



## Entanglements of adaptation, allegory, and reception: *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People*

Ellen Rees & Thor Holt

To cite this article: Ellen Rees & Thor Holt (2022) Entanglements of adaptation, allegory, and reception: *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People*, *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, 14:1, 2022864, DOI: 10.1080/20004214.2021.2022864

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004214.2021.2022864>



© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 11 Mar 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

## Entanglements of adaptation, allegory, and reception: *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People*

Ellen Rees and Thor Holt

Centre for Ibsen Studies, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

### ABSTRACT

In this article the authors discuss Steven Spielberg's *Jaws* (1975) with Henrik Ibsen's *En Folkefiende* (*An Enemy of the People*; 1882) as a test case for formulating a better theoretical understanding of adaptations that are neither "announced" nor "extended"; the analysis thus explores adaptation as a special form of intertextuality. The authors reference other cinematic engagements with the same play, including Hans Steinhoff's *Ein Volksfeind* (1937), Detlef Sierck's *La Habanera* (1937), George Schaefer's *An Enemy of the People* (1978), Satyajit Ray's *Ganashatru* (1989), and Erik Skjoldbjærg's *En folkefiende* (2005), as they investigate the importance of polysemic allegorical structures, the inherently "dialectical" nature of the process of adaptation, the role of reception in newer theories of adaptation, and the implications of understanding adaptation as a particular film genre. The authors propose viewing adaptation as a process that necessarily includes the audience's understanding of hypotext and hypertext in ways that influence meaning production; it invites consideration of the source text in the film's reception, consequently linking the source text and its author to other cultural and social discourses that, in turn, influence their reception reflexively in light of the adaptation.

### KEYWORDS

Adaptation; Spielberg; Ibsen; reception; allegory; *Jaws*; *An Enemy of the People*

According to screenwriter Carl Gottlieb, he and Steven Spielberg "always referred to *Jaws* as *Moby-Dick* meets *An Enemy of the People*" (Baer 2008, 204). While the connections with Herman Melville's 1851 novel have been examined in the scholarly and critical literature (Biskind 1975; Torry 1993; Dowling 2014; Robinson 2016; Buck 2018), the uses Spielberg made of Henrik Ibsen's 1882 drama *En Folkefiende* (*An Enemy of the People*) have been largely unexplored, despite frequent (if passing) references in both the critical reception of Spielberg's film (Malcolm 1975; Andrews 1999; Næro 2008; French 2012) and scholarship on Ibsen's play (Rønning 2000; Wærp 2007; Engelstad 2010). Given the many references, it may seem surprising that no sustained analyses of the connections between *Jaws* (1975) and *An Enemy of the People* have been published. This may be because this relationship strains the limits of what viewers expect from a film adaptation of a known literary work. As neither "announced" nor "extended" (though perhaps "deliberate"), in Linda Hutcheon's terminology, we view *Jaws* as a useful test case for examining the conceptual limits of adaptation regarding where mere intertextual referencing ends and adaptation begins, as well as how adaptation as a process influences genre expectations relating to both the source text (or hypotext) and the adaptation as product (or hypertext) (Hutcheon 2013, xvi).

*Jaws* is in one very important sense a completely unambiguous adaptation, building as it does on Peter

Benchley's popular (albeit disturbingly racist) 1974 novel of the same name. Benchley and Gottlieb are credited for the screenplay of Spielberg's film, although as Gottlieb himself acknowledges, Pulitzer Prize-winning playwright Howard Sackler made a major uncredited contribution to the screenplay (Gottlieb 2001, 197 note 13).<sup>1</sup> Nigel Andrews suggests that Benchley drew on *An Enemy of the People* for the "initial story of clashing interests and moral double-dealing in a small town" (Andrews 1999, 4); but as Arne Lunde points out, the film adaptation is actually closer to Ibsen's play than the novel is.<sup>2</sup> There is little else in the novel to suggest a connection to the play. In Benchley's *Jaws*, for example, the meeting with the town's selectmen, which takes place behind closed doors in the mayor's office, has almost none of the dramaturgical impact that the open public meetings in *An Enemy of the People* and Spielberg's *Jaws* have (1974, 175–81).

The complicated relationship between *Jaws* and its various hypotexts might be viewed as what Thomas Leitch calls a "triangular notion of intertextuality," a rhetorical strategy that "depends on ascribing their value to a classic earlier text and protecting that value by invoking a second earlier text as betraying it" (1990, 147). In this sense, Benchley's novel is the unfaithful "remake" and *Jaws* is positioned as the true heir to the classics, *An Enemy of the People* and *Moby-Dick*. Yet for many if not most casual *Jaws*

viewers, none of these hypotexts have any relevance to their experience of the film, particularly since they are not announced.

Leitch questions the popular notion that an adaptation must be “extended and announced as such” (2012, 88). This intervention is crucial to our thinking about the limits of adaptation because it allows for two conceptual moves on our part. On the one hand, it directs attention toward underlying structural similarities. Regardless of the question of its literary origins, upon its release *Jaws* was widely interpreted as an allegory about the Vietnam War or the Nixon Watergate scandal. It is our hypothesis that it is the underlying structure of political allegory in combination with its ensuing reception that makes it meaningful to claim that *Jaws* functions as an adaptation of *An Enemy of the People*.

On the other hand, if the relationship of a given work to a possible hypotext is not necessarily announced, extended, or even deliberate on the part of its creator, audiences themselves may play an important role in linking the work to that hypotext, in some cases reframing the work as an adaptation. This suggests that examining the reception of a work can help to determine whether the relationship is loosely intertextual or crosses over into adaptation. Highlighting the constructive role played by audiences in determining what is and what is not an adaptation is in line with both Nico Dicecco’s “reception model of adaptation” (2017, 607) and the “reception-based definition of adaptation” suggested by Dennis Cutchins and Kathryn Meeks (2018, 303). In our view, adaptation as a process necessarily includes the audience’s understanding of hypotext and hypertext in ways that influence meaning production; it invites consideration of the source text in the film’s reception, consequently linking the source text and its author to other cultural and social discourses that, moreover, influence their reception reflexively in light of the adaptation. To push this point: by anchoring definitions and questions of adaptation in reception processes, it matters less whether Spielberg had a thorough knowledge of Ibsen’s play and made intended use of *An Enemy of the People* in the production process than whether audiences and critics activate the play in their interpretative interaction with the film.

Since no in-depth comparison between Ibsen’s play and Spielberg’s film has yet been carried out, we will first present an adaptation analysis of how this intertextual layering and a “conceptual flipping back and forth” between *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People* raises specific questions and prompts specific readings (Hutcheon 2013, 139). The most remarkable aspects here concern how the clashing of discourses in Spielberg’s film draws its strength from the same allegorical structure that underlies Ibsen’s play, which leads us to a more detailed consideration of how the

structure of political allegory might relate to adaptation. This in turn returns us to the question of how to distinguish between intertextuality and adaptation. Finally, we explore adaptation as one possible generic route among many in the reception of *Jaws*.

### Characters and plot points

In terms of narrative structure, *An Enemy of the People* differs substantially from *Jaws*. Doctor Tomas Stockmann fails in his attempt to warn of a deadly microscopic infestation in the water and is ridiculed and ostracized, whereas in *Jaws* police chief Martin Brody and oceanographer Matt Hooper succeed in killing the shark that threatens the public and presumably become heroes. Nonetheless, echoes of the play can still be seen in the constellation of characters and plot elements from the film. It is widely accepted that the major part of the film, during which the protagonists pursue the great white shark by boat, leaves *An Enemy of the People* behind and morphs into an adaptation of *Moby-Dick*.

The iconic moment when Captain Sam Quint scratches the chalkboard in *Jaws* does not, however, necessarily signal complete abandonment of *An Enemy of the People* for all viewers. One could arguably read the film’s new protagonist as a version of Ibsen’s Captain Horster, even though any traces of this character’s romantic interest in Tomas Stockmann’s daughter is missing in the film. Both Quint and Horster are sea captains as well as outsiders, in the sense that they are detached from society and democratic processes. Horster does not care about politics and says that democracy would fare poorly at sea (Ibsen 2008, 548–49), whereas Quint dismisses democratic processes by asserting that “there are too many captains on this Island.” Reading the construction of Quint with Ibsen’s play as an intertext also makes it possible to extend the bifurcation of Dr. Stockmann into multiple characters in Spielberg’s film. In this light, the more masculine and maniacal aspects of Ibsen’s doctor that come to light in the play’s fourth act—character traits not recognizable in Brody—are transferred onto the shark hunter in Spielberg’s adaptation.

