FRANKENSTEIN FROM LITERATURE TO CINEMA: TRIVIAL NARRATIVES OR CONTEMPORARY TRENDS?

Naiara Sales Araújo[1], Monica Fontenelle Carneiro[2] and   Sonia Maria Correa Pereira Mugschl[3].

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the relationship between literature and cinema based on the concepts of Deep Structure and Surface Structure by Flávio Kothe (1994) and the ideas of hypertextualization explored by Gerard Genette (2005). Here, we seek to show how Mary Shelley's Frankenstein has been, over time, the object of inspiration for numerous film productions that often use technological devices to disguise the semantic structure that originated the plot. From this perspective, we reflect on the characteristics of the current discourse in the relationship between literature and cinema, pointing to repetitions that favor the construction of narratives that seem trivial, but that respond to the desires of the contemporary public.

Keywords: Literature, Cinema, Deep Structure, Trivial Narratives, Adaptation.

[1] Dr. in Comparative Literature
Federal University of Maranhão
[2] Dr. in Linguistics
Federal University of Maranhão
[3] Dr. in Education
Federal University of Maranhão

INTRODUCTION

Technological advances have promoted profound changes in our habits, customs and ways of perceiving the world. The way we consume information and narratives has gradually transformed our way of thinking and, consequently, our behavior. These changes reflect the human capacity to reshape, for better or worse, the environment in which we live. Scientific and technological evolution, although often in tension with popular mentalities and moral values, has consolidated itself as indispensable in the modern world. Historical examples, such as the nineteenth-century clashes between science and social morality, illustrate how the human desire to overcome limits and achieve glory can lead to controversies about ethics and identity.

Literature, as a witness and protagonist of this process, has recorded and reinterpreted the impacts of science and technology. Over time, literary discourse has adapted to reflect the fundamental questions of humanity, creating and recreating narratives that transcend eras. A classic example is *Mary* Shelley's Frankenstein (1818), which explores the conflict between science and human values, depicting Dr. Victor Frankenstein as the archetype of the mad scientist. The work not only denounces the dangers of scientific lack of control, but also dialogues with ancient myths, such as that of Prometheus, by speculating on the limits of creation and morality.

The contemporary contributions of Naiara Araújo (2011; 2028; 2023; 2024) broaden the understanding of these issues by highlighting how literary narratives, such as *Frankenstein*, transcend their origins to influence other media, such as video games and television series. From 1910, when the first film adaptation of *Frankenstein* appeared, the work became a milestone of narrative reinvention, inspiring productions that use advanced technology to capture the public. In addition to film, video games and television series have also explored Shelley's deep storytelling, reimagining the myth of Frankenstein in interactive formats and series that dialogue with contemporary culture.

In this context, the hypothesis that there is a repetition of deep narrative structures in modern adaptations gains strength. The analysis of Steven Spielberg's cinematographic work *Artificial Intelligence* reveals echoes of the concerns present in Shelley's text, updated for new generations. From the perspective of the theories of Flávio René Kothe (1994) and Gerard Genette (2005), which discuss the relationship between hypotext and hypertext, and between deep and superficial structures, it is possible to understand how literature remains the main source of inspiration for new forms of narrative production. The adaptations

reaffirm the relevance of literature in translating universal human issues into contemporary languages, maintaining its essence while transforming itself to dialogue with new technologies and audiences.

FROM FRANKENSTEIN TO DAVID: THE REINVENTION OF MYTH IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Mary Shelley's Frankenstein continues to be one of the most adapted and reinterpreted in cinema and, more recently, on streaming platforms. According to Araújo (2023), this recurrence reflects the power of its universal themes, such as the ethical limits of science, existential loneliness, and the human desire to transcend its natural condition. Recent film and streaming adaptations of the work have explored these issues in new contexts, often emphasizing the relationship between creation and creator from modern perspectives, including artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and technology-mediated human relations.

In cinema, productions such as *Victor Frankenstein* (2015), directed by Paul McGuigan, offer a reinterpretation of the myth from the perspective of modern science, while series such as *The Frankenstein Chronicles* (2015–2017), available on streaming platforms, delve into the historical and investigative context, expanding the narrative possibilities of the work. These adaptations often integrate contemporary issues, such as the ethics of creating life in laboratories or the impact of disruptive technologies on society, updating the original text for current audiences (Araújo, 2021).

