

Reanimated: The Contemporary American Horror Remake

Laura Mee

Chapter 1

Horror Reanimated: The Rise of the Remake

In its opening weekend, *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* (Marcus Nispel, 2003) secured both the top spot at the domestic box office and some brutal reviews.¹ While the film was not universally panned, the opprobrium that some critics levelled at this remake of Tobe Hooper's 1974 film was explicit. Roger Ebert (2003) described it as 'vile, ugly and brutal', suggesting that the film 'wants to tramp crap through our imaginations and wipe its feet on our dreams'. It was 'made with venom and cynicism', he argued, and he doubted 'that anybody involved in it will be surprised or disappointed if audience members vomit or flee'. Others complained it was 'suped up and overly stylized' (Foundas 2003), 'painfully derivative' (Kehr 2003) and 'the most gruesome, most pointless, episode of "Scooby Doo" ever' (Morris 2003). In *Sight & Sound*'s final issue of 2003, Mark Kermode lamented the 'textbook disembowelling of a once unruly genre classic', reflecting on *Chainsaw* as part of a 'dispiriting model of 30-year industrial recycling' (16). Complaints about contemporary horror's genericity, formulaicity, seriality and self-referentiality are common, even among those who (like Kermode) profess their love for the genre. Horror cinema, so the argument goes, is prone to recycling, regurgitation and rebirth, but also appears to be under some persistent illusory threat from its own popular cycles, forms and styles – the slasher film, found footage, torture porn, 'elevated' horror and remakes alike. The genre is the eternal victim of its own imagined villains. Horror is somehow forever dying and continually reanimated.

The criticism levelled at *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* indicated what was to come. Its success inspired a raft of new horror remakes throughout the 2000s and 2010s, as American studios recycled old versions of domestic and international genre films, both for theatrical release and direct-to-home-video. While Hollywood recycling was not a new phenomenon, the trend for remaking horror cinema became seemingly so pervasive that, for many fans, critics and scholars alike, it represented a tiresome exercise in reproducing and rebranding cherished films which challenged the memory or status of those originals. Horror remakes were lambasted as purposeless, artless and meaningless duplicates churned out by cynical studio executives. Critics like Kim Newman (2009b) wearily suggested that the trend was symptomatic of mainstream cinema 'swallowing its tail to the point where the finite number of remakable films will run out'. It is true that the remake, alongside other serial and adaptive forms, is a key feature of twenty-first-century cinema. But as another critic reasoned: 'To complain about a certain quality of sameness in American movies is to wilfully misunderstand many of the basic facts about why they are made' (Baron 2012). *Reanimated* explores this 'quality of sameness' in American horror cinema since 2000, by considering remakes within their own industry, cultural and reception contexts, and by analysing the processes of adaptation at play in their production. Rather than assessing arbitrary differences between 'originals' and 'copies', I instead aim to offer some insight into the reasons for those differences, their potential resonance with audiences and remaking's contribution to contemporary American horror cinema. No new version of a film can be studied entirely in isolation from its source; however, it is more illuminating to consider remakes not only in comparison to their originals, but also in relation to their place and purpose within horror as part of recognisable cycles, production patterns and genre trends. This book draws examples from a range of contemporary horror remakes, analysing both text and context in order to address some connected key issues: the remake's position within a wider culture of cinematic recycling, its relationship to other adaptive forms and the problems with defining and distinguishing it from these forms; the reasons for remaking and the appeal to audiences (as well as viewers' issues with remakes); the ways in which horror remakes update the themes and styles of original films to align with other contemporary genre films and cycles. Most significantly, I suggest reasons why, instead of simply seeing horror remakes as derivative rip-offs, we can understand how they demonstrate originality and innovation, and significantly contribute to the horror genre's evolution.

The Hollywood Remake Massacre?

By the turn of the 2010s, horror remakes had become a common scapegoat for what many saw as the genre's shortcomings over the prior decade.ⁱⁱ Horror of the 2000s was decried as stale, inartistic and derivative, sacrificing originality and substance for more commercial imperatives – and remakes were the worst offender. Ian Conrich's introduction to *Horror Zone* opens with a list of horror remakes, suggesting that 'any reflection on the drive of the contemporary horror film for establishing remakes could conclude that the genre is saturated, imitative, and lacking progression', before immediately moving on to consider preferable genre trends (2010: 1). In *American Horror Film: The Genre at the Turn of the Millennium*, Steffen Hantke is more scathing, citing the 'mindless series of remakes' which followed the 1990s postmodern irony of films such as *Scream* (Wes Craven, 1996) as representative of American horror cinema 'at its worst'. Hantke talks of Hollywood 'lowering its sights', arguing that:

. . . nothing seems safe from the greedy hands of studio executives out for a quick remake: George Romero was targeted with a remake of *Night of the Living Dead* (Zach Snyder, 2004), Carpenter by Rob Zombie with a remake of *Halloween* (2007), and Hitchcock became fair game too (2010: x–xi).

Describing filmmakers as 'targeted' or 'fair game' insinuates an attack, as if these adaptations were an affront to horror auteurs and cherished films (when of course, celebrated filmmakers are not just subject to the remake treatment, they themselves also remake – John Carpenter, Tobe Hooper, Spike Lee and others have all remade key American genre films).ⁱⁱⁱ Even Hantke's erroneous inclusion of a 2004 remake of *Night of the Living Dead* (George A. Romero, 1968) – Snyder's film was a 'reimagining' of Romero's 1978 sequel *Dawn of the Dead* – is perhaps symptomatic of the disdain toward remakes. Much of this complaint is on account of remakes' commercial appeal for studios, but even Hantke notes that existing ideas, a marketable title and audience familiarity are 'simply good business' (xvi). Horror, like any other genre, has of course always had economic motivations that exist alongside (and sometimes necessarily above) its creativity. Horror's propensity for seriality and recycling are certainly evidence of that, but many celebrated horror filmmakers 'targeted' for the remake treatment were themselves able to break into commercial filmmaking because of formative work in a genre renowned for cheap production (Becker 2006). The enduring popularity and appeal of retold tales is intrinsically linked to this commerciality:

(1) Something is offered as original and different (according to the requirements of modern aesthetics); (2) we are aware that this something is repeating something else that we already know; and (3) notwithstanding this – better just because of it – we like it (and buy it). (Eco 1985, quoted in Zanger 2006: 18)

We can accept that remaking is a financially driven practice without seeing it solely as indicative of an unimaginative, parasitic film industry. Instead, remakes can be understood as a valid art form and a valuable contribution to the horror genre in their own right.

