Introduction: Film Remakes in the Context of European Cinema

Eduard Cuelenaere, Gertjan Willems and Stijn Joye

Stating that film remakes are an integral part of cinema and cinema history is stating the obvious. One of the first films ever, *Exiting the Factory* (*La Sortie de l'Usine Lumière à Lyon*, 1895), by the French engineer Louis Lumière, was even remade (at least) twice. The two versions that followed, also made by Lumière, can be discerned by, among other things, the style of clothes and the number of horses appearing in the films. Hence, the invention of the film medium itself practically coincided with the genesis of the film remake.[1] That same year, Louis Lumière also made the slapstick film *The Sprinkler Sprinkled* (*L'Arroseur Arrosé*). One year later, in 1896, the famous French filmmaker and illusionist George Méliès remade the latter into *Watering the Flowers* (*L'Arroseur*). The year 1896 also saw the production of the Société Pathé Frères' first film, titled *The Arrival of a Train* (*Arrivée d'un Train*), another remake of a Lumière film. In Pathé's version, the train arrives in a city located southeast of Paris (Vincennes), whereas the train in Lumière's version arrives in a seaside resort called La Ciotat. It was not only in France where the production of these European film remakes took place. British remakes followed as well, such as Robert William Paul's remakes of other Lumière films, or, for example, a Swedish remake by Ernest Florman of the American film *The Barbershop* (1894), produced by the Edison Manufacturing Company (Forrest 2002).

Over the past two decades, European film industries have been breathing new life into this old form of recycled filmmaking, resulting in a significant rise of European film remakes. Meir (2019: 133) has demonstrated how large European film industries and powerful pan-European studios in the early 2000s slowly started to follow Hollywood's lead by 'utilizing tried and tested generic models, [. . .] remaking older films [. . .] or readapting source material that has provided the basis for successful films'. Furthermore, as a recent

study (see Cuelenaere, Joye and Willems 2019a) shows, apart from these large European industries, various culturally (and linguistically) proximate small film industries also started to remake each other's films. Next to the remake cycle in the Low Countries (Cuelenaere et al. 2019a), one could, for instance, also point towards the many Dutch-German film remakes. Examples are the Dutch *Misfit* (2017) which received a German and a Polish remake in 2019, or the German film *Joy of Fatherhood* (*Vaterfreuden*, 2014) which was remade in the Netherlands as *Made for each other* (*Voor elkaar gemaakt*, 2017).

Another example of such synchronic remaking – 'the production of remakes that takes place at roughly the same point in time as the production of the predecessors' (Loock 2019: 327) – is *Perfect Strangers* (*Perfetti sconosciuti*, 2016). This Italian comedy was included in the Guinness World Records as the most remade film in film history (Rolling Stone 2019). No less than eighteen remakes have been released (and more are coming), ranging from a French to a Spanish version, from a Chinese to a Turkish one. This case illustrates very clearly the global dimensions of contemporary remake practices.

With the above in mind, it is quite surprising that most research in the field has been restricted to Hollywood remake practices (remaking both Hollywood and foreign films) and to the question of how other film industries remake Hollywood films. Indeed, until today, due to a variety of reasons – among them Hollywood's global dominance – the association of the film remake practice with Hollywood's film industry still seems to prevail in academic literature as well as in popular discourses (see Smith and Verevis 2017). Luckily, more and more scholars in the field are making attempts to look beyond Hollywood, probing into other film industries that produce remakes, thereby showing that the remake has never been 'a peculiar American phenomenon' (Forrest 2002: 89). As the preceding paragraphs already indicated, and as the chapters in this book will clearly demonstrate, both the history and the present of European cinema provide numerous opportunities for a rich analysis of the remake from a non-Hollywood perspective.[2] Hence, focusing on the European remake practice, this book aims to expand and rethink the research field of remake studies.