Although these adaptations are fundamental to understand the perenniality and versatility of Mary Shelley's work, our analysis will focus on a film that, although not a direct adaptation, dialogues deeply with the structure and themes of Steven Spielberg's *Frankenstein*, *Artificial Intelligence* (2001). Such a production revisits the archetype of the "creator and creature," but from different contemporary and stylistic perspectives. Here, the focus falls on the relationship between humanity and technology, exploring emotional intelligence and the desire to belong in a world dominated by science.

This work exemplifies how Frankenstein's central themes continue to reverberate in contemporary culture, being reinterpreted in contexts that reflect the ethical, technological, and emotional challenges of our time. Next, our analysis will seek to highlight how *Artificial Intelligence* dialogues with Shelley's work, highlighting the structural and thematic

connections that reaffirm the relevance of literature as a matrix for narrative production in cinema and in current media.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Steven Spielberg's film production *Artificial Intelligence*, produced in 2001, tells us the story of David, a robot child, produced to make up for any losses or absence of loved ones. With this objective, David is adopted by a couple whose son, Martim, is in a coma with little chance of recovery. Although afraid of her ability to love a robot, Monica (the mother) decides to follow the instructions that would lead David to love her and recognize her as a mother. Following the instructions, David begins to behave like a normal child, in need of affection and attention. After some time, Martim comes out of the coma and returns home, where he starts to compete with David for his parents' attention. Seeing herself powerless in the face of the various conflicts between the two children, Monica decides to return the small robot to the company that produced it, which would lead to its destruction. Overcome with compassion, she chooses to abandon him in a forest, so that he would have a chance of surviving. Then begins David's journey to be recognized as Monica's true son and take a place in her heart.

For many viewers, *Artificial Intelligence* was another of Spielberg's (2001) super productions, with special effects worthy of a good science fiction movie, which aroused the sensibility of lovers of this genre of film by following the trajectory of a robot, with Artificial Intelligence and child's clothing, in search of a real life. However, behind this layer of special effects, we find the same profound structure present in the work of Mary Shelley (2001): the danger of science and technology to humanity, the burning desire for man to be equal to God, as well as his lack of control over his own creatures, in addition to the insensitivity of the scientist, oblivious to the feelings of the artificial being. Through this structure, we guide our analysis, showing points of convergence between the literary work *Frankenstein* and the film production *Artificial Intelligence*.

As the first point of convergence, we point out the sentimental expressiveness of the work. In the character of David, Spielberg reveals what seems to be the most sublime characteristic of man – the need to love and be loved. Around this theme, the narrative is developed, making *Artificial Intelligence* a futuristic film, but with a strong exaltation of human feelings, as the director tells us in an interview, presented on the complementary DVD of the work. This sentimental charge is a characteristic that is repeated in many

science fiction narratives, especially if it reflects, in some way, the Promethean myth described by Mary Shelley (2001) in *Frankenstein* in the nineteenth century, but assumed by contemporary scientists.

This repetition of facts or ideas reveals, *roughly speaking*, the same deep structure that, according to Kothe (1994), constitutes and operationalizes the unconscious of the receiver, which is why the narrative becomes so attractive and familiar to the public. It should be noted here that the term "receiver" also refers to the director/screenwriter who, at the end of his production, will end up being a consumer-critic of his work, and it is up to him to analyze in detail the structural stratagems used by himself.

Spielberg does not hesitate to stage the most varied special effects: robots capable of loving, a toy that talks and understands what is going on around it, sophisticated means of transport and a completely futuristic setting. Such stratagems take part of the attention that the spectator would devote to the deep structure of the film. Thus, the underlying ideas often go unnoticed in the eyes of the receiver, who, in turn, tends to explore only the most superficial layers.

It is perfectly expected that filmmakers and screenwriters present us with monsters of different profiles, varying according to the context in which they are inserted or according to the reality they want to point out. Mary Shelley (2001) presented us with a monster physically deformed by the inefficiency and precariousness of scientific resources. On the other hand, Spielberg (2001) praises scientific efficiency and presents us with a robot boy, physically equal to humans. Apparently they are two completely different creatures, but with the same sensibilities, desires and needs. The physical variation between these two artificial beings confirms the autonomy of each field of production in relation to the way the work is presented to the public. The look with which the filmmaker observes a given reality can be completely different from that used by the novelist in the face of the same reality. This statement can be complemented by the words of Randal Johnson (2003, p. 44):

> When a filmmaker makes a film, he or she is responding, consciously or unconsciously, to questions raised or made possible by the field itself, in the first place, and by society or other fields second.

