Language, Literature, and Interdisciplinary Studies (LLIDS)
ISSN: 2547-0044
http://ellids.com/archives/2019/07/2.4-Puckett.pdf

www.ellids.com

Toward a Dialogic Reception in Adaptation Studies: Bundle Theory and Fidelity Discourse in Contemporary Adaptations of *Macbeth*

William Puckett

William Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of Macbeth* has retained a position of continual presence in films with renowned directors such as Orson Welles (1948), Akira Kurasawa (1957), and Roman Polanski (1971) undertaking adaptations on the source text. Though these directors did not feel bound by fidelity within their respective films, fidelity criticism, especially for canonical texts, has retained a privileged perspective in any discourse of adaptation studies. This paper examines adaptations of *Macbeth*—Jeremy Freeston's *Macbeth*, 1997; Billy Morrissette's *Scotland, PA*, 2001; Geoffery Wright's *Macbeth*, 2006; and Justin Kurzel's *Macbeth*, 2015—in order to discuss and problematize fidelity criticism in adaptation studies.

However, within the field of adaptation studies, as with any cultural or artistic criticism, from what perspective does one observe and with what critical toolbox does one examine a work is paramount for a discussion on the relation of a source text to a new work. Consequently, there have been many schools of thought that have affected critical inquiry and engagement with arts and literature; from the Formalists of the early twentieth century placing import on the form of the work, New Criticism emphasizing close reading and evaluation, Semiotics studying how meanings are made according to a study of signs, to Psychoanalysis, Deconstruction, Feminism, and Queer Theory to name a few. The point of such a brief account of Western literary criticism (which is not exhaustive by any means) acts as a starting point for the perspective of this essay and the inevitable plurality of historical precedence and contemporary trans-textual approaches that must accompany any inquisition into this paper. The paper attempts to build a comparative critique on the relevance of an inquiry on fidelity in adaptation studies and how do the spacio-temporal locale and generic shifts within an adaptation affect the reception of a new work in relation to the former. The paper also analyzes whether time, place, and generic shifts offer a potential escape from the trappings of fidelity criticism. While raising these questions the paper seeks a way out from fidelity criticism through Bundle Theory.

Films, as Sergei Eisenstein (1898–1948) described, are a "montage of attractions." According to Jaques Aumont, "[i]n cinema the attraction is defined by the associative relationship to the theme – and by its concatenation with other attractions, the whole of a chain" (43). This chain of relationships, with regard to 'theme' is what will be drawn forth throughout this essay offering that time, or rather temporality and anachronism along with generic shifts are the liberating factors for adaptations from the dependency on fidelity. While being an established mode of examining film based on literature, fidelity discourse limits any potential engagement with a new work based on a source text to a singular link with that source, whereas this essay will argue for the impossibility of a 1:1 ratio between film (as a new creation) and its source text, even if fidelity is the intent of the new work. It is the relationship to the *theme*, rather than the film's fidelity to the source text, that can enrich accessibility for contemporary audiences.

In the opening lines of *Adaptation* (1984), Dudley Andrew states that fidelity discourse is "[f]requently the most narrow and provincial area of filim theory, [whereas the] discourse about adaptation is potentially as far reaching as you like" (Braudy ed. 452). This remains true, as current scholarship still wrestles with the varying incarnations and valuations based on a taxonomy that would, according to Julie Sanders' *Adaptation and Appropriation* (2016), signal a "relationship to a source text" (27). In accord with this taxonomy Andrew reduced adaptation to three modes: "*borrowing*, *intersection*, and fidelity of *transformation*" (Braudy ed. 453). Other scholars too, according to Thomas Leitch have built upon "…years of theoretical practice dividing adaptations into three categories – *close, loose*, or *intermediate"* (Desmond and Hawkes 2005), or *literal, traditional,* and *radical* (Cahir 2006). Though these tripartite subcategories of adaptation do not align exactly with each other, neither do they offer "…a model of adaptation superior to the fidelity discourse that they reject [n]or a mode of inquiry likely to lead to better questions or better models" (Leitch, *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies* 69). Both the models by Desmond and Hawkes as well as Cahir are dominated by a 1:1 relationship between the text and the film, and even though they reject fidelity as the ultimate goal, each of their models operates within a frame of relative fidelity—marking nuanced levels of individuality as a legitimating evaluative method toward filmic adaptations of "literary originals" trapping the discourse within a prison of fidelity.

