

**Citation for published version:**

Laura Mee, 'The Hollywood Remake Massacre: Adaptation, Reception and Value', in Colleen Kennedy-Karpat, and Eric Sandberg, eds., *Adaptation, Awards Culture, and the Value of Prestige* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

**DOI:**

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52854-0>

**Document Version:**

This is the Accepted Manuscript version. Reproduced with permission of Palgrave Macmillan.

The version in the University of Hertfordshire Research Archive may differ from the final published version.

**Copyright and Reuse:**

© 2017 The Editors and Authors.

Content in the UH Research Archive is made available for personal research, educational, and non-commercial purposes only. Unless otherwise stated, all content is protected by copyright, and in the absence of an open license, permissions for further re-use should be sought from the publisher, the author, or other copyright holder.

**Enquiries**

If you believe this document infringes copyright, please contact Research & Scholarly Communications at [rsc@herts.ac.uk](mailto:rsc@herts.ac.uk)

## **The Hollywood Remake Massacre: Adaptation, Reception, and Value**

**Laura Mee**

Of the various modes of adaptation linked to cinematic recycling, film remakes are generally held in the lowest esteem, seen as shameless rip-offs or pointless copies of cherished classics. Horror remakes are especially susceptible to critical contempt. Belonging to an already derided genre, they are maligned as perhaps the ‘lowest of the low’. Academic studies have largely aligned themselves with this denigration, arguing that remakes can negate the memory of the originals, or that they lack the ‘effectiveness’ of their predecessors (e.g., Frost 2009, Lizardi 2010, Francis 2012, Roche 2014), or else these critics see remakes as symptomatic of a perceived loss of creativity, originality and talent within the genre (e.g., Hantke 2010, Conrich 2010). But these critiques are not limited to scholarly debates, since notions of hierarchy and fidelity—in which originals are favoured over remakes, just as early adaptation studies gave precedence to source novels—are also prevalent in audience responses. Audiences and fans frequently frame their reactions to new versions, or even to rumours of mooted productions, within discussions of taste, respect for the original texts, and, especially, of value and quality.

This chapter considers remakes within this context, drawing on critical and audience responses to contemporary horror remakes to illustrate how the concept of fidelity remains central to reception. While adaptation scholarship continues to distance itself from fidelity as an evaluative strategy, it is clear that an adaptation’s faithfulness to its source remains a key concern for audiences. Adaptation studies may see the fidelity debate as tired and unproductive, but attempts to move away from it, for example by looking at industry, audiences, or critics, only draw attention back to the unavoidable nature of these questions and signal their importance to reception contexts (Murray 2012, 9). Work on audiences and on fandom in particular has begun to address responses to adaptations, with a number of recent collections and individual studies considering issues of fidelity, hierarchy and the nuanced intertextual relationships that can influence their reception. However, more specifically addressing issues of fidelity in remaking is essential to understanding how audiences make sense of both the trend and the particular films it has produced.<sup>1</sup>

Fidelity is intrinsic to discussions of adaptations' cultural value, as these films are frequently judged on their ability to faithfully reproduce their source material, or otherwise adapt it in a way deemed original, creative, or purposeful. When approaching the much-maligned remake, especially those belonging to an already derided genre like the horror film, fidelity is especially central to the discussion. Reception contexts, including fandom and criticism, offer alternative frameworks for understanding the value of texts which are often excluded from the critical appraisal and awards culture open to more prestigious material—primarily, classic literary adaptations and dramatic works. As a counterpoint to industry acclaim, reception naturally plays a part in locating and developing prestige; in the case of the horror remake, audiences, fans and critics also have considerable influence in deciding what is culturally *devalued*.

### **The lowest of the low: Remaking, genre, and cultural value**

As both a category of text and as an industrial phenomenon, remakes (and the industry trend for remaking) are especially vulnerable to criticism rooted in preconceived notions of cultural value. While scholarly work on remaking has begun to move beyond disparaging comparisons of originals and remakes, the broader field of adaptation studies generally continues to ignore or marginalise the remake, aligning academic approaches with negative perceptions in popular criticism.<sup>2</sup> Remaking is often only mentioned perfunctorily as one of the multitude of intertextual possibilities for repetition and recycling. For every progressive approach that acknowledges (albeit only in passing) the film remake as a mode of adaptation (e.g. Hutcheon 2006, 170), other studies reject remaking as adaptation 'proper', citing differences in motivations for or approaches to production. Perhaps this omission is not always deliberate, but the exclusion of the remake is nonetheless clear:

Adaptation theory by now has available a well-stocked archive of tropes and concepts to account for the mutation of forms *across media*: adaptation as reading, rewriting, critique, translation, transmutation, metamorphosis, recreation, transvocalization, resuscitation, transfiguration, actualization, transmodalization, signifying, performance, dialogization, cannibalization, reinvisioning, incarnation or reaccentuation. (Stam 2005, 25, emphasis added).

