

## ФИЛМ И КЊИЖЕВНОСТ 2.0

# ИНСТИТУТ ЗА КЊИЖЕВНОСТ И УМЕТНОСТ

СЕРИЈА Ц: ТЕОРИЈСКА ИСТРАЖИВАЊА

Књига 21

## *Међународни уређивачки одбор*

др Бојан Јовић, Институт за књижевност и уметност у Београду  
др Норберт Бахлјтнер, Универзитет у Бечу  
др Невена Даковић, Факултет драмских уметности у Београду  
др Драгана Грбић, Универзитет у Келну  
др Александра Манчић, Институт за књижевност и уметност у Београду  
др Татјана Алексић, Универзитет у Мичигену  
др Наташа Ковачевић, Источни Мичиген Универзитет  
др Слободанка Владив-Гловер, Монаш Универзитет у Мелбурну  
др Вук Вуковић, Факултет драмских умјетности Универзитета Црне Горе у  
Цетињу  
др Марија Грујић, Институт за књижевност и уметност у Београду  
др Кристијан Олах, Институт за књижевност и уметност у Београду  
др Владан Бајчета, Институт за књижевност и уметност у Београду

## *Рецензенти*

проф. др Никица Гилић, Филозофски факултет Универзитета у Загребу  
проф. др Александра Миловановић, Факултет драмских уметности у Београду  
др Тијана Тропин, Институт за књижевност и уметност у Београду

# ФИЛМ И КЊИЖЕВНОСТ 2.0

ЗБОРНИК РАДОВА

*Уредници*

др Марија Грујић  
др Кристијан Олах

ИНСТИТУТ ЗА КЊИЖЕВНОСТ И УМЕТНОСТ  
2025



## САДРЖАЈ

УВОД	15
------	----

### I

#### КАКО ПИСАТИ КЊИЖЕВНОСТ И ФИЛМ

Бојан Ђорђевић ПЕКИЋ И ФИЛМ	23
Лука Ракојевић ДУШАН ВУКОТИЋ – МИСЛИЛАЦ И МАШТАР	39
Владан Бајчета КОНЦЕРТ ВЛАДАНА ДЕСНИЦЕ: СЦЕНАРИО ЗА ЧИТАЊЕ	53
Марија Шаровић МОДЕРНА ПРИРОДА ДЕРЕКА ЦАРМАНА Однос филмског и књижевног језика	73

### II

#### КЊИЖЕВНОСТ И ФИЛМ КАО СВЕДОЦИ ЖИВОТА У ВРЕМЕНУ

Соња Веселиновић БИОГРАФСКИ ФИЛМОВИ О ПИСЦИМА Од смрти аутора до живота-текста	87
Лариса Костић ПАНОРАМА СЕЋАЊА Културни живот Београда кроз писма и филмове Вукице Ђилас	103

Мерима Омерагић АУТОБИОГРАФСКО ПИСАЊЕ МИРЕ ФУРЛАН У ТЕСТИМОНИЈАЛНОЈ ИНТЕРСЕКЦИЈИ СА КИНЕМАТОГРАФСКОМ ТАЧКОМ ГЛЕДИШТА	121
Тијана Матијевић ЗБУЊУЈУЋИ ПОГЛЕД <i>FLÂNEUSE</i> : КРОЗ АВАНГАРДИСТИЧКЕ УМЕТНИЧКЕ ПРАКСЕ	139
Маријана Терзин Стојчић ДЕЦА У РАТУ, ИНСПИРАЦИЈА ЗА ФИЛМСКИ СЦЕНАРИО Снага ратне хуманости и одрастање деце у филмским сценаријима Арсена Диклића	151
III	
МОТИВИ И ПОЕТИКЕ НА ПУТУ КРОЗ МЕДИЈЕ И ЖАНРОВЕ	
Слободанка Владив-Гловер ЕКФРАЗА (СЛИКА РЕЧИМА) У НАРАТИВНОЈ ФИКЦИЈИ И ФИЛМСКА СЛИКА КАО МОНТАЖА	165
Јован Букумира ПРУСТ У <i>ОГЛЕДАЛУ</i> ТАРКОВСКОГ	173
Урош Бурковић ДЕЈВИД ЛИНЧ И СРПСКА КЊИЖЕВНОСТ Увод у разматрање могућих веза	189
Симка Ђурић ОТАЦ „ИСТЕРНА“ У ВРТЛОГУ АГИТПРОПА Жанровски тропи вестерна у причи „Дете“ и новели „Оклопни воз 14-69“ Всеволода Иванова	203
Драган М. Ђорђевић НАДМАРИОНЕТА Е. Г. КРЕГА У КЊИЖЕВНОСТИ И НА ФИЛМУ	225

---

Матеја Ђедовић НЕВОЉЕ ЈЕДНОГ КИНЕЗА НА ФИЛМУ Филмске варијације на роман Жила Верна	239
Јана М. Алексић ВОЖЊА У ОБА СМЕРА Тематско-мотивске и семантичке интерференције између Муракамијеве збирке прича <i>Мушкарци без жене</i> и Хамагучијевог филмског остварења <i>Повези ме</i>	255
Зоја Бојић FILM AND SOME PHILOSOPHY CONCEPTS OF THE EUROPEAN ANTIQUITY Dramatic culmination of sequential narrative and the visual arts of the European antiquity	271
Александра П. Тодоровић АФАЗИЈЕ Одсуство говора и сан о повратку у филму Андреја Тарковског <i>Огледало</i>	285

IV  
ДИСТОПИЈА И АТМОСФЕРИЧНОСТ У ОГЛЕДАЛУ  
ФИЛМА И КЊИЖЕВНОСТИ

Бојан Јовић ПОСТУПЦИ (РЕ)СЕМАНТИЗОВАЊА У ЕКРАНИЗАЦИЈАМА РОМАНА ФИЛИПА К. ДИКА <i>ДА ЛИ АНДРОИДИ САЊАЈУ</i> <i>ЕЛЕКТРИЧНЕ ОВЦЕ?</i>	301
Часлав Николић АТМОСФЕРОЛОГИЈА <i>Твин Пикс</i> Дејвида Линча и Марка Фроста	325