Given the discourse around remakes such as *Halloween*, *Dawn of the Dead* and *Chainsaw*, anyone less familiar with the genre would be forgiven for thinking that they monopolised horror cinema in the 2000s and 2010s. This was not the case. For a start, remade American horror films sat alongside a number of international genre remakes, notably new Hollywood versions of Japanese, South Korean, Hong Kong and Thai horror films. These include, for example, *Ring/The Ring* (Hideo Nakata, 1998/Gore Verbinski, 2002), *Ju-On: The Grudge/The Grudge* (Takashi Shimizu, 2003/4), *Dark Water* (Hideo Nakata, 2002/Walter Salles, 2005), *Into the Mirror/Mirrors* (Kim Sung-ho, 2003/Alexandre Aja, 2008), *A Tale of Two Sisters/The Uninvited* (Kim Jee-woon, 2003/ Charles and Thomas Guard, 2009) and *Shutter* (Banjong Pisanthanakun and Parkpoom Wongpoom, 2004/Masayuki Ochiai, 2008). However, remakes represent only a fraction of a genre which, despite claims to the contrary, continued to thrive and evolve over the past two decades. Other serial forms attract similar complaints but continued to be significant. New franchises appeared, either capitalising on major theatrical releases or finding a horror audience via home video formats (*Paranormal Activity*, *Saw*, *Final Destination*, *Resident Evil*, *Hatchet*, *Wrong Turn*, *Insidious*, *The Conjuring*, *The Purge*), while established ones grew. As for the latter, there have been several *Amityville* and *Hellraiser* films since 2000; George A. Romero continued his *Night of the Living Dead* series with *Land of the Dead*, 2005,

Diary of the Dead, 2007, and *Survival of the Dead*, 2009; *Friday the 13th*, *Halloween*, *Children of the Corn* and *Child's Play* had new instalments before their first films were remade; and key franchises crossed over in *Freddy vs. Jason* (Ronny Yu, 2003).

The zombie film had a resurgence, ignited by the British films *28 Days Later* (Danny Boyle, 2002) and *Shaun of the Dead* (Edgar Wright, 2004), followed by Romero's last three *Dead* films and sustained by *The Walking Dead* (AMC, 2010–present). Alongside their undead companions, vampires and werewolves remained some of horror's most prevalent monsters (see Abbott 2016, Mann 2020). Ghosts haunted and demons tormented in supernatural horror, including *Insidious* (James Wan, 2010), *Sinister* (Scott Derrickson, 2012), *The Conjuring* (James Wan, 2013) and their various sequels and spin-offs. These successfully built on the back of earlier psychological horror, including *What Lies Beneath* (Robert Zemeckis, 2000) and *The Others* (Alejandro Amenábar, 2001), which had gained popularity in the wake of *The Blair Witch Project* (Eduardo Sánchez and Daniel Myrick, 1999) and *The Sixth Sense* (M. Night Shyamalan, 1999). New styles, cycles and subgenres also flourished. *Blair Witch* inspired a new wave of found footage horror such as *Paranormal Activity* (Oren Peli, 2009) and its sequels, *Quarantine* (John Erick Dowdle, 2008)^{iv} and *The Bay* (Barry Levinson, 2012). This eventually led to screen horror including *Unfriended* (Levan Gabriadze, 2014) and *The Den* (Zachary Donohue, 2013) (see Hallam 2021 and McMurdo, forthcoming). *Saw* (James Wan, 2004) and *Hostel* (Eli Roth, 2005) gave rise to a trend for 'torture porn', a relatively mainstream cycle in comparison to the genre's more extreme underground offerings (see Jones 2013, 2021a). Metatextual horror films continued, post *Scream*, to play with the genre's own rules in *Tucker & Dale vs. Evil* (Eli Craig, 2010) and *The Cabin in the Woods* (Drew Goddard, 2012). Horror went retro, with filmmakers such as Rob Zombie developing a neo-grindhouse style in *House of 1000 Corpses* (2000) and *The Devil's Rejects* (2005), while others looked back to the cycles and aesthetics of the 1970s and 1980s for inspiration, as in *The House of the Devil* (Ti West, 2009), *You're Next* (Adam Wingard, 2011) and *It Follows* (David Robert Mitchell, 2014). Anthology films such as *The ABCs of Death* (Andrews et al., 2012) and *V/H/S* (Bettinelli-Olpin et al., 2012) showcased a number of new filmmakers and the broad range of contemporary approaches to the genre.^v Significant new horror filmmakers such as Jordan Peele changed the shape of contemporary horror with *Get Out* (2017) and *Us* (2019). Recent notable cycles include cosmic horror – such as *Mandy* (Panos Cosmatos, 2018) and *Color Out of Space* (Richard Stanley, 2019) – and 'elevated' or 'prestige' horror exemplified by filmmakers such as Ari Aster with *Hereditary* (2018) and *Midsommar* (2019) (see Church 2021a, 2021b). Key companies connected to these trends (SpectreVision and A24, respectively) have joined the ranks of production houses such as Ghost House Pictures and Blumhouse Productions as major contemporary horror producers and distributors.

This overview represents just some of the best-known developments in recent American horror cinema; it is impossible to cover everything here, and it does not begin to scratch the surface of the styles, cycles, films and filmmakers that have emerged over the past two decades. It is not remotely accurate that remakes dominated contemporary American horror then; neither is it true that repetition and recycling were new to the genre in the 2000s (see Chapter 2). Yet, while remakes only represent a small number of horror films released since the turn of the millennium, there was a clear growth in the remaking trend. Gus Van Sant's controversial shot-for-shot retread of *Psycho* pre-empted the boom in 1998 and was followed by a brief cycle of supernatural horror remakes: *The Haunting* (Robert Wise, 1963/Jan de Bont, 1999), *House on Haunted Hill* (William Castle, 1959/William Malone, 1999) and *13 Ghosts/Thir13en Ghosts* (William Castle, 1960/Steve Beck, 2001). However, it was *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* that truly initiated the surge. Produced by Platinum Dunes, a new company which would soon become known for its horror remakes, Chainsaw was marketed via brand recognition to a new young horror audience familiar with Tobe Hooper's 1974 film through its notoriety alone (see Chapter 3). The film's low budget and box office success – alongside that of the 'J-horror' remakes *The Ring* and *The Grudge*, which made \$249 million and \$187 million worldwide, respectively (boxofficemojo.com) – set a significant example of horror remaking as viable commercial strategy, paving the way for a subsequent flood of remade American horror titles, mostly from (first) the 1970s and (then) the 1980s – and more recently, the 1990s and even 2000s.