As the title *European Film Remakes* shows, this volume clearly focusses on the remaking of films. In valuable attempts to better grasp the research object, many different scholars and critics have come up with a variety of specifications and categorisations of the general idea of the film remake as being a new version of a previous film (see, for instance, Horton and McDougal 1998; Leitch 1990; Forrest and Koos 2002; Verevis 2006; Zanger 2006; Loock and Verevis 2012; Verevis 2017). Although their endeavours might provide handy signposts, 'their competition is often characteri[s]ed by a normative insistence that we use the right words, as if cinematic formats existed as ideal forms that are then articulated more or less precisely by this or that film' (Kelleter and Loock 2017: 129–30). Yet, on the contrary, not only are filmic formats never

ideal (in the Platonic sense), they also do not exist in canonised shapes as they are formed contingently. Indeed, 'formal boundaries are always fluid [and] cinematic remaking is a reflexive, multi-agential, and temporally shifting process, ultimately competition-based and spanning the fields of production and reception' (Kelleter and Loock 2017: 130). Therefore, by not adding another definition to the already long list, this volume instead embraces and promotes the complexity of the term, the phenomenon, the practice and its surrounding discourses. This does, however, not imply that some of its contributors do not demarcate their objects of research by providing a proper definition. Yet, it is clear that such an undertaking mainly meets analytical rather than terminological demands.

THE 'EUROPEAN' IN EUROPEAN CINEMA: ENTER THE FILM REMAKE

In the 1990s, the political, economic and cultural unification of Europe came with an increasing scholarly interest in European cinema. However, as Elsaesser (2005: 13) famously noted: 'Any book about European cinema should start with the statement that there is no such thing as European cinema, and that yes, European cinema exists, and has existed since the beginning of cinema a little more than a hundred years ago. It depends on where one places oneself, both in time and in space'. This paradoxical stance – European cinema *an sich* does not exist, especially not outside the critical field (Fowler 2002: 1); yet, it exists in different forms and contexts, depending on the perspective – lies at the heart of this volume. Consequently, a conceptualisation of Europe (and, therefore, European cinema) will always be questionable and intrinsically contingent. Therefore, in line with Elsaesser's plea, most studies on European cinema are quick to acknowledge the impossibility of providing a strict delineation of their subject (Kaklamanidou and Corbalán 2018).

Perspective is key in reflecting on European cinema. From an outsider perspective, Europe as a continent may look like an entity with diminished influence – its cinema being 'in view of its declining impact and seeming provincialism, merely a part of "world cinema"' (Elsaesser 2005: 30). From the inside, European cinema may be perceived as extremely diverse, but for many it is still united in this diversity, thereby recalling the European Union's motto. Acknowledging the discursive status of such an endeavour, however, does not imply that the adoption of a concept such as European cinema is analytically useless, provided that a clear contextualisation is given. The fact that 'European cinema has not become irrelevant' (Harrod, Liz and Timoshkina 2014: 7) is reflected not only in the recurrent use of the concept in academic, critical, popular and policy discourses, but also in terms of cinema admissions. Based

on an analysis of the period between 2004 and 2014, 12 percent of cinema admissions in Europe were for non-national European films, while 21 percent of European movie-goers went to nationally produced films. This total of 33 percent may seem small in comparison to the 65 percent of US films, but in comparison to the 'rest category' of non-American and non-European films (2 percent) it becomes more significant (Jones 2017).

A recurring idea in discourses about European cinema posits that it is characterised by an artistic mindset, fuelling two binary oppositions that go hand in hand: commerce versus art and Hollywood versus European cinema. Even though these reductionist discourses have oftentimes been criticised, until today '[t]his stereotypical construction [. . .] still has currency with audiences, policy-makers, and filmmakers' (Meir 2019: 152). As Mazdon (2000) has pointed out, the film remake, known for its inherent, almost transcending hybrid status, directly disapproves of such easy binary oppositions.