- Снежана Савкић  
 ФОН ТРИРОВА ТОПОГРАФИЈА ХАОСА  
 Два облика антикреације у филмовима *Анџихрисџи*  
 и *Кућа коју је саградио Цек* 339
- Жарко Миленковић  
 СТООКИ СТРАХ  
 Постапокалиптична егзистенција у роману *Пуџ* Кормака  
 Макартија и његовој филмској адаптацији у режији Џона Хилкоута 357
- Зорана Симић  
 THE DOES IN THE “ECO-TERRORIST” REVENGE  
 Some remarks on the novel *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead* by Olga Tokarczuk and the film *Spoor* by Agnieszka Holland 371
- Владимир Перић  
 У ДУПЛОЈ ЕКСПОЗИЦИЈИ  
*Година зеца* у преклопу филмског и књижевног 387
- Милена Владић Јованов  
 ДИСТОПИЈА РЕЛИГИЈЕ, ЕТИКЕ И ПОЛИТИКЕ У  
 НАРАТИВИМА ФИЛМСКЕ ФРАНШИЗЕ *КУЊИЦА ЗА ПТИЦЕ* 397
- V  
 ЕКРАНИЗАЦИЈА И КРИТИЧКИ ДИЈАЛОГ
- Невена Даковић  
 ЗОНА ИНТЕРЕСА: ПРОСТОР И ВРЕМЕ, ФИЛМ И РОМАН 413
- Јелена Милинковић  
 МАЛЕ ЖЕНЕ ГРЕТЕ ГЕРВИГ 427
- Татјана Росић  
 БЕЛА БАКСТЕР ЊОМ САМОМ  
 О роману Аласдира Греја и филму  
 Јоргоса Лантимоса *Јадна створења* 443

---

Дејан Дурић ПОДРУЧЈЕ БЕЗ СИГНАЛА И „КВАЛИТЕТНА ТЕЛЕВИЗИЈА“ У ХРВАТСКОЈ	459
Тијана Копривица FROM THE NOVEL TO THE FILM TO THE FILM WITHIN THE NOVEL Media Realizations of Jasminka Petrović's <i>Leto kada sam naučila da letim</i>	475
Наташа Дракулић Козић ХАДЕРСФИЛД НА СЦЕНИ И НА ЕКРАНУ	489
Марина Миливојевић Мађарев ОДНОС РЕДИТЕЉКЕ СОФИЈЕ СОЈЕ ЈОВАНОВИЋ ПРЕМА ЖЕНСКИМ ЛИКОВИМА У КОМЕДИЈАМА ( <i>Пој Бира и пој Сџира, Далеко је Аустралија, Рањени орао и Извињавамо се, мноо се извињавамо...</i> )	503
Ана Дошен ПАТОЛОГИЈА УСАМЉЕНОСТИ Стратегије репрезентације у роману и филму <i>Аудиција</i>	517
Александра Жежељ WELTANSCHAUUNG IRREALIS АНДРЕА АСИМАНА И ЛУКЕ ГВАДАЊИНА <i>Зови ме својим именом</i> – роман и филм	529

VI  
ФИЛМСКИ ЖИВОТ КЊИЖЕВНЕ  
И МИТСКЕ ТРАДИЦИЈЕ

Лада Стевановић ОДИСЕЈ НА ФИЛМСКОМ ПЛАТНУ И ТЕЛЕВИЗИЈСКОМ ЕКРАНУ	547
--	-----

Данијела Марот Киш, Саша Станић ТЕМАТИКА ПОТОПА У КЊИЖЕВНОСТИ И НА ФИЛМУ Сувремене трансформације митске приче	563
Бојана Аћамовић ЖИВОТ И СМРТ ПЕСНИКА У ЦАРМУШОВИМ ФИЛМОВИМА <i>МРТАВ ЧОВЕК</i> И <i>САМО ЉУБАВНИЦИ ОПСТАЈУ</i>	579
Милица Шпадијер СЛАТКИ ЖИВОТ ПЕТРОНИЈА АРБИТРА КАМЕРОМ ФЕДЕРИКА ФЕЛИНИЈА	597
Марија Грујић ИЗБОР ПЕСНИКА, ИЗБОР ЉУБАВНИКА Мит о Еуридици у филму <i>Порџиреџ game у ѿламену</i>	613

## VII

## ЈЕЗИК, ЗНАЧЕЊЕ, САЗНАВАЊЕ

Марија Копривица Лелићанин МОЋ ЈЕЗИКА У ЧИТАЊУ ФИЛМА: ОД РАНИХ АНАЛОГИЈА ДО МУЛТИМОДАЛНОСТИ	629
Владимир М. Вукомановић Растегорац ПРЕДСТАВЕ СМРТИ У РОМАНИМА ЗА МЛАДЕ И ЊИХОВИМ ФИЛМСКИМ ОБРАДАМА Упоредна анализа и методички потенцијали	645
Горан Чворовић АНГЛИЦИЗАЦИЈА СРПСКОГ ЈЕЗИКА У КОНТЕМПОРАЛНОЈ ФИЛМСКОЈ РАВНИ И ЈЕЗИЧКИ ДОПРИНОС ФИЛМА КАО ПОЈМА ШИРЕГ ЗНАЧЕЊА	661

Блаженка Лакетић Тривунчић ОД СЕМАНТИКЕ И ЕСТЕТИКЕ ФИЛМСКЕ НАРАЦИЈЕ КА КЊИЖЕВНИМ И КУЛТУРНО-ИСТОРИЈСКИМ САДРЖАЈИМА Проблем интерпретације и рецепције српског уметничког дела у трећој генерацији српско-француских билингвала у Паризу	669
Биљана Солеша ПОЕТИКА ПРОСТОРА У ТЕЛЕВИЗИЈСКИМ АДАПТАЦИЈАМА ПРИПОВЕДАКА ЛАЗЕ ЛАЗАРЕВИЋА	683
Јована Јосиповић МИТ И НАРОДНА КЊИЖЕВНОСТ У СРПСКОМ ФИЛМУ	697
Слађана М. Миленковић ФИЛМ И КЊИЖЕВНОСТ У ОБРАЗОВНОМ ДИСКУРСУ	711
Ана Далоре ПРОДУЦЕНТСКИ МОДЕЛИ ЕКРАНИЗАЦИЈЕ РОМАНА НА ФИЛМУ	727

## VIII

## ТЕХНОЛОГИЈЕ ЕКСПЕРИМЕНТА И НОВИ СУБЈЕКТИ НАРАЦИЈЕ

Сава Дамјанов А1 – КЊИЖЕВНОСТ – ФИЛМ	747
Олег Јекнић ФИЛМ У ДОБА ВЕШТАЧКЕ ИНТЕЛИГЕНЦИЈЕ Пристрасност према класичним причама	753
Јелена Кусовац ФИЛМ БАЈКА АЛЕКСАНДРА СОКУРОВА Зачарани историјски круг и у њему – маса	767

- Марина Габелица  
 (RE)INVENTING CRIME FICTION IN DIGITAL  
 MEDIA – THE CASE OF *HER STORY* 775

IX  
 НОВИ ЖИВОТ АУРЕ ЦРНОГ ТАЛАСА

- Михајло Витезовић  
 БОШАК ТАМНОГ КАДРА  
 Филмови црног таласа инспирисани фантастичком  
 књижевношћу 795
- Магда Миликић  
 „НЕОТПОРНИ НОЋНИ ЛЕПТИРИ“  
 Сценарио *Фарови и деца* Миће Поповића  
 и селинџеровски наративни модел 809
- Ивана Раловић  
 КЊИЖЕВНОСТ НА ПУТУ ЗА ВЕЛИКИ ЕКРАН  
*Бења Краљ*, нереализована адаптација  
 из заоставштине редитеља Александра Саше Петровића 825

X  
 ЧУВАЈУ ЛИ ФИЛМ И КЊИЖЕВНОСТ ВАТРУ  
 ХУМАНИСТИЧКИХ ЗНАЊА?