Since 2003, almost eighty new versions of US horror films have been produced domestically. There were three in the year of *Chainsaw's* release^{vi} and two a year later, five in 2005 and seven in 2006;

this is telling of the film's influence, given production turnaround times. The number dropped again before peaking with seven in both 2009 and 2010. The period of 2011–14 had four releases per year on average, and numbers have since plateaued with an average of three per year. There are variables here which render mapping remake trends difficult. Firstly, because of the repetitive nature of genre film, it is impossible to identify every unacknowledged remake (for example, where a film significantly changes its title, plot and/or setting) or films closely 'inspired by' other earlier films – especially given the lack of information available on very-low-budget independent features. The figures outlined include wide and minor theatrical releases, as well as those released direct-to-video or video-on-demand. The difficulty with clearly defining horror film remakes also influences the numbers – for example, we might choose to include or discount reboots such as *Children of the Corn: Genesis* (Joel Soisson, 2011) or *Wrong Turn* (Mike P. Nelson, 2021); science fiction hybrids such as *Plan 9* (John Johnson, 2015) and *The Stepford Wives* (Frank Oz, 2004); made-for-television remakes such as *Children of the Corn* (Donald P. Borchers, 2009); or conversely theatrical releases based on made-for-television films, such as *Don't Be Afraid of the Dark* (Troy Nixey, 2010); or even films that are debatable in their remake status, such as *The Thing* (Matthijs van Heijningen, 2011) (see Chapter 2) – all of which I have included here. The figures represent actual releases and do not account for abandoned projects or proposed films; there have been numerous rumoured or stalled productions which nevertheless indicate studio interest, and clearer patterns may emerge as new remakes appear over the coming years. These numbers should not be considered precise then, even if I have been consistent in defining and selecting examples; without a doubt, an alternative survey might return different results. Caveats aside, it is possible to observe some patterns. There was a rise in remakes in the mid- to late 2000s, which maxed out at the turn of the decade, coinciding with so many critiques of the remake 'flooding' the genre. Production subsequently decreased and remained steady in the 2010s. Furthermore, while the total number of US horror remakes is not insubstantial and while there were more in the 2000s than in the 2010s, an average of four to five films a year hardly supports claims that 2000s horror was a decade of remakes.

The remakes can be grouped within broad categories. These include new versions of the work of horror auteurs, notably George A. Romero (*Night of the Living Dead* [Jeff Broadstreet, 2006],^{vii} *Dawn of the Dead* [Zack Snyder, 2004], *Day of the Dead* [Steve Miner, 2008], *The Crazies* [Breck Eisner, 2010]), John Carpenter (*The Fog* [Rupert Wainwright, 2005], *Halloween*, *The Thing*) and Wes Craven (*The Hills Have Eyes* [Alexandre Aja, 2006], *The Last House on the Left* [Denis Iliadis, 2009],^{viii} *A Nightmare on Elm Street* [Samuel Bayer, 2010]). Brian De Palma (*Sisters* [Douglas Buck, 2006], *Carrie* [Kimberly Peirce, 2013]), Herschell Gordon Lewis (*2001 Maniacs* [Tim Sullivan, 2005], *The Wizard of Gore* [Jeremy Kasten, 2007], *Blood Feast* [Marcel Walz, 2016]), Tom Holland (*Fright Night* [Craig Gillespie, 2011], *Child's Play* [Lars Klevberg, 2019]) and Fred Walton (*When A Stranger Calls* [Simon West, 2006], *April Fool's Day* [Mitchell Altieri and Phil Flores, 2008]) also had more than one of their films remade. Equally, new directors helmed multiple remakes; among them count Marcus Nispel with *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* and *Friday the 13th* (2009),^{ix} Glen Morgan with *Willard* (2003) and *Black Christmas* (2006), Nelson McCormick with *Prom Night* (2008) and *The Stepfather* (2009), and Alexandre Aja with *The Hills Have Eyes* and *Piranha 3D* (2010).^x

There also exist trends in the types of horror remade. Cycles and subgenres include the following: First, there is the zombie film, with various remakes of Romero's *Dead* films. Second, sci-fi hybrids are represented by *The Stepford Wives*, *The Thing* and *The Invasion* (Oliver Hirschbiegel, 2007), which is a third remake of *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (Don Siegel, 1956) following Philip Kaufman's 1978 and Abel Ferrara's 1993 versions. A third cycle is 1970s American horror, with *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre*, *The Hills Have Eyes*, *The Last House on the Left*, *The Crazies*, *Night of the Living Dead* and *Dawn of the Dead*. The fourth group, rape-revenge films, include *The Last House on the Left*, *I Spit on Your Grave* (Steven R. Monroe, 2010) and *Straw Dogs* (Rod Lurie, 2011). Fifth, slasher films are exemplified by *Friday the 13th*, *Prom Night*, *Halloween*, *My Bloody Valentine* (Patrick Lussier, 2009), *Silent Night* (Steven C. Miller, 2012) and *Black Christmas*, remade again in 2019 by Sophia Takal. Then there is exploitation, such as *I Spit on Your Grave*, *The Toolbox Murders* and *Maniac*. Psychological thrillers as the seventh group comprise *Sisters*, *The Hitcher* (Dave Meyers, 2007), *The Stepfather*, *When A Stranger Calls*, *Knock Knock* (Eli Roth, 2015) and *Jacob's Ladder* (David M. Rosenthal, 2019). An eighth group consists of creature features: *Willard*, *Piranha* and *The Wolfman* (Joe Johnston, 2010). Ninth, supernatural or religious horror can be found in *The Fog*, *The*

Amityville Horror (Andrew Douglas, 2005), *The Omen* (John Moore, 2006). Finally, there is Universal's attempt to create a new 'dark universe' based on the studio's original monsters, such as *The Wolfman*, *The Mummy* (Alex Kurtzman, 2017) and *The Invisible Man* (Leigh Whannell, 2020). I have charted some of these connections in order to demonstrate the range of American horror remakes released since 2000 and the various ways in which we might think about the patterns of their production. There are many alternatives but insufficient space to analyse every film and every cycle or configuration with appropriate nuance. Remakes provide illuminating examples of the ways in which adaptive modes in contemporary genre cinema overlap and of the ways in which new versions resurrect, recycle and homage earlier films. *Reanimated* is not only an exploration of the remake's much maligned contribution to contemporary horror cinema, but also a study of adaptation, and I have approached these films with the synergy between adaptation and horror ever in mind.