We want to open up for the possibility of continuing to read *Jaws* as an adaptation *as adaptation* even after the introduction of Quint, by focusing on how similarities and deviances from *An Enemy of the People* are played out in Spielberg’s blockbuster, despite the differences in dramaturgy that strain this mode of spectatorship. Whether *Jaws* functions as an adaptation, in other words, depends on how audiences and critics activate the play in reciprocal and cumulative ways, in line with the reception-oriented models of adaptation.

Both *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People* are set in idyllic resort towns. Amity Island is a popular summer vacation spot in New England, while the unnamed coastal town in southern Norway depicted in *An Enemy of the People* has a thriving spa with many visitors. Both tourist destinations are threatened by an invasive but natural threat; the microscopic “infusoria”—a now archaic term for various microorganisms—that pollute the waters of the spa in Ibsen’s play are reimagined as a giant killer shark that stalks the beaches of Amity Island. Both plots center around whistleblowers who seek to protect the public from an invasive menace in conflict with public officials who want to promote economic interests by hushing up the threat. The news media serves as a complicating factor in both plots as well.

There are a number of suggestive one-to-one parallels—but also differences—across a number of the characters (see Figure 1). Among these roles, the most central relationship is that of the whistleblowers and the profiteering mayors. Arne Engelstad points out that the main theme of *An Enemy of the People* can be reduced to “the conflict between scientific truth and short-term profit” (2010, 379). In Ibsen’s play, the conflict is heightened by the fact that the protagonist doctor and the antagonist mayor are brothers. Without this familial tension, Spielberg relies on the public roles of Martin Brody and Larry Vaughn and presents a more idyllic nuclear family; as chief of police, Martin Brody states early in the film that his mandate is to protect the people, while as mayor, Larry Vaughn has the economic interests of the town at heart. Tomas Stockmann and Martin Brody place human life and safety above economic progress. Many have noted that in *Jaws* the role of the whistleblower is bifurcated, with Chief Brody calling upon external help from an expert from “the Oceanographic Institute,” Matt Hooper, to assist him in figuring out how to eliminate the threat of the shark. This is, in fact, in keeping with the character of Tomas Stockmann, who also relies on outside scientific expertise when he sends water samples to “the university” to confirm his suspicions about the infusoria (Ibsen 2008, 560). Both Tomas Stockmann

and Martin Brody are happily married men who are affectionate toward their wives and children, though conversely in Benchley’s novel Martin Brody’s wife Ellen is unhappy and has an affair with Matt Hooper. Finally, Tomas Stockmann is framed as a kind of alien, having returned to his hometown after working for many years in the far North of Norway. In this regard as well he resembles Brody, whose alien status as a New Yorker is repeatedly highlighted in the film.

In both *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People* the mayors appear in their official capacity only; we gain little or no insight into the personal lives of Peter Stockmann (other than that he lives alone [Ibsen 2008, 547]) and Larry Vaughn. They thus rather single-mindedly represent the pursuit of profit at all costs. Another parallel between the two plots is that the antagonists both have multiple roles that complicate their positions. Spielberg increases Larry Vaughn’s financial interest in the economic growth of Amity Island by making it clear that he is a real estate agent; there is a sign for “Vaughn’s Realty” on his car door. Similarly, Peter Stockmann is the chairman of the board for the spa. A further complicating factor in *An Enemy of the People* is the mayor’s additional role as “Politimester” (chief of police; Ibsen 2008, 530); in this position, he, like Martin Brody, should have the safety of his citizens at heart, but he seems remarkably willing to sacrifice them in exchange for economic gain. Larry Vaughn challenges Martin Brody’s authority to close down the beaches, evoking bureaucratic red tape (“going by the book,” as Meadows comments) and the higher authority of the city board.

Another twist in *Jaws* is the fact that the “medical inspector” changes his initial finding of cause of death from “shark attack” to “boating accident,” presumably under pressure from the mayor. Thus, unlike in *An Enemy of the People*, the medical profession is implicated in the public deception. Doctors typically have a privileged position as truth-tellers in Ibsen’s plays, and it is thus no accident that Tomas Stockmann is a medical doctor, albeit one who shows signs of being a “lamarckiansk [sic] humanist” (Lamarckian humanist) and a “sosialt engasjert

Role	<i>An Enemy of the People</i>	<i>Jaws</i>
Whistleblower	Doctor Tomas Stockmann	Chief Martin Brody Matt Hooper
Mayor	Peter Stockmann	Larry Vaughn
Newspaper editor	Hovstad ( <i>Folkebudet</i> )	Harry Meadows ( <i>Amity Gazette</i> )
Supportive wife	Katrine Stockmann	Ellen Brody
Innocent children	Ejlif and Morten Stockmann	Michael and Sean Brody
Modern young woman	Petra Stockmann	Chrissie Watkins
Outsider	Captain Horster	Captain Sam Quint
Threat	Infusoria	Great white shark

Figure 1. Character parallels in Ibsen’s *An Enemy of the People* and Spielberg’s *Jaws*.

rasehygieniker” (socially engaged race hygienist) at heart (Jakobsen 1998, 88). The fundamental difference between Stockmann and the medical inspector is that, while Stockmann may rather ridiculously think of society as consisting of a lower class of “køtermennesker” (mutt-people) and a social elite of pure-bred “puddelmennesker” (poodle-people), he would never lie about someone’s cause of death, especially not in support of the mayor’s cover-up (Ibsen 2008, 677).

The newspaper editor Meadows is much more closely tied to the mayor’s agenda than Hovstad is. In the first act of *An Enemy of the People*, Hovstad initially takes the side of Tomas Stockmann and by the second act goes even further, arguing that the real cause of the problem the doctor has identified is the corruption of the rich men in power; in the third act he goes so far as to call Tomas Stockmann’s article revealing the water pollution “et rent Mesterstykke” (a pure masterpiece; Ibsen 2008, 563; 575–6; 613). By the end of the third act, however, he has entirely reversed his position, clearly submitting to the mayor’s arguments about the financial security of the town (Ibsen 2008, 632). Meadows, on the other hand, is on Larry Vaughn’s side from the very beginning. He joins the mayor in questioning Martin Brody’s authority to close down the beaches and later, just before the town hall meeting, states that he intends to downplay the second death in the film (the child Alex Kintner), calling it a “small story” that he is going “to bury as deep as [he] can.”

Differences in the constellations of offspring are worth noting as well. In *An Enemy of the People*, the Stockmanns have two young sons and an adult daughter, Petra, who is an independent voice and important moral compass in the play. Her role is primarily to point out the hypocrisy of Hovstad. Benchley gives Brody three boys, a teenager and two younger sons, while Spielberg dispenses with the oldest boy. Nonetheless, it is possible to interpret Chrissie Watkins as a kind of replacement for Petra Stockmann. She appears in the opening sequence in both novel and film as an independent and modern young woman, eager for the attention of her male companion, but also eager for the freedom of swimming in the ocean, even when the man is too drunk to join her. Chrissie Watkins is punished for her independence and promiscuity with death by shark, most overtly in Benchley’s novel, as Andrews points out (1999, 24). In other words, she suffers the stereotypical fate of sexually active young women in the horror movie genre more generally—the more sexually active, the more likely they are to die, with only the most morally upstanding among them surviving to become the “final girl” left standing, according to Carol Clover (1992). Petra Stockmann, on the other hand, survives and potentially even thrives, despite

being punished by the small-minded townspeople when she is fired from her job as a teacher.<sup>3</sup>

Dramaturgically speaking, the town hall meeting provides a turning point in both *An Enemy of the People* and *Jaws*. Ibsen devotes the entire fourth act of his play to a town hall meeting in which the crusading protagonist is defeated by the mayor and the forces of “den kompakte majoritet” (the compact majority; Ibsen 2008, 670), though not without giving an impassioned speech that many scholars have identified as expressing Nietzschean elitism and contempt for the working class.<sup>4</sup> Martin Brody plays a much more marginal role in the town hall meeting in *Jaws*, which is called after the second shark death has occurred on Amity Island. He is overshadowed in the meeting by a new protagonist, shark hunter Captain Quint. In *Jaws* scholarship, the meeting is often seen to mark the beginnings of the *Moby-Dick* narrative within the film, as Quint is revealed to be as single-mindedly obsessed with the great white shark as Captain Ahab is with the white whale (Dowling 2014, 51–2).