Stam's distinction that the process of adapting must necessarily take place *across media* is telling. As a specifically film-to-film adaptive process, rather than, for example, a novel-to-film, comic-to-film or game-to-film one, remaking has remained problematic for many

adaptation scholars, preventing it from being understood and appreciated as adaptation, and thus perpetuating its lower status. However, the frequent adaptation of visual sources, like television programmes, comic books, and computer games blurs the traditional definition of adaptation as the movement from written to visual forms, and the remake's exclusion seems at odds with an increasingly intertextual approach to adaptation, particularly when many of those literary sources discussed have themselves already been adapted multiple times (e.g. *Dracula* or *Frankenstein*), drawing inspiration from earlier cinematic incarnations and making newer versions remakes by default (Verevis 2006, 82).

The intertextual nature of contemporary cinema blurs the boundaries between original and copy, and the variety of ways in which films adapt other films—through sequels and prequels, rip-offs and spin-offs, parodies, franchises, reboots and remakes—supports Stam's view of adaptation as a ceaseless, intertextual process (2005, 31). This perpetual cultural borrowing ensures that, regardless of any given film's potential merits, if it is based on or explicitly inspired by another film, it is not usually granted access to the prestige available to an original text. As a result, remakes are seen as derivative, imitative and belonging to an adaptive type with a "low cultural status":

The problem of sequels and remakes, like the even broader problem of parody & pastiche, is quite similar to the problem of adaptation [. . . in that] all these forms can be subsumed under the more general theory of artistic imitation, in the restricted sense of works of art that imitate other works of art [. . .] all the 'imitative' types of film are in danger of being assigned a low cultural status, or even of eliciting critical opprobrium, because they are copies of 'culturally treasured' originals. (Naremore 2000, 13).

Naremore's attempt to distinguish film-to-film forms (remakes, sequels, pastiches and parodies) from adaptation 'proper', only serves to further connect these modes through association; all can be included under the banner of "artistic imitation", all are intertextual, all are 'imitative'. And yet, his distinction further emphasizes critical intolerance for the remake (or the parody, or the sequel). The remake is as prone to critical scorn as any adaptation—but there is an implicit suggestion that its low cultural status is somehow justifiable, or even deserved.

There is, of course, a separate debate to be had over the concept of cultural value itself—and indeed, who gets to ascribe it, and why. In the context of adaptation, these debates often imply that the replication and recycling so common to contemporary film is a

lamentable postmodern phenomenon, rather than one which existed in the form's earliest decades, e.g. in the comic book serial, silent Shakespeare adaptations, or remaking as industrial necessity when repeated screenings wore out original film reels. Textual recycling has, in some form or other, always been an inescapable feature of the cinema. Furthermore, there are obvious issues around the policing of taste, the distinction between 'high' and 'low' culture, and the social implications of these hierarchies. Remakes and other adaptive or serial forms are subsumed under a broad, and broadly judged, category of culturally worthless 'rip-offs'. This not only risks judging viewers who appreciate both the recycled and the popular, but also fails to grasp the commercial nature of cinema, which is often ignored in favour of the presumed originality and worthiness tied to auteurism, artistry and culture—as if the two sides were mutually exclusive. As Amanda Klein and R. Barton Palmer argue, “critical disdain for texts appearing in multiplicities is rooted in the necromantic belief that art should somehow *not* be concerned with making money, that a [text] that unabashedly courts the audience's desires is somehow less artful, less complex, or less worthwhile than one that exists to thwart, complicate, or comment on those desires” (2015, 12).

Genre can be understood to function in a similar way to the various modes of cinematic recycling: “adaptation, much like genre itself, is a method of standardising production and repackaging the familiar within an economy of sameness and difference” (Hunter 2009). The appeal of remakes lies precisely in their patterns of repetition and variation (Hutcheon 2006, 4, Horton and McDougal 1998, 6). Similarly, generic codes and conventions become recognisable by telling “familiar stories with familiar characters in familiar situations” and remain popular by both promoting this familiarity and displaying difference as genres evolve (Grant 1986, ix). The repetitive, cyclical nature of genre lends itself to adaptation, and vice versa; the relationship between the two is reciprocal, adaptation relying on familiarity with a particular genre's key themes, tropes and iconography while simultaneously contributing to its evolution, offering new examples of differentiation or distinction. As an especially cogent generic form, and as an already typically low-budget genre, horror provides a particularly appealing option for low-cost repetition and recycling, which plays an important role in its sustained popularity and production. Horror cinema has long relied on seriality and familiarity as much as it has on change and development. From the recurrence of Dracula and Frankenstein's monster in Universal movies of the 1930s and 1940s (and their resurgence in Hammer films of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s) to the multiple

entries in the *Halloween*, *Friday the 13<sup>th</sup>* and *A Nightmare on Elm Street* franchises, the genre's evolution is supported by its recognisable monsters, repeated concepts and continued stories. Remakes are yet another example of the recycled nature of genre, not an anomaly within it.