Thus, it is clear that, through visual resources, the field of cinematographic production is responsible for showing current or futuristic facts, from the perspective that the filmmaker wishes to explore. When questioned about the general characteristics of *Artificial Intelligence*, Steven Spielberg (2001) expresses himself as follows:

> [...] A futuristic movie, but it's very domestic. We wanted to show technological advances and at the same time human feelings, to make it as close to people as possible. (Complementary DVD – acting in AI – 00:01:00).

With these words, the director recognizes the intention of making the viewer identify with the plot, through the feelings revealed by it. This, with this, is the fact that this film is both a romantic and scientific production, that is, along the lines of the Frankenstein literary narrative.

In the film production *Artificial Intelligence*, we perceive parts of Mary Shelley's narrative that have been repeated, transformed and reactivated in a more futuristic context, in which the technological apparatus plays the role of main attraction, putting in the background the deep structure that is behind it. The trajectory of the robot boy looking for a fairy that transforms him into a real boy, so that he can be loved by his mother, is the same trajectory experienced by Victor's monster when he looks for him to ask him to make a companion capable of loving him. Both are driven by an impossible dream of fulfillment. The fairy, as Spielberg's scientist suggests, represents this impossibility: "The fairy represents the human failure to seek what does not exist, or the greatest human gift: the ability to pursue our dreams" (scene: 24, 01:42:00). These were the words addressed to David by the scientist who produced him at the end of his journey in search of the blue fairy. At this moment, the scientist reveals his inability to turn him into a real boy, leading him to give up his quest. Victor Frankenstein also denies his creature the right to happiness by destroying the female that was about to give life.

> Taken by fury, in a fit very close to madness, I took what was at hand to use as a destructive weapon and tore to pieces the structure that was beginning to take definitive shape (Shelley, 2001, p. 158).

The monster had before his eyes the result of his search, and, paradoxically, the end of all his dreams. Like David, despair was inevitable: "the wretched man watched everything in astonishment, and when he saw me finish exterminating the creature that was his greatest desire, he staggered away, raising his hands to his head, in despair" (Shelley, 2001, p. 158).

It should be noted that it is not difficult for us to visualize the scene described by Victor: a being in a moment of despair. By using visual aids, Spielberg offers us a version of Mary Shelley's scene, when, upon discovering that he was just one more robot among hundreds of others and that the fairy did not really exist, David loses the sense of his

search and throws himself from the top of the building where the company that produced him operates. The feeling of despair that is extracted only from the facial image of the little robot is comparable to the hands on the head of the desperate Frankenstein monster.

In Mary Shelley's narrative (2001) there is no existence of the fairy tale that the filmmaker used to give more life to his fiction. However, we have verified the frequent reference that the Monster makes to *Milton's Paradise Lost* as being the source of his inspirations to continue his illusion of one day being loved by someone. We consider the reference to the fairy tale, *Pinocchio*, in the filmic narrative, one more evidence that such a production is a hypertext of *Frankenstein*, since, by using the literary work, without, however, mentioning it, the director makes its transformations or adaptations, but preserves the characteristics of the original work. If in film production the fairy represents the illusion that every human being has of making the impossible real, in literary production, in turn, Adam represents the protective action of the creator on his creature. Both ideas are brought from previous works as an allusion to the myths present in the reader's unconscious, as suggested by Flávio Kothe (1994). Such myths are personified, in some way, through our discourse.

According to Gerard Genette (2005) and Naiara Araújo (2011), through hypertext, an author can tell a completely different story, but to do so, he is inspired by another story. Imitation is also one of the characteristics of hypertext, although it constitutes a more complex process that goes beyond a simple transformation, since, in order to do so, "it is necessarily necessary to acquire at least partial mastery over it (the imitated text): the mastery of that trait that one has chosen to imitate" (Genette, 2005, p. 23). Since Mary Shelley's work is so well known in the cinematographic world, it would not take much effort for any screenwriter to learn about the plot present in *Frankenstein*, at least partially, as Gerard Genette suggests to us.