When Wieland Schwanebeck writes that “die ersten 30 Minuten von *Jaws* sind eine durchaus werkgetreue Adaption von *Ein Volksfeind*” (the first 30 minutes of *Jaws* is a completely faithful adaptation of *An Enemy of the People*) this is not strictly accurate (2015, 18). A conservative reading of the film’s “fidelity” would concentrate most of the main action of acts 1–3 in *An Enemy of the People* within the brief ferry ride where Martin Brody goes out to warn a team of swimmers about the shark, but is intercepted by a delegation consisting of Larry Vaughn, Harry Meadows, the medical inspector, two selectmen, and deputy Hendricks.<sup>5</sup> And even if we include the parallel scenes that establish the harmonious family life of the protagonists of the two works, we are still well short of thirty minutes of “werkgetreue” (faithful) adaptation in *Jaws*. In fact, the town meeting scene occurs after only eighteen minutes of running time, and those minutes also contain sequences that have no direct parallels in the diegesis of *An Enemy of the People*; this includes the bonfire setup, the skinny-dipping sequence where Chrissie Watkins is killed by the shark, and the locating of her corpse. If we equate the discovery of the shark in *Jaws* with Tomas Stockmann’s discovery of the infusoria, we see that much of the film’s opening concerns events that take place prior to the action in Ibsen’s play. These sequences are “amplifications” in Robert Stam’s sense of the term (2000, 66). And indeed, as Egil Törnqvist has pointed out, it is typically in the opening sequences where the greatest variations from the hypotext occur in screen adaptations of Ibsen’s plays (2000, 61–72).

We see an example of amplifying the discovery of the lurking threat in the opening of Norwegian director Per

Bronken's 1972 television adaptation of *An Enemy of the People* for the Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation. Bronken opens with a sequence depicting Tomas Stockmann in a rowboat, quietly taking the samples that he will send to the university for analysis before the action of the play proper commences. In Bronken's dramatization, we see this through the eyes of Morten Kiil, who spies on his son-in-law; since Kiil's tannery may be the source of the infusoria, this point-of-view increases the tension and mystery (Ibsen, 2008 709). More recently, Norwegian director Erik Skjoldbjærg's 2005 feature film, *En folkefiende* (*An Enemy of the People*), presents a long sequence partway through the movie in which Tomas Stockmann and his son Eilif search for water samples deep within a cave. Here too it turns out that the father-in-law is the ultimate source of the pollution, in this case because of leaching from barrels of banned herbicide that he illegally buried on the family farm. There is no direct parallel to Morten Kiil in Spielberg's *Jaws*.<sup>6</sup> The junk that Matt Hooper pulls from the gut of the tiger shark does suggest some degree of human fault and thus perhaps an underlying ecocritical perspective; Spielberg, however, never fully develops this theme.

In amplifying these moments of discovery, these much less widely known adaptations share a critical feature with *Jaws*. But where both of the Norwegian adaptations maintain the character Tomas Stockmann's bravery in facing up to his fellow citizens, particularly in the town meeting sequence, Spielberg's Brody is passive to a striking degree; he struggles even to speak when Mayor Vaughn asks for an account of how the police plan to protect the public. Whereas the variations on Tomas Stockmann's character presented by Ibsen, Bronken, and Skjoldbjærg all emphasize his uncompromising willingness to stand up to a hostile public, regardless of the personal consequences, Martin Brody clearly needs the other two characters who support him in his battle with both the mayor and the shark, Sam Quint and Matt Hooper. It is Quint who not only speaks at length during the town meeting, but who also effectively shuts down any objections to his pursuit of the shark. He is thus quite unlike Ibsen's Tomas Stockmann, who is thoroughly ridiculed and humiliated by both his brother and his fellow citizens in the course of the town meeting in the play.

Quint functions as a catalyst who makes it possible for the otherwise passive Brody, terrified as he is of boats and water, to hunt and kill the shark. Quint, like Melville's Captain Ahab, operates outside the realm of mainstream society. Much has been made of the need to sacrifice Quint for allegorical purposes relating to the contemporary American context; he represents an outdated way of life, while Brody and Hooper project

a new, more optimistic vision of American society. Frederic Jameson suggests that *Jaws* presents an ideological critique in which Brody and Hooper represent the combined forces of "law and order" and "the new technocracy of the multinational corporations," which willingly sacrifice the old order of American "private enterprise ... and ... classical liberalism" that Quint represents in order to construct a utopian vision in which boundless capitalism defeats the collective anxieties represented by the shark and establishes a new social order (1990, 26–9).<sup>7</sup> There is no parallel to Quint in his role as shark hunter in *An Enemy of the People*, and consequently the infusoria remain unconquered at the end of the play.<sup>8</sup>

Tomas Stockmann's only weapon is the rhetorical power of persuasion, which he links to scientific knowledge, but which ultimately fails. The perceived external threat is also much more abstract; microorganisms do not instill the same visceral fear that a shark does. Moreover, Ibsen seems to suggest that Tomas Stockmann is at least to a certain degree complicit in the danger, given that his father-in-law owns the tannery thought to have polluted the waters; although he did initially suggest an alternative system for piping water to the spa facility from further upstream, he ultimately went along with his brother's less expensive but more dangerous plan to pipe the water from downstream from the tannery (Ibsen 2008, 562–3).

Tomas Stockmann's ethical positioning in *An Enemy of the People* is thus much messier than that of Martin Brody and Matt Hooper, who come across as essentially innocent in *Jaws*. They bear no personal responsibility for the presence of the shark in the waters off Amity Island. When Alex Kintner's mourning mother blames Brody and slaps his face, it likely strikes viewers as unfair because they know that the real responsibility for keeping the beach open lies with the mayor. This point was reiterated in 2020 by Mary McNamara in an impassioned opinion piece prompted by the death of Lee Fiero, the actor who played Mrs. Kintner, due to complications from COVID-19. For McNamara, who exclaims "we are all Mrs. Kintner now," the mayor remains unambiguously responsible for the boy's death, just as she viewed the American president at the time as culpable in the death of Fiero and thousands of other Americans because of his unwillingness to inform the public about the dangers of the virus (McNamara 2020). The political allegory virtually writes itself.

### Political allegory

Given that so much of *Jaws* is devoted to a quite different narrative arc and given that the similarities in characters are relatively superficial, it

might appear that the grounds for calling the film an adaptation of the play are rather tenuous. Nonetheless, we want to argue that the fundamental allegorical similarity that underlies both narratives does in fact make it meaningful to speak of *Jaws* as an adaptation of *An Enemy of the People*. This allegorical structure relates to the conflict between whistleblower and powerful profiteer. It is a conflict that appears in multiple forms in multiple historical and cultural contexts. In the current historical moment, we see it reflected ironically in Boris Johnson's 2006 quip that Larry Vaughn is the "real hero" of *Jaws* or Donald J. Trump's frequent invocation of the phrase "enemy of the people" to condemn journalists who seek to reveal alleged corruption and cover-ups on the part of his administration (O'Donoghue 2020). There has been a striking increase in the number of stage productions of *An Enemy of the People* around the globe in recent years. Out of the 1,794 registered productions of the play since it premiered in 1883, fully 566 were staged between 2010 and 2019. That is a significant jump from previous decades, with 339 productions in the aughts, 183 productions in the 1990s, and only 91 and 95 in the 1980s and 1970s respectively. Moreover, it surpasses the entire number of productions staged between 1883 and 1969, which totals 554.<sup>9</sup> In this regard, Spielberg appears to have been a bellwether in activating the allegorical structure of *An Enemy of the People*.