Another issue that should be taken into account when studying European cinema is that the parameters and (historical) perspectives that have dominated the research field have failed to acknowledge 'the supranational implication of the term "European"' (Bergfelder 2005: 315). Consequently, the lion's share of studies has analysed European cinema through the national cinema lens. Luckily, in the past fifteen years, the transnational has been increasingly adopted in the concept of national cinema,[3] which partly responds to Bergfelder's (2005: 315–16) call to emphasise the 'issues of transnational interaction and cross-cultural reception, and reposition some areas of European film history which, until now, have often been seen as peripheral'.

Taking these considerations into account, this book employs the film remake to reflect on the conceptualisation of European cinema itself, instead of providing a clear-cut – whether geographical, socio-cultural, political, economic or even aesthetic – delineation of European cinema. Of course, we must be aware that, by its sheer existence, this volume also indirectly takes part in reshaping the meaning of European cinema – however, for the first time from the perspective of the film remake. Its title, *European Film Remakes*, does not designate the idea of a clear, overarching pan-European film industry and culture, but refers to the ever-changing diversity as well as common grounds of European cinema, thereby following Bergfelder (2005: 320) in his understanding of 'the "European" in European cinema [. . .] as an on-going process'.

EUROPEAN REMAKING PRACTICES IN THE PAST: DIACHRONIC OR SYNCHRONIC?

Although little is known about the particular history of European film remakes, Herbert (2008: 217) has argued that the flows of film remakes within Europe

have generally 'conformed to much greater patterns of cultural and cinematic exchange'. Think, for instance, of how the expressionist cinema of Weimar Germany from the 1910s until the early 1930s circulated not only around the globe, but also resulted in, among others, a Czechoslovak-French remake of the German film *The Golem* (*Der Golem*, 1920), titled *The Golem: A Legend of Prague* (*Le Golem*, 1936) and released sixteen years later. Herbert (2008: 217) adds that 'despite this tendency of cycling, there are numerous "oddball" transnational film remakes [. . .] which defy trends or common patterns of exchange'.

What these cycles and seemingly singular remakes share, however, is their 'system of "trial and error" that, in some accounts, resembles the means by which genres develop over time' (Herbert 2008: 218). Hence, driven by a rather conservative commercial logic, these so-called 'oddball' remakes regularly launched cycles, ultimately seeking to bypass the financial risks of film production by employing tried-and-tested formulas. Because of the industrial nature of this logic, usually just a handful of financially unsuccessful remakes were sufficient to either stop a cycle, or incite a transformation in the strategy, leading to another distinct type of cycle (Herbert 2008).

According to Loock (2019), throughout history, remaking films in Europe was mainly transnational in nature, as well as highly commercially driven. Moreover, she argues, the synchronic type of remaking is most common in European cinema, whereas diachronic remaking, the 'production of remakes over decades-spanning period of time' (Loock 2019: 326–27), is rather rare – at least compared to Hollywood's history of remaking. However, even though until now there is no overarching study, dataset or index to confirm the opposite thesis, one can find much anecdotal proof that 1930s sound remakes of silent films from preceding decades ('talker remakes')[4] were also popular in national film industries across Europe (see, for instance, Bachmann 2013; Bock and Bergfelder 2009; Gundle 2013; Hake 2002; Wood 1986).

The different chapters in this volume equally show that there arguably is more evidence to be found proving the exact opposite of Loock's (2019) statement. Indeed, the different chapters on the remake practices in, for instance, post-war Germany (see Frank), post-socialist Russia (see Noordenbos and Souch) and Hungary (see Varga), as well as Sweden in the 1950s (see Sanyal and Cuelenaere) all seem to point out that, rather than synchronic transnational European film remakes, diachronic intra-national ones were more common. Nevertheless, in a way, Kris Van Heuckelom's chapter conversely seems to bring us back to Loock's findings, while relocating her thesis to the contemporary context. Indeed, Van Heuckelom argues that the four Polish remakes under analysis in his study 'mark a significant transition in terms of temporal and geographical scope: whereas the first two productions embody a particular form of "diachronic remaking" within a distinct Eastern Bloc context – offering

contemporary variations on communist-era film classics – the two most recent projects (which take their cues, respectively, from a Dutch and an Italian screenplay) indicate that Polish film professionals are becoming increasingly active in the field of transnational (synchronic) film remaking'.