Remaking Adaptation Studies, Adapting Horror Studies

The 2000s' horror remake boom coincided with a critical shift in scholarly approaches to adaptation and, consequently, an emerging field of remake studies that eventually led to new analyses of the horror remake. Adaptation studies as a field was evolving beyond its literary focus and concerns over faithfulness, which had previously dominated the area, as well as the hostility towards adaptations in many 'profoundly moralistic' studies which 'reinscribe[d] the axiomatic superiority of literature to film' (Stam 2005: 3–4). Faithfulness was an increasingly futile measure of an adaptation's success, and a fruitless line of analysis; as Thomas Leitch argues, 'the main reason adaptations rarely achieve anything like fidelity is because they rarely attempt it' (2007: 127) (see Chapter 2). Further arguments encouraged a move away from an over-reliance on comparative case-studies of canonical literature and its adapted works (Ray 2000). New foci for the field instead included intertextuality, genre, industry, socio-political and cultural contexts, consideration of media other than books and films, as well as positioning adaptation alongside other contemporary forms of retelling, repetition and reproduction – including the remake (see Naremore 2000, Ray 2000, Stam 2005, Hutcheon 2006, Leitch 2007 and others).^{xi}

The drive towards intertextual approaches offered new potential for understanding remakes in their wider adaptation contexts. Linda Hutcheon considers adaptation across various media as a form of 'cultural recycling', where one text borrows from another and where these different versions 'exist laterally, not vertically' (2006: xiii), challenging the hierarchical nature and accompanying clichés of novel-to-film debates. Similarly, Robert Stam argues that intertextuality 'dismantled the hierarchy of "original" and "copy"' (2005: 8). Texts adapt, reuse and reference other texts to such an extent that linear comparative analyses between old and new versions are inadequate. Stam suggests that models such as Gérard Genette's 'transtextuality' offer more productive analytical frameworks, in that they address intertextual references to other texts, para-textual materials that exist in dialogue with the text itself and the hypertextual relationship between two texts (an existing or source 'hypotext' and its adaptive 'hypertext'). When considered as transtextual creations, so Stam argues, adaptations are 'caught up in the ongoing whirl of intertextual reference and transformation, of texts generating other texts in an endless process of recycling, transformation and transmutation, with no clear point of origin' (31). In this context, we should address production and reception, as well as textual and formal approaches. Considering a source and its adaptation within a vacuum is of limited use. The distance (spatially and temporally) between versions demands attention, and contemporaneous social, cultural and industry contexts must be addressed if we are to understand adaptations and their reasons for being. Adaptations are as much a product of their own time and place as they are of their source: 'Even in today's globalized world, major shifts in a story's context – that is, for example, in a national setting or time period – can change radically how the transposed story is interpreted, ideologically and literally' (Hutcheon 2006: 28).

Since 2010, adaptation studies has addressed these wider issues, but much of the most significant work focused predominantly on literature (MacCabe et al. 2011, Murray 2012, Elliott 2020). Given the push towards analysis of the 'postliterary' adaptation (Leitch 2007) of sources such as comic books, videogames and even theme park rides, the field's hesitance to include films adapted from other films

is notable. Remaking is the focus of the odd chapter in adaptation collections (Verevis 2017a, Mee 2017, Griggs 2018), and articles on remakes occasionally appear in adaptation journals (Evans 2014, Stephens and Lee 2018, Cuelenaere 2020 and 2021), but its inclusion in broader studies is often cursory. This relegation is perhaps due to the remake having the same (film) format as its adapted source. However, as Hutcheon notes, 'remakes are invariably adaptations because of changes in context [. . .] not all adaptations necessarily involve a shift of media or mode of engagement' (170). Remaking is a form of film-to-film adaptation, and many of the field's intertextual arguments and theoretical frameworks provide useful methods with which to analyse both the process of remaking and film remakes themselves.

Two edited collections at the turn of the 2000s – Andrew Horton and Stuart McDougal's *Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes* (1998) and Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos's *Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice* (2002) – aimed to address this imbalance by '[removing] the phenomenon [of remaking] from the purgatory of casual reference and summary dismissal and [placing] it within the purview of serious film criticism' (Forrest and Koos 2002: 3). After all, remaking had been significant throughout cinema history. The earliest remakes replaced 'exhausted' negatives of popular films; remaking kept independent production companies afloat during the Depression; and remakes often test potentially expensive new technology via the security of a presold property (3–4). Remaking even predates cinema; classic myths were retold by the Greek dramatists, and Chaucer and Shakespeare 'borrowed liberally' from predecessors (Horton and McDougal 1998: 2). The collections' chapters analyse an array of remake case-studies, addressing intertextuality alongside industry and cultural contexts and the ideological implications of Hollywood remaking. The 1980s American reinterpretations of French cinema feature in several of the essays, indicative of the popularity of this example in earlier remake studies (see also Verevis 2006, Mazdon 2000).

However, both collections demonstrate some of the limitations of earlier adaptation studies, as if this new area was playing catch-up with the wider field. Many of the chapters are comparative case-studies, and several analyse new versions of respected 'classics' by noted auteurs (Hitchcock, Godard, Bergman) or familiar tales (Dracula, Robin Hood). *Play It Again, Sam* concludes with an afterword by Leo Braudy, who argues that 'to remake is to want to re-read – to believe in an explicit way that the past reading was wrong or outdated and that a new one must be done' (1998: 332) and generalises that 'remakes are invariably inferior to their originals' (329). In *Dead Ringers*, Thomas Leitch suggests that film remakes are different from other adaptations on account of a triangular relationship between the source text, the original film and the remake itself (2002: 39), without acknowledging that the 'source' text may well be the original film. Leitch maintains that remakes directly compete with the original, threatening their economic viability, but remakes may bring a new audience (and in turn, new revenue) to the original, and rights-holders are often paid by (re)makers – new films may even be produced with a view to brokering a remake deal (Xu 2005).^{xii} These arguments are at odds with the innovative aims of the collections (and Leitch's own work on adaptation), again demonstrating the disconnect between adaptation and remake studies in the 2000s.