While it is not true that contemporary horror cinema is entirely dominated by remakes, their presence has become stronger post-2000, meaning complaints about the remake's prominence within the genre are not entirely unfounded.<sup>3</sup> This uptick in production ensures that discourse around horror remakes remains largely disparaging, a clear example of the critical contempt imposed on the "imitative" adaptations that Naremore describes. Conveniently, many of horror's tropes, themes, and associated terminologies—zombification, cannibalisation, rebirth, resurrection, reincarnation, reanimation, life after death, etc.—exemplify the adaptable (or un-killable) nature of horror cinema while also lending themselves to critics' vocabulary as handy metaphors to voice their malaise over 'yet another' genre remake. In this context, texts are vampiric, old classics are cannibalised, storylines are dug up. As critic Brian D. Johnson argues, "no genre is more fond of replicating itself" than horror, and furthermore:

The horror movie remake is hard-wired in the DNA of the genre, which exploits the fear of something coming back to haunt us – whether from the grave, the asylum, or the basement. What we're most afraid of, after all, is not the unknown, which we can't begin to imagine, but a scary new prototype of the monster we've already come to know and hate. (2009)

The horror remake acts as a figurehead for the recycled nature of contemporary popular culture, the perfect "monster we've already come to know and hate" in mainstream cinema's propensity toward remaking and self-referencing. For many audiences, critics and scholars, there is no better representation of a worthless textual model produced by an industry constantly repeating itself.

In an industry geared toward financial success and/or critical accolades, establishing the cultural value of the horror film remake may seem futile, even as the form's commercial potential remains reliable. Generally low-budget films that make enough money from guaranteed audiences to sustain (re)production, they are rarely outright financial failures.

However, commercial imperatives tend to take second place to critical ones in ascribing value. Many reviews (as well as an objective viewing) of most of the films position them as distinctly average rather than especially bad, yet their form and categorisation ensure that they are automatically pushed toward denigration.

Certain kinds of adaptation are given their own forms of prestige—for example, in the Adapted Screenplay Oscars category (although it could of course be argued that this distinction takes second place to the Original Screenplay award). In comparison, remakes get their own category at the annual Golden Raspberry awards: the Worst Prequel, Remake, Rip-Off or Sequel (or a variation of this title).<sup>4</sup> *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* (Nispel 2003), *House of Wax* (Collet-Serra 2005) and *The Wicker Man* (LaBute 2006) have all been nominated in the category, and Gus Van Sant's lambasted *Psycho* remake 'won' in 1998. The high number of horror films—whether originals, remakes, sequels, or prequels—nominated for Razzies of various categories further underlines the lack of prestige associated with the genre. This is even more apparent given the rarity with which the Academy nominates horror films. Films by respected directors with mainstream success, for example *Rosemary's Baby* (Polanski 1968) and *The Exorcist* (Friedkin 1973)—both adaptations—can serve as exceptions, but the genre is largely ignored at the Oscars and other major awards.<sup>5</sup> Ultimately, just as awards recognition and rave reviews play a part in a film's financial or critical success, so too can critical derision (or a Razzie) frame a film's lack of cultural value.

### **Favouring the original: Fidelity, audiences and prestige**

Understanding a film as a remake—even if this paratextual connection is not foregrounded as part of the pre-release strategy—affects audience expectation (and, in turn, their acceptance or rejection) of a particular release. Acknowledging the relationship between 'original' and 'copy' at any point during a film's conception, production, or distribution makes comparisons inevitable, whether this acknowledgment comes through as a deliberate promotional ploy, or as the result of legal obligations relating to copyright. Using fidelity as a measure of success (or deviation from the source text as a mark of failure) privileges an original film over its remake not only in the semantic connotations of the original-remake binary (for instance, 'the original – and best!'), but also in the temporal hierarchy awarded by the original's 'coming first'. Indeed, the language used in describing

the relationship between any text and its adaptation further cement their positions in this hierarchical relationship; ‘source’, ‘original’, ‘first’ all imply a definite, fixed point of inspiration for a version which may be as derivatively faithful as a ‘copy’, or as unfaithfully unlike as a ‘reimagining’. The scope for remaking highlights a key problem with the use of fidelity as a benchmark for success: “a ‘faithful’ film is seen as uncreative, but an ‘unfaithful’ film is a shameful betrayal of the original [...] the adapter, it seems, can never win” (Stam 2005, 8).