Allegory is a rhetorical figure that, as Franco Moretti describes, underwent a transformation during the nineteenth century. While it had been a productive trope that generated more or less fixed meaning in earlier periods, with the rise of romanticism it came to be seen as overly rigid. As Moretti puts it, "being conventional, allegory gradually acquires a whole series of pejorative connotations. It is an artificial figure, mechanical, dead" (1996, 78). With the rise of capitalism, however, this starts to change, and allegory takes on new significance. A number of thinkers have pointed out a parallel between the structure of allegory and the structure of the commodity as understood by Karl Marx in *Das Kapital* (1867). Following Moretti's useful summary, "Like the commodity, allegory humanizes things (making them move and speak), and it reifies human beings. In both cases, furthermore, an abstract reality (exchange value, allegorical meaning) subordinates and almost hides the concrete reality of use value and literal meaning" (Moretti 1996, 78–9). Moretti builds his analysis on Hans-Georg Gadamer's description of how radical societal change in the nineteenth century altered how allegory came to be understood:

Once Gadamer's "firm traditions" are broken, the old signs do not fall dumb at all: if anything, they speak in even louder voices. They have been transformed into so many hieroglyphics, and seem to say to the interpreter: there is a sign, here, so there is assuredly also a meaning; but since the key is now lost, you are free to interpret it as you like. (1996, 83)

Moretti calls this a transition from a "univocal" function of allegory to one that is "polysemous"; in relation to Melville's *Moby-Dick* and other nineteenth-century texts that make active use of allegory, he points out that "protagonists are not so much the story's characters, as its *signs*" (1996, 86, italics original). Perhaps the appeal of the modern figure of allegory is that it promises "the revelation of a sacred text: the certainty that plunges its roots into the established tradition of the most distant past" but at the same time through its now "limitless polysemy," it opens itself up "to innumerable future interpretations" (Moretti 1996, 88). This tension between the notion of some fixed, knowable truth on the one hand, and an infinite flexibility of assigning meaning or value on the other, is certainly present in *Jaws* as well. In his discussion of the multiple interpretations of the shark, for example, Jameson writes that "none of these readings can be said to be wrong or aberrant, but their very multiplicity suggests that the vocation of the symbol—the killer shark—lies less in any single message or meaning than in its very capacity to absorb and organize all of these quite distinct anxieties together" (1990, 26). But whereas Jameson locates this polysemy primarily in the specific imaginative function of the shark, we want to emphasize that it applies equally to the heroes and indeed to the film (and Ibsen's play) as a whole.<sup>10</sup>

In an attempt to understand the broader ideological implications of *Jaws*, Jameson hypothesizes that "works of mass culture cannot be ideological without at one and the same time being implicitly or explicitly Utopian as well: they cannot manipulate unless they offer some genuine shred of content as a fantasy bribe to the public about to be so manipulated" (1990, 29). The contrast between the idyllic (even utopian) tourist destinations in which *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People* are set and the harsh real-world political fiascos that an allegorical reading of these narratives reveals is striking. In both film and play the townspeople stand to lose everything regardless of the outcome of the struggle between whistleblower and politician; if the political cover-up is maintained the townspeople will lose their health or even their lives, and if it is exposed, they will lose their economic livelihood. The struggle between whistleblower and profiteer is fundamentally ideological in nature. In seeking to expose the health risk, Tomas Stockmann may indeed have morality on his side, but he is also

perfectly willing to sacrifice the economic security of his fellow townspeople in a manner that demonstrates an arrogant disregard for the complexity of the situation and the precarity of the individual in a capitalist society. This is why Tomas Stockmann's Nietzschean undertones are so unsettling in Ibsen's play.

Both *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People* have inspired repeated direct comparison to contemporary political issues throughout their respective reception histories. Andrews gives an overview of political cartoons from 1975 that hints at the seemingly endless allegorical potential of the blockbuster film:

*Jaws* became the flavour of the year in political cartoons. There were over thirty of these featuring a variant on the movie's poster. The shark was cast as the Soviet submarine force, inflation, the energy crisis or Ronald Reagan (pre-presidency). The nubile swimmer-victim was the Statue of Liberty, Congressional ineffectiveness or President Ford. (1999, 115–16)

Even Fidel Castro famously and enthusiastically approved of Spielberg's film as an explicitly Marxist critique of capitalism (Andrews 1999, 118). While this kind of polysemous allegorizing of the film continues to this day, much of the critical and scholarly reception of *Jaws* argues that the film comments either on the Vietnam War—with the shark standing in for an unseen enemy that attacks out of nowhere with deadly force, much as the Viet Cong were imagined and experienced—or the Nixon Watergate scandal—most obviously through the attempts by Mayor Larry Vaughn to cover up the shark attacks—or both (see e.g. Biskind 1975, 26; Heath 1976, 25; Torry 1993, 32–33). Because of Quint's chilling retelling of the sinking of the U.S.S. *Indianapolis* in World War II, *Jaws* is also frequently evoked whenever a military scandal involving a failure of leadership occurs (Torry 1993, 34; Andrews 1999, 138).

Ibsen conceived of *An Enemy of the People* as political commentary from its very inception. H.G. Kohler documents Ibsen's awareness of the real-world case of a medical doctor, Eduard Meissner, who was threatened by an angry mob and driven from his position in 1832 for his whistleblowing relating to the spread of the cholera epidemic in the spa town of Teplitz (1990, 1125; see also Koht 1954, 134; Ystad 2008, 599). Orm Øverland gives a relatively early example of the play's perceived social and political relevance from the USA: "In 1903 John Corbin in the *New York Times* recommended the sending of a 'carload of Ibsen's play to Ithaca' where doctors apparently had tried to play down a serious typhoid epidemic by giving it the more harmless name, 'Ithaca fever'" (1969, 164). The acclaimed Indian director Satyajit Ray's 1989 adaptation of *An Enemy of the People*, *Ganashatru*,

is a striking example of how the central allegory can be seamlessly transported to an entirely different context. Ray replaces Ibsen's spa with a Hindu temple that dispenses holy water. In a familiar pattern, the local doctor, Ashok Gupta, who discovers the contamination, comes into conflict with the chairman of the temple, who happens to be his younger brother Nishith and who attempts to silence Dr. Gupta in pursuit of profit. In this version, the doctor ultimately triumphs, gaining the full support of the people. Engelstad is critical of this substantial change in the plot but does not attempt to frame it in relation to political and cultural trends in India (2010, 380). On the other hand, Rochelle Wright, who is otherwise critical of the adaptation (she argues that it "obliterates Ibsen's spirit and intention"), does situate the adaptation within Indian debates concerning religion and secularism (2006, 135).<sup>11</sup> In this regard, the radical alteration from Ibsen's "den stærkeste mand i verden, det er han, som står meste alene" (the strongest man in the world is he who stands alone) to a triumphant "I am not alone!" in Ray's version serves a quite specific ideological function, which is aligned with a broader program of inclusivity in addressing, among other possibilities, sectarian conflict in South Asia (Ibsen 2008, 727).

In stage performances of *An Enemy of the People*, theater directors use the play to express specific political agendas, as Frode Helland discusses in connection with German director Thomas Ostermeier's critique of capitalism. Helland argues that Ibsen is a "contextually over-determined phenomenon" harnessed for the promotion of both left- and right-wing ideologies (2015, 30–1). According to Helland, "the ideological ambivalence that made the play suitable within Goebbels' propaganda system was also the reason that Arthur Miller felt the need to adapt the play when he made his version as a critique of the anti-communist hysteria of the McCarthy era in America" (2015, 31). The American dramatist's heavily modified translation from 1950, which eliminates Ibsen's undertones of authoritarianism and elitism, has had an enormous, if largely unacknowledged impact in the Anglophone context and beyond.<sup>12</sup>

We see a clear example of Miller's sanitization of Dr. Stockmann in actor Steve McQueen's pet project, the version of *An Enemy of the People* directed by George Schaefer and released in 1978. The opening credits announce the film as based on *An Enemy of the People* "as adapted for the American stage by Arthur Miller." McQueen plays Tomas Stockmann as a passive, self-sacrificing hero. Noting the actor's long hair and beard, Helge Rønning calls the character "Christ-like" and almost a "martyr" (2000, 86). Schaefer establishes this characterization in an amplified opening sequence during which the doctor tends to his brother Peter, carefully examining him behind



the closed doors of his office. The mayor in this version is gravely ill and the fact that Tomas lovingly cares for him without revealing his illness to anyone makes the betrayal later in the film all the more egregious.<sup>13</sup>

Schaefer's whitewashed version needs to be understood within a broader film historical tradition of adapting Ibsen for commercial purposes in Hollywood and other major film markets. Eirik Frisvold Hanssen notes in his study of American silent film adaptations of Ibsen in the 1910s that studios were wary of Ibsen's plays and protagonists from the very beginning. Ibsen's reputation "was based to a large extent on controversy and moral ambiguity," and as Hanssen points out, these were precisely the "distinctive characteristics that film adapters during this period were attempting to avoid, even actively resist" (2017, 171). We see a clear example of this in the 1915 version of Ibsen's *Ghosts* (*Gengangere*, 1881) produced by D.W. Griffith, in which the play's controversial but central themes of syphilis and euthanasia were removed entirely. As Hanssen points out, the "unwelcome moral transgressions and ambiguities" of Ibsen's texts in general were seen as a problem (2017, 175). Similarly, Nazi star director Hans Steinhoff's *Ein Volksfeind* (1937) inserts a new opening sequence and ending in a film that turns Tomas Stockmann into a much less morally ambiguous character who is rehabilitated by the Nazi regime in the end.