Constantine Verevis' *Film Remakes* (2006) turned the tide for remake studies, similar to the mid-decade shift in adaptation theory, offering a comprehensive approach for analysing the remake in context. Verevis explores remaking as 'an elastic concept and a complex situation' (viii), identifying three categories: industrial, textual and critical. These provide the impetus for my analyses in *Reanimated*. Considered as an industrial category, the remake is a 'pre-sold' product with a guaranteed audience (3); yet, rather than seeing remaking as a cynical economic ploy, Verevis addresses the necessity of securing revenue. In this industrial context, film is a commercial product, and remakes 'repeat successful formulas in order to minimise risk and secure profits in the marketplace' (37). They revive franchises, create new cross-media market potential, or take advantage of new technologies (38); therefore, they should not be dismissed as simplistic, derivative 'rip offs' designed to cash in on the success of an original. Verevis' textual category addresses the difficulty of defining remakes when understanding them as intertextual modes. A remake might feature anything from shot-for-shot replication, or scene repetition, to unacknowledged allusion to the source or other texts, or even to the process of remaking itself (see Chapter 2). Yet, he suggests, remakes are largely understood as 'intertextual structures which are stabilised, or limited, through the naming

and (usually) legally sanctioned (or copyrighted) use of a particular literary and/or cinematic source which serves as a retrospectively designated point of origin and semantic fixity' (21). Textual understandings also appreciate how remaking updates or transforms a source through historical changes, industrial progress, and other contextual factors such as ideology and politics: 'Remaking [needs] to be placed in a contextual history, in a "sociology [of remaking] that takes into account the commercial apparatus, the audience, and the [. . . broader] culture industry"' (Naremore, quoted in Verevis 2006: 101). It is insufficient to acknowledge changes between versions; we must address why changes are made and how they impact our understanding. Critical and audience reception forms the crux of Verevis' final category of remakes. Acknowledged remakes, relying on the familiarity of the original, use their title to appeal to a pre-existing audience, drawing attention to their source in promotional materials and discourses (131–32) – a clear strategy with *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre*. However, a film's status as a remake is not always the most pertinent promotional factor; a star, director or genre often features more significantly (146–47), which constitutes a further reason to consider remakes in their own contexts.

Remake studies has grown since the mid-2000s to address the complex media phenomenon of twenty-first-century remaking, and the scope and depth of research reflects the myriad ways in which films remake other films. Anat Zanger's *Film Remakes as Ritual and Disguise* (2006) explores issues of feminism and intertextuality in what she refers to as 'multi-versions', arguing that 'the constant repetition of the same tale keeps it alive in social memory, continually transmitting its meaning and relevance' (9) – echoing calls for the consideration of cultural contexts. New studies of cross-cultural remaking have acknowledged the multi-directional processes at play in global adaptation, evolving beyond the focus on Hollywood remakes to consider instead the 'complexity of the transnational film remake and the broader cultural issues that are raised by this form of cinematic repetition', including those 'surrounding national and/or ethnic identity and questions of cultural power' (Smith and Verevis 2017: 2). Iain Robert Smith (2016), for example, analyses popular 'rip-offs' and reversions of Hollywood properties such as *Star Wars* and *Batman* made in the Philippines, Turkey and India (see also Evans 2014, Stenport and Traylor 2015, Stephens and Lee 2018, as well as the chapters in Smith and Verevis). Other works addressed production contexts and the industrial and economic imperatives of remaking (Cuelenaere 2020), patterns of re-circulation which reflect the themes of the texts that they spread, in this case contemporary zombie narratives (Boluk and Lenz 2011), and remaking and contemporary digital media culture (Stenport and Traylor 2015). Remake studies continues to address overlapping, interacting and non-linear modes of remaking, reproduction and adaptation as part of contemporary seriality, as well as the ways in which these processes complicate definitions and understandings of remakes (Loock and Verevis 2012, Kelleter and Loock 2017, Klein and Palmer 2017, Verevis 2017b).

Research on genre adaptation also grew in the late 2000s, in response to the swell of horror remakes, but it had antecedents. *Play It Again Sam* and *Dead Ringers* include essays on Wes Craven's *The Last House on the Left* (Brashinsky 1998) – an uncredited remake of Ingmar Bergman's *The Virgin Spring* (1960) – as well as analyses of *Dracula* and *Nosferatu* retellings, *The Fly* (David Cronenberg, 1986) and *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (Konigsberg 1998, Michaels 1998, Roth 2002). In their introduction to *Monstrous Adaptations*, editors Richard J. Hand and Jay McRoy argue that 'horror film thrives on the notion of transformation', from mutation, metamorphosis, and transformation (of both the corporeal and body politic) to the 'adaptive journey' from life to death (2007: 1–2). Horror's themes and the practice and process of adaptation are natural bedfellows (see Chapter 2). *Monstrous Adaptations'* case-studies cover *Body Snatchers* (McRoy 2007), *Psycho* (Pomerance 2007) and *The Ring* (Blake 2007) – Blake's chapter followed an upsurge in research on Japanese horror film remakes (see also Hills 2005b, Ozawa 2006, Xu 2005, Park 2009, Klein 2010, Wee 2013).

It was the end of the decade before substantial work on the new American horror remake emerged. Much of this was initially aligned with reflectionist film criticism in the post-9/11 period which analysed horror films as cultural responses to terrorism and the 'War on Terror' (Robinson 2009, Blake 2008, Briefel and Miller 2011, Wetmore 2012; see Chapters 5 and 6). Yet, there were broader contextual considerations, too. Scott A. Lukas and John Marmysz's introduction to *Fear, Cultural Anxiety and Transformation: Horror, Science Fiction and Fantasy Films Remade* stresses the ideological functions of both genre and adaptation. They argue that horror remakes play a part in a 'psychological

connection to a shared social world', performing a social function 'by binding us all together with commonly shared stories that speak to our particular fears, anxieties, and hopes for the future' (2009: 8–9). Remakes' allusions to social, political or cultural concerns are a key focus of the collection's chapters, which cover *Body Snatchers* iterations including *The Invasion* (Robinson 2009, Huygens 2009) and Romero remakes (Borrowman 2009), as well as discussion of copyright regimes (Park 2009), transnational remaking (Park 2009, Herbert 2009), fan films as remakes (Frazetti 2009), new technologies and remaking (Frazetti 2009, Constandinides 2009) and cross-media adaptation (Lukas 2009). Other writers at the turn of the 2010s covered horror remakes in journals and collections: Craig Frost (2009) argues that the remade *Texas Chainsaw* negated audiences' understanding and appreciation of the original, impacting the status of Hooper's version. Ryan Lizardi (2010) addresses hegemonic misogyny in slasher remakes. Andrew Patrick Nelson (2010) offers a comparative structural analysis of the uncanny and the fantastic in *Halloween*, *Black Christmas* and other remakes, and Tony Perello (2010) focuses on ocular horror in Alexandre Aja's films, including *The Hills Have Eyes*.

