolic capital in his review by referring to an earlier accomplishment: “Trevor Nunn, who formerly ran the Royal Shakespeare Company” (Travers). Despite this recognition, Travers is not very positive on Nunn’s influence on the film adaptation, referring to “Nunn’s error” (Travers). This suggests that the symbolic capital of Nunn does influence the film adaptation, regardless of the quality of his work. The performances of the actors were hardly discussed; Travers only stated that Imogen Stubbs “looks fetching in a mustache” and Stephens, “the son of Maggie Smith, has real star shine”
(Travers). There were no substantive comments on their acting performances, and the review mostly focussed on Shakespeare and Nunn. This suggests that the source text is still relevant for the adaptation, and the prestige brought in by the author of the source text reflects on the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation.

The review in Variety was written by Todd McCarthy, an American film critic who wrote over thirty years for Variety as its chief film critic (Fritz). After his dismissal, it was stated that “the loss of a reviewer with the title of chief film critic could be a blow to Variety's credibility and prestige” (Fritz). This statement suggests that McCarthy can be seen as an established critic. McCarthy also opened his review with referring to Shakespeare: ““Twelfth Night” is an OK Shakespeare adaptation” (McCarthy). This suggests that McCarthy, similar to Holden and Travers, recognized the symbolic capital of the source text. McCarthy also referred to Nunn as “renowned theatre director”, which demonstrates that he recognized the prestige of the director (McCarthy). According to McCarthy, Nunn took “considerable liberties with the text”, but this did not work out very positively (McCarthy). Although McCarthy recognized Nunn’s symbolic value, he stated that the film adaptation is “unfunny and unedifying” and “doesn’t promise to live up to the international success of its predecessors” (McCarthy). These statements suggest that despite Nunn’s established position, his prestige did not influence the critic’s evaluation. The critic had high expectations due to the established source text and Nunn’s previous works, which suggests that their symbolic capital might have had a negative influence towards McCarthy’s final opinion. The focus in this review is mostly on the performance of the actors, suggesting that their role was important for the prestige of the stage adaptation. McCarthy also referred to the economic capital that can be gained by the film adaptation by stating that “commercial prospects look modest” (McCarthy). Overall, McCarthy’s review suggests that the source text is still of importance.

The established critic Roger Ebert also referred to Shakespeare in the first line of his adaptation of Twelfth Night (1996). Egbert showed his knowledge of the source text with this statement, and stressed his position as a acknowledged critic. The critic also recognized Nunn’s position as a director and refers to him as “for 20 years a stalwart of the Royal Shakespeare Company”, who “knows the material, and knows the right actors to play it” (Ebert). This suggests that the director’s knowledge of the source text is important for the adaptation. Ebert also reflected on the actors in the adaptation, which suggests that their symbolic capital is also valuable for the film adaptation. Overall, Ebert was much more positive about the film adaptation than the other reviews.
Angie Errigo of Empire Online reviewed Nunn’s film adaptation four years after it was released. She referred to Shakespeare immediately in her review by opening with the statement “Twelfth Night is counted as one of Shakespeare’s most perfect comedies but it is much more than a wheeze of cross-dressing confusions and thigh-slapping burlesque” (Errigo). This statement suggests that she has knowledge of both the source text and other works by Shakespeare. Errigo stated about Nunn that “after running the Royal Shakespeare Company for 20 years Trevor Nunn knows his Bard”, which indicates her knowledge about him (Errigo). Errigo’s review acknowledges Shakespeare’s prestigious position, but also Nunn’s position as a director of the adaptation, which suggests that both Bourdieusian actors contribute to the symbolic capital of the film adaptation. Errigo stated that Twelfth Night (1996) is “bold and intricate, one of the better Shakespeare adaptations” (Errigo). This statement suggests that the critic is aware of the source text, and the author of the source text. Errigo hardly focuses on the performances of the actors, who are described in only one word (“Maria (a clever Imelda Staunton)”) (Errigo). This suggests that the symbolic capital of the author and the director influence the prestige of the film more than the actors that were involved in the production.