With Andrew's claim that "…well over half of all commercial films have come from literary originals" (453) the field of adaptation

studies must continually undertake the valuation of filmic adaptations for the infinite ways and combinations that directors, cinematographers, or any other collaborative union might address, situate, or relate a new work to a source text. However, Andrew's use of the term "literary originals" takes on import in that regardless of his intention, it implies primacy of the literary work – relegating the filmic adaptation as secondary. By shifting the language used from 'literary original' to 'source text' or 'literary platform,' a de-prioritization can occur that might help, or allow for more plural readings of filmic adaptations that would not be subordinated to the "literary original." However, this want to remove the import on fidelity—as being the degree of exactness with which something is copied or re-produced—is not a new notion. According to Leitch, "…fidelity discourse [has been] universally attacked by theorists as far back as George Bluestone…with each text, avowed adaptation or not, afloat on a sea of countless earlier texts which it could not help borrowing" (*The Oxford Handbook*, 63)—a chain of connections—with multiple arguments and theoretical roots that would remove subjectivity, authorial intent, and originality in earlier presentations by authors and theorists such as Roland Barthes and Julia Kristeva.

Building off Andrews' provocation that the most "…frequent and tiresome discussion of adaptation concerns fidelity and transformation" (455), this essay will look at the cultural, geographic, temporal, and generic transposition—in the controlled shift from the original to the present—as a mechanism that might alleviate the reliance on a 1:1 relationship between text and film allowing for filmic adaptations to break free from a debilitating discourse of fidelity, encouraging a more contemporary accessibility to the source text. In order to position such an approach, this essay, as previously stated, will look at multiple adaptations of William Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of Macbeth*.

While it is not the intention of this essay to qualify any one adaptation over the other or argue for a preferred approach to adaptation, the films addressed will stand as examples of the tripartite subcategories offered by Andrew, Desmond and Hawkes, and Cahir. In order to offer that the evaluation of a filmic adaptation is not limited to the degree with which a film relates to the source text, this essay forwards Bundle Theory as a means to read the filmic adaptation as a continuation in a chain of individuating properties. These individuating properties are, as will be shown, a part of a larger individuating chain of 'origins' that demand a pluralistic engagement in order to address the multiple aspects of temporal location, setting (geographic and cultural), and genre within any departure from, or adherence to, a *source*

text or *literary platform*. Such an engagement is necessary to move beyond the 1:1 relational adaptation toward a polysemous method that such a discourse requires. It is not necessarily the degree of accuracy with which a film relates to a source text, but rather, the dialogue with the *source text* or *literary platform* takes on import.

However, prior to the discussion on Bundle Theory, first a look at current issues and takes on fidelity discourse must be established in order to ground Michael Losonsky's revisionist take on Bundle Theory as a viable alternate approach. *Leitch* has argued that while transposition—generic, cultural, geographic, temporal, or other—can be persuasive with regard to specific adaptations, he feels that "…they are unlikely to play a leading role in advancing adaptation studies as it struggles to emerge from the disciplinary umbrella of film studies and the still more tenacious grip of literary studies" (*The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, 68). However, while it is difficult not to agree with Leitch in this regard, it is the focus on specific or individual adaptation that Leitch brings up which can prove to be the freeing mechanism that could potentially offer the most for the reception of contemporary filmic adaptations of canonical source material.