- Милица Мустур  
 ХУМАНИСТИКА У СЛУЖБИ ПРАВДЕ  
 Литерарна поетика детективске серије *Ендевор* 837
- Новак Малешевић  
 КУРОСАВИН *ИДИОТ*  
 Живот након апокалипсе 857

---

Милена Гвозденовић ЕКСПАНЗИЈА НОВИХ РУСКИХ ТВ СЕРИЈА ЗАСНОВАНИХ НА КЊИЖЕВНИМ КЛАСИЦИМА	871
Милош Живковић ДА ЛИ ЈЕ МОГУЋЕ СНИМИТИ ФИЛМ О НЕМАЊИЋИМА? Национални идентитет између слике и текста	887
Кристијан Олах КАДРОВИ ОД РЕЧИ О духовности филма у романима Теодора Росака <i>Трейшај</i> и Пола Остера <i>Књига оисена</i>	901
РЕГИСТАР ИМЕНА	925

ZORANA SIMIĆ\*  
(INSTITUTE FOR LITERATURE AND ARTS, BELGRADE)

**THE DOES IN THE “ECO-TERRORIST” REVENGE**  
**Some remarks on the novel *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead***  
**by Olga Tokarczuk and the film *Spoor* by Agnieszka Holland**

*Abstract:* In the paper, the novel *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead* by the Polish writer Olga Tokarczuk (originally published in 2009, translated by Milica Markić and published in Serbia in 2014) and the film *Spoor* (*Pokot*, 2017) by the author's compatriot and contemporary, the director Agnieszka Holland, based on their co-authored screenplay, are briefly (and) comparatively discussed. Turning to the harsh accusations of a kind of eco-terrorism in the Polish media, the paper broaches the following questions: In what ways and to what extent did the transposition of the literary into the text of the film screenplay condition and (re)shape the semantic, genre, and stylistic comprehensiveness, layering, and openness of each one individually? Did the film's transmediality redefine the novel's complex intertextuality? How did the simultaneous “global” promotion of Olga Tokarczuk's literary oeuvre and the film she co-wrote, along with different models of cultural translation, influence the forms of their (de)coding, as well as the media representation and reception of (eco)feminism in the contemporary media and cultural context? Why, in the end, was there resistance to the double fictional possibility of certain joint revenge of the does and other endangered creatures, their femininity, and archetypality?

*Keywords:* *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead*, *Spoor*, Olga Tokarczuk, Agnieszka Holland, (De-)Blakeisation

Thanks to the influence of the Nobel and Man Booker international prizes, both of which she received in 2018, Olga Tokarczuk, an author situated on the very fringes of Europe (Silesia, Poland), is progressively becoming a prominent literary figure transnationally. Until recently, her reception has been dynamic and fruitful, but mostly limited to the national framework of Poland – where it abounded in controversies connected with the notions of gender and nation (see Kołodziejczyk 2022) – as well as to linguistically and geographically proximate areas, above all the Slavic-speaking ones,

---

\* zorana\_simic@hotmail.com

where it was predominantly affirmative, but also non-institutionalized and “non-politicized” at the same time (for instance, she has been a beloved and assiduously translated author in Serbia and other post-Yugoslav countries for decades; see Marčić 2021). Nowadays, interest in this woman author has increased, particularly in Anglophone areas within and outside Europe’s administrative borders.

However, a body of literature on Tokarczuk’s fiction, which, except for the two monographs in Polish by Katarzyna Kantner and Monika Świerkosz, a thematic issue of *The Polish Review* (2021), and a first-ever collection of academic papers in English published by Routledge (Wiśniewska and Lipski, ed. 2023), still mostly consists of literary reviews, brief essays, and individual articles – indicates a discrepancy in its reception in the “East(s)” and in the “West(s)”. Thus far, in addition to contextual (research) differences, this has been explained by the (market-conditioned) translation and publishing policies. In this dialectics, significant variances from the source texts, defined by cultural specificities, constantly (re)appear, with the issue of gender proving particularly salient (Paleczek 2010). Accordingly, the consideration of Olga Tokarczuk’s oeuvre and its reception becomes a relevant and inspiring challenge in the light of contemporary (gender-based) transnational literary and cultural translation studies.

Numerous Tokarczuk readers insist on the following aspects of her work on the whole, in large part summarized by Edwin Bendyk (Bendik 2021): the holistic approach to life; revaluation of polytheism(s) as an act of democratization; re-symbolization and transfiguration of myth(s); deconstruction of essentialist identities and constructed boundaries; variability of multiple epistemic perspectives; philosophy of eccentricity and heterotopy; ethics of self-limitation, self-reflection, and rejection of sovereign anthropocentrism; utopian critique of rationalism and the Enlightenment tradition, while still maintaining a fundamental trust in human progress. Olga Tokarczuk’s prose is marked by an impressive syncretism of various intellectual, scientific, spiritual, and philosophical traditions and systems – both “Eastern” and “Western” ones – as well as a sovereign authorial competence, grounded, among other things, in European (post)modern poetics. Consequently, this woman author’s oeuvre, wide open to a plethora of hermeneutic possibilities, has so far been more or less elaborately viewed, for instance, through the lens of psychoanalytic (Pascarelli 2020), (eco)feminist (Mortensen 2021), post- and transhumanist (Michna 2022) approaches, with special focus on the influence of Jung (Huss 2021; Jarzyńska 2023), or in the mirror of the Frankfurt School (Adorno and Horkheimer) and Foucault’s theory (Kantner 2021).