Thor Holt has explored the ideological uses that Steinhoff made of Ibsen's source text in *Ein Volksfeind*, arguing that what on the surface appears to be "an innocuous adaptation, only with a happy ending not to be found in Ibsen's play" is in fact "a *Gesamtkunstwerk* in the service of the Nazi state and its insidious racial agenda" (2020, 194). Steinhoff transforms Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* into a story about "German" victimization, where Ibsen's "compact majority" resembles "Jewish" forces that ostensibly have debased the soul and soil of the nation. This adaptation supports the hateful racist rhetoric of the Nazi regime and preaches the primacy of the *Volksgemeinschaft* (people's community), which is represented by Tomas Stockmann, Petra Stockmann, and the journalist Hofstetten (Hovstad) in the film (see also Rønning 2000, 86).<sup>14</sup>

The pattern that emerges is that film adaptations of Ibsen's works tend to retain the underlying allegorical structure while updating the setting, inserting a new opening sequence, removing controversial topics depending on the socio-political pressures of the time and place in which a given play is adapted, reforging the protagonists into positive role models, and changing the ending to support the overt political and ideological implications of the film; these are

precisely the transformations we see when examining *Jaws* in relation to *An Enemy of the People*.

Although the suspense and excitement of the shark hunt takes up most of the film, these sequences could have been significantly shortened without altering the politics and thematic content of *Jaws*, which remain remarkably conservative regarding gender and family dynamics. In other words, much of the "infidelity" to Ibsen writes itself neatly into the gender and family politics of Spielberg's films more generally. As Robert Kolker asserts, these features support the Hollywood conservatism of the 1970s and 1980s, where "two things have to happen: the family unit needs to be secured against an external threat and the male member of that unit need not only to protect (or in some instances avenge) the family but, in the process, must prove himself" (2011, 231). After a loosening of traditional values and sexual taboos in the 1960s, Emanuel Levy remarks how Hollywood in the 1970s returned to family themes, arguing that Spielberg exemplified this trend as the "strongest defendant of white, middle-class suburbanism as the ideal of American Way of Life" (1991, 194). Replicating the more progressive gender politics of Ibsen's play (largely expressed through the figure of Petra Stockmann) would deviate strongly from the larger ideological project of Spielberg's output in the 1970s, but the allegorical structure of the play is flexible enough to contain a completely different message. In this sense, *Jaws* might even be seen as part of a patriarchal backlash against the larger emancipatory project that is the hallmark of Ibsen's dramatic oeuvre.

The cruel death of Chrissie Watkins, the restoration of ideal masculinity on the part of the whistleblower, the supportive wife, and the ideal of the middle-class suburban family are all aspects of the film that come to light through the kind of "conceptual flipping back and forth" between the two texts that Hutcheon argues is central to the act of reading adaptations as *adaptations* (2013, 139). Further film historical contextualization suggests that *Jaws*, in fact, differs less from other, more overtly announced adaptations of the play than previously assumed.

### Adaptation and Intertextuality

In her introduction to *An Enemy of the People*, Vigdis Ystad makes a point that seems to escape much of the scholarly reception of the play, namely that it has intertextual parallels to William Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* (1609). She argues that Ibsen may have taken his title from the Danish translation of this work (2008, 592).<sup>15</sup> The main connection lies, however, in the stubborn and uncompromising character of the two protagonists themselves rather than in Ibsen's whistleblower plot. At least one scholar has

pointed out a similar link between the personalities of Coriolanus and Melville's Captain Ahab, which in turn links back to the similarities between Ahab and Quint, further heightening the complex intertextual undertow in *Jaws* (Barnett 1983, 142).

Julie Sanders frames adaptation as a "sub-section" of intertextuality, which she in turn defines as "how texts encompass and respond to other texts both during the process of their creation and composition and in terms of the individual reader's or spectator's response" (2006 17; 2). Yet, as Leitch notes, she, like Hutcheon, "declines to draw a categorical distinction between the two terms" (2012, 88). It is our position that adaptation is something qualitatively different than intertextuality, but where exactly the dividing line goes has not been fully articulated. Despite leaving an apparent opening for the effects of the "individual reader's or spectator's response" or reception of a given work, neither Sanders nor Hutcheon's explorations of the phenomenon of adaptation—as rich as they otherwise are—fully account for the polysemous nature of both hyper- and hypotexts that openly invite multiple simultaneous allegorical readings in the way that *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People* do. We argue thus that the way interpretation functions within allegorical structures may be part of why adaptations feel like a different category than intertextuality more generally.

Sanders and Hutcheon seem to suggest that any given adaptation is an essentially stable transposition to a specific cultural and historic context that presents a similarly fixed interpretation of the hypotext on the part of its creators. Regardless of whether a given adaptation exemplifies the "transposition," "commentary," or "analogue" categories first developed by Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan, Sanders posits that the resulting work of art has a more or less fixed meaning that can be uncovered through a relatively unambiguous process of decoding on the part of the audience (2006, 20–3). Even when Sanders considers examples of the relatively autonomous "analogue" category of adaptations, such as Francis Ford Coppola's *Apocalypse Now* (1979), her focus is more on whether knowledge that the film is an adaptation of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1899) is "necessary" for the viewer to understand it than on the dynamic process of generating meaning between hypotext and hypertext. Sanders' methodology resembles Hutcheon's "who, what, where, when, why, and how" approach to adaptation analysis, which also falls short of fully accounting for less clear-cut examples and their ensuing receptions.

We find another useful test case for the importance of the relationship between allegorical structures and interpretation in adaptations in Detlef Sierck's *La Habanera* from 1937, the last film before

the director fled Germany and reinvented himself in Hollywood as Douglas Sirk. Sierck was deeply familiar with Ibsen's dramas through his work as a theater director, having staged *Pillars of Society* in 1923 and *John Gabriel Borkman* in 1925. Moreover, he went on to direct a film adaptation of *Pillars of Society* in 1935 (*Stützen der Gesellschaft*), in which the connection to the hypotext is clearly announced. Like *Jaws*, the relationship between *An Enemy of the People* and *La Habanera* is unannounced and, while the plot has certain similarities, it cannot be said to be extended. In *La Habanera*, an unidentified plague hits the island nation of Puerto Rico, with any news about the disease's devastating effects being suppressed by the main villain, Don Pedro de Avila, in order to ensure continuing profits from his fruit export business regardless of the danger this poses to the local inhabitants.<sup>16</sup> Among other motifs recognizable from Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* is how Don Pedro hinders the Swedish doctor Nagel in his attempt to find a cure and make the disaster publicly known, which echoes Tomas Stockmann's effort in Ibsen's play and attests to how film adaptations of *An Enemy of the People* tend to amplify and dramatize the discovery of the threat. Sierck contrasts the doctor's self-sacrificing devotion to duty and strong conviction of the importance of truth with the dubious and hypocritical scheming of Don Pedro.

The conflict between whistleblower and powerful profiteer remains at the core but it is repackaged within a racialized melodramatic love story in which the two men compete for the love of the female lead, Astrée Sternhjelm, played by the biggest film star of the Third Reich, the Swedish actor Zarah Leander. In Eric Rentschler's reading of the film, *La Habanera*, like Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* before it and Spielberg's *Jaws* after, "served multiple purposes." The setting of Puerto Rico can be read both as a racialized, lawless island and the authoritarian Nazi state's displaced double; the film thus generates "an ideological surplus value and unconscious meaning" (1996, 134). The relationship between *La Habanera* and *An Enemy of the People* is not so much intertextual as structural, in that it replicates the political allegory of Ibsen's play, but without the overt intertextual activation of the hypotext that we see in, for example, the critical reception of *Jaws*.

