

## Our Common Cultural Heritage — Classic Novels and English Television

Len Platt

Modern media have used the novel as a source for drama from the beginning. The production companies responsible for reproducing ‘classic novels’ have been attracted not just by the ready-made plots and characters, but also, perhaps especially in British film and television,<sup>1</sup> by the status of canonical texts that have a virtually unassailable currency in terms of cultural value. Indeed these two elements are inseparable, with the ‘filmability’ of the classic novel being shaped and determined by its high status in cultural terms. As the cultural form *par excellence* of the educated classes, the novel gives filmmakers not just a stock of stories and memorable heroes and villains, but also a direct line to prestige. It is not surprising that the adaptation of the novel to film has been seen as playing a considerable part in establishing the reputation of mainstream film as a serious and important ‘popular’ culture.<sup>2</sup>

The BBC, a key institutional force in bringing classic literature to a wider modern audience, began its involvement in the 1920s — the 1928 radio production of *The Three Musketeers* is usually seen as a landmark in this respect.<sup>3</sup> Further radio productions of nineteenth-century novels swiftly followed, with the works of such writers as Austen, Dickens, Scott, Trollope and Thackeray, forming the staple of radio serialization. The first classic serial shown by BBC television was a six-part version of Trollope’s *The Warden* (1951). Thereafter classic serials became a regular feature in BBC television scheduling. From 1963-1979 there was a separate BBC department set up specifically for the production of serials generally (called the Serials Department), and it was here that the hugely successful classic serials of that period were produced — possibly the most

talked about classic serial of all, *The Forsythe Saga*, for example, ‘reached an average weekly audience of 15,500,000 in Britain, and by 1970 the BBC could boast that it had been watched by more than 160,000,000 people in 45 countries.’<sup>4</sup>

Between 1951-1981 there were no fewer than ? television serializations of classic novels. Their appearance has continued more or less evenly to the current time and they have been exported all over the world. The 1972 version of *Emma*, for instance, with all its romanticized images of early-nineteenth-century England and Englishness, was apparently actively sought after in such postcolonial environments as Australia, Bahrain, Ireland, Kenya, Malaysia and Singapore, as well as Iceland, Rumania, Hungary, and Sweden.<sup>5</sup> There was a brief period from the mid 1980s to early 90s when the popularity of classic serials seemed to wane somewhat, corresponding to an accelerated Americanization of British television — not that American corporations have been unsupportive of the British classic serial. Much of the budget for Granada’s 19? production of *Hard Times* came from New York’s Public Broadcasting station WNET-TV,<sup>6</sup> a relatively early example of transnational funding operations that are now standard — Arts and Entertainment New York, for instance, was the co-producer of the 1995 BBC version of *Pride and Prejudice*. The later nineties, however, did see a renewed interest in the viability of the classic serial, with the emergence of new writers — Andrew Davies being one obvious and eminent representative here — making strong reputations as interpreters of the great novel tradition. Similarly new popular actors found mileage in what is often understood to be a characteristic style of English performance and one of the quintessential English cultural forms.

From its earliest days to the present day, then, television has systematically both adapted and adopted the ‘classic’ English novel. The classic serial has been a standard feature in television programming, especially in BBC schedules. Indeed, although other British production companies have invested in classic serials, the relationship between the BBC and this particular form remains intimate<sup>7</sup> and has contributed to the sense that the classic serial is not just a celebration, but a continuation of, a standard of high cultural value that is frequently nationalized, or racialized. Thus an eminent theorist of television, writing in 1993, applauds the success of one such serialization on the grounds that it supported ‘the notion that Britain had the best television in the world, certainly the best television drama’, without too much concern over what it means to construct cultural value in such a way.<sup>8</sup>