Aggregate websites like *Rotten Tomatoes* illustrate how collective reactions—both positive and negative—to remakes such as *Halloween* (Zombie 2007) are framed within comparisons to original versions. For example: “Though undeniably preferable to yet another misbegotten instalment of the long-exhausted franchise, [Zombie’s film] certainly doesn’t compare to John Carpenter’s landmark original film” (Scheck 2007). Or, more succinctly: “Anyone can trace a Picasso” (Ali 2007).<sup>6</sup> Scheck’s review, which favours Zombie’s remake as a “fresh start” and a welcome alternative to further sequels in an arguably tired series, indicates an understanding of the connected nature of these adaptive forms, but simultaneously illustrates the pervasiveness of the hierarchical structures in which critics place them.

However, remakes face a further challenge here. When adaptation takes place from book to film, fidelity is often valorised, but this faithfulness is not seen as a virtue in remaking. A faithful remake is frequently regarded as not just uncreative or derivative, but as ultimately *pointless*. This line of critique is directed at cross-media adaptations far less frequently; presumably, the new format sufficiently justifies their existence. This notion of pointlessness is especially apparent in many reviews of genre remakes. Michael Haneke’s English-language redo of his own *Funny Games* (2007) is considered “superfluous” (James 2008); potential viewers of *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* are warned in an otherwise positive review: “you’ll have to overcome resentment towards this unnecessary remake before you can be properly terrorised” (Newman 2003); *I Spit on Your Grave* (Monroe 2010) has been colourfully described as “completely pointless, like being in the *Guinness Book of Records* for eating a wheelbarrow of your own shit” (Glasby 2011). A Google search of ‘unnecessary remake’ or ‘pointless remake’ results not only in news and reviews of a number of specific films, but many hyperbolic articles which use genre remakes to lament a perceived dearth of creativity in contemporary mainstream cinema. In many



instances, it is the practice of remaking itself, rather than any resulting films, which is deemed pointless, as evidenced by the outright rejection of versions not even in production:

[...] even if it hasn't been done, I must bring up *Rosemary's Baby* for it would surely have made my Top Ten ['Pointless Remakes' list]. Simply imagining how painful that will be is enough for me. I don't even need to see it to call it pointless.<sup>7</sup>

Reasons cited for the production of remakes are many: they can technically or thematically update a film or address its shortcomings; they can bring a new audience to an existing property, are easy to promote through name recognition and broader audience familiarity; and it is relatively cheap to produce a version of an established story. These are 'points' that respond to the accusations of 'pointlessness,' but they are not, it seems, explanation enough for audiences who complain of an industry oversaturated with retold stories.

As with any kind of adaptation criticism, focusing on fidelity automatically awards a degree of prestige to original texts. A remake of a film with 'classic' status—whether awarded by consensus or personal preference—is likely to encounter complaints. Yet hypertextuality itself can shift a (hypo)text toward canonicity, and over time, repeated adaptation contributes to or even creates outright the “prestige of the original” (Stam 2005, 31). While Stam refers to Victorian novels and their film adaptations, this theory can equally be applied to cinematic remakes of films which have come to define a particular time, genre, or cycle. A key example here is Hitchcock's *Psycho* (1960), which, following a mixed critical response at its moment of release, ultimately achieved canonicity by repeated referencing, homage and re-versioning that solidified its influence on the genre (helped along, of course, by Hitchcock's association with auteur theory). The film's classic status triggered critical outrage at Gus Van Sant's remake— a reaction that, in itself, adds to the prestige of Hitchcock's film.<sup>8</sup>

### **Considering Fan Responses to Remakes**

For many critics and audiences (fans, specifically), remaking a classic film is a step too far, a sacrilegious act which disrespects the iconic status of the original. However, in expressing their anger and/or disappointment at these remakes, fans not only articulate their frustration, but also seek to further their own subcultural capital. Research on fandom often considers the construction of fan self-identity through interaction with others, and the

accumulation of subcultural capital and authority through knowledge and ownership<sup>9</sup>. The internet has become a particularly useful forum for enabling widespread discussion among fans. Matt Hills (2005) examines online forum discussions between American fans of the Japanese cult horror *Ringu* (Nakata 1998) to consider the ways in which fans view its remake (Verbinski 2002) as challenging the anti-mainstream, cult status of the original. In this study, Hills applies bias theory, a temporal concept in which fans reiterate their preference for the original as opposed to the remake (and thus reinforce their status as a cultist) through discourses of “first viewings” versus “first viewers” (163-166). Many fans, Hills observes, are quick to confirm that they not only saw *Ringu* before *The Ring*, but also that this first viewing took place prior to the release of the remake:

These fans ‘got there first’, if you like, representing themselves as early adopters of a text that would only later go on to achieve widespread film-cultural notoriety. Such fans are hence able to display their status as having been ‘in the know’ ahead of ‘mainstream consumer culture’ which is discursively figured via ‘the average American Joe’ as well as through ‘clueless teens’ (165).