(RE-)ASSESSING EUROPEAN FILM REMAKES IN TODAY'S (GLOBALISED) CONTEXT

From the 1990s onwards, the critical discourses on remakes were marked by a specific take on, or interpretation of film remake practices. Adopting terms such as cultural assimilation and domination (often in tandem with 'Americanisation'), film remake practices were mostly seen as reflective of the existing hegemonic cultural forces and broader industrial hierarchies (Herbert 2008: 198). As Christopher Meir argues in this collection, Hollywood is generally 'seen as the stronger industry that exploits smaller industries such as those of Europe, virtually mining it for raw materials to turn into English-language remakes for international release, including in the home countries of the original films in question'. With Mazdon's 2000 seminal work on the Hollywood remake cycle of French films in the 1980s and 1990s (and how this remake cycle is exemplary of a complex process of exchange rather than a one-dimensional power relation) as one of the first studies and Smith's 2016 book on Turkish, Filipino and Indian remakes of Hollywood products as one of the more recent, these above-mentioned simplistic binaries have been questioned and critiqued, both theoretically and empirically.

In the new millennium, under the influence of broader globalising and digital developments, the industrial context of European cinema has drastically changed. Among other things, the quantity of European films produced annually has surpassed the number of 1,000. Between 2013 and 2017, on average, admissions to European films outside Europe itself amounted to 20 percent (90 million for a total of 440 admissions), mainly driven by the Chinese market – China, rather than the US, is now the largest export market for European films (Kanzler and Patrizia 2019). Furthermore, several vertically and horizontally integrated pan-European studios with large back catalogues have succeeded in producing mid- to big-budget films that perform well globally (Meir 2019).

In this renewed context, around the late 2000s, several European-based companies such as Crazy Cow in Brussels and Cinema Republic in Madrid started concentrating on the acquisition, representation and selling of remake rights of both European and non-European films, which is now deemed a viable financial strategy (Labayen and Morán 2019). Additionally, other recent research shows that smaller national European film industries that are culturally proximate

started remaking each other's domestic hits (with or without the mediating role of a remake rights representative) in the 2000s in order to bypass the apparent European films' impotence of crossing its national borders (Cuelenaere et al. 2019). Lastly, during the same period, pan-European studios such as the French Studiocanal have also seen potential in remakes and became quite active in this specific segment of the industry by purchasing and selling remake rights. Even more, since Studiocanal's global reappearance in 2006, '[r]emakes and readaptations are at the heart of its creative strategies' (Meir 2019: 134).

One might wonder if the evolution and recent transnational and synchronic development of the European film remake industries might eventually mirror the success story of European television formats. While the US has been leading the international trade of TV formats, research by Esser (2016) reveals that since the 2000s European production companies quickly invested in the format business and became highly successful in it (for example, companies such as the Dutch Endemol and the British FremantleMedia). However, from 2011 onwards 'the U.S. media conglomerates, initially slow to reali[s]e the business potential of internationally formatted and locally produced content, have cemented their leadership in television entertainment by buying nearly all of the largest (available) groups' (Esser 2016: 3608). This makes one wonder how Hollywood will respond to the advancements in the European film remake industry.

ON THE 'EUROPEANNESS' AND HOLLYWOOD-LIKE STATUS OF EUROPEAN FILM REMAKES

This brings us to the elephant in the room: how does Hollywood relate to European film remakes? Although it is precisely this volume's purpose to look at the remake phenomenon beyond the context of Hollywood, in one way or another Hollywood always seems to be lurking in the background. Through the appropriation of 'Hollywoodian' narrative and stylistic elements, genre tropes, or even production, promotion and distribution strategies, many of the films that fall under the category of European remakes often show much 'cultural familiarity with Hollywood' (Higson 2018: 316) and could therefore be labelled 'like-Hollywood' films. This raises the question of the (perceived) 'Europeanness' of these European film remakes, not only in terms of their representations, but also in terms of industrial strategies, stake-holders and financial involvement.