The film adaptation Twelfth Night (1996) earned 33,451 USD in the opening weekend, and 588,621 USD in total. With a budget of 5 million USD, the film cannot be seen as an economical success. In comparison to other Shakespeare adaptations in the same decade, the box office of Nunn’s adaptation was not successful. According to Box Office Mojo, Branagh’s Hamlet (1996) gained 4,773,189 USD, Parker’s Othello (1995) gained 2,844,379 USD, Loncraine’s Richard III gained 2,684,904 USD. The most successful Shakespeare adaptation was Baz Luhrmann’s Romeo + Juliet (1996), which gained 147,5 million USD. In comparison to these other film adaptations, Twelfth Night (1996) cannot be seen as an economical success.

3.4 The Film: Fickman’s She’s the Man (2006)

Fickman’s She’s the Man (2006) is a teen movie adaptation of Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night. The film adaptation is an analogy, which means that the elements are radically changed (Cho). Teen movie adaptations were very popular in the nineties, when Austen’s Emma (1815) was adapted into the teen movie adaptation Clueless (1995), Shakespeare’s The Taming of the Shrew (1623) became 10 Things I Hate About You (1999) and Romeo and Juliet (1597) became Baz Luhrmann’s Romeo + Juliet (1996). The teen movie adaptation has
the possibility of “giving [the source text] an afterlife it would never have had otherwise” (Hutcheon 176). This is certainly the case for *She’s the Man* (2006), because the popular teen movie gives a different perspective on Shakespeare’s source text and attracts a new audience. Despite these differences, the purpose of this adaptation was not to “radically undermine them [Shakespeare’s source texts], but to update and develop certain of his topical concerns (and by the same token to underline its universality)” (Onega, 12). The adaptation *She’s the Man* (2006) was updated in a way that made the play relatable for a younger public, thus creating a new afterlife for the source text.

The DVD cover and film posters of *She’s the Man* (2006) do not refer to Shakespeare at all (figure 17). This means that the audience is not explicitly informed this is a Shakespeare adaptation. If the audience is not aware of the film’s status as an adaptation, they will most likely see the film adaptation as a work on its own, thus they will not expect a high level of consecration. This film adaptation is released for the mass market and aimed at a teenage audience. In Bourdieu’s field of cultural studies, works with a high degree of consecration are generally aimed at the intellectual or bourgeois audience, and works with a low degree of consecration are either for the mass market or do not have an audience. The film poster and DVD covers of *She’s the Man* (2006) are not influenced by the symbolic capital of the source text, the source text is ignored and intentionally not mentioned to attract a different audience. Thus the role of the source text in this adaptation is not stressed for the audience.

The extra features on the DVD do not refer to Shakespeare’s source text. Despite the film being a loose adaptation, there are many references to the source text *Twelfth Night* (1623), such as names of the characters and the setting. Most of the characters are the same as in the source text, although some of them have a different relationship with the main characters than in the source text. In this film adaptation, Viola is not impersonating a man called Cesario, but she is impersonating her brother Sebastian. In several cases, these names are used in a different setting, for example the name Cesario, which is used as a name for a restaurant in *She’s the Man* (2006), the name Malvolio is used for Malcolm’s pet tarantula. Furthermore, the school where the film takes place is called Illyria, which is the name of the country where the play is featured. There is also a reference to the clown Feste in the film adaptation; in Sebastian’s room there is a poster of a band called Feste next to his door. At Viola’s first day at Illyria, a poster for the school theatre play titled “What You Will”, the subtitle of Shakespeare’s source text, is shown. Furthermore, the soccer team is called “the Stratford Junior League”, which refers to Shakespeare’s birthplace Stratford-upon-Avon.
Duke Orsino also quotes the source text in the soccer game: “Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them” (Fickman). Although Duke states that he quotes his soccer coach, this is a direct quote from Malvolio in act two, scene five (Shakespeare 60). Although most references in the film are subtle, the Shakespeare’s source text is still present in the adaptation. The references are subtle, so only people who are familiar with the source text will recognize them. This suggests that Shakespeare’s symbolic capital hardly influences the film adaptation She’s the Man (2006). Only the public that is aware of the film’s position as an adaptation will be influenced by the prestige of the source text. This suggests that the role of the source text is present, but declining. There are no direct references towards Shakespeare, thus his prestige is not used to influence the symbolic capital of the film adaptation. Nevertheless, for the audience that is aware of the film’s status as an adaptation, the symbolic capital of the source text does influence their perception of the film adaptation.