Hills suggests that fans of *Ringu* construct themselves as “pre-mainstream” as opposed to “anti-mainstream”, and most do not see the remake as a threat to the cult status of the original; in fact, the remake can be welcomed as an opportunity for the original to become more widely available to previously “uneducated” fans of *The Ring* series (Hills 2005, 163-164). With foreign language remakes, including *Ring* and *Funny Games*, there is of course an additional cross-cultural aspect to their appeal—the lack of subtitles, recognisable actors, changes to familiar locations or customs and practices, for example—which in part secures them a new, English-speaking audience and thus directly challenges accusations of ‘pointlessness’. But in these instances, the original is still granted a higher status and the original’s audience a similar worthiness. Even as fans welcome the opportunity for new support and broader appeal, they mark themselves as “pre-mainstream”, early adopters of foreign films with some level of cult status.

Another common cause for complaints over remakes is the idea of disavowal or disrespect, that a remake somehow negates or undercuts the status of an original film, and that the practice of remaking itself shows contempt for a cherished text. This is evident in reviews, editorials and blogs (as in MovieMaven’s speculation over a “painful” *Rosemary’s Baby* remake) that ask questions such as “why are the ‘80s being so mercilessly exploited? [...] movie studios clearly lack respect for these 30-year-old classics” (Cook 2012); and

begrudge “[...] the potential (likely) bastardization of something we hold dear (and, yes, of course the original is still out there; it’s the principle of the thing)” (Beggs 2012). The use of terms like “bastardization”, “cannibalisation”, “exploitation”, and even the more extreme suggestion from some fans that a particular remake “raped my childhood”, suggest that even the *potential* to ruin an existing film, or the memories associated with it, leads audiences to reject the new versions *a priori*.<sup>10</sup>

Rather than creating something new by taking a film as a point of departure, this rhetoric implies that the remaking process changes, challenges, or damages the earlier text, aesthetically, emotionally, or even economically. This, of course, is inaccurate:

Adaptation is not vampiric: it does not draw the life-blood from its source and leave it dying or dead, nor is it paler than the adapted work. It may, on the contrary, keep that prior work alive, giving it an afterlife it would never have had otherwise. (Hutcheon 2006, 175)

The potential for sustained audience appeal, a wider viewership, or a new take on an existing horror film is rarely held in high regard by genre fans, and the idea that remaking can bring new stature or even a new audience to the original is often dismissed in favour of comments that claim disavowal or disrespect:

Most kids will not even know that this is a remake because they have forgotten about ‘the horror from long time ago’.<sup>11</sup>

There are other remakes that I have found that destroy the original movie to the point that several ‘die hard’ fans of the original no longer like the movie or its remake.<sup>12</sup>

These suggestions are rarely met with anything other than emphatic agreement, yet occasionally, fans of originals will acknowledge the illogical nature of the argument in which they are engaged:

[. . .] who cares what some kid that you don't know watches...the status of the original doesn't suffer because some person doesn't know what version to watch. The great originals are still great, the bad ones are still bad [. . .] everyone is making it out like some kid in Michigan is watching *The Haunting* remake and the original is shrivelling up and wilting away, or that that same kid in his whole life will never ever ever know that there was an original movie out there [. . .] And while some horror fans are perched ever so dangerously on their high horse looking down their noses on things they are supposed experts on, maybe just maybe some of those people watching remakes are actually enjoying them. I know, I know perish that thought.<sup>13</sup>

It would appear that the issues of production strategy and profitability most anger horror fans, with debates in forums frequently turning into attacks on the state of the contemporary American film industry:

Well it's the studios who are deciding to make these movies, and we all know it's about money to them. Only if they let the director do what he wants and not interfere too much then we MAY (get) a good remake like HHE [*The Hills Have Eyes*] and Dawn [*of the Dead*]. Those 2 had awesome directors behind them which helped. Now mostly remakes are getting music video directors which sucks.<sup>14</sup>