Concerning the cultural identity or character of (both international and intranational) European film remakes, it is useful to summon Hjort's (2009) distinction between marked and unmarked transnationalism. According to Buonanno (2015), this can easily be translated into the idea of 'Europeanness'. Whereas 'marked Europeanness [. . .] is the peculiarity of those types of [. . .]

drama that convey and display discernible and often unmistakable evidence of European involvement and presence at some level of the creative and production process' (Buonanno 2015: 210), unmarked Europeanness characterises content that in spite of its clear European involvement (for example, in its conception or production) is not typified or recognised as European by its viewing audiences. As transnational film remakes are usually 'subjected to a process of indigeni[s]ation purposely aimed at re-framing and re-imagining the original concepts and scripts' (Buonanno 2015: 210) that were conceived in a specific cultural and industrial context, they could be considered as archetypical examples of unmarked Europeanness. Put simply, the possible foreignness and/or Europeanness of the source text can be overshadowed because of the domesticating frameworks at work in the remake process.

Next to the fact that a European identity is as equally constructed, contingent and imagined as whatever national or cultural identity, because of its subjection to the process of localisation or indigenisation, the remake process might equally so disguise, or indeed, bury the possible Europeanness of these intra-European remakes. Hence, 'remaking films in Europe could [. . .] be regarded as a process that prevents mediated cultural encounters in a kind of national echo chamber' (Cuelenaere 2020: 229). Glancing at the statistics of the Eurobarometer (Kantar Public Brussels and European Commission 2018), most EU citizens feel most attached to their country (93 percent), then to their city/town/village (89 percent), but only in third place to Europe (65 percent) and finally to the European Union (56 percent). In light of the preferences for a particular cultural or national identity in the new millennium, we should be wary of the cultural consequences of the national echo chambers that these European film remakes might be(come). Indeed, the rise of these localised versions of European films might contribute to national European spectators perceiving 'their' culture as mainly national, in spite of its 'global and European dimensions' (Bondebjerg et al. 2017: 4). Nevertheless, we can also ask if and how these intra-European film remakes condition the possible mediated encounters with 'other Europeans', and, therefore, help in 'build[ing], maintain[ing], or re-shap[ing] the perception of similarities and differences between diverse European societies and cultures and contributed to the formation of a sense of European belonging?' (Buonanno 2015: 209).

REMAKING FILMS TO OVERCOME STRUCTURAL LIMITATIONS IN THE EUROPEAN FILM INDUSTRY?

When studying European cinema, we must, as mentioned above, acknowledge its fragmented nature. Due to its linguistic and cultural diversity, the European film market is characterised by a dual economy, split between

the almost crushing dominance of Hollywood films, on the one hand, and a smaller yet still significant market share for local or national films targeted solely at domestic audiences, on the other (Paris 2014). This dual economy illustrates how difficult it is for European films to cross their borders and be distributed within Europe (Jones 2017).[5] Whereas large film industries (such as Germany, France, the UK, Italy and Spain) can benefit from 'economies of scale and larger businesses with access to more substantial funds for production, distribution and marketing' (Higson 2018: 308), smaller European film industries (such as Belgium, the Netherlands, Hungary, Portugal, or Denmark) have to deal with low admission rates. Consequently, their production companies have difficulties in competing with the distribution and marketing budgets of both Hollywood and the bigger European film industries. Yet again this aspect of distribution brings us to Hollywood and its dominance in the global distribution market. Meir (2019: 4) asserts that the reasons for the weak distribution of European films (both in and outside Europe) are multiple, 'but suffice it to say that many stem from the persistent and fundamental separation in European cinema between production and distribution', while Hollywood studios have quickly commenced to vertically integrate. Hence, throughout the history of European film industries, most of the capital was allocated to the production of films, and to a much lesser amount to their distribution (Puttnam 1997). Therefore, one wonders whether the enduring prospect of low admission rates and limited budgets have forced these small film industries in Europe to increasingly resort to 'solutions' such as remaking films instead of trying to distribute them.