Perhaps the most costly programmes to produce, these modern reconstructions of classic novels remain highly prestigious, then, and therefore central to the BBC’s earliest and most celebrated mission to ‘inform, educate and entertain.’<sup>9</sup> For all its critics, the serialized classic novel is still a key component in British television’s much vaunted, if now diminished, reputation for high quality. Strangely, given its status and relative longevity as a ‘popular’ cultural form, there have been relatively few attempts at theorizing this phenomenon, at least as far as the formal academy is concerned — a fact that renders this current essay provisional in some respects and quite generalized in its approach. With something of a focus on televised versions of Austen’s novels, it considers classic novel serializations and the issue of cultural value from a perspective governed by cultural studies, and influenced by contemporary critical approaches to literature. This does not much involve arguing for or against the standard of individual

serializations, or of the genre generally — although, inevitably, some dispositions do creep in this respect. Nor is the intention to compare specific novels against films for quality, or to participate seriously in the long-standing debate over whether the classic serial ‘corrupts’ the novel tradition or is educative in bringing it to a wider audience. The primary interest, rather, is in the larger question of what it means to reproduce ‘Literature’ (meaning the canon and all the values attached to it)<sup>10</sup> in a modern, industrial and visual form. The emphasis is not on ascribing cultural value, but on understanding the complex dynamics that have developed between a modern contemporary culture and the tradition culture that has supported it. In the first instance, this involves some interrogation of the general relationships that exist, or are commonly supposed to exist, between the classic serial and its prototype.

### **Verisimilitude — the spectacle of likeness**

Classic serials respond to a mimesis imperative in two distinct ways. First, the televised classic has to be seen to be ‘faithful’ to the original text. This is not simply a matter of respect for the master copy, as it were; it is also a question of responding to an imagined sense of relationship between the reader and the classic novel. Viewers, according to television legend, expect and demand utter faithfulness to the fictions they love. They will, allegedly, be quick to complain about deviations from the original, although one suspects that for every viewer who protests about a classic serial on this score, there must be millions who miss such divergences, or have no feelings about them at all. The idea that there is a powerful interest ‘out there’, avidly protecting the virtue of English literature from the ravages of popularization is, to a large extent, a myth which serves a dual function. It both underwrites the ‘authenticity’ of classic serialization, because it

places the form under such apparently strict surveillance, and authorizes its claim to contemporary relevance. Thus the media interest generated in rumored sex scenes in the 1995 version of *Pride and Prejudice*. The ‘exposure’ of the awful liberties that long-haired television makers were apparently about to inflict on a national treasure did no harm to the viewing figures of the show, but whether it reflected a real concern of ‘the British public’ must be highly doubtful. Whatever, makers of classic serials have frequently expressed what they see as their responsibility to ‘Literature’ and its readers and this invariably implicates the idea of remaining ‘true’ to the text. Against those who understand the televised classic novel as ‘aerosol versions of great work’<sup>11</sup> constituting a ‘hollowing out of our common cultural heritage’,<sup>12</sup> the makers of these serials, and some critical traditions, talk of an implied cultural continuity, of honest, professional and creative attempts at ‘getting it right’, and of bringing high culture to a wider constituency, albeit in a modern, commercial form.<sup>13</sup>

Second, almost all classic serializations become costume dramas. As well as recreating the novel, they must also reproduce the historical period in which the novel was written, or set. Since classic novels are, overwhelmingly in the collective mind of television companies, nineteenth-century novels, the recreation of the novel means the recreation of a historical culture. Sometimes this is achieved in very approximate ways and involves little more than a general Victorianization that stands in for ‘old England’ (see, for instance, the very crude version of Victorian London constructed in Granada T.V’s ? version of *Oliver Twist* or the more marginal 1980 version of *Pride and Prejudice*, scripted by Fay Weldon, which seems reasonably convincing in terms of dress and interiors but, even to the inexpert ear and eye, particularly poor, even disinterested, when

it comes to early-nineteenth-century music and dance). Other shows, however, have gone to great lengths to get the reproduction as plausible as possible. In the 1995 production of *Pride and Prejudice* substantial resources were devoted to the antiquarian instinct, with researchers being employed to find out about a great range of aspects of landed society in the early-nineteenth century, from the obvious signifiers (buildings, dress, hairstyles, carriages, soft furnishings and so on) to the less so (fashions in garden flowers, the intricacies of ballroom etiquette and the protective clothes worn by early-nineteenth-century beekeepers, for example).<sup>14</sup>