That 'hardhousehead' draws attention to the "awesome" directors of "good" remakes in contrast to "music video directors" suggests that, like many other active fans of the original films, they are affirming their fan status using authoritative knowledge as subcultural capital—other posters know they are referring to directors Alexandre Aja (*The Hills Have Eyes*, 2006) and Zack Snyder (*Dawn of the Dead*, 2004). Aja's horror credentials were established with *Haute Tension* (2003), and Snyder's *Dawn of the Dead* is one of the rare horror remakes which had a reasonably positive reception. The "music video directors" are understood to refer to, for example, Marcus Nispel (*The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* and *Friday the 13th*, 2009), Andrew Douglas (*The Amityville Horror*, 2005), or Samuel Bayer (*A Nightmare on Elm Street*, 2010), whose career trajectories are used as shorthand for their reputation as commercial filmmakers, unlike an established genre figure like Aja, or the more auteurist Rob Zombie—even if, as in the case of Snyder, they started out in advertising. This argument suggests that a sense of authenticity can be added to a remake by involving a filmmaker who is respected by fans, or indeed that fans can assert a director's (and therefore a film's) status regardless of their prior experience. Furthermore, just as the repeated reappraisal of original films pushes texts toward canonicity, remakes by more respected directors like Aja or Zombie (among others) contribute to their evolving status as genre auteurs. If prestige can be attached to a text through association with a particular filmmaker, then fans can be understood to play a significant role here in locating and ascribing that prestige.

Ultimately, any debate that deliberately (or incidentally) functions to boost fans' cultural capital can also play a part in the canonisation of an original text. Such debates draw attention to beloved films and attract new audiences to both remakes and their precursors. By enabling reception discourses, remakes create the opportunity to reiterate or revisit the cultural status of the adapted film. In turn, by further canonising the hypotext, a remake

automatically pushes itself toward denigration as the ‘worthless rip-off’ of a much-loved genre classic. This renders remaking an inherently masochistic process, one whose pitfalls should be clear to the would-be adaptor. But perhaps the advantages of horror’s low costs and all-but-guaranteed audiences mean that the likelihood of critical scorn and cultural devaluation is, simply, *worth it*. Horror remakes are not worthless to the studios who profit from them, nor to the crews who find work in their production, nor to the directors who can build a career on their success, nor indeed to the many viewers who take pleasure in recognising (and publicly parsing) intertextual references. Questions of fidelity and hierarchy in reception contexts play an important part in locating—or indeed denying—cultural value.

Horror remakes can and do provide creative and commercial opportunities that not only sustain genre production, but actively contribute to its evolution. Yet they are subject to suspicion and scrutiny and are ultimately ascribed little cultural value precisely because of what they are. The indifference of audiences and critics is a common response to many types of adaptation. But as the ‘lowest’ mode of adaptation within a genre often already ascribed a low cultural status, horror remakes invite a disproportionate level of scorn and little opportunity to be considered on their own merits. When texts are positioned outside of the regular streams for accolades and recognition (such as mainstream awards), prestige is defined or denied by reception contexts.

## Works Cited

- 'Ali'. 2007. "Halloween: Review." *The Shiznit*. Accessed June 27, 2016.  
<http://www.theshiznit.co.uk/review/halloween.php>
- Beggs, Scott. 2012. "Remakes failed hard at the box office in 2011." *Film School Rejects*. Accessed December 2, 2012. <http://www.filmschoolrejects.com/opinions/remakes-failed-hard-at-the-box-office-in-2011.php>
- Conrich, Ian. 2010. "Introduction." In *Horror Zone: The Cultural Experience of Contemporary Horror Cinema*, edited by Ian Conrich, 1-8. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Cook, Tom. 2012. "Era of the Pointless Remake." *Huffington Post*. Accessed February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013. [http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/tom-cook/era-of-the-pointless-remake\\_b\\_1651020.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/tom-cook/era-of-the-pointless-remake_b_1651020.html)
- English, James F. 2008. *Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fiske, John. 1992. "The Cultural Economy of Fandom", in *The Cult Film Reader*, edited by Ernest Mathijs and Xavier Mendik, 429-444. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Forrest, Jennifer and Leonard R. Koos, eds. 2002. *Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Francis Jr., James. 2012. *Remaking Horror: Hollywood's New Reliance on Scares of Old*. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Frost, Craig. 2009. "Erasing the B out of Bad Cinema: Remaking Identity in *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre*." *Colloquy* 18. Accessed November 4, 2010.  
[www.colloquy.monash.edu.au/issue18/frost.pdf](http://www.colloquy.monash.edu.au/issue18/frost.pdf)
- Glasby, Matt. 2011. "I Spit on Your Grave." *Little White Lies*. Accessed February 12, 2011.  
<http://www.littlewhitelies.co.uk/theatrical-reviews/i-spit-on-your-grave-13263>
- Grant, Barry Keith. 1986. "Introduction", in *Film Genre Reader*, edited by Barry Keith Grant, xvii-xxii. Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Hantke, Steffen. 2010. "Introduction: They Don't Make 'Em Like They Used To: On the Rhetoric of Crisis and the Current State of American Horror Cinema", in *American Horror Film: The Genre at the Turn of the Millennium*, edited by Steffen Hantke. Mississippi: University of Mississippi Press.
- Hills, Matt. 2005. "Ringling the Changes: Cult Distinctions and Cultural Differences in US Fans' Readings of Japanese Horror Cinema", in *Japanese Horror Cinema*, edited by Jay McRoy, 161-174. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hills, Matt. 2006. "Realising the cult blockbuster: LOTR fandom and residual/emergent cult status in the mainstream", in *"Lord of the Rings": Popular Culture in Global Context*, edited by Ernest Mathijs. London: Columbia University Press.