Director Andy Fickman had not established his position as director yet when the film was released. The character Viola is performed by Amanda Bynes, who had played in many other teenage romantic comedies, such as What a girl wants, Big Fat Liar and The Amanda Show. On the exterior of the DVD, the cast and their previous roles are named, and on the front of the DVD it is stated “Starring Amanda Bynes”. There are no references towards Shakespeare, so the star discourse of the cast is more important for the prestige of the adaptation than the author of the source text. This suggests that the symbolic capital of the cast influences the symbolic capital of the film adaptation more than Shakespeare’s symbolic capital.

She’s the Man (2006) was reviewed by some established newspapers, but these were short reviews. This may indicate that despite the film being a Shakespeare adaptation, the newspapers were not inclined to publish a big article on it. The Guardian reviewed the film adaptation when it was released. The review was written by Peter Bradshaw, the established critic who also reviewed the film adaptations of The Hours (2002) and The Golden Compass (2007). The review is under 100 words, and the film only gets one star. The review opened with the statement “There have been some very smart American high school pictures paying homage to Shakespeare: but this notional twist on Twelfth Night is dire”, which placed She’s the Man (2006) in the tradition of Shakespeare adaptations (Bradshaw). This suggests that the critic Bradshaw is aware of the history of Shakespeare adaptations. Despite the negative review, Shakespeare’s symbolic capital is recognized by Bradshaw, who might be using it to
express his knowledge of Shakespeare. Furthermore, Bradshaw criticized Bynes’ acting performance, but the other actors are only named. This suggests that the source text was important for Bradshaw’s review.

Nathan Lee of The New York Times also reviewed the Shakespeare film adaptation. Lee is a critic, curator and PhD student. This review did not initiate with stating that She’s the Man (2006) is a Shakespeare adaptation, like The Guardian’s. Nevertheless, it does refer to the source text: “The ensuing complications -- romantic, social, sporty -- are modeled [sic] on "Twelfth Night"” (Lee). This review is slightly longer than the review in The Guardian and also praises Fickman for his work. Thus the symbolic capital of both the director Andrew Fickman and the writer of the source text Shakespeare both influences the film review of The New York Times.

The film was also reviewed by online media, such as Keith Phipps for the A.V. Club, who also reviewed the film adaptation of The Hours (2002). She’s the Man (2006) was graded a D by Phipps and a C by the community reviewers. Overall, the review was quite negative about Bynes’ acting skills and therefore her symbolic capital hardly influences how consecrated the film adaptation is. Phipps opened his review with a reference to the source text: “The notion that Shakespeare’s plays work no matter how they're updated gets tested again in She's the Man, which ports the plot of Twelfth Night into a private high school named Illyria” (Phipps). This statement suggests that Phipps is aware of the film’s position as a Shakespeare adaptation. He also refers to 10 Things I Hate About You, another high school adaptation of a Shakespearean work, so Phipps placed Fickman’s film adaptation in the tradition of high school adaptations. This suggests that the symbolic capital of Shake speare’s source text does influence the film adaptation.

