



# Aiding and Abetting Survival: Americanizing *Robinson Crusoe* through Adaptation

Defne ERSİN TUTAN<sup>1</sup> 



<sup>1</sup>Assist. Prof., Başkent University, Faculty of Science and Letters, Department of American Culture and Literature, Ankara, Türkiye

ORCID: D.E.T. 0000-0002-9863-3636

**Corresponding author:**

Defne ERSİN TUTAN,  
Başkent University, Faculty of Science and Letters, Department of American Culture and Literature, Ankara, Türkiye  
**E-mail:** defneersin@yahoo.com,  
defne@baskent.edu.tr

**Submitted:** 19.01.2022

**Revision Requested:** 14.02.2022

**Last Revision Received:** 21.02.2022

**Accepted:** 28.04.2022

**Citation:** Ersin Tutan, D. (2022). Aiding and abetting survival: americanizing *Robinson Crusoe* through adaptation. *Litera*, 32(2), 573-585.  
<https://doi.org/10.26650/LITERA2022-1059943>

**ABSTRACT**

Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) has been insistently adapted to both the big screen and TV throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century and well into the 21<sup>st</sup>, the earliest version dating back to 1902 and the most recent to 2016. Although a full list of all versions would be elusive and also redundant, almost 50 adaptations are readily available for viewing and/or for analysis. Moving away from the 'fidelity' criticism in the earlier vein of adaptation studies and proceeding from the argument that all adaptations are essentially rewritings, alternative ways in which the source text may be reconstructed in an ultimately intertextual framework, this paper scrutinizes American screen adaptations of *Robinson Crusoe*, namely *Robinson Crusoe on Mars* (Dir. Byron Haskin, 1964), *Lt. Robinson Crusoe, U.S.N.* (Dir. Byron Paul, 1966), and *Cast Away* (Dir. Robert Zemeckis, 2000). Far from shedding new light on an almost-exhausted source text, these rewritings reflect more about their own discourses, relating to the historical and social contexts of their own making. In so doing, they 'Americanize' *Robinson Crusoe*. As such, three centuries after its publication, *Robinson Crusoe* is still being repeatedly reinvented and reconstructed in film, and this analysis investigates the dialogical relations among these adaptations while, at the same time, emphasizing how every new adapted version of a work of literature aids and abets the survival of its source text.

**Keywords:** Adaptation Studies, *Robinson Crusoe*, Intertextuality, Rewriting, Survival



## Introduction

Film studies, adaptation studies, or any form of study rooted in film analysis, whatever the context may be, are fast-moving, rapidly-consumed fields of study. So much so that the urge is to critically analyze and/or review a film as soon as it comes out before it is swiftly consumed both by audiences and by scholars, then taking its place in the archives. Nevertheless, films are also invaluable objects for study in retrospect, and as Adrienne Rich points out, “[r]e-vision – the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entering an old text from a new critical direction – is for us more than a chapter in cultural history: it is an act of survival” (1972, p. 18). Hence, viewed through alternative critical approaches, adaptations provide fruitful analyses whereby ‘old texts’ reverberate in their revised, rewritten, and recontextualized versions, depicting the survival process.

Evolving out of innumerable investigations of novel-to-film adaptations, adaptation studies have, for a long time, been overshadowed by the ‘fidelity’ debate, according to which the adapted versions would always be weighed against their source texts, gradually leading to the conclusion that ‘the book was better’ – a cliché in and of itself. As Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan assert, “[a]daptation as a pale copy of the real thing is an entrenched belief prevalent in popular press reviews of film adaptations, where the final paragraphs almost always contain an obligatory return to the inevitable ‘not as good as the book’ conclusion” (2007, p. 3). The same reactionary process applies also to textual rewritings of literary works, and in the perspective of Tisha Turk, “[w]hen we read a novel whose intertext we know, our expectations are activated, completed, reversed, or frustrated not only by the narrative and discursive events within the novel we are currently reading but also by events within the intertext and by points of congruence and difference between the texts” (2011, p. 297). Therefore, whether the rewriting appears in the form of a novel or a film, the preconditioning remains at work. To put it differently, a rewriting/adaptation almost always starts off on the wrong foot, as it were, since it is interpreted in relation to its predecessor, therefore conditionally and never autonomously. As such, “popular adaptations” are “put down as secondary, derivative” (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 2), “culturally inferior” (Naremore, 2000, p. 6), as “tampering” or “violating” (McFarlane, 1996, p. 12), and, therefore “haunted at all times” (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 6) by their source texts, thereby demonstrating cases of “bastardization” (Stam, 2005b, p. 3). Whether utilized or criticized, these attitudes depict the tendency towards name-calling and value judgments which adaptations end up having to fight against to secure their legitimacy.