### Adaptation and genre

Whereas much existing adaptation theory might exclude *Jaws* as an adaptation of *An Enemy of the People*, there are good reasons not to disqualify it. Dennis Cutchins draws on Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of dialogism to stress how intertextual interconnections should not be anchored in questions of "influence," but are primarily the work of the reader, or, in

the case of film, the spectator (2017, 84). Simply put, where some perceive an adaptation, others do not, independent of whether the film is announced as an adaptation or whether the director knowingly interpreted the relevant source text in the production process. One consequence of our focus on reception, is that the intentional fallacy tied to announced adaptations, guided as they are by how filmmakers or production companies intend a film to be seen, is largely eliminated.

A less frequently discussed but productive way of thinking about adaptation is in relation to genre. The process of reading a film as an adaptation, in which the spectator searches for traces of the hypotext, closely resembles how genre functions in reception more generally, especially given the fact that part of the pleasure of spectatorship is the anticipation of what comes next according to generic conventions that the viewer invests in the film. It is this horizon of expectation that forms the core of “adaptation as adaptation” in Hutcheon’s theory, as the viewer repeatedly likens the film to a former, in this case, literary text (2013, 6).

In *Film/Genre* (1999), Rick Altman stresses generic pleasure as a key factor for how a viewer chooses to engage with a film. He revises our understanding of generic operations, emphasizes that multi-generic plots are the rule in Hollywood films, and connects the roles played by industry, critics, and audiences in making and re-making genre. According to Altman, moreover, “generic experiences” are generated by the viewers themselves, who “invest their energy in extremely diverse modes” (1999, 151). In Altman’s view, genres are more productively understood as unpredictable social forces than as fixed categories serving as ideological entrapment for passive consumers. This allows for active audience participation that even has the capacity to modify and create new generic itineraries.

Arguably, the many references to Ibsen’s *An Enemy of the People* in the critical reception of *Jaws* gradually bring “(Ibsen) adaptation” to light as one generic itinerary among many, thus adding to the plethora of genres discussed in the scholarly literature on *Jaws*. Sofia Glasl, for instance, identifies horror, thriller, adventure film, and buddy-movie as central ingredients in a film that draws on and combines “einer Vielzahl an Meta- und Subgenres” (a multitude of meta- and sub-genres; 2015, 112; see also Melia 2020 on the relevance of the western for *Jaws*). We understand adaptation as genre in how knowing audiences can activate *An Enemy of the People* in their encounter with *Jaws* and seek pleasure by comparing and contrasting the hypotext with the hypertext.<sup>17</sup> Adaptation as one generic route among many can vary from highly unlikely (a viewer may have never heard of

the connection; a viewer may have read a review mentioning Ibsen but have no knowledge of the play; alternately the viewer may simply choose to let other generic itineraries guide their interpretation of the film) to highly likely (not only active but hyper-active Ibsen readers who, like us, eagerly invest their knowledge of *An Enemy of the People* into their evaluation of *Jaws*). While we are not suggesting that adaptation is the only relevant genre lens for interpreting *Jaws*, we see it as one of many highly productive categories for understanding the film and its broader cultural impact.

## Conclusion

Why does *Jaws* “feel” like so much more of an adaptation of *An Enemy of the People* than it “actually” is in terms of running time? More important than a scene-by-scene or character-to-character comparison, are the links forged between film and play through a mutually reflexive reception history. The very fact that *An Enemy of the People* figures as an almost obligatory (if often completely superficial) touchstone in so much of the *Jaws* reception suggests in turn that readers and audiences today approach the play with a very different horizon of expectation than before 1975. Jørgen Bruhn is only the latest in a series of adaptation theorists (going back to André Bazin) who ask, “Should we not admit that the adaptive process is dialectical, and that the source text is changed in the process as well?” (2013, 70). It is just as possible that *Jaws* has contributed meaningfully to how *An Enemy of the People* is understood and activated by contemporary audiences as it is that an awareness that *An Enemy of the People* is a hypotext for *Jaws* contributes to how we understand the film.

The two are, for example, linked imaginatively when Julian Zelizer compares the former president’s downplaying of the seriousness of the COVID-19 virus to the actions of Larry Vaughn. A Twitter post by actor Jim Carrey conveys this point visually (see Figure 2). In his opinion piece, Zelizer describes a frightening new situation where “our shark is a virus.” Here we see that, even without mentioning Ibsen explicitly, Zelizer circles back to the play, pointing out that “today, too, we are on a mission to thwart an organism that can kill us. Our intrepid ‘shark hunters’ are health care workers and scientists” (2020). While it is unclear whether he is at all aware of the connection to *An Enemy of the People*, the comment inevitably activates a reflexive interpretive chain for those who recognize it. The political allegory of *An Enemy of the People* seems ripe for adaptation in these times, with the threat of global pandemics and climate change reactivating the play on numerous levels.



**Figure 2.** An image by Jim Carrey that likens mayor Vaughn in *Jaws* to Donald J. Trump via Twitter.

The author would like to thank Jim Carrey and Dan Aloni at William Morris Endeavor for kindly granting permission to print the caricature of mayor Vaughn as Donald Trump.

Our exploration of the relationship between *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People* suggests that Ibsen's most substantial contribution to film history lies less in traditional announced adaptations of his works, such as Schaefer's *An Enemy of the People*, than in the polysemous allegorical structures that underlie his plays. In ways that remain to be explored, similar political allegories are central to a number of films that may have been influenced by *An Enemy of the People* or mutated from *Jaws*. Steven Soderbergh, for example, has called *Jaws* his favorite film and both *Erin Brockovich* (2000) and *Contagion* (2011) share reminiscent conflict structures (Gabriel 1991). And as Rønning points out, Hollywood films as diverse as *High Noon* (Fred Zinneman, 1952) and *Dante's Peak* (Roger Donaldson, 1997) echo *An Enemy of the People* in that they feature a "lonely soothsayer who stands for truth and real values" whose knowledge is rejected by the local community; as with *Jaws*, this structure is easily linked to the current political climate—McCarthyism and the Korean War in the case of *High Noon* (2000, 86).<sup>18</sup> Like *La Habanera*, films like *Dante's Peak* and *High Noon* activate the allegorical structure of *An Enemy of the People* and reference it intertextually, but ultimately do not read as full-blown adaptations.

Even more suggestively, Stanley Cavell notes how female characters in classic Hollywood melodramas

are true "descendants of Nora in Ibsen's *A Doll's House*" (1996, 78–82), and that in comedies of remarriage, Ibsen's play from 1879 "establishes a problematic to which the genre of remarriage constitutes a particular direction of response" (1981, 23). Yet, in a rather sweeping judgment, Ibsen scholar Robert Ferguson has dismissed the impact of Ibsen on film history more generally, arguing that adaptations of his plays have failed to leave "any particular mark on the film histories of their countries of origin," because of what he sees as the almost insurmountable "problems of adapting Ibsen for the screen" (2006, 48). It is symptomatic that Ferguson does not seriously consider unannounced adaptations like *Jaws*.

Reception processes influence the viewer's generic pleasure and the reflexive generation of polysemous meaning in ways that go beyond mere intertextuality. This leads us to argue in favor of using "adaptation" rather than "intertextuality" as a productive guide for understanding unannounced filmatizations that rely on allegorical structures like *Jaws*. We find that the complex allegorical entanglements between *Jaws* and *An Enemy of the People* suggest that adaptation studies has much to gain from more explicitly incorporating reception, especially in unannounced cases. Finally, we find that Spielberg's *Jaws* is arguably the hypertext that more than any other has reactivated, influenced, and amplified Ibsen's play.