Other online media also reviewed She’s the Man (2006): PluggedIn gave the film adaptation 2,5 stars and only referred to Shakespeare and the source text in the conclusion. The review of the so-called “Hollywood teenization” was much more elaborate than the others, focussing on multiple aspects of the film (Neven). Empire Online also gave the film adaptation two stars, stating that “the plot holds interest, but that’s more thanks to Shakespeare than the writers of Legally Blonde” (Smith). This statement suggests that Empire Online was influenced by Shakespeare’s prestige and not by the symbolic capital of the actors involved in this production. CinemaBlend was more critical and gave the film 1,5 stars. The critic Scott Gwin stated that “in the case of She’s the Man it’s hard to tell who is dumber. On the one hand you have the director, screenwriters and actors who have crafted the worst ever
teen movie version of a Shakespeare play…” (Gwinn). Gwinn was very negative about the adaptation, but does recognize Shakespeare’s high level of consecration by comparing the source text to the film adaptation. Gwinn stated “the equating of “Twelfth Night” to She’s the Man probably has Shakespeare rolling in his grave and English teachers everywhere weeping aloud”, indicating that the source text is much more consecrated than this film adaptation could ever be (Gwinn). Overall, the online reviews referred to Shakespeare in a positive manner, which suggests that his symbolic capital influences the film adaptation. Furthermore, they placed Shakespeare’s position above the influence of the director and actors, which suggests that they acknowledge the influence of the source text. Because of this influence, the expectations of the film adaptation were very high. Since these expectations were not met by the film adaptation, the reviews are all quite negative.

Despite these negative reviews, the film was quite popular amongst the mass audience. The film was appealing to its targeted audience. CinemaBlend stated that the audience, “raised on a steady diet of Hilary Duff, Freddie Prinze Jr. and Kenan and Kel, they [teenagers] somehow find this sort of schleppy project appealing” (Gwinn). The film adaptation earned about 52.2 million dollars, which is considerably more than Nunn’s Twelfth Night (1996). This suggests that the decision to not market She’s the Man (2006) as a Shakespeare adaptation, but for the mass market, was mostly rewarding in economic capital. In comparison to other teenage movie adaptations, She’s the Man (2006) was moderately successful; 10 Things I Hate About You (1999) brought in 53.5 million dollars, the Shakespeare adaptation O (2001) only brought in 19.21 million dollars, Baz Luhrmann’s Romeo + Juliet (1996) gained 147.5 million USD and the Austen adaptation Clueless (1995) had a box office of 56.6 million. She’s the Man (2006) was also featured in the “top 10 most successful films based off of or inspired by the work of Shakespeare at the box office”, on place number four (Adamczyk). Although the economic capital of She’s the Man (2006) was not influenced by the source text, the film can be seen as a box office success.

3.5 Conclusion: Twelfth Night (1623) vs. Twelfth Night (2013) vs. Twelfth Night (1996) vs. She’s the Man (2006)

Shakespeare’s source text can be seen as very prestigious and an inspiration for adaptations. Julie Sanders states that “it is no coincidence that the Shakespearean canon has provided a crucial touchstone for the scholarship of appropriation as a literary practice and form” (Sanders 45-46). Connecting Shakespeare to an adaptation can be very valuable for the
symbolic capital of the adaptation: Shakespeare’s high amount of symbolic capital might reflect on the appropriation of adaptations. Cartmell stated that his name “ensures a degree of academic credibility not always awarded other form of cultural and/or film studies” (Cartmell 50). The adaptations that are discussed in this chapter sometimes rely on Shakespeare for their symbolic capital, but mostly the professional reviewers are focussed on the author of the source material and his prestige. In the film adaptations, the source text is less important in the exterior and the extras of the DVD’s, but still stressed by the critics in their reviews.