Two books had timely releases in 2012, reflecting the rise of the horror remake and the need for its serious consideration. Christopher T. Koetting's *Retro Screams: Terror in the New Millennium* covers production minutiae (development histories and trivia, script changes, cast and crew) and identifies illuminating patterns of production and key industry figures such as Platinum Dunes. Koetting offers a useful overview of the horror remake trend, but through a series of informative comparisons with little analysis or argument, which is of course entirely appropriate for an overview written for horror fans. In the introduction to *Remaking Horror: Hollywood's New Reliance on Scares of Old*, James Francis Jr claims his book as the first academic intervention and a 'dedicated effort to begin formal discussion' (2012: 8) of the American horror remake trend. Francis outlines comparative case-studies of *Psycho*, *Halloween*, *Friday the 13th* and *A Nightmare on Elm Street*, offering plot synopses, production histories and an assessment of the ways in which the films portray fear. Emulating some of the earlier remake and adaptation studies, discussion is weighted towards a focus on the original films (see also Knöppler 2017), highlighting arbitrary differences rather than identifying coherent patterns or connections among the remakes. Francis' interviews with notable figures, including actor Robert Englund and former Fangoria editor Tony Timpone, offer insight on how the 'state' of contemporary horror is viewed within the industry itself (146–65); often this positions the remake as parasitic and devoid of creativity. Ultimately, Francis contends that remakes, unlike their sources, 'cannot fully embrace [the] combined cinematic effect' of both 'inject[ing] fear' and 'inspir[ing] thought-provoking discussions' (6).

Later works offer more in the way of contextualisation and analysis, while still resonating with some of the critical discourse around horror remakes. The subtitle of David Roche's *Making and Remaking Horror in the 1970s and 2000s: Why Don't They Do It Like They Used To?* (2014) riffs on Steffen Hantke's introduction to *American Horror Film: The Genre at the Turn of the Millennium* (2010), titled 'They Don't Make 'Em Like They Used To'.^{xiii} Roche's question suggests a retort ('of course not, but why not?'), while simultaneously reiterating Hantke's implication, positioning original/older films as better and the standard of contemporary horror, including remakes, as low. Roche makes no secret of his disdain for many of the adaptations:

My dislike of the remakes [has] more to do with the way they threaten my identity as a fan and an academic than with the actual films, and the answer to the question raised in the subtitle would quite simply be: they don't necessarily (not do it like they used to, or do they?); I just like to think they do (because it safeguards my identity) (4).

It is unclear how one's academic identity is 'threatened' by remakes, but Roche's point about horror fans raises interesting questions which horror remake studies has yet to answer (see Chapter 2). Roche offers a comprehensive analysis of four key pairs of originals and remakes: *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre*, *The Hills Have Eyes*, *Dawn of the Dead* and *Halloween*, combining formal and cultural approaches to address aesthetic and thematic features of the films, including Gothic motifs, violence, verisimilitude, representations of race, gender and class, as well as the family. His thesis is that the remakes are less 'disturbing' than (and therefore not as good as) the originals when judged against three criteria: 'A film can disturb because of its subtext ("enlightenment")', because of its

“perlocutory effect” (emotion), or because it thwarts viewer expectations (originality)’ (7). Conversely, he suggests that the 1970s films retain their effectiveness on account of the ‘technical limitations’ (19) of the period, partly a result of their low budget (compared to remakes, but seemingly unadjusted for inflation or for changes in distribution and exhibition).

The horror remake of the 2000s and 2010s has continued to inspire recent scholarship. Christian Knöppler’s *The Monster Always Returns: American Horror Films and Their Remakes* (2017) analyses six case-studies – *The Thing*, *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, *The Crazies*, *Dawn of the Dead*, *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre* and *Halloween* – addressing shifting cultural fears through the configuration of the monster as it evolves between versions. Knöppler’s approach is notable for distancing from questions of quality, originality and critical appreciation, and for presupposing that the remakes have a function beyond the purely economic. Yet, like Francis’ analyses, it dedicates more space to the discussion of originals in its case-study comparisons. Finally, a range of recent publications exemplifies the diverse approaches to understanding the new American horror remake: the formal and intertextual qualities of *Carrie* (Bettinson 2015), queer aesthetics in *Chainsaw* (Elliott-Smith 2015), *Halloween* and *A Nightmare on Elm Street* as horror reboots (Tompkins 2014, Proctor 2020), and scopophilia and rape-revenge remakes (Mantziari 2017). However, articles and chapters are inevitably confined to the scope of their case-studies, and some major studies have been restricted by a contempt for new versions, which echoes an adaptation studies field that has long moved on. The topic demands new appreciation for industry, reception, genre and wider remaking trends.

Scope, Approach and Structure

The subjective nature of some horror remake studies is perhaps inevitable considering that the genre trades on personal reactions and emotions. Measuring how ‘disturbing’ a horror film is, or how it ‘instils fear’, can only be as reliable as the viewer’s own response. ‘Effectiveness’ is ephemeral and individual; horror relies on affect but cannot be objectively, uniformly ‘horrifying’ or ‘not horrifying’ to some imagined homogeneous viewership. Analysis which presupposes that a film succeeds or fails based on these qualities reiterates questions around definitions, value judgement and taste, all of which have long been contemplated in horror studies.^{xiv} A key aim of this book, then, is to consider the remakes objectively – but I acknowledge that this is difficult. I do not need to claim my horror fandom here in order to justify researching a supposedly controversial subject, as many studies begin by doing (see, for example, Tudor 1989, Wells 2000, Worland 2007, Francis 2012); the genre’s ever-evolving nature and popularity continues to validate horror studies research. However, as a ‘scholar-fan’ (Hills 2005a: xiii) researching not just my favourite genre, but an iteration of that genre which is often roundly derided, it has been important to reflect on my ability to be impartial. My feelings about the *A Nightmare on Elm Street* remake, for example, cannot be entirely separated from my nostalgic affection for Craven’s original film, but I can approach its analysis with an understanding that the remake does not damage the original nor negate my love for it (see Chapter 2). There are also more appropriate (and far more interesting) ways to consider its recycling, such as its production, promotion and franchise contexts (see Chapter 3).