## Notes

1. The screenwriting process led by Spielberg was by all accounts fluid, if not to say chaotic, with multiple drafts of the screenplay and constant rewrites involving suggestions from both the director himself and the actors. While we do not have a record of Sackler's exact contribution to the screenplay, his engagement with Ibsen is well documented through previous projects, such as a production of *Hedda Gabler* (Sackler 1965; see also Abrams 2020, 117).
2. The authors would like to thank Arne Lunde for sharing the manuscript of his unpublished conference paper with them.
3. The immediate cause of Petra's firing, which occurs after her father's humiliation, is a number of anonymous letters accusing her of being too open minded, but the consequences are far from as dire as those we see in *Jaws*; the final act of the play clearly leaves an opening for a happy future for Petra together with Captain Horster. This can be seen as a reward for her moral fortitude, even though it lies outside the action of the play.
4. For an overview, see Kristin Gjesdal, "Nietzschean Variations: Politics, Interest, and Education in Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*," *Ibsen Studies* 14, no. 2 (2014): 109–35.
5. As a side note, it may well be that Hendricks, the name of the deputy who finds the first mauled body in *Jaws*, is an oblique allusion to Henrik Ibsen. "Henrich," "Hendrik," and "Hendrich" are alternative Norwegian spellings of "Henrik" (Narve Fulsås 2013, 44; 211). Spielberg took the name directly from Benchley's novel.
6. There is, however, a very tenuous echo of Morten Kiil in Benchley's novel, where a shadowy investment company called Caskata Estates buys up real estate at cut-rate prices after the shark attacks become known; the fact that the mayor secretly facilitates these deals is reminiscent of Morten Kiil's purchase of deeply discounted spa stocks after the pollution has become known and casts him in a similarly unethical light (Benchley 1974, 183).
7. Peter Biskind's earlier review in *Jump Cut* makes much the same point, describing Quint as "an anachronism, a composite of the last vestiges of ruthless Yankee self-reliance, traces of working class pride, and a touch of New England transcendental madness, a true spiritual heir of Ahab" (1975, unpaginated).
8. In contrast to Spielberg's Captain Quint, Ibsen's Captain Horster character is more of a patron than anything else; he protects Tomas Stockmann throughout the play and appears to be motivated to help primarily out of romantic interest in Petra Stockmann.
9. These statistics were gathered in October 2021 from IbsenStage, a continually updated relational event-based database of global Ibsen stage productions maintained by the University of Oslo's Centre for Ibsen Studies: <https://ibsenstage.hf.uio.no/>
10. We should note that our interest lies in precisely the more simplistic type of "two-level system" of allegory that Jameson, using Albert Camus' *La Peste* (*The Plague*, 1947) as his primary example, dismisses as simply "bad allegory," since that is how the phenomenon most often manifests in popular receptions (2020, 6).
11. Rønning is similarly critical in his evaluation of Ray's adaptation (2000, 86).
12. Benedikte Berntzen points out that Miller's adaptation, which is far less ambivalent than Ibsen's text, is used as the basis for stage productions in multiple languages around the world, which further complicates the process of cultural transmission (2011, 23; see also Wright 2006, 129–30).
13. Steinhoff's 1937 film is the only other screen adaptation that depicts Tomas Stockmann actually practicing as a physician. In Skjoldbjærg's version the doctor wears scrubs, a white lab coat, and stethoscope, but these are merely props to increase perceived authority in his television show. Ironically, the only medical treatment depicted in the film is when Tomas' wife Katrine inserts acupuncture needles into his face.
14. Nathan Abrams argues convincingly for "the possibility, albeit not the certainty, of reading Jewishness into *Jaws*" in his account of Spielberg's activation of both positive and negative Jewish tropes in the film (2020, 116). Returning to Leitch's triangular notion of intertextuality for a moment, through his insertion of Jewishness into *Jaws*, Spielberg creates a kind of counter-narrative, not only to Benchley's "bitter, cynical and pessimistic" novel, but also to Steinhoff's anti-Semitic adaptation of *An Enemy of the People* (2020, 117). The Jewishness that is almost entirely absent from Benchley's novel and demonized in Steinhoff's film is recast as (anti-)heroic and embodied in Hooper and Brody, both of whom Abrams reads as possessing stereotypically Jewish character traits (2020, 123; 125).
15. Ystad mistakenly claims that the phrase "chief enemy to the people" from the opening scene of *Coriolanus* is the source of the neologism "folkefiende" (2008, 592). "First, you know Caius Coriolanus is chief enemy to the people" is actually translated into Danish as "Først er der, som I vide, ingen, der bær større Had til folket end Cajus Marcius" (literally: first there is, as you know, no one who carries greater hatred for the people than Cajus Marcius). Instead, two related phrases from Act III, Scene 3 taken together appear to be the source: "Envied against the people" ("Har viist sig som en Fiende af Folket"); and "As enemy to the people and his country" ("Som Folkets og som Landets Fiende") (Shakespeare 1818, 8; 136; 137).
16. Pedro is also the Spanish form of Peter, the given name of the main antagonist in Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*.
17. This understanding of genre differs substantially from Leitch's exploration of adaptation as a Hollywood genre, which is oriented toward a shared set of film-internal markers (2008, 106–20).
18. Matthew Melia points out a strong resemblance between Chief Brody and Gary Cooper's iconic portrayal of Marshall Will Kane in *High Noon*, noting that there are also similarities in how they are confronted by the public in the town hall in *Jaws* and the church in *High Noon* (2020, 190). In fact, Melia argues that "the western is a distinct yet largely

unrecognized part of its [Jaws'] extensive cross-generic hybridity" and claims that Spielberg "specifically references" *High Noon* and other classic Hollywood westerns (2020, 185).

### Notes on contributors

**Ellen Rees** earned her Ph.D. from the University of Washington (1995) and is a professor of Scandinavian literature at the University of Oslo's Centre for Ibsen Studies. She recently completed a book on popular receptions of Ibsen (forthcoming on Scandinavian Academic Press in 2022) and has published widely on Norwegian literature and film.

**Thor Holt** earned his Ph.D. from the University of Oslo (2020) and is a visiting senior lecturer at the Centre for Ibsen Studies. He wrote his dissertation on Nazi era adaptations of Henrik Ibsen and is currently working on Weimar cinema (as a visiting scholar at UC Berkeley).

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

### References

- Abrams, N. 2020. "Jaws as Jewish." In *The Jaws Book: New Perspectives on the Classic Summer Blockbuster*, edited by I. Q. Hunter and M. Melia, 115–131. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Altman, R. 1998. *Film/Genre*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Andrews, N. 1999. *On Jaws*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Baer, W. 2008. *Classic American Films: Conversations with the Screenwriters*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Barnett, L. K. 1983. "Speech in *Moby-Dick*." *Studies in American Fiction* 11 (2 (Autumn)): 139–151. doi:10.1353/saf.1983.0017.
- Benchley, P. 1974. *Jaws*. New York: Doubleday.
- Berntzen, B. 2011. "Insisting on the Truth: Arthur Miller's Adaptation of Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*." *The Arthur Miller Journal* 6 (1 (Spring)): 17–24.
- Biskind, P. 1975. "Jaws between the Teeth." *Jumpcut* 9 (1): 26.
- Bronken, P., dir. 1972. *En Folkefiende*. NRK.
- Bruhn, J. 2013. "Dialogizing Adaptation Studies: From One-Way Transport to a Dialogic Two-Way Process." In *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, edited by J. Bruhn, A. Gjelsvik, and E. F. Hanssen, 69–88. London: Bloomsbury.
- Buck, D. 2018. "Jaws (Steven Spielberg, 1975)." *Off/Screen* 22, no. 11 (November): unpaginated. Accessed 2 September 2020. <https://offscreen.com/view/jaws-steven-spielberg-1975>
- Cavell, S. 1981. *Pursuits of Happiness: The Hollywood Comedy of Remarriage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cavell, S. 1996. *Contesting Tears: The Hollywood Melodrama of the Unknown Woman*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clover, C. 1992. *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cutchins, D. 2017. "Bakhtin, Intertextuality, and Adaptation." In *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, edited by T. Leitch, 71–86. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cutchins, D., and K. Meeks. 2018. "Adaptation, Fidelity and Reception." In *The Routledge Companion to Adaptation*, edited by D. Cutchins, K. Krebs, and E. Voigts-Virchow, 301–310. London: Routledge.
- Dicecco, N. 2017. "The Aura of Againness: Performing Adaptation." In *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, edited by T. Leitch, 607–621. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dowling, D. 2014. "'Revenge upon a Dumb Brute': Casting the Whale in Film Adaptations of *Moby Dick*." *Journal of Film and Video* 66 (4 (Winter)): 50–63. doi:10.5406/jfilmvideo.66.4.0050.
- Engelstad, A. 2010. "Henrik Ibsens *En Folkefiende* (1884) Fra Dramatekst Til Filmadaptasjon: *Ganashatru – An Enemy of the People* (Satyajit Ray 1989) Og *En Folkefiende* (Erik Skjoldbjærg 2005)." In *Nordisk Drama: Fornyetelser Og Transgressioner. Foredrag Fra Den 27. Studiekonferens I International Association for Scandinavian Studies*, edited by M. Sibińska, K. Michniewicz-Weisland, E. Mrozek-Sadowska, and A. Lubowicka, 376–382. Gdańsk: Fundacja Rozwoju Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Ferguson, R. 2006. "Ibsen on Film." *Scandinavian Review* 94 (2 (Autumn)): 42–54.
- French, P. 2012. "Jaws – Review." *The Observer*. Accessed 2 September 2020. <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2012/jun/17/jaws-review-steven-spielberg>
- Fulsås, N., ed. 2013. *Biografisk Leksikon Til Ibsens Brev – Med Tidstavle*. Oslo: Senter for Ibsen-studier.
- Gabriel, T. 1991. "Steven Soderbergh: The Sequel." *New York Times*. Accessed 2 February 2021. <https://www.nytimes.com/1991/11/03/magazine/steven-soderbergh-the-sequel.html>
- Gjesdal, K. 2014. "Nietzschean Variations: Politics, Interest, and Education in Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*." *Ibsen Studies* 14 (2): 109–135. doi:10.1080/15021866.2014.1000659.
- Glasl, S. 2015. "'It's Really a Miracle of Evolution': *Jaws* Als Genrehybrid." In *Der Weisse Hai revisited: Steven Spielberg's Jaws und die Geburt eines amerikanischen Albtraums*, edited by W. Schwanebeck, 112–122. Berlin: Bertz & Fischer.
- Gottlieb, C. 2001. *The Jaws Log: 25th Anniversary Edition*. New York: Faber and Faber.
- Heath, S. 1976. "Jaws, Ideology and Film Theory." *Framework* No 4: 25–27.
- Helland, F. 2015. *Ibsen in Practice: Relational Readings of Performance, Cultural Encounters and Power*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Holt, T. 2020. *Far from Home: Ibsen Through the Camera Lens in the Third Reich*. Ph.D. diss., University of Oslo.
- Hutcheon, L. S. O'Flynn. 2013. "." In *A Theory of Adaptation* Second Edition. London: Routledge.
- Ibsen, H. 2008. "En Folkefiende." In *Henrik Ibsens Skrifter*, edited by V. Ystad, and Janss, C., 529–727. Vol. 7. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Jakobsen, K. 1998. "Legetalen Hos Ibsen." *Arr: Idéhistorisk Tidsskrift* 10 (2–3): 79–92.
- Jameson, F. 1990. *Signatures of the Visible*. New York: Routledge.
- Jameson, F. 2020. *Allegory and Ideology*. London: Verso.
- Kohler, H. G. 1990. "Henrik Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* and Eduard Meer's Expulsion from Teplitz." *British*