In reality, however, neither of these imperatives can be completely fulfilled. Indeed the whole business of 'faithful reproduction', whether of the novel itself or of 'society and culture then' must be loose and highly provisional and involves a great deal of sleight of hand or 'television magic'. As far as the television serial reproducing the novel is concerned, there is the obvious point that film and novel are distinct forms — to put it simply, many textual qualities of the novel do not transfer easily to film, if at all. There have been some critical attempts to argue that film can reproduce the novelistic, with the camera operating as an author discourse or 'metalinguage',<sup>15</sup> but few would now accept such positions, especially with regard to a tradition of televised classic serials which has been so typically homogenous in style. The result, far from reproducing the stylistic variation of the novel, has been a flattening that erases what is often most interesting about the written text. Even without this manifestation of the commercial reproduction of the novel tradition for a 'mass' audience, however, the film will always be a version of the novel, rather than a 'faithful copy'. It is distinct medium with a distinct aesthetic, which is why debates about the quality of the film relative to the book and vice versa

have so little meaning or impact in terms of critical theory (although analyzing the *version* of a novel produced on film in order to compare textual meaning does seem a reasonable and possibly important critical challenge). The film must be *different* from the book and makers of classic serials know this better than most — which is why they often talk about the freedom of interpretation, as well as the imperative of faithfulness to the original.<sup>16</sup>

Reproducing the ‘historical setting’ of the novel and its novelist is equally problematic. The practical impossibility of producing absolute accuracy means that this kind of reconstruction, however thoroughly researched and assembled, is always a question of ‘avoiding the worst anomalies’ and creating a consistent approximation of period that works internally. The skill, as one set designer puts it, is in ‘judging just how much liberty you can take.’<sup>17</sup> Moreover, the ‘historical setting’ of the novel is not somehow divorced from the manufacture of the novel text. It is, itself, a version of history, an interpretation of culture and society with its own emphases, distortion, gaps and inconsistencies. In aiming for a reproduction of the historical dimension, the television serial replicates not ‘history itself’, as the makers often imply, but the past as it is thought to have been reproduced in fiction. It is an interesting question how indebted our imaginative and critical understanding of the past (of Victorian London for instance, so much a product of Dickens’s fiction, or early-nineteenth century landed society, organized by Austen as ‘England’) is shaped and determined by these fictional interventions, and the filmic versions that popularize them anew.

The classic serial clearly does involve a strong recognition of ‘Literature’ — the sheer persistence of the classic serial, and the resource level devoted to producing it, tell us just

how viable the status of ‘Literature’ seems to be in modern television culture in Britain and, indeed, worldwide, both in cultural and commercial terms. But it is only in a highly qualified sense that the classic serial reconstructs the specific novel. Nor is it actually ‘history’ that is celebrated in classic serials, or some unmediated past, but (at least where the reproduction is compelling and consistent) the modern, technological culture that can image the past so splendidly. It is the transforming power of modern culture that is demonstrated and applauded here, or criticized where it fails to be convincing. As so often in modern culture, the facsimile makes the first impression, with the copy being marveled at as copy — another way of making the point that adaptations often consume the memory of novels ‘to efface it with the presence of its own images.’<sup>18</sup> For this reason, the education discourse frequently employed by makers of classic serials misses the point in many respects, and is misleading. It is not so much ‘information’, ‘knowledge’ or ‘Culture’ that the serializations of classic novels produce, but, rather, a very specific, notionally middlebrow and technologically advanced form of spectacle that is packaged as ‘Literature’.

### **Classic serials and *l’écriture***

The suggestion that the classic serial, for all its apparent literariness, functions as high-status eye candy is consistent with some extremely influential theorizations of modern popular culture. For someone like Daniel Bell, following the culture industry theorists, one crucial characteristic of modern culture is its movement away from complex textual meaning and the subsequent reliance on the immediate sensual experience. This has often been understood both in terms of aesthetic decline and of the implications for social order

and consent, with the state and corporate life expanding its influence in and through a 'culture industry' whose main function is as soporific. Here astonishment, delight and amazement would become key to the cultural experience, displacing more traditional, cerebral and critical engagements. Hearing and seeing would become more forcefully deployed than listening and 'reading'; extravagant design, spectacular costumes, again in theatre terms, would take over from more complex and literary textual effects. Sights and 'also sounds... [would] become central in the production of meaning and identity', indeed the dominant social outlook of modernity in Bell's *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* is considered to be 'visual', with the characteristic positioning being more outwardly disposed than inwardly regarding.<sup>19</sup>