In many cases, as Linda Hutcheon argues, “if an adaptation is perceived as ‘lowering’ a story (according to some imagined hierarchy of medium or genre), response is likely to be negative” (2013, p. 3), yet “to be second is not to be secondary or inferior” (Hutcheon, 2013, p. xv). Fidelity to the intertext should not be the first and foremost condition to be fulfilled by an adaptation; the intertext, taken to be the original, should not be regarded as superior to the adaptation, claimed to be the replica. Rather, they should be judged as separate and individual works of representation. In “Adaptation and Intertextuality, or What isn’t an Adaptation, and What Does it Matter,” Thomas Leitch approaches the debate from a different perspective, though arriving at a similar conclusion, as he begins “with the axiom that adaptation is a subset of intertextuality” (2012, p. 89). Reviewing “nine different accounts of the relation between adaptation and intertextuality” (2012, p. 89), Leitch discusses the paradigm that “adaptations are quintessential examples of intertextual practice” (2012, p. 100). Nevertheless, the question remains: “If a given audience misses the intertextual reference of a particular adaptation, does it still count as an adaptation?” (2012, p. 95). Leitch argues that this perspective, at least, builds on “the near-unanimous rejection of fidelity discourse, the bad object of adaptation studies” (2012, p. 103). To this end, adaptation studies can be claimed to thrive, at present, through different objectives, moving beyond the urge based on fidelity. It is undeniable, as Rachel Carroll fervently claims, that

[a]ll adaptations express or address a desire to return to an ‘original’ textual encounter; as such, adaptations are perhaps symptomatic of a cultural compulsion to repeat. The motivations informing the production and consumption of adaptations may seem intent on replication but, [...], every ‘return’ is inevitably transformative of its object [...]. A film [...] adaptation of a prior cultural text – no matter how ‘faithful’ in intention or aesthetic – is inevitably an *interpretation* of that text: to this extent, every adaptation is an instance of textual *infidelity*. (2009, p. 1)

Hence, stepping beyond the fidelity criticism in the earlier vein of adaptation studies and proceeding from the argument that all adaptations are essentially rewritings, alternative ways in which the source text may be reconstructed and recontextualized in an ultimately intertextual framework, this paper scrutinizes American screen adaptations of *Robinson Crusoe*, namely *Robinson Crusoe on Mars* (Dir. Byron Haskin, 1964), *Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.* (Dir. Byron Paul, 1966), and *Cast Away* (Dir. Robert Zemeckis, 2000). Far from shedding new light on an almost-exhausted source text, these rewritings

reflect more about their own discourses, relating to the historical and social contexts of their own making. In so doing, they 'Americanize' *Robinson Crusoe*. As such, three centuries after its publication, *Robinson Crusoe* is still being repeatedly reinvented and reconstructed in film, and this analysis investigates the dialogical relations among its Americanized adaptations while, at the same time, emphasizing how every new adapted version of a work of literature aids and abets the survival of its source text.

## Rewriting *Robinson Crusoe*

In his "Introduction" to *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*, Robert Stam argues that

centuries or even millennia can elapse between the publication of the source novel and production of the adaptation. [...] The adaptations of novels like [...] *Robinson Crusoe* are necessarily filmed centuries after the original. As a result, the adapter enjoys more freedom to update and reinterpret the novel. The existence of so many prior adaptations relieves the pressure for "fidelity," while also stimulating the need for innovation. At times the adapter innovates by actualizing the adaptation, making it more "in synch" with contemporary discourses. (2005a, p. 41-2)