Beginning with Andrew[1] who divides his subcategories into *borrowing, intersecting,* and *transformation* and suggests that *borrowing* is "the most frequent mode of adaptation" in which "…the artist employs more or less extensively the material, idea, or form of an earlier, generally successful text…hoping to win an audience by the prestige of its borrowed title or subject" (454). The notion of borrowed power is of import here, in that the adaptation cites an earlier successful text in order to derive power by association. This is not a new technique solely embodied in filmic adaptation; as Andrew notes medieval paintings employing biblical iconography or Julian Schnabel's painting *Exile* (1980), coinciding with the time of Andrew's writing, which visually cites and adapts Caravaggio's *Boy with a Basket of Fruit* (1593) are examples of the same practice. Schnabel, much as Andrew suggests, is *borrowing* the power of the source text to validate his claim for figurative painting, which according to Hal Foster is "…taking the referential status of its images and meanings for grant-

[1]Andrew's subcategories in this regard, can act as a foundation, or rather, because all of the discussed authors are essentially breaking down their respective subcategories in a similar fashion, this paper will focus on Andrew's version as it offers an overarching look at how adaptation has been subcategorized with Desmond and Hawkes, and Cahir being only slightly differential to his thought each will consequently come into discussion.

ed" (129) using the power of the former text to validate the new manifestation.

Geoffery Wright's 2006 adaptation of *Macbeth*, set in the ganglands of Melbourne, Australia, offers an excellent example of reliance on the borrowed power of the earlier work. Though Wright modernizes the film—offering a young and sexy, black leather clad cast—it maintains the language of the original work while shifting the geo-temporal location. Though the temporal, cultural, and geographic setting has been shifted, the script or text of the source text remains un-affected. The audience is presented with the source text in black leather and guns instead of the original tartans and swords.

Intersecting, in contrast to *borrowing* for Andrew is less a direct adaptation (1:1 reflection) but a refraction, suggesting that the direction of a given text has been changed as it passed into a new medium. This refraction has been best summarized by André Bazin who, building off Baudelaire's presentation of the theatre as a "crystal chandelier," offers that:

> If one were called upon to offer in comparison a symbol other than this artificial crystal like object, brilliant, intricate, and circular, which refracts the light which plays around its center and holds us prisoners of its aureole, we might say of the cinema that it is the little flashlight of the usher, moving like an uncertain comet across the night of our waking dream, the diffuse space without shape or frontiers that surround the screen. (Bazin 107).

Regardless of the fact that Bazin is speaking about the theatricalization of film, he suggests that the film gives a glimpse of the *dark corners* of the source text. *Intersection* as such, according to Andrew, provides "…an experience of the original, modulated by the particular beam of the cinema" (455). Justin Kurzel's *Macbeth* (2015) embodies such a scope—keeping true to themes, language, temporal location, and setting, mostly shot in Scotland, in period appropriate wardrobe, and true to the Shakespearean language. Kurzel has shown the text through the lens of the cinema, with sweeping landscapes, montage, close-ups, shot/re-shot, etc. The cinematic effect captured through editing releases the confinement to individual acts and scenes, that stage productions must rely on, as each scene is liberated from the constraints of the physical stage which has to be changed between acts. Within such a cinematic scope, the transition is fluid and open to capture the landscapes that the text and stage can only allude to. This kind of *intersection* between literature and film refracts the scope of

the source text through a multiplicity of vantage points unavailable on the page or stage production. The camera can move anywhere—visualizing the text, script, or stage production from any angle—breaking free from the constraints of the limited orientation of the stage and the authors' description of the setting.

Finally, *transforming*, which concerns fidelity directly, is a mode of evaluation which, according to Andrew, assumes "…that the task of adaptation is the reproduction in cinema of something essential about the 'original' [source] text" (455). This essential-ness is referring to the degree of the word for word account and representation of the cultural, temporal, and geographic location of the source text, that is, how is it transformed and with what degree of fidelity does it relate to the source text. Jeremy Freeston's *Macbeth* (1997), which is true to the letter transformation of the original source text—retaining fidelity as its goal—was filmed in the actual location(s) and landscape that the source text names with scenes being shot in Dunfermline Abbey (Fife) and Blackness Castle (Falkirk), which are but a stone's throw away from Inverness, Dunisnane, and Birnam Wood. As with the location, the scenes are shot in the same static tradition of theatre, restricting each scene to a singular location—following the description to the letter and, in this case, to the historical theatrical presentations of the text. It can thus be surmised that Andrew's subcategories lack delineation between the borders of each subcategorization that might help to clarify his terminology—as all of these films could easily occupy multiple if not all three categories at the same time.