Now the classic serial is in many ways highly suggestive of a modern culture that is visual and it does exploit the visual spectacle in modern ways. Indeed, inasmuch as it involves the 'translation' of a reading culture into a seeing one, the classic serial stands as a particularly resonant emblem of modern culture in this respect. However, that does not make words and scripts redundant to the televising of the novel. On the contrary, the serialized novel makes an obvious investment in words and word culture. This is partly how the classic serial culture gets its defining character as a particular mediator that manages the traditional/modern and high/low cultural divides. Whatever its investment in the modern, and however visual its interpretation of the original narrative, the classic serial remains notionally intertextual with its prototype and in this sense performs the highly significant balancing act of reconciling modern technological culture with a more traditional privileging of the written word and the 'literary'. In a potentially highly

charged and ideological configuration, it purports to make traditional ‘quality’ meaningful and accessible in modernity, and on a ‘mass’ scale.

The classic serial must remain devoted to the idea of a word culture if it is to exploit the status of ‘Literature’, which is perhaps one reason why it has so often utilized the services of the most writerly of contemporary writers — Alan Bleasdale, for instance, whose *Oliver Twist* is one of the best televised serials, and Denis Potter, who wrote the ? version of *The Mayor of Casterbridge*. What is produced here in the television scripts however, and whoever the writer may be, is obviously very different from the original novel in terms of language, whether one thinks of language as system, aesthetics or discourse. One obvious distinction between the playscript and the novel is that the playscript is comprised exclusively of dialogue and stage direction. Other ‘voices’ the novel might adopt — narrative, descriptive, discursive, parodic voices, for instance — are, at best, compromised. The point about such ‘dialogic’ or multi-vocality is that it is central, not just to the workings of individual novels, but to most contemporary accounts of the novel form and its traditions. In the playscript, however, all this ‘fabric’ is seriously displaced, if not altogether erased. What remains is not so much the individual text, registering the uniqueness of a novelist and a novel as it articulates against the imagined social world, but, rather, a non-standard dialogue. This latter has a number of key functions. It operates plot (the key organizing principle of adaptation)<sup>20</sup> and characterizations and is supposed to stand-in for some notion of the specific literary signature of a canonical writer. It also features as a version of period English. But it is not the authentic novel text. In describing her difficulties memorizing lines for *Pride and Prejudice*, the actress Jennifer Ehle talks misleadingly of learning *Austen’s* dialogue and

as this being like ‘learning another language’. Similarly Alison Steadman talks in similar terms of finding the language of the show ‘very difficult’.<sup>21</sup> Actually they were not learning Austen’s language at all, or early-nineteenth century English (whatever that abstraction might mean) but, rather, generalized approximations of imagined literariness.

It should be emphasized that this gap between the literary text and film is not simply a matter of elements of ‘narrative’ not translating to filmed dramatic versions. Even the dialogue of classic novels refuses transcription for television, as many writers who undertake adaptation have pointed out. Andrew Davies, for example, has talked about wanting to make Austen’s dialogue ‘something that could be spoken in the early nineteenth century, but also something you wouldn’t find terribly artificial if it were spoken now.’<sup>22</sup> Denis Constanduros is more extreme in this respect, arguing that Austen’s dialogue on television would be ‘terribly long, stilted and unnatural sounding.’<sup>23</sup> There are, of course, authenticating gestures but most playscript dialogue is usually much altered, and often entirely made up. Bleasdale’s foregrounding of the ‘back-story’ of *Oliver Twist* is suggestive here. This works extremely well dramatically, but it is not Dickens. Indeed, it involves nothing less than the creation of a character, the invention of a murder and a whole episode comprised largely of scenes and dialogue that have no counterpart in the Dicken’s novel at all. The playscript, then, bears little real resemblance to the novel itself, so much so that it is usually quite impossible to follow a televised serial and the original text in tandem. What we have in the language text of the classic serial, as with the filmed image, is, again, a version which stands-in for, somewhat like pastiche, or, at its least successful, like parody, for the imagined literary quality of a writer and a text.