In the covers and theatre or film posters of the Shakespeare adaptations, the focus was not always on the source text. In the case of Carroll’s stage adaptation, the focus on Shakespeare was present on the cover of the DVD. By referring to both Shakespeare and The Globe, this stage adaptation relied on the symbolic capital of the source text, which might have influenced the stage adaptation. The exterior of Nunn’s film adaptation mostly relies on the symbolic capital of the director and the actors. Shakespeare is hardly mentioned and his symbolic capital is not stressed. With Fickman’s *She’s the Man* (2006), there are no references towards Shakespeare on the DVD cover or film poster; the focus is on the cast. Therefore, it can be suggested that in the case of film adaptations, the focus is mostly on the film cast, but in the case of the stage adaptation, the focus is still on Shakespeare, despite the established cast. The symbolic capital of the actors involved in the production is more prominent than the symbolic capital of the source text. The contemporary covers of the Shakespeare play have not been influenced by the adaptations at all, which suggests that the symbolic capital of the source text has not been influenced by the adaptations.

In the reception of the adaptations, the critics always address Shakespeare or the source text, but the focus in most reviews is on the performance of the cast. The reviews of the stage adaptation focussed on the actors in the play; Stephen Fry in the UK and Mark Rylance in the US. Their symbolic capital influenced the professional reviews, thus they may have influenced the symbolic capital of the stage adaptation *Twelfth Night* (2013). In the case of the film adaptation by Trevor Nunn, the established critics refer to the source text in their reviews, and some even open their review with mentioning Shakespeare. These critics also refer to Nunn and his symbolic value, but they are mostly negative about his adaptation. This suggests that the symbolic capital of both Shakespeare and Nunn has been acknowledged, but it does not influence the opinion of the critics. The source text is still important for this adaptation, but mostly in the reception of the film and less in the adaptation itself. Although the film adaptation *She’s the Man* (2006) does not refer to Shakespeare on the film poster or
the DVD cover, but critics in established press and the online critics always refer to Shakespeare in their reviews. The symbolic capital of Shakespeare can influence the audience that is aware of the film’s position as an adaptation, which is the case for the critics. Their references towards the source text might be important to justify their decision to review this high school adaptation, since reviewing a film with a low level of consecration cannot be positive for their own position as a critic. In this adaptation, the role of the source text is negligible for mass market audience, only the established critics refer to the source text to stress their own position.

The great amount of Shakespeare adaptations show that his works can be adapted in many ways. Although the alterations can be seen as degrading for the source text, especially in the teen movie adaptation, it can be stated that “Shakespeare on screen, in spite of a culture of anxiety regarding the impact of media studies on English literature, is here to stay” (Cartmell 50). From the stage in 1602 to high school adaptations in the twenty-first century, Shakespeare continues to be adapted. According to Graham Greene, “adaptations of Shakespeare have a social purpose, to teach ‘the great middle class a little about Shakespeare’s plays’” (Greene qtd. in Cartmell 32). This might have been the case for the film adaptations, since they attract a different audience than the stage play and the source text. Thus the symbolic capital of Shakespeare does still reflect on most of his adaptations, but She’s the Man (2006) is an exception: this adaptation was mainly made for the mass audience. It was not the intention to gain symbolic capital with this adaptation, the focus was on gaining economic capital by producing a Hollywood teen version of the source text.

Overall, Shakespeare’s source text was more important in the reception of the adaptations than their presence on the exterior of the adaptations. The focus in the reception lies on the performance of the actors involved in the production of the cultural work, but Shakespeare is always mentioned. In the case of the amateur reviews on Goodreads and Amazon, the reviewers tend to refer to adaptations in a way, but they also refer to Shakespeare, preferably while referring to his prestige. This suggests that the critics are aware of their relation to the established source text, and the influence of this source text on the adapted work.
Conclusion

This research considered the influence of the source text on an adaptation and reversed by comparing three case studies: Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998), Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy and Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*. Bourdieu’s theory on symbolic and economic capital was used to compare this influence. Relationships between the source text and the adaptation can be intertwined, and the source text might influence the symbolic and economic capital of the adaptation and vice versa.

The posters and covers of the adaptations in all three case studies showed that the source text is more emphasized in the stage adaptations than in the film adaptations. The poster of the *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004) stage adaptation still refers to Pullman, calling it “Philip Pullman’s *His Dark Materials*”, and “Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*” refers to both Shakespeare and The Globe. This suggests that both stage adaptations seem to rely on the symbolic capital of the source text by explicitly referring to the source text and its author.