As such, Wright's *Macbeth* (2006) could easily fit into the category of *intersecting* as it makes use of the mobility of the camera's perspective lens, just as Kurzel's *Macbeth* (2015) is *borrowing* from the original source text—though employing a more sweeping scope. Freeston's *Macbeth* (1997) too, though seemingly conscious of a want for fidelity utilizes the camera to allow for close-ups and varying perspectives presented by the director through cinematic tropes that would be unattainable in traditional theatrical productions or the original script. However, all of the above three cases could be considered within the construct of *transforming* due to the fact that each retains core elements as well as (returning to Andrew's quote) "something essential about the 'original' [source text]."

However, Desmond and Hawkes, and Cahir's more simplified subcategories of adaptation can perhaps be of more use with these examples in the sense that they—much like Andrew's subcategory of *transforming*—relate adaptation to the closeness or distance from an

exactness or specific correspondence with the source text or literary platform. So, with regard to the aforementioned examples and the freedom with which Desmond and Hawkes, and Cahir address the relationship between a filmic adaptation of a work of literature: Freeston's adaptation can be understood as a *close* or *literal* adaptation (fidelity of transformation); Kurzel's as *loose* or *traditional* (intersecting); and Wright's as *intermediate*, or *radical* (borrowing). Though a bit clearer than Andrew's subdivisions, these particular articulations toward a taxonomy of adaptation still limit the evaluation between film and text to a 1:1 ratio, prioritizing the source text as the control group with which the latter is measured. Within each of these three articulations of a tripartite division, adaptation remains an essential evaluative aspect as argued by the given authors. Cahir promotes *traditional* adaptations (Leitch 71), and Andrew, though not specifically saying so, aligns himself with André Bazin's "championing of this mode" (intersecting) that was "a refraction of the original" (454), both seeking the middle, offering nothing more than a re-hashing of previous thoughts and circular arguments that bring us back to a discourse of fidelity.

Though current taxonomy aims to organize adaptive practices so as to evaluate filmic adaptations based on specific critical preferences—that is, the freedom with which an adaptation engages with a source text—it may also prove relevant to examine how the generic, cultural, geographic, and temporal transposition of a source text can affect its filmic adaptation or literary platform that disregards the current trade embargo which would limit the number of sources that can be incorporated into an adaptation study. Thus, a movement away from the 1:1 ratio between the source text and film, and the temporal, geographic, and generic shifts, can be viewed as degrees of relation to the literary platform, toward an engagement with all of the elements, or individual properties as a bundle—a dialogic relationship.

Coinciding with the two tripartite divisions that have so far been discussed in this paper, it is now necessary to look at cultural, geographic, and temporal transposition within the process of adaptation. However, there is a fourth transposition: a *generic* transposition which can occur between two mediums, as was touched on by Andrew's in the subcategory *intersecting*, which will be focused upon later in order to highlight the potential for renewed engagements and receptions. What needs to be discussed between the source text and the adaptation is the occurrance of trans-medial, intertextual, and inter-medial exchange—a crossing of borders (trans-medial), a mosaic of quotations (intertextual), and an operation between two media (inter-media). Irina Rajewsky delineates these three categories as: "me-