- Medical Journal* 300 (4 (April)): 1123–1126. doi:10.1136/bmj.300.6732.1123.
- Koht, H. 1954. *Henrik Ibsen: Eit Diktarliv. Volume 2*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & .
- Kolker, R. 2011. *A Cinema of Loneliness*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Leitch, T. 1990. "Twice-Told Tales: The Rhetoric of the Remake." *Literature/Film Quarterly* 18 (3): 138–149.
- Leitch, T. 2008. "Adaptation, the Genre." *Adaptation* 1 (2 (September)): 106–120. doi:10.1093/adaptation/apn018.
- Leitch, T. 2012. "Adaptation and Intertextuality, Or, What Isn't an Adaptation, and What Does It Matter?" In *A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation*, edited by D. Cartmell, 87–104. London: Blackwell.
- Levy, E. 1991. "The American Dream of Family in Film: From Decline to Comeback." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 22 (2 (Summer)): 187–204. doi:10.3138/jcfs.22.2.187.
- Lunde, A. "Don't Go in the Water: *How an Enemy of the People* Turned into *Jaws*." Paper presented at the 12th International Ibsen Conference, Fudan University, Shanghai, China. June 2009.
- Malcolm, D. 1975. "Great White Hope." *The Guardian*. Accessed 2 September 2020. <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2016/dec/22/jaws-steven-spielberg-1975-review-derek-malcolm>
- McNamara, M. 2020. "'You Knew, and Now My Boy Is Dead.' Trump Is as Craven as the Mayor in 'Jaws.'" *Los Angeles Times*. Accessed 6 January 2021. <https://www.latimes.com/entertainment-arts/story/2020-04-06/coronavirus-trump-response-jaws-mayor>
- Melia, M. 2020. "Relocating the Western in *Jaws*." In *The Jaws Book: New Perspectives on the Classic Summer Blockbuster*, edited by I. Q. Hunter and M. Melia, 185–197. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Moretti, F. 1996. *Modern Epic: The World System from Goethe to García Márquez*. London: Verso.
- Næro, S. S. 2008. "Hva Har Ibsen Med 'Haisommer' Å Gjøre?" *Aftenposten*. June 9.
- O'Donoghue, D. 2020. "What Will Boris Johnson's 'Beaches Are Open' Instinct Cost Us?" *The Press and Journal*. Accessed 5 January 2021. <https://www.pressandjournal.co.uk/fp/news/politics/uk-politics/2093197/dan-odonoghue-what-will-boris-johnsons-beaches-are-open-approach-cost-us/>
- Øverland, O. 1969. "Americans Debate Ibsen, 1889–1910." *Americana Norvegica* 2: 135–159.
- Ray, S., dir. 1989. *Ganashatru*. NFDC.
- Robinson, D. 2016. "Monster or Great Fish? Peter Benchley's *Jaws* as Ecocritical Text." *Scrutiny* 21 (3): 57–72. doi:10.1080/18125441.2016.1255246.
- Rønning, H. 2000. "Ibsen on Screen." In *From Snorre to Dante's Peak*, edited by J. E. Holst and A. Sæther, 73–88. Oslo: Centre for Ibsen Studies/Norwegian Film Institute.
- Sackler, H., dir. 1965. *Hedda Gabler*. Translated by, M. Meyer. Caedmon TRS-322 S, 33 1/3 rpm.
- Sanders, J. 2006. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London: Routledge.
- Schaefer, G., dir. 1978. *An Enemy of the People*. Solar Productions.
- Schwanebeck, W. 2015. "Womit wir es hier zu tun haben, ist ein perfekter motor: Die Filmmaschinerie." In *Der Weisse Hai revisited: Steven Spielberg's Jaws und die Geburt eines amerikanischen Albtraums*, edited by W. Schwanebeck, 9–23. Berlin: Bertz & Fischer.
- Shakespeare, W. 1818. *Coriolanus*. Christiania: Jacob Lehmann.
- Sierk, D., dir. 1937. *La Habanera*. UFA.
- Skjoldbjærg, E., dir. 2005. *En Folkefiende*. Nordisk film.
- Spielberg, S., dir. 1975. *Jaws*. Hollywood: Universal Pictures.
- Stam, R. 2000. "Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation." In *Film Adaptation*, edited by J. Naremore, 54–76. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Steinhoff, H., dir. 1937. *Ein Volksfeind*. FDF.
- Törnqvist, E. 2000. "Opening the Ibsen Teleplay: Variations within an Art Form." In *Ibsen on Screen*, edited by J. E. Holst and A. Sæther, 61–72. Oslo: Senter for Ibsen-studier and Norsk filminstitutt.
- Torry, R. 1993. "Therapeutic Narrative: *The Wild Bunch*, *Jaws*, and Vietnam." *The Velvet Light Trap* 31 (Spring): 27–38.
- Wærp, L. P. 2007. "The Tropological Turn to Morality: Dr. Stockmann's Speech as Ibsen's Parody of the Reception of *Ghosts*" in *The Living Ibsen: Proceedings – The 11th International Ibsen Conference, 21–27 August 2006*, edited by F. Helland, K. S. Mollerin, J. Nygaard, and A. Sæther, 177–184. Oslo: Centre for Ibsen Studies.
- Wright, R. 2006. "Ibsen Transcreations in Iran and India." *Tijdschrift Voor Skandinavistiek* 27 (2): 77–93.
- Ystad, V. 2008. "'En Folkefiende 1882: Innledning,' Vol. 7K." In *Henrik Ibsens Skrifter*, edited by V. Ystad, 587–649. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Zelizer, J. 2020. "What 'Jaws' Can Teach Us about Our Coronavirus Response." *CNN*. Accessed 6 January 2021. <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/05/22/opinions/jaws-lessons-on-covid-19-response-zelizer/index.html>