When considering the film adaptations, the focus on the covers is mostly on the actors involved in production. In Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998), the source text is not addressed in the adaptation and the focus is on the three actresses, which suggests that the star discourse of the cast is more important. This is not entirely the case for the film adaptation of Pullman’s trilogy, because his name is stated on the back of the DVD covers. Nevertheless, the names of the actors are explicitly featured on the front of the cover, which suggests that the symbolic capital of the actors is more important for the prestige of the film. In the case of the adaptations of the adaptations, such as the video game, making-off book and quiz books, Pullman’s influence is hardly mentioned. The symbolic capital of these adaptations mostly relies on the symbolic capital of the film adaptation *The Golden Compass* (2007). This suggests that the source text becomes less important in the afterlife of these adaptations, and that the film adaptation *The Golden Compass* (2007) takes over the role of the source text for these adaptations. In the film adaptations of *Twelfth Night*, the focus is also on the actors, and Shakespeare is not mentioned on the DVD cover. There also seems to be a precedence in which order the actors are featured; some names are put more prominently on the cover than others. This is especially the case for *She’s the Man* (2006), where actress Amanda Bynes is featured more prominently than the other actors. The result of these case studies show that the symbolic capital of the source text is still important for the stage adaptations, but in the case of the film adaptations, the symbolic capital of the film cast might have a bigger influence on the symbolic capital.
The analysis of the book covers after the adaptation shows that the influence of the adaptation on the source text is very prominent in the case of Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) and Pullman’s *His Dark Materials*, but not in the case of Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*. Shakespeare had already established his position as a prestigious playwright, thus the influence of the adaptations was less prominent in the afterlife of the source text. This suggests that the symbolic capital of the adaptations hardly influenced the established position of the source text. For Cunningham and Pullman, the film posters that were used as book covers could have attracted a different audience, which might have influenced the economic capital of the books. As Cartmell stated, “film did not kill the ‘classic’ book but rather, via adaptations, assured it a stronger position within postmodern culture than it had achieved via high modernism” (Cartmell 52). This might be the case for Cunningham’s *The Hours* (1998) and Pullman’s *His Dark Materials*, which gained a stronger position with a contemporary audience after being adapted.

In the professional reception of the adaptations, critics always referred to the author of the source text. With these statements, the critics showed their knowledge of the adaptation’s position in relation to the source text. Most adaptations were compared to the source text and treated as an adaptation and not as a work on its own. In some cases, the critics were positive about adapting the source text. For example the *January Review* called the film adaptation of *The Hours* “the best thing that ever happened to Michael Cunningham” (Gunning). In other cases, the critics were negative, for example calling the stage adaptation Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004) “a clipped hedge compared to Pullman’s forest”, or calling *She’s the Man* (2006) “the worst ever teen movie version of a Shakespeare play” (Billington, Gwinn). The critics focussed on the faithfulness of the adaptations, which suggests that they focussed on the importance of the role of the source text in the adaptation. This approach suggests that the symbolic capital of the source text is still important for the professional reception. The professional reviews also discussed the role of the actors, and their prestige is often stressed. This was especially the case for the stage adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*, where the professional reviews mostly focussed on Stephen Fry’s performance. This suggests that despite the symbolic capital of the source text, the symbolic capital of the actors also involved in the production influences the prestige of the adaptation.

The amateur book reviews referred to the adaptations more often than the professional reviews. Cartmell stated that “an adaptation is a dangerous thing, and a major player in the decline of cultural values and the levelling of classes” (Cartmell 48). This might be the case
for these case studies, since many amateur reviewers referred to film or stage adaptations in their reviews of the source text. These reviewers stated that they read the book after seeing the film: “I'm a little ashamed to admit that I read this book [The Hours] because Oprah told me to. Actually Oprah, Meryl Streep, Julianne Moore and Nicole Kidman told me to” (Minervasowl qtd. on Goodreads). Another reviewer also demonstrated the influence of an upcoming movie adaptation by stating that the upcoming adaptation of Northern Lights (1995) makes it “the perfect time to read this magical series for the first time, or simply to reread it again” (Alex Telander qtd. on Goodreads). The amateur reviews made it evident that the adaptations have an influence on the mass market public, but this influence of the adaptations is not as big as expected. This suggests that the influence of the adaptations on the source text is more prominent in the amateur reception, but the symbolic capital of the source text is not as much influenced in the reception as one would expect by looking at the covers of the source text after the adaptation.