dial transposition" which would include filmic adaptations and novelizations; "media combination" such as opera, film, theatre—collaboration constituted by media constellation; and "intermedial references" which would account for references in a literary text to a film in so far as an evocation of filmic techniques, that is, zoom, pan, fade, montage editing, etc… (51–52). Though she acknowledges that "…a single medial configuration may certainly fill the criteria of two or even all three of the inter-medial categories…"—much as Andrew's taxonomy was blurred—it is Rajewsky's inter-medial practices which examine a "...perceptible medial difference between two or more individual media," a remediation on, not a replication of the source text (62). It is the plurality that is of great import here as a relationship between media has more than just a 1:1 ratio that would quantify fidelity as a significant discursive apparatus. An inter-medial engagement, as such, not only calls for, but requires a plural engagement and dialogue between references and properties. In order to move beyond the 1:1 relationship of fidelity discourses and emphasize on the plurality that Rajewsky brings up, Rebecca Bushnell's "Tragedy and Temporality" (2014) can act as a spring board, enabling a dive into Michael Losonsky's revisionist take on Bundle Theory and the infinite chain of individuating properties, leaving behind pedestrian examinations of filmic adaptations that would attempt to qualify an adaptation on the degree of accuracy a film showcases to its earlier source text.

Bushnell offers (with regard to reception) that "…each experience is unique…a play is staged again and again, a film rescreened, and a text reread, each time differently and each time affected by what came before" (784). Though Bushnell is not explicitly speaking on adaptation, it is a reasonable comparison for adaptation studies. Just as each reception of a work will be unique, so will be any adaptation, even if fidelity to the source text in the strictest sense is the goal. In one way or another, via the reader, viewer, or adaptive director, some elements undergo a change—Losonsky refers to these as impure individuating properties—which alters the authorial intent of the source text, its historical reception and presentation, and any contemporary reception of the work.

Taking up Losonsky's presentations in "Individuation and Bundle Theory" (1987) enables an argument against current discourses that would prioritize the primacy of the source text or 'literary original,' further building on Rajewsky's plurality, and Bushnell's individuation of experience. Consequently, this essay posits that there can be no original, only a thematic dialogue—any work, source text or adaptation, is made up of a bundle of properties that come before

them, of which any reciprocal work is individuated by an impure individuating property—and that each impure individuating property is made up of another bundle that is individuated by yet another impure individuating property, which is again made up of another bundle of individuating property ad infinitum.

Bundle Theory, having its origins in the eighteenth century with David Hume, offers that "…individuals [or for the purposes of this essay—works of art, that is, texts, plays, film, etc.,] are identical to bundles of properties…properties related to each other in some way" (Losonsky 191–192). However, much of the conflict and discourse surrounding Bundle Theory is related to and directed at notions of *human nature, being,* and the *identity of indiscernibles*, offering that no two sets have the same members (Van Cleve 96). Comparing two things (works of art, adaptation or not) will never accord to a degree of fidelity but rather to a degree of difference—of othering—a degree of distance from a perceived center. Consequently, from Hume's introduction of Bundle Theory to the secondary and tertiary receptions and objections as such, a continual revisionist perspective has been maintained allowing for change ("new" versus "old" Bundle Theory*).* Whereby "old" Bundle Theory identifies the individual via a complex of properties, "new" Bundle Theory translates a statement about individuals into a statement about properties—allowing for change and "accidental qualities" (Van Cleve 103). As such, the differentiation between "old" and "new" Bundle Theory continues to push Hume's question "[a]nd the question still is, by what standard do we proceed when we judge them to be equal; or in other words, what we mean when we say they are equal" (Steinberg 136).

Therefore, for the purposes of this essay, Losonsky's essay takes on greater centrality as it can allow for filmic adaptation to move beyond the previous focus of Bundle Theory and its engagement with *human nature* and *being* toward a reception and evaluative criticism of fidelity discourses' reliance on a 1:1 relationship between text and film—which the critics against Bundle Theory would deem impossible—enabling an infinite dialogue with further individuating properties and encouraging a polysemous engagement with multiple sources of influence, adaptation, and appropriation, that is, geographical, temporal, and generic. However, such a theory is not without its problems[2] with the premier challenge to it being human nature and the problem of the principle of the identity of indiscernibles which would ascertain that no two identities could be made up of the same properties. However, the problematic within this essay is not that of human

[2]For a list of objections against Bundle Theory see: Van Cleve pg. 95–96.

nature or of individuation but of how to engage a filmic adaptation with something that would not prioritize the original literary platform—a way to discuss individuation(s) without attempting to identify the original.