David's character was, at least partially, inspired by *Frankenstein*'s monster. If we analyze separately the traits that characterize the personality of the little robot, we can see a constant imitation of those traits present in the monster. In addition to all the emotional characteristics shown above, we also verify, in David's intellectual capacity, aspects comparable to those of the gigantic monster. The skill with which the boy elaborates his trajectory towards the Blue Fairy is a reason for amazement and admiration for the scientist who produced him: "inspired by love, full of will, he went on a journey to make it (David) real. And most impressively, no one taught you" (scene: 24, 01:40:00).

Checking the literary text, we also find references to the abilities of the monster that, for months, had followed the creator without, however, letting anyone notice him.

> Yes, he will accompany me on my travels. He had wandered through the forests, hidden himself in caves, or taken refuge in deserted moors. He did not lack intelligence and cunning, I know not what audacity, what diabolical tricks they would not have used to cross the English Channel without being seen (Shelley, p. 158).

We perceive in the discourse of both scientists the recognition of the flaw in the creation project. Not having been able to keep up with the evolution of creatures, they lost them, leaving them to learn, for themselves, the laws of defense and survival. They also weren't able to predict how sensitive their creatures would be. Although the scientist intended to produce a robot that could love, he did not know the dimension of this love, which makes this feeling not only difficult to measure but also to control. Feelings such as fear, jealousy, envy were not foreseen by the manufacturer. We can confirm this by the words of the scientist when he tries to convince David of his importance for being the first of a kind. When he finds himself in front of a boy just like him, David loses control and destroys him.

> - I am David, I am unique, Monica is mine [...].
> - You are very important to us, because of you we became famous [...]. You are the first of a kind (scene: 24, 1:39:00).

In turn, Victor also speaks of the monster's sensitivity, as if he did not expect such human feelings, coming from such a horrendous-looking creature, even being moved when he heard its cry.

> Oh! My creator answers my plea! Allow me to awaken the sympathy of another being! Let me transform into eternal gratitude all the evil feelings I have for you (Shelley, 2001, p.139).
> I was moved [...] His story and the sentiments he expressed with such ardor showed me that he was a creature of great sensitivity (ibid.).

It is seen that both creatures are driven by feelings that seem to be absent in the creators. They lacked the sensitivity of the father who loves, protects and allows himself to be loved by his son. The desire to become a creator through science left no room for feeling, which, according to Christian tradition, was the first of all gifts, paternal love. Both narratives refer to this divine deed: "but did not God create Adam to love him?" (scene:1, 00:06:00); "Adam was produced by the hands of God as a perfect and happy creature, under the protection of his creator" (Shelley, 2001, p. 124). As we can see, through the

excerpts mentioned above, the filmic and literary narratives try to show the failure of the scientist/creator who cannot protect and provide a harmonious coexistence of his creatures with others.

Spielberg could have opted for a script that demonstrated the acceptance of men to scientific feats of this nature, since, as he himself says, "it is a futuristic film". However, he chooses to follow the same structure as the original work, in which the being generated in the laboratory needs to isolate himself from the rest of the humans, as can be seen in Monica's speech: "stay away from humans, only talk to another mecca (artificial beings) like you" (scene:13, 00:51:00).

It is true that Spielberg (2001) puts on stage beings who, being of the same nature as David, could share his sadness, a fact that completely escapes the narrative of Mary Shelley (2001). On the other hand, this procedure only confirms the idea that humans will never live harmoniously with beings of this nature. This is also confirmed in the monster's own speech.

> The human being will never accept my company, but someone as deformed and horrendous as I am will not refuse it. My companion must be of the same species and have the same defects... It is true that we would be two monsters isolated from all over the world, but for that very reason closer to each other (Ibid., p. 137-139).