\*

The novel *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead*, originally published in Poland in 2009, stands out as a particularly inspiring and exemplary object of study. This novel was translated into Serbian by Milica Markić, and published in 2014 by the Novi Sad Cultural Center (KCNS; see Tokarczuk 2014). Tokarczuk was translated into Serbian both before and after 2014 thanks to the efforts of the same translator. As already indicated, since she received the (Man) Booker and Nobel prizes for literature in 2018, her works, including *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead*, which until that moment had been significantly less accessible or known to the Anglophone than to the *local* audience, were reprinted and became the subject of attention in the *global* public – both in the general media and among experts – while the author slowly began to attain the status of a literary classic. To that extent, her international visibility increased sharply and significantly decades after she originally started writing and publishing in Poland (back in 1979) and promoting her work in Central and Eastern Europe. Of course, the scope and consequences of this complex process are not yet possible to analyse optimally, and on this occasion, I do not pretend to do so. I believe, however, that it is important to first take into account this current reception context.

Apart from obtaining two of the most prestigious literary awards globally, prior to 2018, Olga Tokarczuk worked as a co-writer on the script for the 2017 movie *Pokot* by the widely established and internationally recognized Polish director and screenwriter Agnieszka Holland, who had been arrested during the Prague Spring and who later emigrated from Poland in the early eighties (see for instance Grodź 2023). The screenplay – it is reasonable to assume, partly due to the direct participation and interventions of Olga Tokarczuk herself – is quite firmly based on the novel *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead*. The title of this film is translated differently into Serbian, most often as *Trofejna divljač* (The Trophy Game). In English, it is translated as *Spoor* – which also connotes (wild) animal tracks, or game tracks, primarily in the context of hunting. In any case, already in the title of the film, there is an indicative deviation from the title of the book itself (inspired by William Blake), which I will soon refer to in more detail.

Agnieszka Holland directed this feature film with the assistance of her daughter, Kasia Adamik. It premiered in early 2017 in Berlin and immediately afterward in Poland. At the 67th Berlin International Film Festival, it won the Alfred Bauer Award, known as the “Silver Bear”, for inventiveness and the opening of new perspectives in film art. Otherwise, the reactions of the critics and reviewers to the film could be generally described as predom-

inantly laudatory or supportive, but also relatively measured and reserved, which I will also touch upon later. In the descriptions of the film, the leitmotif appears to be an indication of its anarchist, ecofeminist, and subversive impulses. Nevertheless, reporting from the Berlin festival, a Polish journalist, the associate of national television, Cezary Gmyz, notoriously described this film as “deeply anti-Christian and pagan”, and as a work that brings and represents the extreme “apotheosis of eco-terrorism” (see Birkholc 2022). Moreover, even some activists for animal rights and advocates of environmentalism, who normally share positions with Olga Tokarczuk – but also the protagonist of the novel and film, Janina Duszejko – recognized or perceived this work by Agnieszka Holland as too radical or as a potentially dangerous promotion of the ideas that they themselves hold (ibid.). What interests me here, among other things, is this paradox or aporia in the reception of the film *Spoor*, in the light of and based on its juxtaposition and comparative analysis with the novel *Drive Your Plow over the Bones of the Dead*.

\*

Janina Duszejko, a woman of around sixty, the main protagonist of both the novel and the film (played by Agnieszka Mandat), figures as a kind of avenger of dead animals that are mercilessly killed and exploited by people – more precisely, by men, “fathers of families, exemplary citizens”, the bearers of patriarchy. These same men are serially and equally brutally killed by Janina Duszejko herself. When it comes to the novel, her exclusive narrative perspective, since it is about a person who responds to violence with violence, which represents an ethical issue *par excellence*, is consistently and complexly implemented as unreliable. The lucidity and *moral law* in Janina Duszejko – who, thanks to Olga Tokarczuk’s skilful narration, is constructed as a very charismatic and intriguing heroine – inseparable from the intentional and well-controlled caricature of her targets, wins over readers to the extent that, even if they are experienced fans of thrillers, hints of her guilt can easily be missed, or at least remain vague. The antisocial features of her personality, necessary to commit the crimes described in the novel, are at the same time mitigated and highlighted by Duszejko’s strong *feminine* orientation towards animals and care of them, her almost friendly relationship with her own car, her teaching job at a local school, the persistent, undefined chronic pains (possibly Lupus) with which the woman protagonist lives alone in the archetypally wild borderspace, and finally the careful problematization of her mental state and processes (describing dreams about the Girls, deceased ancestors – mother and grandmother – in the basement and hospi-

talization). At the same time, Duszejko's ability to maintain meaningful sporadic contacts with other people, to help them and show respect, just like the self-control she exhibits in her hetero-aggressiveness – relying exclusively on the emblems of power structures that exploit animals and subjugate the *feminine* under the guise of benevolence – additionally provoke the reader's sympathy, support and respect for Duszejko, on which the author Olga Tokarczuk intelligently counts.

By thematizing, above all, patriarchy, the current ecological crisis, and the exploitation of animals in the novel, Tokarczuk, in a certain way, repeatedly points to and privileges the marginalities of various kinds. For instance, astrology, a discipline that, in the modern age, just like the thriller genre itself, thanks to its ubiquitous exploitation, is also experiencing an equal degradation (often gendered). Accordingly, as an educated psychologist who has repeatedly emphasized in public her dedication to Jung and the Jungian tradition of thought (see for instance Jarzyńska 2023) – a tradition that to a significant extent determined the trajectory of contemporary astrology and (Astro)psychology – Tokarczuk in this novel, referring to the collective unconscious and archetypal representations (of *masculine* and *feminine*), makes an invigorating departure from Freud's influence and the hermeneutics of doubt, embodied in the masculinist idea of the Oedipus complex and (over)emphasized individualism.

In addition, Olga Tokarczuk insists on intertextuality and auto- and meta-referentiality, focusing on selected segments of the oeuvre of the English poet, painter, and mystic William Blake. It is the oeuvre, and those parts of it which, both in the Western canon and in the Western cultural tradition in general, also have an ambivalent status and reception (see, for instance, Gross 2019). Tokarczuk does not point out the most generally accepted *Poems of Innocence* and *Poems of Experience*, whose poetic and epistemological preference for binary oppositions (paradigmatic examples are the poems "The Lamb" and "The Tyger") are more easily reconciled with the phallogocentric vision of the world. Rather, the author privileges *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* starting with the title itself, already at this point introducing a free implicit intervention by omitting the word "cart" – and opens each chapter of the novel with quotations from *The Proverbs of Hell*, from the poems "Auguries of Innocence" and "Mental Traveller", as well as Blake's non-fictional notes and correspondence (see: Simić 2021).