### **Imitation/intervention**

Claims about the classic serial being ‘faithful’ to the novel, and to a ‘spirit’ that can be captured, are misleading given what separates the two, and, indeed, rather suspect in some ways.<sup>24</sup> They are, on the one hand, suggestive of the old myth that real art has a ‘timeless quality’ or ‘essence’ that stands indefinable and unquestionable, impervious to critical tradition, contemporary perspective, and the politics of cultural value. On the other hand, they seem to obscure so much of the material nature of the classic serial. It is not that the films produced for ‘mass’ consumption do not, and cannot, come up to the standard of the ‘great tradition’ of novel writing, as so many have claimed, but, rather, that the notions of a classic serialization simply imitating or reproducing the novel, or capturing its ‘essence’, seem so critically naïve. There might be the illusion of a film ‘bringing the novel to life’, but actually classic serializations are specific cultural products operating under material circumstances that simply did not, and do not, apply to the novel. They are also interventions, more transformative than reproductive and certainly more active in sustaining and creating cultural meanings than might be thought.

One dimension of this intervention is the effect not just of sustaining the ideologized concept ‘Literature’, but of doing so in a particularly cleaned-up, anodyne and, again, nineteenth-century way. Like Anglo-Irish versions of Celtic texts or Victorian bowdlerizations of Shakespeare, television versions of the classic novel are invariably expurgated. The target, however, is no longer sexual content. In fact, this is often exaggerated or invented in modern styling, perhaps especially when Austen is the writer being televised. The makers of the 1972 *Emma*, for instance, felt so starved of sexual

content that they invented a highly unlikely scene where Mr Elton straightens Harriet Smith's dress at the leg. In the 1995 *Pride and Prejudice* there is the entirely un-Austen-like image of Darcy (played by Colin Firth) taking an impromptu dive into a lake and emerging to drip suggestively at the feet of a startled Elizabeth Bennett. This, with its romantic and highly sexualized overtones, became a defining promotional shot for the production. More usually, then, it is perspectives, and narrative strategies, that now seem distorted, excessive or 'beyond reason', that disappear from television, rather than sex or 'bad' language. Thus the televised Lawrence is a Lawrence without the fascism and romanticized as a class hero; Dickens is stripped of the dark excesses of his grotesquerie and the specifics of his social comment, which is presumably one reason why Fagin in *Oliver Twist* is traditionally softened from irredeemable otherness as a Jew into a more ambiguous trickster/magician figure; and so on. This smoothing out of the novel tradition to produce a homogenized genre may also be reflected in the canon as it is has been interpreted by the BBC classic serial, by a 'Literature' configured crucially from notions of English 'realism' (Austen, Dickens, Eliot, Hardy, and Lawrence) instead of from different traditions, represented by such figures as, say, Rabelais, Sterne, Woolf, Richardson, Joyce and Beckett.

Further dimensions of this intervention have already been suggested in this essay. It seems quite clear that a British corporation constructing 'Literature' in terms of English writers and idealized notions of English identity, to be sold worldwide as an English product, must surely work in fairly conservative ways. Indeed, it is possible to argue that the BBC and the classic serial fight something of a rearguard action in this respect. Whereas the traditional literary canon has been seriously scrutinized and interrogated in

other institutional contexts — libraries, schools, publishing houses and, perhaps especially, university departments — television, at least as represented by the classic serial, has managed to maintain a literary tradition that is predominantly white, English and male. Austen remains the essential exception that confirms the latter hegemony, although her status in terms of the classic serial far exceeds any role of token female writer.

The BBC has serialized the work of a great many ‘classic’ authors, including Balzac, the Brontes, Collins, Dickens, Dumas, Eliot, Hardy, Hemingway, James, Scott, Stevenson, Waugh, Wells and Zola, but there is a sense in which the Austen novel remains preeminent as a subject for classic serialization, a fact explained by Monica Lauritzen in terms of economics and conservative cultural politics. ‘For a television audience of family viewers, *Emma* is ... perfect in the eyes of those responsible for the program output. It is limited in scope (and thus quite cheap to film) and safely traditional in its outlook.’<sup>25</sup> The effect of this identification between Austen and safe pleasure is worth comment. The development of Austen as the author most frequently visited and revisited by modern television, as Lauritzen implies, has meant rather more than the production of entertaining spectacles of historical recreation. In yet a further example of what Alison Light and others have understood as the ‘conservative modern’,<sup>26</sup> the Austen serial has commercialized a strong conservative domain in a contemporary and technological context. Conservative sexual identities, for example, (the remote, authoritative male, the English rose, the gamine and so on) are reproduced and maintained in the Austen serial. Traditional class systems are configured as the essential social structures, and traditional authority is upheld. The landed elite, for instance, is

defended in this environment, sometimes reformed by the better elements of the bourgeoisie and invariably associated with essential 'English' qualities romanticized as universals. Urban life is marginalized, indeed, in its most radical form it is excoriated as an invention quite alien to the native English intelligence. Perhaps above all, the Austen novel has become a springboard for that elevation of pragmatism and fair play into 'the English way'. Silent about radical change and social conflict, the Austen novel, updated as an electronic and digitized culture, becomes the means by which a timeless order is managed and maintained as 'England'. It is hardly surprising that this package sells and achieves such substantial commercial backing from the corporate world.