Losonsky argues that individuals, or in the case of this essay, artworks "…can have the exact same properties…thus individuals [or artworks] cannot be individuated by their properties" (191). A solution to this problem, Losonsky maintains, is the introduction of "impure properties," that is, "…if we assume that every individual [or work of art] has a haecceity," that is "…a unique spacio-temporal location…then the Bundle Theory has available impure properties that individuate…," thus, "…taken at face value, Bundle Theory is analyzing or defining [the concept of an] individual" (191–192). Therefore it is the individuation not the individual that becomes paramount for such a discussion allowing cultural, geographic, and temporal transposition, and plurality to come into play. It is through this spacio-temporal location that the individuation of a given bundle gains import as a part of a network. Furthermore, if according to Losonsky:

> …we can distinguish the chain of *x*'s from the chain of *y*'s [text from film]…then if we [can] assume that necessarily every chain of individuation traces out a spacio-temporal 'line' (or worm)[3] that is distinct from all other chains…the process of one thing developing out of another has a spacio-temporal feature that can be relied on to distinguish that process…[because]…there will be spacio-temporal differences between two objects. There will also be other differences…but it seems obvious…that the property of originating *in* something is such that it entails properties that it will allow one, at least in principle, to distinguish between an object and the objects from which it originates. (196).

Similarly, a contemporary adaptation of *Macbeth* is not reliant solely on the *source text,* but on a chain of infinite individuations that have occurred in the process of adaptation that have come after Shakespeare's initial publication, and of all the tales, myths, and motifs (individuating properties) that were part and parcel to the individuating properties which made up the 'bundle' that is Shakespeare's source text *The Tragedy of Macbeth*.

[3]Here, Losonsky is referring to a specific entity—an individual that is representative of the line of connection, but is its own individuation—made up of that which came before it but individuated by its very existence within its own spacio-temporal location.

What this means for any contemporary adaptation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and its subsequent reception is that it is not imperative for the contemporary version/adaptation to adhere to any protocol of fidelity with the *original* in order to impress upon the contemporary audience the essential qualities of the Shakespearean original, rather it is the dialogue between the contemporary auteurs and the classical master that will resonate and enrich the experience within and for the present.

A key adaptation in this regard that can help illustrate such a dynamic is Billy Morrissette's *Scotland, PA* (2001), set in small-town Pennsylvania (USA) circa 1975, at a fast food burger joint, soundtracked by period specific rock-n-roll beset in the American dream. Such an adaptation clearly moves the *source text* culturally, geographically, and temporally from feudal Scotland toward the veils and shadows of an American democracy that promotes the dream of upward mobility. It is much in line with challenging the 1:1 relationship between film and text that fidelity criticism is tied to, and thereby offers a generic shift from tragedy to dark comedy that refreshes the source text for contemporary audiences while retaining the literary platform's essential themes. As previously discussed, Cahir would argue that such a move towards a *radical* adaptation would be at one's own "peril," however, this is a troubling position for adaptation studies in which the persistent question remains whether adaptations should limit the possibilities of audience reception(s) to degrees of fidelity or rather allow for and promote a dialogue beyond it.

To prioritize the source text, as much of the current discourse does, is to limit the present (adaptive) work's future orientation with the past. As an example, a comparative analysis of Italian Renaissance and Neoclassicism can be made to establish which of the two offers a more enriching experience with regard to adaptation(s), spacio-temporal location, and a relationship with past works of art and literature: Italian renaissance offers a more enriching experience in terms of engagement with both the forms and stories of the past (classical antiquity, Greek and Roman mythology, and the old testament) as well as the religious propaganda of the Catholic church, giving new life to the "source texts" of Ancient Greece and Rome within a new setting and overarching narrative of Catholicism or the Neoclassicism that followed centuries later that would quote and replicate the forms of the past directly. While Neoclassicism's adaptive process (*borrowing)* is quoting the past in order to capitalize on the cultural value of the previous period or specific work, adaptive practices of the artists of Italian Renaissance (*radical*) bring the source texts (both classical antiquity and the old testament) to life within a new plurality and spacio-

temporal shift, revitalizing the previous works into their own contemporaneity. What becomes key here is the plurality of engagement. The renaissance gave new life to the source text(s) of the past by shifting them geographically, culturally, temporally, and generically—shifting from what was perceived as Greek and Roman Paganism to a Christian doctrine in order to make them knowable to an audience that would not have been familiar with the works of the past.