- Hills, Matt. 2006. "Sherlock's Epistemological Economy and the Value of 'Fan' Knowledge: How Producer-Fans Play the (Great) Game of Fandom", in *Sherlock and Transmedia Fandom: Essays on the BBC Series*, edited by Louisa Ellen Stein and Kristina Busse. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Horton, Andrew and McDougal, Stuart Y. 1998. "Introduction", in *Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes*, edited by Horton, Andrew and Stuart Y. McDougal. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 2006. *A Theory of Adaptation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hunt, Nathan. 2003. "The Importance of Trivia: Ownership Exclusion and Authority in Science Fiction Fandom" in *Defining Cult Movies: the Cultural Politics of Oppositional Taste* edited by Mark Jancovich, Antonio Lázaro Reboll, Julian Stringer and Andy Willis, 185-201. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hunter, I.Q. 2009. "Exploitation as Adaptation." In *Cultural Borrowings: Appropriation, Reworking, Transformation*, edited by Iain Robert Smith. Accessed February 17, 2011. Scope: An Online Journal of Film & TV Studies.  
<http://www.scope.nottingham.ac.uk/cultborr/chapter.php?id=5>
- Jancovich, Mark. 2001. "Genre and the Audience: Genre Classifications and Cultural Distinctions in the Mediation of *The Silence of The Lambs*" in *Hollywood Spectatorship: Changing Perceptions of Cinema Audiences*, edited by Melvyn Stokes and Richard Maltby, 33-45. London: BFI.
- Jancovich, Mark. 2008. "Cult Fictions: Cult Movies, Subcultural Capital and the Production of Cultural Distinctions", in *The Cult Film Reader*, edited by Ernest Mathijs and Xavier Mendik, 149-162. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- James, Nick. 2008. "Funny Games." *Sight & Sound* 18(4): 58-59.
- Jenkins, Henry. 1992 "Get a Life!': Fans, Poachers, Nomads", in *The Cult Film Reader*, edited by Ernest Mathijs and Xavier Mendik, 429-444. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Johnson, B.D. 2009. "Horror Undead: Horror remakes specialize in bringing the dead to life." *Macleans* 122(42): 56-58.
- Klein, Amanda and R. Barton Palmer, eds. 2016. *Cycles, Sequels, Spin-Offs, Remakes and Reboots: Multiplicities in Film and Television*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Lizardi, Ryan. 2010. "'Re-Imagining' Hegemony and Misogyny in the Contemporary Slasher Remake." *Journal of Popular Film & Television* 38(3) 113-121.
- Lukas, Scott A. and John Marmysz, eds. 2009. *Fear, Cultural Anxiety and Transformation: Horror, Science Fiction and Fantasy Films Remade*. Plymouth: Lexington.

Murray, Simone. 2012. *The Adaptation Industry: The Cultural Economy of Contemporary Literary Adaptation*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Naremore, James. 2000. "Introduction: Film and the Reign of Adaptation", in *Film Adaptation*, edited by James Naremore, 1-16. London: The Athlone Press.

Newman, Kim. 2003. "The Texas Chainsaw Massacre ." *Empire* 174: 56.

Roche, David. 2014. *Making and Remaking Horror in the 1970s and 2000s: Why Don't They Do It Like They Used To?* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Scheck, Frank. 2007. "Halloween: The Beginning ." *The Hollywood Reporter*. Accessed June 27, 2016. <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/review/halloween-beginning-159228>

Stam, Robert. 2005. "Introduction: The theory and Practice of Adaptation", in *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*, edited by Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo, 1-52. Oxford: Blackwell.