With the rise of intra-European film remakes, one could argue that, finally, audio-visual stories are able to travel in Europe, yet guised in the banal (national) familiarities that film remakes are able to offer us. On the one hand, they 'cater to tastes shaped by global [read: Hollywood] cinema' (Mueller 2019: 2); on the other hand, they capitalise on the audiences' desire for cultural proximity by localising culturally specific aspects that otherwise make it difficult for these films to travel outside their national borders. This volume, therefore, aspires to partly answer Bergfelder's (2005: 326) call for 'a transnational history of European cinema [that focuses] precisely on the strategies and practices by which filmic texts "travel" and become transformed according to the specific requirements of different cultural contexts and audiences'. This brings us to a thesis that certainly needs further investigation: should we understand the dissemination of intra-European film remakes as a possible new (successful) form of film circulation? We deliberately adopt the term 'circulation' here. Following Garofalo, Holdaway and Scaglioni (2018: 302), we deem 'circulation' more accurate than 'distribution' in this case, permitting 'a more nuanced image of the movements of media: accounting for the multitude of distribution windows for a film, but also foregrounding, vitally, the wider cultural impact

of cinema'. From such a perspective, it appears that the practice of remaking films might present a novel and workable approach to bypass the European film industries' inability of crossing national borders.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

In order to further deepen our knowledge and understanding of film remakes in the context of European cinema, we have collected fifteen essays that reflect the broad diversity of the issue at hand, in terms of both theoretical perspectives and practical manifestations.[6] To conclude this introduction, let us briefly wander through the different sections. While each section looks at the film remake from a different perspective – conceptual, historical, contemporary and industrial – as a whole they echo the central idea of the remake as a kind of prism, allowing us to address a broad variety of themes within the realm of European cinema.

Given the young and emerging nature of the field of remake studies, the first section ('Conceptual Perspectives') presents five chapters that contest, expand or rethink the notion and practice of the remake on a theoretical and methodological level. Eduard Cuelenaere introduces us to a model to systematically analyse film remakes which goes beyond the mere description of textual similarities and differences between source text and its remake. His holistic approach calls for an additional interpretative layer, hence reconciling the textual with dimensions of production and reception. Likewise, the following three chapters also call for broadening the field, not in terms of the applied methodology, but regarding its conceptual *vocabularium* and manners of classification. Marie Martin teases out the idea of a 'secret remake', which she presents as the European take on the traditional (Hollywood) remake given the new concept's departure from a European perspective on film. She hints at more latent, hidden or unconscious processes related to remaking films, experienced by authors as well as by the audience. In a similar vein, Peter Verstraten and Mario Slugan further problematise the ongoing debate on how to define the remake. Verstraten travels into the world of the homage as a way to expand and question our terminology used to get a grasp on the practice of remaking. Just like Martin, Verstraten equally puts forth the idea of hidden or latent familiarity either in remaking films, related to a director's admiration for a precursor film, or in watching remakes as a(n) (un)conscious viewer. The chapter by Mario Slugan further delves into the question of how multiple versions of the same narrative are connected to one another, ranging from book to adaptation and remake. Exploring the case of Rainer Werner Fassbinder's *Berlin Alexanderplatz* (1980), Slugan makes the call to understand the remake

as a knowing intentional engagement with a proximate source text. Concluding the first section is Iain Robert Smith who previously coined the concept of the 'Hollywood meme' (Smith 2016) as a way to empirically explore the politics of cultural globalisation in processes of cinematic cultural exchange. In the present chapter, Smith supplements his US-centred conceptual model with the study of a cultural flow that does not focus on Hollywood. Consequently, the case-study of a low-budget Turkish remake of an Italian giallo invites a wider reflection on cinematic cultural exchange within and beyond Europe and simultaneously introduces us to the broader phenomenon of 'remakesploitation' – that is, unlicensed exploitation film remakes.