Many dimensions of this complex intertextual and metatextual procedure, characteristic of the novel *Drive Your Plow...*, are either absent from (the screenplay of) the film or significantly modified and narrowed. The comparative analysis of the novel and the film has already been the subject of several academ-

ic articles. For instance, Robert Birkholc recently offered a possible comparative reading of the novel *Drive Your Plow...* and the movie *Spoor* through the prism of Foucauldian and post-Foucauldian discourse and critical discourse analysis. Starting from this case study, he called for a review of the potential of discourse analysis, specifically in adaptation studies. Birkholc particularly touches on the concept of “infecting discourses”: a strategy of undermining social discourses and their coherence, which rests on opposing and combining the same discourses with other, often completely contradictory or different ones. He quite rightly points out that Olga Tokarczuk, as a very self-aware author, built her poetics as a whole, and especially in the novel *Drive Your Plow...*, precisely on these principles of “infecting discourses” – primarily biblical, that is Catholic-dogmatic, and administrative-legal, but also, it could be added, phallogocentric (family-oriented) discourses, with the focus on the so-called Law of the Father – to shape an anarchic fictional order that corresponds with the burning contemporary ethical and epistemological dilemmas in the domain of ecofeminism and posthumanism, i.e. with the age of the Anthropocene and the growing ecological crisis (Birkholc 2022; see also Nowak-McNiece 2021).

Elżbieta Ostrowska, on the other hand, offered an exhaustive and inspiring interpretation of *Spoor*, approaching “the film as an attempt to break with anthropocentric and patriarchal systems whose centuries-long hegemony resulted in the oppression of humans and non-humans who are weak and marginalized” and proposing “the concept of *anima(l) moralia*, which compounds the Jungian concept of anima – referring to the feminine part of the unconscious – and animal to suggest figuratively a deep connection between struggles for feminine and animal subjectivity that are indispensable for a new moral system to emerge” (Ostrowska 2024: 203). She concludes that “*Spoor* attempts to establish a non-anthropocentric perspective; however, it remains within the anthropocentric limits of cinematic representation” (ibid.: 205), i.e., that “despite its attempt to alter the human-animal relationship, *Spoor* conveys anthropocentric perspectives and as such it does not participate in the ‘non-human turn’” (ibid.: 202). The author proposes that it would be more plausible to situate *Spoor* within the *emotional or affective turn* in contemporary theory, claiming that the negative sentiments of the *woman director* toward the “various forms of patriarchal oppression” inherent to contemporary Polish society, including the Church – sentiments visible both on the textual and extra-textual level – predominantly define the movie and direct its reception, and that “Holland’s anger expressed in the film can be seen as a form of political activism” (ibid.: 207).

Anger is the *spiritus movens* of the main protagonist, Janina Duszejko, and her activism, as well. Birkholc (2022) correctly refers to the impor-

tance of Janina Duszejko as an atypical *protagonist* in the world of thrillers or crime genres (both in literature and film) – a lonely old woman, a pensioner who has the aura of a “crazy grandma” in her surroundings, who obsessively quotes William Blake (especially in the novel and, and to a significantly lesser extent in the film), and who lightly offers astrological analyses of people, phenomena, and cosmic issues (this aspect is highlighted both in the novel and the film); an atypical (unreliable) *narrator* – which is significantly more pronounced in the novel than in the screenplay; and finally, an unstable *focalizer* – which again induced a great challenge for Holland and Tokarczuk as the co-screenwriters. At the same time, it was a particularly demanding task for both Tokarczuk, who adapted her own writing for the first time, and the director Holland, who had to translate the entire range of intertextual and metatextual impulses of Tokarczuk’s book into film language, subtly conjuring it up with the directing method, the camera’s eye or the visual representation of the story.<sup>1</sup> As Ostrowska shows – and as many critics noticed – this resulted in a somewhat simplistic solution:

*Spoor* offers a cinematic spectacle that presents a feminist and ecological fantastical tale sending a bold ideological message. The film uses the affective power of the cinematic image to criticize the national rhetoric used by the Polish right-wing government while revealing its oppressive nature based on the patriarchal order. It also criticizes the Roman Catholic Church in Poland that, as is shown in the film, legitimizes the economic and political power held by the overtly negative characters of the local businessman, policeman, and civil servant. Holland presents these embodied patriarchal structures of power in a grotesquely amplified, or – as many critics have claimed – simplistic fashion (Ostrowska 2024: 206).

Nevertheless, what neither the critics nor Ostrowska and Birkholc dwelt on is hinted at by the very difference in the titles of the books and the film. The Blakean tendency of the novel *Drive Your Plow...*, including the aforemen-

1 When it comes to the process of co-writing, Holland commented: “I have always liked Olga’s writing very much, but most of her novels don’t have a classical storytelling structure – they are more a mix of essays, reflections, meditations and a lot of small stories that are intertwined. So this one seemed to be quite a simple piece to adapt because it’s a psychological thriller with detective story elements, suspense as well as certain psychological elements, and humour and grotesque. Olga wrote the first draft and it was the first time she had adapted her own writing and she was pretty sure that it would be quite simple. She did it in two months or even faster and when we read it, we found it really awful! It didn’t work at all! It was stripped of all the bits of mystery and ambiguity and it was a very flat journalistic statement. So we then sat together, made a new structure and wrote some scenes, trying to find a common style. We were sure then that it would be the final script in three months’ time but, two years and eighteen drafts later, we were still battling to find the right one” (Karajica 2019: *sine pagina*).

tioned intervention (omission of the word “cart”), which represents a kind of interpretive key for understanding the intertextual play in Tokarczuk’s novel, is absent from the title of the film, which did not attract too much attention from the media or critics.

\*

In a nutshell, a kind of *Blakeisation* is omnipresent in Tokarczuk’s novel (see McQuail 2021). As indicated by Danijela Petković and Dušica Ljubinković, for instance, “*Drive Your Plow...* plays with the tensions and contradictions between the local and the global (including, but not limited to, the universal ethics of animal rights), allowing them, Blake-like, to mutually expose their flaws and contradictions” (Petković, Ljubinković 2022). As those two authors emphasize, Tokarczuk’s intertextual play with Blake’s legacy is very complex. Inspired by Blake is not only the capitalization of certain words, and not only the character of Dizzy, who translates Blake together with Duszejko, but also the characterization of the eccentric Janina Duszejko in principle, her understanding of everyday life, as well as the ontological nebulousness and potential transcendence of her insights and experiences. According to Blake, roughly put, Urizen would be the authoritative figure, the master of an oppressive order and strict laws, and Orc a rebel who resists him, and Los a kind of old sage with prophetic qualities, whose position is especially important when it comes to Blake’s understanding of poetic imagination. Both Orc-like and Los-like motivation of the heroine’s anarchic, illegal actions, which in the novel she even explicitly explains as anti-Urizen-like, will be reminiscent to those familiar with Blake of his famous Visions, intimate mystical encounters with Angels, saintly figures, spirits of the dead, and communicating with them. In them, Blake himself located the source of his Christ-like (Duszejko would add: Mercurial) poetic imagination and inspiration, claiming that in writing he figures only as a medium, a transmitter of messages from the realm of the beyond. This model, for its part, is tacitly transmitted by Tokarczuk and inscribed into the motivation of the heroine’s mission, which could be called the joint revenge of the does and other endangered creatures. It is a messianic mission that Duszejko undertakes to resist the patriarchy’s hunting of innocent and “weak” creatures, which also implies a questioning of clericalism in the context of Christianity, a symbolic-religious order on which Blake, through Swedenborg, himself guided by anti-clerical motives, established his poetics. Relying on the messages (from) the Universe, which are at the same time messages both from handwritten Ephemeris (books with tables that provide the trajectory of naturally occur-

ring astronomical objects and phenomena, used in astrology) from the computer screen, Duszejko carefully, but still aware of their arbitrariness, moves along the coordinates given by astrology, *interpreting* existence, including her own actions, according to those coordinates.