Morrissette's adaptation—much as the renaissance—repositions the adaptation of the source text culturally, geographically, temporally, and generically allowing for and encouraging a polysemous interaction with the film and a contemporary connection that not only represents a work of the past, but makes it temporally and culturally accessible to his contemporary audience. Though the temporal location of the film is still removed from the relative present of the film's release date the temporal distance is shifted. The *time* of the narrative is not the present but shifted to the past which, though removed slightly (by roughly thirty years), becomes closer still to the contemporary audience while remaining within a knowable past. The acts of travesty are not so removed as to be too distant to be relatable. The tragedy is replaced with a dark comedy that would adhere to the realities of contemporary American life and the farce of the American Dream. An upward mobility can be seen within a conversation of Shakespeare's work whereby ruthlessness—intentional or otherwise—enables relatability, but at a cost. The relationship of the film with Shakespeare's source text is subverted from tragedy to dark comedy, from the halls of Scottish royalty to small town American white trash class divisions where rock-n-roll, commercialism, the myth of the American Dream, and "a fantasy of social mobility" gloss over the "…inequalities and social hierarchies structuring the country's real but invisible class system" (Deitchman 140). All of these themes which corroborate with the source text, and could easily be exploited by the previously mentioned subcategories of Desmond and Hawkes, Cahir, and Andrew as degrees of relation toward a discourse of fidelity. They can also be viewed within the scope of Losonsky's Bundle Theory whereby the shifts or transpositions become impure individuating properties that demand recognition in their own right, notwithstanding the more general individuating properties that would include: actors, director, cinematographer, screenwriter, etc.

Even though Desmond and Hawkes, Cahir, and Andrew's tripartite subdivisions are valid and can account for the examples of current and past adaptations of Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, they still qualify the adaptation with regard to the degree of accuracy

filmic adaptations retain to the "original" through a discourse not just of similarities but of otherness and difference. Bundle Theory, in contrast, offers a dialogue with the source text that deprioritizes the primacy of the "original"—a movement away from a center-peripheral dialectic. Fidelity discourse, however, still presents an "othering" of the filmic adaptation as something outside of the original that is almost the same but not quite[4]—something to be evaluated according to the closeness of the "other" with the original, or rather, as mimicry.[5]

However, as a potential counter to Bundle Theory's import with regard to the dialogue between texts, and a discussion of fidelity discourse, according to Losonsky "…one way to handle this problem is to stop the regress within a privileged set of individuals that are individuated by pure properties" (192). This type of thinking however would privilege the "literary original" with "pure properties" retaining the current dilemma and subjugation of literary primacy over adaptation studies. Consequently, this privileged set of individuals would only take us to the current debate over fidelity discourse requalifying the subjugation and colonization of any filmic presentation outside of the literary source text. It offers a conception of Bundle Theory that is "…giving a reductive analysis that aims at eliminating the concept of the individual" (192), re-reducing adaptation to its current 1:1 evaluative relationship with the source text, perpetuating literature's colonial/imperial dominance over Film Studies and, even more so, over Adaptation Studies as a field.

If we are to accept Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of Macbeth* as a source text which is made up of a bundle of properties that are individuated by the impure properties associated with the infinite chain of origination (present, past, and future) then with each adaptation there is a consequent introduction of further impure individuating properties, that is, medium, director, cultural, geographical, and temporal location as well as performance, film quality, lighting, genre, etc. Thus, no presentation can ever simply operate as a 1:1 relationship because to do so is to "other" and subjugate anything outside the "original"—the relationship as such becomes an imperial occupation and colonization of the subject of filmic adaptations. The criticism and reception as well as the presentation of the adaptation is a line of further individuation(s) on a chain of individuations. Within this same theory, the source text too would also be individuated through an "in-

[4]Referring to Homi Bhabha's famous essay "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse" (1984).