Understanding that horror is a genre with a dedicated viewership and that remakes often provoke the ire of many fans is a vital starting point to this and other remake studies, and inevitably I draw from some audience and fan responses (see Chapter 2), as well as fan studies (Fiske 1992, Jenkins 1992, Hills 2002, Hunt 2003). Significant research connecting horror or cult film and fandom exemplifies the crossover between these two interrelated areas and demonstrates the role that subcultural capital, ownership, creativity and community play in horror fandom (see Egan 2003, Hills 2005a and 2005b, Jancovich 2008, Jones 2017 and 2018). However, this book is not a study of horror fandom, nor does it propose a comprehensive theoretical or empirical understanding of the ways in which fans have responded to horror remakes; to do so would demand an entire book dedicated to the subject. My summary analyses of fan responses have attracted criticism of overly literal, rational or ‘cold’ interpretation (Proctor 2020), but my focus throughout this research has been on the remakes

themselves and not fan discourses – although, of course, such discourse can reveal much about remakes' reception.

Definitions of 'horror' are open to interpretation, again on account of subjectivity, as well as the vast array of cycles, subgenres and forms of which the genre consists. What constitutes a 'remake' is also debatable, due to the myriad ways in which texts recycle other texts. Likewise, I do not presume that the meaning of an 'American' horror remake is immediately clear, and a reader might question my inclusion of, for example, original slasher films produced in Canada (*Black Christmas*, *Prom Night*, *My Bloody Valentine*) or internationally co-produced remakes (*Dawn of the Dead*, *Maniac*, *The Crazies*); the concept of national cinema remains slippery. For the purposes of this study, I consider an American remake to be a new version of a North American film, which was at least co-produced in America and which purports to be culturally American (via its plot, cast, setting and/or themes). Canadian slashers, for example, are connected to a cycle broadly seen as American. The settings of the films are ambiguous or implied to be in the US (American flags are seen in *Black Christmas*, suggesting that events take place on a US college campus); key filmmakers including Bob Clark were not Canadian; and the decision to film north of the US border was a commercial rather than an artistic one, encouraged by Canadian tax breaks (see Nowell 2011a). The adaptations under discussion are cross-cultural in so far as they hold a temporal distance from their origin texts; culture varies over time and between generations. However, I am not including remakes which might be considered significantly cross-cultural on account of their originating countries and which can therefore be more productively analysed in other contexts (such as the research on Japanese horror remakes previously mentioned). In limiting discussion to 'American' remakes of 'American' films, I am omitting, for example, *The Wicker Man* (Robin Hardy, 1973/Neil LaBute, 2006) which could instead be understood as part of a cycle of American remakes of cult British films such as *The Italian Job* (Peter Collinson, 1969/F. Gary Gray, 2003) and *Get Carter* (Mike Hodges, 1971/Stephen Kay, 2000), or even as a precursor to American studio interest in folk horror tropes a decade later, as with *The Witch* (Robert Eggers, 2015), *Midsommar* and *Pet Sematary* (Kevin Kölsch and Dennis Widmyer, 2019).

Knöppler argues that the 'sources for remakes are almost by definition canonical' (2017: 14). I disagree. The range of horror remakes included in this book exemplifies the extent of the remaking trend in horror, with new versions appearing across subgenres, cycles and types. It is not just well-known franchise titles or celebrated classics that have been remade, but everything from exploitation cinema to religious horror, via made-for-TV films, psychological thrillers, splatter, slashers and sci-fi hybrids. The films discussed in this introductory chapter are not a complete list of the horror remakes released since the turn of the 2000s; nor have I exhaustively outlined the numerous ways in which we might group, analyse or understand them. I have set parameters for debate based on significant remaking trends and pertinent areas for discussion, which enable an understanding of some key films and the contexts that shape their creation and reception. This is both an industry study and an analysis of the remakes themselves, informed by cultural studies, adaptation studies and remaking studies. Distinctions between text and industry are common in film studies, but the horror remake is criticised from multiple angles as an aesthetically and creatively limited mode and as indication of the supposed decline of the genre. A fairly holistic approach is needed to address these issues. Rather than focusing solely on paired comparative case-studies, I draw connections between cycles of remakes with common forms or themes, combining textual analysis, consideration of paratextual and ancillary materials such as trailers and posters, commentaries and special features, interviews, reviews and trade press reports, as well as audience and fan discussions. Instead of simply observing that changes take place in the process of remaking, the chapters that follow ask how, why and for whom such changes occur, considering the remakes as a significant feature of contemporary American horror cinema. Horror remakes do not signal a dearth of creativity in horror but are evidence of that creativity.

In Chapter 2, I address some theoretical issues that arise when using adaptation studies to analyse horror remakes and consider remaking as just one intertextual form among many in contemporary cinema. Ideas and texts are continually recycled, re-versioned and referenced; they interact, overlapping and creating patterns of similarities and differences. In part, this explains the remake's purpose, as well as its charm (for some). The appeal of retelling and revisiting cinematic stories, so Hutcheon argues, 'comes simply from repetition with variation, from the comfort of ritual combined

with the piquancy of surprise. Recognition and remembrance are part of the pleasure (and risk) of experiencing an adaptation; so too is change' (2006: 4) (see also Zanger 2006, Verevis 2006). The vast web of intertextual allusion (via remakes, reboots, sequels, prequels, spin-offs, rip-offs and more) renders taxonomies and definitions of adaptive and serial forms elusive. *The Thing* and *Scream 4* (Wes Craven, 2011) – a prequel and a sequel, respectively, but both featuring formal and metatextual qualities of remakes – provide useful case-studies for analysis here. In addition, I explore issues of fidelity and accusations of 'pointlessness' which have been levied against the remake. These debates are exhausted in adaptation studies but clearly a concern for remake audiences, academics and critics alike, as they are fundamentally connected to the practice of remaking.

Chapters 3 and 4 map out connections and distinctions between cycles of remakes, analysing the ties that bind new versions. In Chapter 3, I explore the commercial strategies used by Platinum Dunes, the studio that originated the new American horror remake with *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* and followed up with remakes of *Friday the 13th*, *A Nightmare on Elm Street* and *The Amityville Horror*. During production, the producers promoted the films as respectful retellings to appease fan concerns, and marketing capitalised on the connections to their origin texts. While some remakers actively distance their film from an original text, the Platinum Dunes films achieved (financial) success by invoking audience nostalgia and drawing on the iconic status of antagonists from major horror franchises. This chapter also builds on the interrogation of terms and modes of adaptation laid out in Chapter 2; the Platinum Dunes films were planned to 'reboot' franchises, but despite rewriting series origins, all but one of the new series faltered – potentially rendering them more of a remake than a reboot. Chapter 4 surveys a wide range of remakes of slasher films. The slasher cycle thrived in the late 1970s and early 1980s, its style and form eventually so common within the horror genre that it became more of a subgenre. Slashers are often maligned as formulaic and derivative examples of the genre; however, both original films and remakes demonstrate a great deal of variety, creativity and innovation. New versions are both influenced by and simultaneously contribute to the evolution of the horror genre, which I demonstrate via analyses of the creative approaches to style in *Halloween* and *Maniac*. Rather than over-emphasising connections in an attempt to categorise remakes within specific cycles, this chapter suggests that we should also see their disparities as evidence of growth and examples of originality within contemporary horror.

