

Adaptation is inclusive: blending novelty and tradition

Seminar convenors: Prof. Ewa Kęłowska-Ławniczak, University of Wrocław, prof. Jacek Fabiszak, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań (fabiszak@amu.edu.pl)

Hounds and greyhounds, mongrels, spaniels, curs,
Shoughs, water-rugs and demi-wolves are clept
All by the name of dogs. (*Macbeth*, 3.1.94-96)

Macbeth addresses these words to the Murderers and they are meant as terms of abuse. Yet, the context in which Macbeth resorts to this rant is that the Murderers refuse to kill Banquo claiming that they are MEN. Adaptation, too, has been considered inferior to the ‘original’ work (source-text), less creative (or non-creative at all) and called critically-condemning names. Yet, as many scholars today observe adaptation is an essentially human predilection. The aim of the seminar is to invite papers on adaptations of texts of culture into other texts of culture, including transmedial transpositions into arts such as literature, theatre, film, painting, sculpture, music, digital media, video games, etc.; and involving traffic between Linda Hutcheon’s three modes of engagement: telling, showing and interactive (2013: 22-27). The proposals should address the question of how works selected for analysis contribute (or not) to the human and eco critical diversification necessitated by the evolutionary cultural meme circulation (Hutcheon 2013: 167) in the process of transposing source texts into new contexts and forms (media). Particularly noteworthy is the adaptation’s propensity to re-focalise or complement significantly (prequels, sequels, gap-fillers), the perspective of the source text and give voice to the marginalised, thus creating a (dynamic) mosaic of multiple viewpoints, often struggling with each other. This ‘struggle’ does not need to be competitive; Julie Sanders, when beginning to theorise on adaptation in her 2006 *Adaptation and Appropriation*, references Homi Bhabha’s concept of hybridity, a ‘process of relocation [which] can stimulate new utterances and creativity’ (16). Consequently, adaptation, hybridity, mongrelisation can be perceived as creative practices thanks to the positively-oriented coexistence in a ‘third space’.

We are looking for papers which will discuss the adaptation’s inherent inclusive potential and openness to novelty and the marginalised.

References:

- Bhabha, Homi K. 1995. “Cultural diversity and cultural differences”, in: Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffith and Helen Tiffin (eds.) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge. 206-212.
- Hutcheon, Linda with Siobhan O’Flynn. 2013. *A theory of adaptation*. Second edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sanders, Julie. 2006. *Adaptation and appropriation*. London and New York: Routledge.