It is precisely with this 'freedom' and 'relief from fidelity' that the adaptations at hand have been constructed 'in synch' with their contexts of production and consumption. To begin with, the 1964 film *Robinson Crusoe on Mars* narrates the story of Commander Christopher Draper of the United States Navy, former co-pilot of the Mars Gravity Project spacecraft. While, at first, he is accompanied by Colonel Dan McReady, the pilot, and Mona, the monkey, Draper's probe is shortly later ejected as part of an emergency procedure since they are trying to avoid collision with a meteor, and he lands on Mars. Afterwards, discovering Colonel McReady's crash site, with the Colonel dead but Mona alive, Draper sets out on his quest with the monkey in his company. Hence begins his arduous efforts to survive although the total amount of time he spends on Mars is not disclosed.

Similarly, *Lt. Robin Crusoe U.S.N.*, from 1966, has a naval officer as its protagonist. During a routine mission in the Pacific, the lieutenant's plane is about to crash and he, too, follows the emergency procedure, is ejected, and ends up in a minuscule inflatable

boat in the middle of the ocean. It takes four days for him to get washed ashore and to end up on an Edenic tropical island, which he assumes at first to be Hawaii, from where he will be saved in about a year. While the former film is a work of science-fiction, independently made but distributed by Paramount Pictures, the latter is designed as a comedy, if not a children's film, by Walt Disney and filmed with the cooperation of the United States Navy.

*Cast Away*, from 2000, on the other hand, shifts the setting closer to the present day, and its protagonist Chuck Noland represents not the American aeronautical or military forces but the commercial business life. An extremely successful manager of the FedEx company, Noland travels constantly to ensure branch offices abroad operate efficiently. During Christmas dinner with his fiancé and family, he is told to leave on the FedEx jet right away, and due to a thunderstorm, the plane crashes somewhere over the ocean, leaving Noland as the only survivor. This adaptation, categorized as a survival drama, narrates Noland's 1500-day challenge.

In *A Theory of Adaptation*, Linda Hutcheon argues that "adaptations have an overt and defining relationship to prior texts," and that they "usually openly announce this relationship" (2013, p. 3). The first two of the three films under scrutiny clearly mark their relations with the source text in their very titles, thereby also conditioning audience expectations. Interestingly, *Robinson Crusoe on Mars* includes end credits that state the film is "Based on a Story by Daniel Defoe," while *Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.* opens by stating, quite mockingly, that it is "Based on a Story by Retlaw Yensid," which, when read backwards, is Walter Disney. Despite the allusions to the source text within the film, this statement suggests it does not owe anything to Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. *Cast Away* includes neither opening or end credits nor does it allude to the source text in its title. Instead, it reconstructs the castaway archetype, albeit in new ways.

Moreover, in all of the three films, there are Fridays, though in varying forms. In *Robinson Crusoe on Mars*, an interplanetary vehicle lands at a distance, followed by numerous UFOs attacking it. It is revealed that aliens have their slaves mine precious rocks on Mars, and a runaway slave – with undoubtedly the appearance of an Egyptian but who is from the center star of the belt of Orion, therefore an alien himself – joins Draper who, from the onset of their interaction, states "Me, I'm the boss; remember that!" (01:10:34). Upset that they cannot communicate, except in sign language, Draper starts by naming him: "Come on Joe or whatever your name is. Friday! That's it. With

apologies to *Robinson Crusoe*" (01:18:04). The fates of the two thereafter intertwined, along with Mona, the monkey, the remaining part of the film depicts their efforts to get rid of the slave bracelets on Friday's wrists, through which the UFOs constantly locate them, and to go over valleys and hills while volcanoes erupt and snowstorms occur. The master and servant relationship between the two men is subtly implied, and Friday saves Draper's life at least twice. It could be assumed that Friday is paying back Draper for rescuing him from enslavement, and by saving Friday, Draper becomes the abolitionist rather than the enslaver of the source text. The film comes to a rather abrupt ending when a spacecraft arrives to save them, suggesting that they will be taken back to Earth, without any implications as to how Friday would survive there.