Knowing the impossibility of humans living in harmony with the meccas, Joe (mecca who accompanies David on his journey) tries to convince the boy to give up his search: "humans hate us [...], that's why you should stay here (away from humans) with me" (scene:18, 01:20:00). Joe went to David the company that *Frankenstein*'s monster could not find. These two narratives, however, do not find similarities only in their sentimental characteristics. Right at the beginning of the film, we find a point of convergence with the work of Mary Shelley (2001): when discussing the creation of an artificial being, a visionary, Professor Hobby, played by William Hurt (the same actor who plays Professor Waldman in Connor's Frankenstein), takes us back to an old, but still longed-for, dream of the scientific community: "Creating an artificial being has been the dream of man since the dawn of science" (Cena:1, 00:03:00). A dream that was well recorded by Mary Shelley already in the nineteenth century and that seems to be reinvigorated from generation to generation.

Professor Hobby's desire to produce a perfect being, without diseases or any problems, is the same as that of the scientist Victor, as can be seen in the discourse of both:

> I would be the creator of a new species – happy, pure beings (without diseases), who would owe me their existence (Shelley, 2001, p. 36).
> [...]
> Ours will be a perfect child, always lovable, would never get sick (Connor, scene:1, 00:04:00).

What difference is there to point out in the desire (and words) of both scientists? We perceive, in the filmic plot, the repetition of the discourse present in the literary plot. Such a discourse is articulated with others that constitute parts of a new narrative. Justifying this type of procedure in the cinematographic environment, according to Glória Palma (2004, p. 13):

> It is not a matter of constructing the discourse of continuum, nor of reconstructing traditions and highlighting influences, but of not letting escape the fragile, but alive, articulation of discourses that are subject to repetition, transformation and reactivation in the universe of languages.

In other words, Glória Palma reaffirms the ideas of Roland Barthes (1987), who refers to the text as a "fabric of past quotations" (p.49). Of course, this is not a random repetition, but a cultural interference that is slightly linked to the way we see the world and how we behave in the face of changes brought about by technological advances. All these changes experienced by us are recorded in our memory and are reflected in our discourses, thus favoring possible repetitions when we produce new messages.

According to the Theory of Adaptation, the filmmaker is perfectly free to add any effects to his production, making use of recent or future events that, in some way, will provide the reading of a new reality. According to Christian Metz (1973), in the adaptation process, the filmmaker can use montage to make cuts and reorganize the material to be used (literary work), appropriating an external process of intervention on this matter. Thus, Spielberg (2001) did not need to make David a "diabolical enemy" of his creator to show that the latter had lost control of the former. Professor Hobby himself claims to have had no control over his creature: "in fact we lost you [...] we did not imagine where his reasoning would take him [...]" (scene: 24, 01:42:00).

Although the director chose to present us with a creature whose feelings of love and friendship were not destroyed by the rejection suffered, which could open space for a diabolical revenge, he does not hide the underlying idea that the scientist has lost control of his creature, like *Frankenstein*. Also expressed in this filmic narrative is the danger of science and technology to humanity. This point of convergence with the literary work is well explained by the men's rejection of meccas, who are burned in public because they are

considered an offense to human dignity:

> - This is the latest example of a series of offenses to human dignity. It is part of their plan to annihilate God's children.
> - See how they mimic our emotions (scene: 16, 01:15:00).

As we can see, Spielberg (2001) used the means of current film production to, from an underlying structure brought from literature, elaborate a new narrative. Sometimes, this intervention is so profound that there seems to be the existence of two completely distinct plots in a single film, thus compromising the result of the union of the literary text with the cinematographic text (be warned: this does not occur in AI). In this way, a process that could be perfectly healthy becomes harmful, because from this mutual relationship of transference, a transformation is expected, in which one vehicle does not overlap another as an expression of hierarchical superiority. Although narrative is, for some authors, a type of discourse that allows one to approach the narrated world and narration without having to consider the particularities of each material medium, it must be done in a harmonious way without, however, neglecting the extent of the interference of one medium to the other.

Taking this conception to the dialogue between books and films, we have, paraphrasing Randal Johnson (2003, p. 11), the idea that the adaptation dialogues not only with the source text, but with its own context, updating the book's agenda. In the film production IA, Spielberg (2001) dialogues not only with the work of Mary Shelley (2001), but also with other works that are explicitly mentioned in the course of the plot – the Bible, *Pinocchio*, by Mario Collodi – to name a few examples; in addition to promoting a dialogue between these texts and the current social context characterized by increasingly modern and technological productions.