Horror has often been understood as a genre ripe for allegorical reflection and cultural commentary. While not wanting to undermine these potential interpretations – on the contrary, while outlining some of my own – Chapters 5 and 6 interrogate this idea, situating socio-cultural themes within their broader genre and industry contexts. Films of the 1970s such as *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre*, *The Hills Have Eyes* and *Dawn of the Dead* were retrospectively heralded as rich reflections of the politically troubled decade in which they were produced. In Chapter 5, I analyse the remakes of these films in response to analyses that claim that the new versions deal with equivalent concerns such as the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and the subsequent 'War on Terror'. While these arguments are certainly plausible, some interpretations are undermined by alternative readings, especially when taking into account the commercial nature of their production. I suggest that any such allusions are ambiguous at best and that, ultimately, many remakers are largely unconcerned with addressing such issues. Chapter 6 focuses on the representation of gender in two remakes of 1970s rape-revenge films, *The Last House on the Left* and *I Spit on Your Grave*, while drawing on feminist models of analysis. Both films update the portrayal of their female protagonists, first as victim and then as avenger (or avenger-by-proxy in the case of *Last House*), to reflect more contemporary filmmaking approaches to gender and violence. However, I argue that they did this in order to appeal to a contemporary genre audience, specifically by aligning the films more coherently with horror trends such as torture porn.

Finally, I conclude by considering the opposing reactions to two horror remakes released in 2013, *Carrie* and *Evil Dead* (Sam Raimi, 1981/Fede Alvarez, 2013). The contrasting reception of these films demonstrated the swell of critical fatigue over remakes, which had reached breaking point in the early 2010s, as well as the creativity that horror remakes continued to bring to the genre. I also survey the recent state of the remake trend, including an increase in television remakes and adaptations such as *Bates Motel* (A&E, 2013–17), *Hannibal* (NBC, 2013–15) and *Scream* (MTV, 2015–19), as well as a cycle of readaptations of Stephen King's work. The chapters that follow address a series of general questions initiated by this opening chapter: Is it possible to precisely define and categorise the horror

remake? What is its position within a wider culture of cinematic recycling and its relationship to other adaptive forms? Can horror remakes ever be considered original in their own right, or does their nature reduce them to simplistic 'copies' of what came before? How do remakes update both the themes and style of original films to appeal to contemporary audiences and fit with contemporary trends? What concerns audiences and critics? How did the genre incorporate remakes over the past two decades, and what did the remake contribute to its evolution? Ultimately, why did the remake prevail in contemporary horror cinema, and why is horror fair game for reanimation?

ⁱ Throughout this book, the use of both *Chain Saw* and *Chainsaw* reflects variations in the original and remade films' respective titles. Although Hooper's 1974 film is often referred to as *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre*, including on its theatrical poster, the credits give its title as *The Texas Chain Saw Massacre*. Nispel's remake uses the compound *Chainsaw*.

ⁱⁱ For examples across both film criticism and horror studies, see Hantke 2007, 2010; Conrich 2010; Frost 2009; Gilbey 2007; Johnson 2009; Lizardi 2010; Newman 2009b; Church 2006, 2010; Odell and LeBlanc 2007; Kermode 2003; Macauley 2004, 2005; Bacal 2004; Simon 2006.

ⁱⁱⁱ Respectively, *The Thing* (1982), *Toolbox Murders* (2003) and *Da Sweet Blood of Jesus* (2014), a remake of *Ganja & Hess* (Bill Gunn, 1973).

^{iv} Itself a remake of a Spanish film, *[REC]* (Jaume Balagueró and Paco Plaza, 2007).

^v *The ABCs of Death* and the *V/H/S* films featured filmmakers from other countries, too. Just as the genre flourished in America in the 2000s, so it continued to thrive elsewhere – in the East Asian horror films that inspired remakes, in the New French Extremity of *Frontier(s)/ Frontière(s)* (Xavier Gens, 2007), *Inside/À l'intérieur* (Julien Maury and Alexandre Bustillo, 2007) and *Martyrs* (Pascal Laugier, 2008) – the last two both inspiring American remakes – and in a British horror cinema revival (see Walker 2016).

^{vi} One is a remake of Hooper's film, and one is remade by Hooper himself (*The Toolbox Murders*).

^{vii} Broadstreet's remake is just one of many 'reimaginings' of *Night of the Living Dead* due to its public domain status, including American versions released in 2014, 2015 and 2020.

^{viii} See also *Chaos* (David DeFalco, 2005), an 'unofficial' *Last House* remake.

^{ix} Nispel also directed a television version of *Frankenstein* (2004) and the *Conan the Barbarian* remake (2011).

^x Aja has also been involved with additional remakes. He directed *Mirrors* and co-wrote and produced *Maniac* (Franck Khalifoun, 2012).

^{xi} The 2008 launch of the journals *Adaptation* and *Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance* demonstrated the growth and sea change of approaches in the field. In the introduction to its first issue, *Adaptation's* editors denounced earlier obsessions with adaptations as 'inferior, diluted versions of an "original"', as they set out more innovative aims (Cartmell et al. 2008: 2).

^{xii} Xu (2005) describes how producer Roy Lee was approached by East Asian horror filmmakers with a 'remaking mentality' following the success of the US remakes of *The Ring* and *The Grudge*, wanting to make films that would appeal to adapters (see Chapter 2). This is akin to the practice of synchronic remaking described by Kathleen Loock – 'the production of remakes that takes place at roughly the same point in time as the production of the predecessors' (2019: 327).

^{xiii} Roche asserts that his title was developed before Hantke's work but acknowledges that the two align in terms of what they suggest about the state of horror cinema in the 2000s (2014: 4).

^{xiv} Research addressing these issues is extensive, but Tudor (1997), Hills (2005a) and Cherry (2009) offer accessible, thoughtful starting points.