The *Crusoe of Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.*, on the other hand, first befriends a chimpanzee, the Astro-Chimp Floyd, that he meets in the stranded submarine on the beach. When dazzled by what he calls a "Japanese Supermarket" (00:30:12), the submarine's treasures, Crusoe openly says: "Let's do it the way Robinson Crusoe did it hundreds of years ago" (00:30:37) and prioritizes what to take with him. Trying to further explore the island with Floyd, Crusoe finds a native totem, Kabuna, and runs into a young woman carrying out a ritual. Afraid, the woman attacks and tries to kill him, and for his 'own protection,' Crusoe takes her hostage. At the hut, the two communicate through sign language but after a few minutes, she starts talking in English and claims she kept the sign language up as a game of charades. Then, Crusoe fulfills the naming process and states: "Robinson Crusoe met his man Friday, except she was a girl. I named her Wednesday!" (01:03:07). In *Cast Away*, there are no monkeys or human Fridays; instead, Noland makes himself a Friday out of a Wilson-brand volleyball washed ashore after the crash. He paints a face on the ball with his own blood and talks to Wilson, without which he is likely to go insane. All in all, with one alien, one female, and one inanimate Friday per film, the three films pay homage to Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. In other words, through these aspects, the adaptations 'repeat' certain elements of the 'original.'

As Hutcheon argues, "adaptation is repetition," as has thus far been depicted, "but repetition without replication" (2013, p. 7). "For the reader, spectator, or listener, adaptation [...] is unavoidably a kind of intertextuality if the receiver is acquainted with the adapted text. It is an ongoing dialogical process, as Mikhail Bakhtin would have said, in which we compare the work we already know with the one we are experiencing" (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 21). However, every adaptation is, at the same time, the product of and conditioned by the cultural context that creates it, keeping it alive

in that very context. As Bakhtin suggests, “every age reaccentuates in its own way the works of [the] past” (1981, p. 421). From another perspective, adaptations can also be seen as “mutations” that help their “source novel ‘survive’” (Stam, 2005a, p. 3). “Stories do get retold in different ways in new material and cultural environments; [...] they adapt to those environments *by virtue of* mutation – [...] in their adaptations. And the fittest do more than survive; they flourish” (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 32). In the case at hand, there are Americanized Crusoes, and in their Americanization lies the very act of aiding and abetting survival. Consequently, interpreting them requires both “textual and contextual analysis” (Geraghty, 2008, p. 4).

In her chapter entitled “Adaptation as Connection – Transmediality Reconsidered,” Regina Schober claims that “to discuss adaptations means to acknowledge their complex textual environment, their cultural implications and their multi-layered process of signification,” thereby recognizing their “intertextual embeddedness” (2013, p. 92). In the light of this claim, the signification that functions towards the Americanization process gains significance. In *Robinson Crusoe on Mars*, Draper states he feels “like Columbus, in a strange new land, full of new wonders, new discoveries; it’s a challenge alright, a challenge to my training” (00:19:04). Thus, in fact, it is not a coincidence that his name is Christopher. In the view of Heike Paul,

[t]he story of Christopher Columbus [...] and his arrival in the Americas holds a pivotal place in an American foundational mythology that stages the ‘discovery’ and the subsequent settlement and colonization of the ‘new world’ in prophetic ways as an inevitable step forward in the course of human progress that eventually would lead to the founding of the USA and to US-American westward expansion, its ‘manifest destiny.’ (2014, p. 43)

Furthermore, the film is clearly preconditioned by the context of its period as it is the time of experiments in outer space, to be followed by the moon landing at the end of the decade. When Draper is watching recordings on surviving and finding water on another planet, the professor in the video emphasizes how “since no one has landed on another planet yet” (00:42:50), “we will have to proceed with hypothetical knowledge” (00:42:53). If, as such, the film is taken to signify the space race of its decade, the US victory is, then, foreseen, and it might not necessarily be far-fetched to presume that the aliens represent the Soviets of the Cold War period. To put it differently, the

protagonist of this film demonstrates multiple roles, functioning both like Christopher Columbus, credited for the continental 'discovery' that paved the way for the making of America, and like Neil Armstrong and/or Edwin Aldrin, credited for the planetary 'discovery' that paved the way for the show of American force in the Cold War era.