By the repeated relativization of the authenticity of the heroine's impulses towards spirituality, and the rich ironising of her perspective, i.e. thanks to the depth and determination with which the privileged intertextual reference is parodically woven into the form of the novel, Olga Tokarczuk offers a truly convincing, and therefore truly subversive interpretation of William Blake's idiosyncratic – anti-rationalist and anti-dogmatic – system of thought. What remains of William Blake after the hypertrophy of doubt about the possibility of a coherent textual centring of extra-textual truths and experiences – especially insofar as it concerns synthetic visions and totalizing "epiphanies" which, unlike modern ones, are not dominantly secular and historically motivated, nor directed at an individual consciousness, the ones embodied by infinitives in the famous lines: "To see a World in a Grain of Sand / And a Heaven in a Wild Flower / Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand / And Eternity in an hour" ("Auguries of Innocence")?

Or, how to both revise and revitalize the poet of "fearful symmetry" textually in a literary-historical moment in which the imperative of doubting the very idea of totality and authenticity is exhausted enough to demand brave (self)questioning and opening towards the utopian principle of hope, with the awareness that in that process it is necessary to go back and find the pledge of literary *innocence* there, but only to truly overcome it and obtain precious, bitter though it may be, literary *experience*? The novel *Drive Your Plow...* itself may well be the optimal answer to both these questions (see Simić 2021).

\*

One of the key questions that the film *Spoor* asks is "Why do you always punish the weak and the good ones?" (*Pokot* 2017). The film, therefore, preserves the messianic role of the protagonist Duszejko, who stops trusting the authorities after a series of unsuccessful attempts to point out poaching and other forms of animal abuse and get the support of competent institutions in that endeavour. Janina Duszejko concludes that the system is not only oppressive but also extremely unresponsive and insensitive, that "justice must be taken into one's own hands" (*ibid.*), and decides to carry it out herself, but by persistently leading people around her on the wrong track, insinuating that a series of murders of influential men in the positions

of power is conducted by the game, i.e. that animals themselves take revenge on people. Nevertheless, due to what we could call the *de-Blakeisation* of the novel's text in its transposition into the text of the film script – the loss of the entire range of intertextuality, primarily that which concerns William Blake – the position and character of Janina Duszejko in the film lose the *literary* and *meta-textual* connotations the book abounds in. In other words, although he is mentioned in the film, Blake remains in the shadow of other aspects of it. To that extent, the agency and activism of Janina Duszejko as a *film* heroine in a certain way seem more *real*, and therefore, can be perceived as more dangerous or morally unacceptable than the agency and activism of Janina Duszejko as a *literary* heroine. This could, among other things, explain why the film was quickly declared “controversial” or too radical by both more conservative critics and progressive environmentalists.

Therefore, I hypothesize that precisely in this *de-Blakeisation*, among other things – interestingly, already present in the very title – one can look for some of the explanations of paradox or aporia in the reception of the film *Spoor*, in the light of and based on its juxtaposition and comparative analysis with the novel *Drive Your Plow...*<sup>2</sup> In other words, we could ask and further discuss: why, in the end, was there resistance in the face of the double fictional possibility of a joint revenge of the does and other endangered creatures, their femininity, and archetypality? In what way and to what extent did the transposition of the literary into the text of the film script condition and (re)shape the semantic, genre, and stylistic comprehensiveness, layering, and openness of each one individually? Did the (trans)mediality of the film redefine the complex intertextuality of the novel? How did the simultaneous “global” promotion of Olga Tokarczuk's literary oeuvre and the film she co-wrote, along with different models of cultural translation, influence the forms of their (de)coding, but also the media representation and reception of (eco)feminism in the contemporary media and cultural context in general? Some of the answers – of course, the scope of this paper necessitates omitting many of them – could be searched for in the future based on the presence/absence of William Blake from the text of the novel and/or screenplay.

2 As Birkholz rightly observes, “[a]nother significant difference between film and literary discourse is that in movies, the entire audiovisual narration is almost never subordinate to the character-narrator. Controversial ideas promoted by the first-person narrator of *Plow* are expressed in its adaptation on an extradiegetic level (in editing, in characteristic music accompanying the appearance of villain characters, etc.). This change of attribution, however, entails serious consequences – the spectator may get the impression that the filmmakers present their own (and not Duszejko's), very radical point of view. Although it can be assumed that the narration of *Spoor* is focalized by the main character, a viewer is not sure to what extent the vision of the world is filtered through her perception” (Birkholz 2022: *sine pagina*).

Nevertheless, in the first-person narration of Janina Duszejko, which is transferred from the book to the film, numerous allusions are preserved and unchanged, which allows both works of art to be seen (comparatively), among other things, in a Jungian perspective. After all, "the weak and the good ones" are the bearers of *femininity*, the one that is found in both men and women, but also in the world that surrounds us. By choosing to privilege the doe over all animals, Olga Tokarczuk, like Agnieszka Holland after her, additionally highlighted the femininity of the natural world, making her authorial involvement ecofeminist and inviting the recipients to think about modernity precisely from ecofeminist perspectives. Assigning Janina Duszejko the role of the perpetrator of crimes against humans in the name of animals, however, the authors left room for an ambivalent reception, implicitly raising the question of whether radical (eco-)feminism has "a dark side" to it.

The heroine's obsession with astrology, also constitutive of the world of the novel, is emphasized at the very beginning, throughout, and at the very end of the film; the protagonist's final monologue may represent one of the most effective interventions made by Agnieszka Holland, since with that monologue the focus returns to the past, to the revolutionary-utopian horizon of the generation of the director herself, in order to point out the possibilities of today's struggling for a better, more just world.

I grew up in a time when people wanted to change the world with their revolutionary vision. Now we only see the status quo and think it will last forever. But things will change again. They always have. When Uranus enters Aries, or... Never mind. Something new will happen that we cannot predict. A new cycle will begin... And reality will be reborn (*Pokot* 2017).