[5]Homi Bhabha's notions of mimicry have their own power and potential for and towards Adaptation Studies and Fidelity Discourse—as a form of liberation that can cross borders.

finite chain of origination" because within the same rationale, no one entity is the original and consequently there can be no prioritization of medium and/or version (adaptation) over the other. As according to Losonsky's accounting of his version of "new" Bundle Theory, all individuals (art, film, text, play, music, etc.,) are infinitely connected in a chain of origination, deprioritizing any one "original" or "center," moving toward a conversation amongst equals.

Therefore, if it can be accepted that reducing a filmic adaptation of a literary source text to a 1:1 relationship is akin to the subjugation of one media over another—that of a center-peripheral dialectic—the only escape from such a subjugating discourse is to acknowledge that both entities are made of "bundles of properties" and neither is reducible to the essence of the other. Bundle Theory with a plurality of origins and trajectories and the idea of inter-medial dialogue and conversation is the only avenue for an audience or criticism that would stand against a discourse of occupation and a comparison of inequality via difference.

Works Cited

Armstrong, D. M. *Universals and Scientific Realism*. Cambridge UP, 1978.

Baylis, Charles A. "Max Black. The Identity of Indiscernibles." *Mind*, vol. 61, 1952, pp.153–164.

Bazin, André. *What Is Cinema?* Vol. 2, California UP, 2005.

Braudy, L. and M. Cohen. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings.* 5th ed., Oxford UP, 1999.

Cahir, Linda Costanzo. *Literature into Film: Theory and Practical Approaches*. McFarland & Co., 2006.

Ehring, Douglas. "Bundle Theory." *Tropes: Properties, Objects, and Mental Causation*. Oxford UP, 2011, pp. 98–135.

Foster, Hal. *Recodings: Art, Spectacle, Cultural Politics*. Bay, 1985.

Freeston, Jeremy, director. *Macbeth*. Cromwell Productions Ltd., 1997.

Hermansson, Casie. "Flogging Fidelity: In Defense of the (Un)Dead Horse." *Adaptation*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2015, pp. 147–160.

Hoefer, Anthony D. "The McDonaldization of 'Macbeth': Shakespeare and Pop Culture in 'Scotland, PA.'" *Literature/Film Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2006, pp. 154–160. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43797271.

Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Eric Steinberg, Hackett Publishing, 1993.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation.* Routledge, 2006.

Kurzel, Justin, director. *Macbeth*. Anton Capital Entertainment, 2015.

Leitch, Thomas M. *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to ThePassion of the Christ*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2007.

---. editor. *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*. Oxford UP, 2017.

Losonsky, Michael. "Individuation and the Bundle Theory." *Philosophical Studies*, vol. 52, no. 2, 1987, pp. 191–198.

Morrissette, William, director. *Scotland, PA*. Lot 47 Films, 2001.

Orr, M. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts.* Blackwell, 2003.

Pike, Nelson. "Hume's Bundle Theory of the Self: A Limited Defense." *American Philosophical Quarterly,* vol. 4, no. 2, 1967, pp. 159–165.

Rajewsky, Irina O. "Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality." *Intermédialités: Histoire Et Théorie Des Arts, Des Lettres Et Des Techniques*, no. 6, 2005, p. 43. www.erudit.org/fr/revues/im/2005-n6-im1814727/1005505ar.pdf.

Saunders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation.* 2nd ed., Routledge, 2016.

Shakespeare, William, and Nicholas Brooke. *The Tragedy of Macbeth*. Oxford UP, 1991.

Singh, Vijaya. "Fiction to Film: A Brief History and a Framework for Film Adaptations." *Filming Fiction.* Oxford UP, 2012.

Van Cleve, James. "Three Versions of the Bundle Theory." *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, vol. 47, no.1, 1985, pp. 95-107. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4319731.

Wright, Geoffrey, director. *Macbeth*. Palace Films and Cinemas, 2006.