In *Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.*, on the other hand, Crusoe is not at all dismayed or even surprised about his situation. In fact, he blames it on his father and the name his father gave him. A frustrated streetcar motorman from Kansas City, his father had always dreamt of running away to sea, and when he could not, he named his son Robinson, thereby sealing his fate. Crusoe asks rhetorically: "Why couldn't dad have named me Dwight or Lyndon?" (00:20:47). Clearly the assumption is that he would, then, have become an American president, a Dwight Eisenhower or a Lyndon Johnson, rather than a castaway. It is also intriguing that the two examples cited are of Cold War presidents. While exploring the island, Crusoe sights a submarine run aground many years ago. Even before he reaches it, the audience realizes it is a Japanese submarine by means of the music playing in the background, confirmed afterwards by the flag. Inside the rusty vessel is where Crusoe finds not only tools and gadgets he could use but also Floyd, the Astro-Chimp from Project Mercury, wearing shorts with the print "Property of U.S. Navy;" to Crusoe, Floyd is "a fellow American" (00:28:55).

Later on, with the introduction of Wednesday, the female Friday, into the film, there are two new overtones initiated. Firstly, Wednesday is the daughter of the native chief Tanamashu, and because she refused to marry the man her father had lined up for her, she was taken to the island and left there to die. When she meets Crusoe, she is attracted, and for most of the time, she flirts with him though Crusoe tries hard not to reciprocate as he is still thinking of his 'intended,' Jane, back home. However, the incident is strongly reminiscent of the story of Pocahontas and Captain John Smith, a distinctly American narrative. According to Heike Paul, "[t]he romanticization of Pocahontas and her encounter with the English settlers has become one of the most enduring narratives of American culture" (2014, p. 89). In her argument, Paul emphasizes how Pocahontas's story has almost always been narrated by/through others; as there are no letters or diaries written by Pocahontas, she has been "appropriated by contemporaries [...] as well as by historians," with "many scholars [dwelling] upon the voicelessness of this American heroine" (2014, p. 89). This argument makes it all the more interesting that, in *Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.*, Wednesday first appears almost as a mute figure, speaking only in sign language, but becomes so talkative afterwards that she is stereotyped as



a nagging female figure. Nevertheless, the structuring of the film's Wednesday may, then, be regarded as an attempt to rewrite the silent Pocahontas into a figure with voice, although the ending of the film diverts from the original story in a different way, as the Lieutenant does not take her with him when he is rescued and heads home like Captain John Smith had done.

Secondly, in many scenes, the interaction between Wednesday and Crusoe has serious repercussions of the typical Adam and Eve story, with all the exotic elements strengthening the depiction. What the film's Eve introduces to the storyline, nevertheless, is "Women's Rights," initiated by her desire to resist her father and supported by Crusoe. Four boats full of women arrive at the island, and they are Wednesday's sisters and cousins, all running away from the patriarchy that suppresses them. When Tanamashu and his men arrive, these women, trained in military discipline by Crusoe in the meantime, march with signs in hand, emphasizing "Women are People" and "Women Got Rights!" (01:48:21). It could, therefore, be argued that *Lt. Robin Crusoe U.S.N.* first echoes the rivalry between the United States and Japan at the beginning of World War II, then refers to the space race of the Cold War, and eventually centers around women's liberation, thereby articulating the concerns of second wave feminism, inspired for the most part by the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. Tying back in with the idea of the film's Wednesday echoing Pocahontas, the feminist vein is not too surprising or out of context, given that "Pocahontas has been cast as an early American *feminist*. [...] [H]er story has been offered as a narrative of empowerment for women, investing her with a specifically female agency in a patriarchal context of male saber-rattling" (Paul, 2014, p. 112). Likewise, in the film, when Crusoe and the group of women outsmart Tanamashu and his men, peace is restored, women's rights are accepted, a feast is held, and everyone sings and dances happily. What Crusoe fails to realize is that it is the native marriage dance, and Wednesday is out to get him. Just then, a helicopter is circling above, and, as if by the bell, Crusoe is saved; going back briefly to get Floyd, he saves the Astro-Chimp, too. When they make it back to the aircraft carrier, a military service is held, not for the lieutenant but for Floyd, the "nation's first hero of outer space" (01:52:15).