Overall, the role of the source text is still evident in the adaptations, but this is mostly expressed in the professional reviews of the adaptations. The hypothesis that adaptations have an effect on the symbolic and economic capital of the source text was tested by looking at three case studies. The result of these case studies shows that the adaptations did have an effect on the symbolic and economic capital of the source text in most cases. In the case of Cunningham’s The Hours (1998), the influence of the film adaptation on the source text can be seen in the book covers and the reception of the book after the film. The influence of the source text on the adaptation is less prominent, which suggests that the influence of the film adaptation on the source text was bigger than the other way around. For Pullman’s His Dark Materials trilogy, the source text was more prominent in the stage adaptation than the film adaptation. With the other adaptations, such as the video game and books about the film, the role of the source text was hardly noticeable and the focus is on the film adaptation The Golden Compass (2007). This suggests that in the case of the adaptation of an adaptation, the influence of the source text will be even less prominent. In the case of Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night, the adaptations hardly influenced the afterlife of the source text. This suggests that due to Shakespeare’s prominent symbolic capital, the adaptations did not influence the source text. Thus in the case of a source text with a great amount of symbolic capital, the adaptations will have less influence on the afterlife of the source text.

This thesis shows that the role of the author of the source text is less prominent in the adaptations than the role of the screenwriter, and the role of the cast involved in the adaptation
is more prominent. This suggests that the symbolic capital of the source text and its author becomes less important in adaptations, but the adaptations will influence the audience of the source text. The afterlife of the source text will be influenced by the adaptations, but mostly the professional reception will still refer to the source text and the contemporary public will become less aware of the cultural product’s position as an adaptation. Further research of adaptation studies can indicate if Shakespeare’s case study is a special case, or if the symbolic capital of the author of the source text has an impact on the influence of the adaptation on the source text.
Appendix

Figure 1: Covers of *The Hours* (1998) before the film

Source: Goodreads

Figure 2: Covers of the film version of *The Hours* (2002)

Source: IMDB
Figure 3: Covers of *The Hours* (1998) after the film

Source: Goodreads

Figure 4: Covers of *Northern Lights* (1996) before 2003

Source: Goodreads
Figure 5: Covers of *Northern Lights* (1996) between 2003 and 2005

Source: Goodreads

Figure 6: Covers of *Northern Lights* (1996) after 2005

Source: Goodreads
Figure 7: Poster stage adaptation *His Dark Materials* (2003/2004)

Source: www.philip-pullman.com

Figure 8: DVD covers film adaptation
Figure 9: Film posters film adaptation

Source: www.moviepostershop.com

Figure 10: Other adaptations: Novella’s

Source: www.philip-pullman.com
Figure 11: Other adaptations: books about the film, video game

Source: www.philip-pullman.com

Figure 12: Other adaptations: graphic novel, BBC radio drama.

Source: www.philip-pullman.com
Figure 13: Shakespeare’s First Folio (1623)

Source: www.amazon.co.uk

Figure 14: Contemporary covers Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*
Figure 15: Carroll’s *Twelfth Night* (2013)

Source: http://www.roh.org.uk/products/twelfth-night-dvd-shakespeare-s-globe
Figure 16: Nunn’s *Twelfth Night* (1996)

Source: IMDB

Figure 17: Fickman’s *She’s the Man* (2006)

Source: IMDB, Wikipedia, Amazon
Figure 18: Bourdieu’s Field of Cultural Production
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