In both cases, the ending is open – in Olga Tokarczuk's book, the reader is expected to gradually "put together the puzzle" and gain insight into the guilt of Janina Duszejko, whereby the author does not leave a direct judgment about that guilt.

The ending to the novel, thus, is not so clean as Janina would like us to believe. Bigfoot, The Commandant, Innerd, the President, and the Priest have all died at her hand. There is a lot for us to parse out in Janina's revenge plot, and as the chapel burns and she hides and runs from the authorities, eventually to take refuge with Boros (a scientist, her lover, remark by Z.S.), we question her judgment (Royle 2020: *sine pagina*; emphasis added by Z.S.).

On the other hand, "when it is revealed at the end of the film that Duszejko murdered all the men, she and her friends are presented in an idyllic

'family dinner scene' whose ontological status remains unclear; it may be her dream, or a post-mortem vision of a secular progressive paradise" (Ostrowska 2024: 204). This is one of the most explicit and intriguing deviations from the literary text. It is precisely in this "ontological unclearness", however, merged with the deliberate ambivalence of the director's procedure, that one could look for reasons for resistance to the film and the ideas it is believed to promote. If the viewer opts for the happy ending, in a certain way, he or she takes the side of the victims – "the weak and the good" – but also the side of the murderer, nullifying the ethical transgressions of Janina Duszejko. In other words, as Missouri Williams notices and asks, "The issue of animal suffering is made urgent, tangible; in being led to literally see what Duszejko sees, are we more likely to share her ethical viewpoint?" (Williams 2021).

Aware of this aporia, both Olga Tokarczuk, as a novelist and a co-screenwriter, and Agnieszka Holland, as a co-screenwriter and director, made an effort, each following their own poetic views and artistic ambitions, to pose questions rather than to offer answers. Whether we see their attempt(s) as a good example of "infecting discourses" (Birkholc 2022), in the light of "anima(l) moralia" (Ostrowska 2024), or as a sort of "blasphemy", we are, either by reading the novel or watching the film, eventually provoked to think more deeply and devotedly about the world we live in, about the potentials and limitations of human agency in the age of the Anthropocene, about the problems of guilt, responsibility, and punishment, but also the protean and persistent nature of patriarchy and the possibilities of its undermining. If it can be said that in the film *Spoor*, "Holland presents these embodied patriarchal structures of power in a grotesquely amplified, or – as many critics have claimed – simplistic fashion" (Ostrowska 2024: 206), the book by Olga Tokarczuk, among other things thanks to a more sophisticated approach to intertextuality and metatextuality, including the specific *Blakeisation*, does not allow readers to draw similar conclusions about simplistic solutions. On the contrary, the novel *Drive Your Plow over the Bones of the Dead*, as well as the rest of Tokarczuk's literary oeuvre, with its complexity and comprehensiveness, but also its relevance in the contemporary *global* context, represents and will continue to represent a treasure trove of hermeneutic possibilities for various readers both in this part of Europe and beyond.

## Bibliography

- Bendik, Edvin. „Ekscentrični svet Olge Tokarčuk, recept u osam tačaka“. Trans. Milica Markić. *Polja*. 2021. God. LXVI. Br. 531. 158–159. <<https://polja.rs/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Polja-531-latinica-158-159.pdf>>
- Birkholc, Robert. “Playing with discourses in literature and film. Comparative analysis of *Drive your Plow over the Bones of the Dead* by Olga Tokarczuk and its adaptation *Spoor* by Agnieszka Holland”. *Literature/Film Quarterly* 50, 4. 2022. [*sine pagina*]. <[https://lfq.salisbury.edu/\\_issues/50\\_4/playing\\_with\\_discourses\\_in\\_literature\\_and\\_film\\_comparative\\_analysis\\_of\\_drive\\_your\\_plow\\_over.html](https://lfq.salisbury.edu/_issues/50_4/playing_with_discourses_in_literature_and_film_comparative_analysis_of_drive_your_plow_over.html)>
- Grodź, Iwona. “Filmmaker on democracy: The case of Agnieszka Holland’s work”. *Studia Medioznawcze* 24/4 (2023): 11–20. <[doi:10.33077/uw.24511617.sm.2023.4.780](https://doi.org/10.33077/uw.24511617.sm.2023.4.780)>
- Gross, Kenneth. “Blake and Bloom, a Memorial Note”. *Blake / An Illustrated Quarterly* 53/3 (2019): [*sine pagina*]. <<https://blog.blakearchive.org/2019/11/26/blake-and-bloom-a-memorial-note/>>
- Huss, Joanna Trzeciak. “From E.E. to Erna Eltzner: Tokarczuk, Jung, and the Ethics of Care”. *The Polish Review* 66/3 (2021): 3–20. <<https://doi.org/10.5406/polishreview.66.3.0003>>
- Jarzyńska, Karina. “Tender Transgressions: Olga Tokarczuk’s Exercises in Postsecular Imagination”. *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 65/3 (2023): 407–420. <<https://doi.org/10.1080/00111619.2023.2196390>>
- Kantner, Katarina. „Šta sve možeš s rečima“. Trans. Milica Markić. *Polja*. 2021. God. LXVI. Br. 531. 111–137. <<https://polja.rs/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Polja-531-latinica-111-137.pdf>>
- Karajica, Tara. *Interview with Agnieszka Holland*. Eurimages. August 2019. <<https://rm.coe.int/interview-with-agnieszka-holland/1680990914>>
- Kołodziejczyk, Dorota. “The Landscape of Hate – Olga Tokarczuk in Populist Discourse in Poland”. *European Review* 30/4 (2022): 545–555. <<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798722000126>>
- Markić, Milica. “Istina slova”. *Polja*. 2021. God. LXVI. Br. 531. 5. <<https://polja.rs/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Polja-531-latinica-5.pdf>>
- McQuail, Josephine A. *Blake, Misunderstood? Review of Olga Tokarczuk's 'Drive Your Plow over the Bones of the Dead'*. *The Human Divine*. 1. 3. 2021. <<https://thehumandivine.org/2021/03/01/blake-misunderstood-review-of-olga-tokarczucs-drive-your-plow-over-the-bones-of-the-dead/>>
- Michna, Natalia. “More-than-human world? A posthumanist critique of anthropocentrism in the art of Olga Tokarczuk and Patricia Piccinini”. *Technoetic Arts* 18/2 (2020): 145–158. <[https://doi.org/10.1386/tear\\_00034\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/tear_00034_1)>
- Mortensen, Ellen. “The Fury’s Revenge: An Ecofeminist Reading of Olga Tokarczuk’s *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead*”. *Scando-Slavica* 67/2 (2021): 227–246. <<https://doi.org/10.1080/00806765.2021.1994002>>