*Cast Away* moves from the context of the 1960s to the commercialism of the new millennium. The film opens with Chuck Noland training the FedEx employees at the Moscow branch, complaining about how they should get used to working with a countdown clock to speed the shipping procedures and following the American principles of business. A brief overview of the Moscow streets depicts, not coincidentally,

Lenin's pictures on the wall being taken down (00:03:32). As such, *Cast Away* can be claimed to celebrate both the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the victory of capitalism as the rest of the film also manifests. The tools Noland survives by on the island – a pair of ice skates, VHS cassettes, a party dress, a volleyball – are all salvaged from the FedEx parcels washing ashore. According to Robert Stam, the “pre-industrial mercantilist Crusoe here becomes the post-Fordist Noland,” also signifying “globalization” as represented by the FedEx company itself (2005b, p. 98). Stam further suggests that the film applies “product placement,” the contemporary tool of advertising (2005b, p. 98). It is interesting to remember that the plane crash had occurred during Christmas, and the FedEx cargo contains presents. Hence, the subtle criticism is directed at consumerism, excessively practiced during the holidays as manipulated by capitalism and the advertising industry.

What is more, Noland has neither a monkey, or any other animal for that matter, nor a Friday, a human companion. He does not meet any natives, either. Completely alone and frequently on the verge of losing his mind, Noland has only himself to rely on. To put it differently, his sense of individualism and self-reliance is heightened when compared to the original Crusoe, as he displays rugged individualism, the kind witnessed during the period of the western expansion in the United States. After all, Crusoe is the ultimate “symbol of self-sufficiency and survival in solitary and strange situations” (Kraft, 2007, p. 37). Like the pioneers who had to become inventive in the process, Noland transforms the blades of the ice skates into a knife and a dental instrument to cure his tooth problem, the VHS cassette tapes into rope, the lace of the party dress into a fishing net, and, more significantly, the volleyball into Wilson, his very own self-made Friday. From another viewpoint, Noland may as well be regarded as a representation of the self-made man, a cultural type that John Cawelti considers an “American invention” and “a unique national product” (1965, p. 1). Moreover, unlike the Crusoes of the first two films, who are saved by others, Noland saves himself. In other words, at the end of 1500 days of suffering and having built a raft from scratch, Noland takes off from the island and is later sighted by a cargo ship in the middle of the ocean. For all these reasons, Noland could also be regarded as depicting the can-do spirit, also a legacy of the American frontier. Although he does succeed in escaping the island, Noland returns home to find his fiancé married and with a kid. His refuge from such heartbreak is, once again, the commercial business life, as he gets his job back and continues from where he left off.

## Conclusion

All in all, these adaptations “come to form part of the *Crusoe* textual diaspora, reverberating with distant echoes of the Defoe text and its basic story of castaways on an island” (Stam, 2005b, p. 98). They depict “a form of intertextuality,” experienced “as palimpsests through our memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation” (Hutcheon, 2013, p. 8). Whether directly or indirectly, *Robinson Crusoe on Mars*, *Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.*, and *Cast Away* mark their relations with the source text – in their titles, opening or end credits, and archetypes. They all have Fridays – though one is alien, one is female, and the other inanimate. Thus far, they ‘repeat’ the ‘original’ *Robinson Crusoe* and openly credit doing so. However, *Robinson Crusoe on Mars* partially rewrites the Columbus myth and the theme of discovery while also allegorizing the dynamics of the Cold War period from an American stand point. *Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.* touches upon the US-Japan rivalry of the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, reconstructs the Captain John Smith-Pocahontas narrative, and resonates the Adam-Eve story to shift to the women’s liberation movement from there on. Moving closer to the present day, *Cast Away* provides the post-Cold War context, highlighting capitalism and globalization while also accentuating the heightened sense of individualism and self-reliance, again from an American viewpoint. In short, despite resonating through repetition, these adaptations become marked by variation – a variation that has transformed them into something ‘new’ and American. In the perspective of Linda Costanzo Cahir, the adaptation process results sometimes in “modification,” at other times in “radical mutation;” yet, in either case, the changes made enable the “entity” to become “better fitted to survive and to multiply in its new environment” (2006, p. 14). In like manner, adaptations help their source texts to remain alive and to survive. Hence, the films *Robinson Crusoe on Mars* (1964), *Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.* (1966), and *Cast Away* (2000) are both ‘re’writings and ‘new’ writings, echoing the original *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) but retaining their own authenticity in not being the same as *Robinson Crusoe*. Evaluated from the lens of intertextuality, they invite the viewers to treat them “not as self-contained systems but as differential and historical, as traces and tracings of otherness, since they are shaped by the repetition and transformation of other textual structures” (Alfaro, 1996, p. 268). By means of such “intertextual dialogism,” in turn, “the aporias of ‘fidelity’” are transcended (Stam 2005b, p. 4), and, in the point of view of Albrecht-Crane and Cutchins, studies on adaptation can now look forward to adopting “a poststructuralist lens” based on “a richer notion of intertextuality,” so as to concede that “adaptations are intertextual by definition, multivocal by necessity, and adaptive by their nature” (2010, p. 19).