Here hypertextuality is made explicit in this "updating of the agenda"; it is at this moment that we can recover a previous message, through elements that, in some way, are familiar to us, although such elements are hidden or embezzled by others entitled superior in their visual forms. Thus, a work can be transformed in different ways, varying according to the objective to be achieved by the transposer. For Genette (2005, p. 53):

> Transposition can be applied to works of vast dimensions whose textual breadth and aesthetic and/or ideological ambition come to mask or erase their hypertextual character, and this productivity is itself linked to the diversity of the transformational procedures with which it operates.

As we can see from the words mentioned above, there is a diversity of means of transforming one text into another, through the processes of hypertextualization (transposition, parody, cross-dressing, pastiche, etc.). With the use of visual resources, these means seem to multiply every day, because according to this author (1997, p.3), the connection of a passage of verbal discourse with an image expands the notion of text beyond verbal language; that is, the fact that a message taken from a literary discourse has been adapted, through visual elements, does not transport it to a purely visual or non-verbal medium, it only expands its area of linguistic coverage.

Thus, if we consider AI a Frankenstein hypertext, we are confirming the possibility of literary discourse being transformed and transported to different media, but preserving its mensagistic content or deep structure.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The current context of artistic production reveals to us an increasingly frequent proximity between different types of arts, which makes us agree with Glória Palma (2004), when she states that the arts do not repel each other, but complement each other. The relationship between literature and cinema has shown diverse possibilities of connections between them. This interface was our study laboratory.

Knowing the existence of numerous discussions about the relationship between literature and cinema, we used ideas from authors who, in our view, served as incentives for the discussion proposed in this study. Theorists such as Christian Metz, James Naremore, Randon Johnson, among others, made up part of our theoretical base, placing us in front of a broad thematic universe, until we arrived at Flávio René Kothe's Theory of Deep Structure (1994) and Gerard Genette's (2005) Theory of Hypertext.

In this universe of ideas, we seek to relate these two theories, showing the approximation between them. To speak of deep structure is to elucidate the presence of one text (of any nature) in another; in the same way that to speak of hypertext is to recognize the existence of an underlying structure from previous productions. Through the analysis of three films, we were able to provide a dialogue between the two theories mentioned, revealing how a literary narrative can serve as inspiration for the generation of increasingly modern films. Throughout the analysis, we tried to present the mechanisms of each communication vehicle, literature and cinema, elucidating that each of these fields has its own ways of conveying a message.

By exploring the relationship between literature and cinema, based on the Theory of Hypertext and Deep Structure, we were able to perceive the diversity of paths that can be followed within this same thematic field. The possibilities of analysis and exploration are countless, especially if we consider the current context of narrative production, pointed out by Flávio René Kothe (1994) as the "era of trivial narratives".

We believe that the two theories mentioned deserve to be the target of discussions and deepening, since they are part of an increasingly frequent reality in the midst of current artistic production. Therefore, it is important to discuss the relationship between literature and cinema, although we can recognize the complexity that exists in the elements that govern such discussions. Here, among so many other paths that have been shown historically, we seek to explore one of them. Our discussions, therefore, do not intend to conclude the ideas explored so far, given that it is a complex and too broad object to reach a satisfactory level of comprehensiveness. Thus, we hope that the considerations presented here can serve as a sketch for future more in-depth studies.

Steven Spielberg's analysis of *Artificial Intelligence* as a contemporary adaptation of the Frankenstein myth highlights the continued relevance of literature as a creative matrix for narratives in multiple media. Mary Shelley's work, by exploring the ethical, emotional, and philosophical dilemmas of creation, transcended her time, becoming a landmark in literature and in the collective imagination. From this matrix, Spielberg recreates the archetype of the "creator and creature" in a context of high technology and deep existential questions, demonstrating how the myth remains up-to-date and impactful.

Naiara Araújo's recent reflections on the aesthetics of virtual reception and literary adaptations for video games and television series expand this debate, by highlighting how these new platforms provide immersive and interactive narrative experiences. In this sense, contemporary adaptations of *Frankenstein*, such as those present in series and games, represent more than reinterpretations: they are recreations that dialogue directly with viewers and players, allowing them to actively participate in the narrative process. This interaction redefines the relationship between work and audience, inserting literature into a virtual aesthetic environment where the narrative is simultaneously reimagined and resignified.