- Nowak-McNeice, Katarzyna. "Madness, Femininity, Vegetarianism: Post-anthropocentric Representations in Olga Tokarczuk's *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead* and Agnieszka Holland's *Spoor*". *Posthumanist Perspectives on Literary and Cultural Animals*. Ed. Krishanu Maiti. Springer International Publishing, 2021. 167–177. <[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-76159-2\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-76159-2_14)>
- Ostrowska, Elżbieta. "Anima(l) Moralia, or Righteous Anger: Agnieszka Holland's *Spoor*". *Film-Philosophy* 28/2 (2024): 202–225. <<https://www.eupublishing.com/doi/10.3366/film.2024.0266>>
- Paleczek, Ursula. "Olga Tokarczuk's *House of Day, House of Night*: Gendered Language in Feminist Translation". *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 52/1–2 (2010): 47–57. <<https://doi.org/10.1080/00085006.2010.11092636>>
- Pascarelli, Pietro. "From Psychoanalysis to Literature: Olga Tokarczuk". *European Journal of Psychoanalysis* 7/1 (2020): [sine pagina]. <<https://www.journal-psychoanalysis.eu/articles/from-psychoanalysis-to-literature-olga-tokarczuk/>>
- Petković, Danijela and Dušica Ljubinković. "Localism, Locavorism, and Animal Rights in Olga Tokarczuk's Novel *Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead*". *Journal of Ecohumanism* 1/2 (2022): 81–94. <<https://doi.org/10.33182/joe.v1i2.2448>>
- Royle, Colton. *The End of "Drive Your Plow Over the Bones of the Dead"*. Medium. 26. 12. 2020. <<https://ctr0042.medium.com/the-end-of-drive-your-plow-over-the-bones-of-the-dead-692363a1cff3>>
- Simić, Zorana. „Oda tumačenju: efemeride romana *Vuci svoje ralo po kostima mrtvih*“. *Polja*. 2021. God. LXVI. Br. 531. 170–176. <<https://polja.rs/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Polja-531-latinica-170-176.pdf>>
- Токарчук, Олга. *Вуци своје рало по костима мртвих*. Прев. Милица Маркић. Нови Сад: Културни центар Новог Сада. 2014.
- Williams, Missouri. *How Do You Solve A Problem Like Duszejko?: On Olga Tokarczuk's 'Drive Your Plow Over The Bones Of The Dead' And Agnieszka Holland's 'Spoor'*. Another Gaze. 1. 2. 2021. <<https://www.anothergaze.com/solve-problem-like-duszejko-olga-tokarczucs-drive-plow-bones-dead-agnieszka-hollands-spoor/>>
- Wiśniewska, Lidia and Jakub Lipski (eds.). *Olga Tokarczuk: Comparative Perspectives*. Routledge. 2023.

## Зорана Симић

### СРНЕ У „ЕКОТЕРОРИСТИЧКОЈ“ ОДМАЗДИ

Нека запажања о роману *Вуци своје рало по костима мртвих* Олге Токарчук и филму *Трофејна дивљач* Агњешке Холанд

#### Резиме

У овом раду најпре се, у кратким цртама, указује на положај Олге Токарчук у „локалној“ и „глобалној“ (књижевној) јавности, те на досадашње тенденције и усмерења у рецепцији њеног литерарног опуса. Пажња се потом усредсређује на њен роман *Вуци своје рало по костима мртвих*, изворно објављен 2009. године у Пољској, а у Србији, у преводу Милице Маркић, публикован пет година касније – 2014. године. Овај роман сагледава се и у компаративној визури, упоредо с филмском адаптацијом *Pokot (Трофејна дивљач)* из 2017. године, коју је са својом ћерком Касјом Адамик режирала Агњешка Холанд. У раду се не претендује на детаљне лингвистичке анализе при јукстапозицији текста романа с текстом филмског сценарија (иза ког коауторски стоје сама Олга Токарчук и редитељка Агњешка Холанд), већ се износе основни увиди који се тичу ова два остварења и могућности њиховог компаративног тумачења, те реферише на део релевантне литературе у том погледу. С једне стране, објашњава се зашто је и како, између осталог, дошло до амбивалентне рецепције филма и до својеврсних оптужби за „екотероризам“ у пољским медијима, до контроверзи које прате филм *Трофејна дивљач* и кад је реч о конзервативнијим критичарима и међу самим енвиронменталистима, а на које су се досад освртали поједини тумачи књиге и/или филма. С друге стране, пружа се и допринос постојећим (компаративним) интерпретацијама: износи се хипотеза о својеврсној, сложеној и деликатној *блејкизацији* романа односно *геблејкизацији* (сценарија) филма, о којима се може размишљати већ на основу наслова. Сугерише се да је филм наишао на негодовања критике и медија, или барем на одмерене судове, оптужбе за поједностављења и плошна решења, између осталог и стога што у њему није очуван изразито висок и значајан степен интер- и метатекстуалности својствен књизи. У исти мах, позива се на даља разматрања књиге и/или филма у том смеру, односно кроз призму (*ге*)*блејкизације*. Најзад, износи се претпоставка да књижевни предложак Олге Токарчук нуди више херменеутичких потенцијала од филмске адаптације Агњешке Холанд.

ФИЛМ И КЊИЖЕВНОСТ 2.0  
*Зборник радова*

*Издавач*

Институт за књижевност и уметност  
Београд, Краља Милана 2  
[www.ikun.org.rs](http://www.ikun.org.rs)

*За издавача*

др Светлана Шеатовић

*Лектура, коректура, рејсџар имена*

др Марија Грујић

др Кристијан Олах

*Ликовно-графичка опрема*

Новак Ђукић

*Дизајн корица*

Ђорђе Букинац

*Тираж*

150

*Штампа*

Вірограф комп доо, Београд

ISBN 978-86-7095-368-0

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији  
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

791.3(082)  
82.09(082)

ФИЛМ и књижевност 2.0 : зборник радова / уредници Марија Грујић, Кристијан Олах.  
- Београд : Институт за књижевност и уметност, 2025 (Београд : Virograf comp). - 962 стр.  
: илустр. ; 23 см. - (Серија Ц : теоријска истраживања / Институт за књижевност и уметност  
; књ. 21)

Радови на више језика. - Тираж 150. - Стр. 15-19: Увод / Уредници. - Напомене и библиографске  
референце уз радове. - Библиографија уз сваки рад. - Резимеи на енгл. или  
срп. или франц. језику уз сваки рад. - Регистар.

ISBN 978-86-7095-368-0

а) Филм - Зборници б) Књижевност - Зборници

COBISS.SR-ID 185446921