## Notes

1. John Ellis suggests that American filmmakers relied less on the classics than on popular literature, whereas in Britain the reverse was so. There may be some room for doubt here, however. Gainsborough films, for instance, which had a considerable influence on classic serials, worked a great deal with popular novels. See 'The Literary Adaptation' *Screen*, 1982, vol 23, p.3 and Len Platt, *Aristocracies of Fiction: The Idea of Aristocracy in Late-Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Literary Culture* (Westport CT: Greenwood, 2001), pp.139-41.

2. See Siegfried Kracauer, *The Nature of Film: The Redemption of Reality* (London: 1961), p. 217.

3 See Asa Briggs, *The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom*, vol 2, p. 169.

4. Paul Kerr, 'Classic Serials — To Be Continued' in *Screen*, 1982, vol 23, p. 15.

5. See Monica Lauritzen, *Jane Austen's Emma on Television: A Study of a BBC Classic Serial* (Göteborg: Göteborg Studies in English, 48, 1981), pp. 9-11.

6. See Kerr, 'Classic Serials', p. 18.

7. Kerr argues that the classic serial is 'an embodiment British television', p. 6.

8. George W. Brandt, 'The Jewel in the Crown — the Literary Serial; or the Art of Adaptation' in George W. Brandt (ed.), *British Television Drama in the 1980s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 198.

9. This, of course, is the classic, Reithian expression of the BBC mission.

10 See Raymond Williams's account of 'Literature' in *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 45-54.

11. Jonathan Miller in the James McTaggart lecture given at the Edinburgh International Festival (1983). Quoted in Brandt (ed.), 'The Jewel in the Crown', p. 196.

12. See Lauritzen, *Emma on Television*, p.11.

13. Brandt, for instance, believes that culture 'has always extended itself in the retelling and remaking of narratives.' It is this general approval that underpins his championing of *The Jewel in the Crown* series. He is dismissive of criticisms about the Anglo-centric nature of this production. See Brandt, 'The Jewel in the Crown', p. 197.

14. See Sue Birtwistle and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice* (Harmondsworth: Penguin/BBC, 1995).

15. This was Colin McCabe's position, at least in regard of film versions of the novel generally. See 'Realism and the Cinema': Notes on Some Brechtian Theses', *Screen*, 1974, vol 15, pp. 7-27. For an account of critical responses to his argument see Kerr, 'Classic Serials', pp. 10-11.

16. '[W]hat is the justification of spending money if you're just going to produce a series of pictures alongside the dialogue of the novel? You have to offer an interpretation.' Andrew Davies reported in Birtwistle and Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice*, p. 3.

17. Birtwistle and Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice*, pp. 32 and 42.

18. See Ellis, 'The Literary Adaptation', p. 3.

19. Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (London: Heinemann, 1976), p. 105ff.

20. 'The principle of Hollywood Aristotelianism ... [means that] all elements of the film — spectacle, diction, character and certainly thought — must be subordinated to plot, the prime arbiter.' George Bluestone, *Novels into Film* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968), p. 103.

21. Birtwistle and Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice*, p. 13.

22. Andrew Davies reported in Birtwistle and Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice*, p. 13.

23. Quoted in Lauritzen, *Emma on Television*, p. 47.

24. '[W]e always thought it was important to go for the spirit of the original book', Sue Birtwistle quoted in Birtwistle and Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice*, p. viii.

25. Lauritzen, *Emma on Television*, p. 49.

26. Light's account of a modernism that is conservative focuses on the English novel between the wars. See *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservatism Between the Wars* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), pp. 14-19 and pp. 61-112.

For an account of the conservative modern in late-Victorian and Edwardian musical theatre see Len Platt, *Musical Comedy on the West End Stage, 1890-1930* (Palgrave-Macmillan, 2004)