The analysis of *Artificial Intelligence* and its dialogue with *Frankenstein* illustrates the transition from classic literature to new formats and languages that go beyond cinema, reaching the territories of the virtual and the interactive. Thus, modern adaptations not only

preserve the essence of the original works but also expand their meanings, creating new layers of reception and interpretation. These reflections reinforce the idea that literature remains an inexhaustible source of inspiration, capable of crossing boundaries of media, time and space, shaping and being shaped by the sensibilities and technologies of each era.

REFERENCES

1. Araújo, N. S. (2023). Literature and videogames: Adaptation and reciprocity. Revista Letras Raras, 6(3), 222–232. Available at https://revistas.editora.ufcg.edu.br/index.php/RLR/article/view/1599. Accessed on November 30, 2024.

2. Araújo, N. S., & Figueiredo, I. F. (2021). Literatura e indústria cultural: Um estudo sobre romance-folhetim como cultura de massa. Estudos Linguísticos e Literários, 70, 490–503. https://doi.org/10.9771/ell.i70.43701. Available at https://periodicos.ufba.br/index.php/estudos/article/view/43701. Accessed on November 30, 2024.

3. Araújo, N. S. (2011). Cinema e literatura: Adaptação ou hipertextualização? Littera, 2(3).

4. Barthes, R. (1987). Mitologias. São Paulo: Difel.

5. Figueiredo, I. F. D. S., & Araújo, N. S. (2022). O poder do fandom: Construção da recepção do romance-folhetim em Game of Thrones. Revista Interdisciplinar em Cultura e Sociedade, 36–58. https://doi.org/10.18764/2447-6498v8n1.2022.3

6. Frankenstein. (2004). Directed by Kevin Connor. Produced by Robert Halmi & Larry Levinson. Written by Mark Kruger. Starring Luke Goss, Alec Newman, Julie Delpy, and others. Warner Bros. Pictures. USA: 1 DVD (204 min), sound, color.

7. Genette, G. (2005). Palimpsestos: A literatura de segunda mão (L. Guimarães & M. A. Coutinho, Trans.). Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.

8. Inteligência Artificial. (2001). Directed by Steven Spielberg. Produced by Steven Spielberg, Kathleen Kennedy, & Bonnie Curtis. Written by Steven Spielberg. Starring Haley Joel Osment, Jude Law, and others. Warner Bros. Pictures & DreamWorks Pictures. USA: 1 DVD (146 min), sound, color.

9. Johnson, R. (1982). Literatura e cinema – Macunaíma: Do modernismo na literatura ao cinema novo. São Paulo: T. A. Queiroz.

10. Kothe, F. R. (1994). A narrativa trivial. Brasília: UNB.

11. Kristeva, J., et al. (1972). Literatura e semiótica. Petrópolis: Vozes.

12. Metz, C. (1973). Current problems in film theory (D. Mathias, Trans.). Paris: Klincksieck.

13. Naremore, J. (Ed.). (2000). Film adaptation. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

14. Palma, G. M. (2004). Literatura e cinema: A demanda do Santo Graal & Matrix, Eurico, o presbítero & A máscara do Zorro. Bauru: EDUSC.

15. Pereira, E., & Araújo, N. (2024). Cinema e literatura especulativa: Uma análise de Terminal Praia Grande. Animus. Revista Interamericana de Comunicação Midiática, 23(51), e023006. https://doi.org/10.5902/2175497769130

16. Shelley, M. (2001). Frankenstein ou o moderno Prometeu (P. Nassetti, Trans.). São Paulo: Martin Claret.

17. Silva de Sousa Borges, J., & Sales Araújo, N. (2022). A relação entre arte e público ao longo da história: Um olhar sobre a estética da recepção virtual. Revell - Revista de Estudos Literários da UEMS, 2(32), 406–428. https://doi.org/10.61389/revell.v2i32.6927. Available at https://periodicosonline.uems.br/index.php/REV/article/view/6927. Accessed on November 30, 2024.

18. Xavier, I. (2003). Do texto ao filme: A trama, a cena e a construção do olhar no cinema. In T. Pellegrini et al. Literatura, cinema e televisão (pp. [pages]). São Paulo: Senac/Instituto Itaú Cultural.