---

**Peer-review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Conflict of Interest:** The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

**Grant Support:** The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

---

## References

- Albrecht-Crane, C. and Cutchins, D. R. (2010). Introduction: New beginnings for adaptation studies. In C. Albrecht-Crane and D. R. Cutchins (Eds.), *Adaptation studies: New approaches* (pp. 11-22). Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP.
- Alfaro, M. J. M. (1996). Intertextuality: Origins and development of the concept. *Atlantis*, 18 (1/2), 268-285. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/41054827](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41054827).
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogical imagination*. (C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: U of Texas P.
- Cahir, L. C. (2006). *Literature into film: Theory and practical applications*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Carroll, R. (2009). Introduction: Textual infidelities. In R. Carroll (Ed.), *Adaptation in contemporary culture* (pp.1-7). London: Continuum.
- Cartmell, D. and Whelehan, I. (2007). Introduction – Literature on screen: A synoptic view. In D. Cartmell and I. Whelehan (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to literature on screen* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Cawelti, J. (1965). *Apostles of the self-made man: Changing concepts of success in America*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Defoe, D. (2001). *The life and adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. London: Penguin. (Original work published 1719)
- Geraghty, C. (2008). *Now a major motion picture: Film adaptations of literature and drama*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Haskin, B. (Director) (1964). *Robinson Crusoe on Mars*. Schenck-Zabel.
- Hutcheon, L. (2013). *A theory of adaptation*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Routledge.
- Kraft, E. (2007). The revaluation of literary character: The case of Crusoe. *South Atlantic Review*, 72 (4), 37-58. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/27784739](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27784739).
- Leitch, T. (2012). Adaptation and intertextuality, or what isn't an adaptation, and what does it matter. In D. Cartmell (Ed.), *A companion to literature, film and adaptation* (pp. 87-104). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McFarlane, B. (1996). *Novel to film: An introduction to the theory of adaptation*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Naremore, J. (2000). Introduction: Film and the reign of adaptation. In J. Naremore (Ed.), *Film adaptation* (pp. 1-18). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP.
- Paul, B. (Director) (1996). *Lt. Robin Crusoe, U.S.N.* Walt Disney.
- Paul, H. (2014). *The myths that made America: An introduction to American studies*. Bielefeld: Clausen & Bosse, Leck.
- Rich, A. (1972). When we dead awaken: Writing as re-vision. *College English*. 34 (1), 18-30. National Council of Teachers of English. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/375215](http://www.jstor.org/stable/375215).

- Schober, R. (2013). Adaptation as connection – transmediality reconsidered. In J. Bruhn, A. Gjelsvik, and E. F. Hanssen (Eds.), *Adaptation studies: New challenges, new directions* (pp. 89-112). London: Bloomsbury.
- Stam, R. (2005a). Introduction: The theory and practice of adaptation. In R. Stam and A. Raengo (Eds.), *Literature and film: A guide to the theory and practice of film adaptation* (pp. 1-52). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Stam, R. (2005b). *Literature through film: Realism, magic, and the art of adaptation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Turk, T. (2011). Intertextuality and the collaborative construction of narrative: J. M. Coetzee's *Foe*. *Narrative*, 19 (3), 295-310. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/41289306](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41289306).
- Zemeckis, R. (Director) (2000). *Cast away*. 20<sup>th</sup> Century Fox.