Verevis, Constantine. 2006. *Film Remakes*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

---

<sup>1</sup> Among these, collections edited by Martin Barker and Ernest Mathijs (*Watching the Lord of the Rings: Tolkien's World Audiences*, 2008), Louisa Ellen Stein and Kristina Busse (*Sherlock and Transmedia Fandom: Essays on the BBC Series*, 2012) and Anne Morey (*Genre, Reception, and Adaptation in the "Twilight" Series*, 2012) feature work which touches on these broader concerns, while studies by fandom scholars including Matt Hills (2005, 2006, 2012) also highlight the importance of fidelity to these debates.

<sup>2</sup> The collections edited by Forrest and Koos (2002) and Horton and McDougal (1998) introduced these more productive approaches to remaking, while more recent work in Lukas and Marmysz (2009) looks at genre remakes, and Klein and Palmer's *Multiplicities in Film and Television* (2016) rightfully addresses remaking as one exemplar of the contemporary transmedia landscape. While a number of full length works on remaking and on genre remakes specifically have been published since the films became prominent, Constantine Verevis's 2006 *Film Remakes* remains the most authoritative title on the topic.

<sup>3</sup> While remakes have always featured in horror, this post-millennial boom can be traced to the success of *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* (Nispel, 2003), the first film produced by Hollywood mogul Michael Bay's Platinum Dunes, a company set up for low-budget genre films that went on to finance multiple horror remakes. *Massacre* made \$107m worldwide, more than ten times its reported budget (boxofficemojo.com).

<sup>4</sup> The Golden Raspberries, or 'Razzies', are the satirical antithesis of the Hollywood awards season, annually recognising the 'worst' examples of directing, acting, writing and so on in mainstream releases. James F. English discusses them as the anti-Oscars in relation to prestige (2005, 100-102). Ernest Mathijs and Jamie Sexton have also observed how such "mock awards" have become entwined with the status of cult films (2011, 36-39). While most horror remakes do not fall within the category of cult, Mathijs and Sexton's model offers a useful framework for locating prestige outside of the mainstream.

<sup>5</sup> Mark Jancovich observes that the multiple Oscar-winning *The Silence of the Lambs* (Jonathan Demme, 1991) was marketed outside of horror fandom as "offer[ing] the thrills of a horror movie



---

without middle-class audiences either having to feel guilty or questioning their sense of their own distinction from that monstrous other, the troubling and disturbing figure of the slasher movie viewer” (2001, 40), a strategy that further supported the cultural sidelining of the genre.

<sup>6</sup> See <https://www.rottentomatoes.com/m/1179254-halloween/> Accessed December 21, 2015.

<sup>7</sup> ‘MovieMaven’. 2011. “Top 10 Pointless Horror Movies.” *Horror Movies*. Accessed October 17, 2011. [http://www.horror-movies.ca/horror\\_11240.html](http://www.horror-movies.ca/horror_11240.html)

MovieMaven, no doubt, would have been among the more critical reviewers of the TV miniseries remake of *Rosemary’s Baby* (NBC 2014).

<sup>8</sup> See Verevis 2006, 58-76 for detailed discussion.

<sup>9</sup> See for example Fiske 1992, Jenkins 1992, Hunt 2003, Hills 2005, Jancovich 2008.

<sup>10</sup> ‘George Lucas raped my childhood’, a meme used by some *Star Wars* fans to express their disapproval of both the second trilogy and Lucas’s own re-editing of the earlier films, has since been appropriated in discussion of other media multiplicities. See for example <http://www.facebook.com/michaelbaysux>, <http://www.voiceofcrazy.com/entertainment/robocop-the-latest-effort-of-hollywood-to-rape-my-childhood-again/>, <http://coyoterose.blogspot.co.uk/2012/04/open-letter-stop-raping-my-childhood.html>.

<sup>11</sup> ‘DeathBed’. 2010. “My Bloody Valentine (Remake).” *Bloody Disgusting*. Accessed January 28, 2010. <http://www.bloody-disgusting.com/forums/showthread.php?t=18424>

<sup>12</sup> ‘Freak123’. 2010. “What’s the Best Modern Remake You’ve Ever Seen?” *Bloody Disgusting*. Accessed January 28, 2010. <http://www.bloodydisgusting.com/forums/showthread.php?t=49109>

<sup>13</sup> ‘thedudeabides’. 2010. “OK, Remakes – What the FUCK?!?! Horror Is \*Dead\*.” *Dread Central*. Accessed January 28, 2010. <http://www.dreadcentral.com/forums/viewtopic.php?t=7163>

<sup>14</sup> ‘hardhousehead’. 2010. “What’s the Best Modern Remake You’ve Ever Seen?” *Bloody Disgusting*. Accessed January 28, 2010. <http://www.bloodydisgusting.com/forums/showthread.php?t=49109>