CFP ANGLISTENTAG 2016 IN HAMBURG

DEADLINE: 15. NOVEMBER 2015

SEKTION:

FORCE FIELDS OF SERIAL NARRATION

Seriality, both as a mode of narration and a form of logic that underlies habits as well as consciously pursued cultural practises, is receiving considerable scholarly attention (e.g. Allen 1995; Hayward 1997; Blättler 2003 and 2010; Blanchet 2011; Kelleter 2012; Mayer 2014; Hißnauer/Scherer/Stockinger 2014). Developed as a mode of narration in the 1830s and popularised by literature during the second half of the 19th century, seriality was re-defined in the 1890s as episodic narrative, and installed as a management philosophy and industrial practice (Taylor), before it was promoted as an aesthetic programme by the avant-garde, chastised in the late 1950s as a tool for mental incapacitation (Adorno; Katz), ennobled in the 1960s by pop art, and identified as an all-pervasive structure of postmodernity that deconstructs the dichotomy of innovation vs. reiteration in the 1980s (Eco). Its emergence from the paradoxical relation between difference and repetition has been the object of cultural theories since the late 1960s (Deleuze 1968; Rimmon-Kenan 1980; Agamben 1995). Most recently, scholars have examined its importance for avant-garde poetics (Haselstein 2010), its ambiguous relations with memory, suffering and pleasure (Engell 2011; Sielke 2012) as well as its ritualistic and self-reflexive character in popular culture (Kelleter 2012).

This panel proposes to discuss how serial narration (in literature and other media) intersects with (one or more of) five chosen force fields of cultural practice: work, crime, therapy, politics and comedy. Point of departure is a double thesis, namely that these different cultural domains may well produce different *kinds* of serial narration and that it is worth exploring why and how specific recalibrations of repetition and variation, which seriality as a concept undergoes in these contexts, produce drastically varying effects. At the same time, the focus on serial narration can also serve as a means of reflecting on the similarities and analogies between these force fields of cultural practice.