The next sections reflect the broad diversity of European cinema in general and of remake practices in particular – what could be called a European patchwork quilt of remakes, thereby embracing its heterogeneous nature while also acknowledging common grounds. Given the drastically changed nature of European cinema since the dawn of the new millennium, a first section ('Historical Perspectives') deals with cases dating back to the early years of film and expanding to post-war Europe and the subsequent decades. To kick off these historical inquiries into the remake practice, Jennifer Forest takes us back to the so-called Golden Age of French sound cinema (1930–60) with her analysis of *La Maternelle* – the novel, the adaptation and the remakes. By looking at this unique intertextual series, she lays bare a dynamic of disavowal and invocation in response to the changing historical conditions. The shaping force of a *zeitgeist* and its everyday evocation in society are also a leading principle in Stefanie Mathilde Frank's chapter on German post-war remakes during the Adenauer era (1949–63). Adopting a diachronic and synchronic approach, she explores the structural and economic conditions under which remakes were produced in post-war Germany, from the first years after the Nazi era until the demise of this particular remake cycle at the start of the 1960s. Concluding our historical section, Kamalika Sanyal and Eduard Cuelenaere head north to study the practice of the Swedish film industry in the 1950s to release colour remakes of film classics based on literary works. Through archival research, they demonstrate how the use of colour was employed as a promotional strategy. Additionally, they map out how these remakes were received, interpreted and labelled by critics and journalists alike, echoing the apparently timeless negative stance and disdain surrounding remaking practices.

Popular discourses surrounding the production and circulation of remakes are generally fuelled by comparative yet often superficial assessments of remake and source film. With our next section ('Contemporary Perspectives'), we wish to offer a scholarly sound counterweight to said evaluations. We do so by presenting the reader with a selection of contemporary case-studies of the European remake practice. Kris Van Heuckelom immediately sets the bar high

by charting the largely unexplored territory of Polish remakes. Meticulously fleshing out textual features, critical discourses and marketing strategies, he is able to disclose the drastic development of Polish remake practices over the past two decades, unravelling the significant transition in terms of temporal and geographical scope. Similar ideas of transition and transformation are subject of the chapters by Boris Noordenbos and Irina Souch, as well as by Balázs Varga, who also introduce the notion of nostalgia into their analyses. Both chapters address the remake as an instrument to cope with the communist past of their respective countries of study, by approaching the remake as a cultural expression of nostalgia. For Noordenbos and Souch, this could be seen as indicative of a (potentially dangerous) desire to return to communist ideology or Soviet authoritarianism. The case of *The Crew* (Lebedev, 2016) allows them to question and understand the cultural 'work' of nostalgia in Russian society today. Balázs Varga takes us further with his fine-grained analysis of a series of Hungarian millennial remakes of classic interwar comedies. Following in the footsteps of the previous chapters, his contribution shows the unique potential of remakes in the shaping and discussion of the traditions of local popular cinema. Leaving a small European film industry such as Hungary behind us, the next stop on our journey through the European cinemascape are two of the largest film markets, France and Italy. Constantine Verevis looks at Luca Guadagnino's *A Bigger Splash* (2015), highlighting the film's status as a new millennial remake (Verevis 2017) in addition to discussing its features of commercial refashioning and authorial branding.

Capturing the above-mentioned drastic changes to the industrial context of European cinema since the new millennium, the final section of the book ('Industrial Perspectives') provides insights into contemporary practices of production and circulation of remakes. The chapter by Robert Munro and Michael Stewart traces the industrial, textual and critical differences and similarities between one of the best-loved Scottish films of all time, *Whisky Galore!* (Mackendrick, 1949), and its 2016 remake, hence combining two different eras of production and demonstrating the value of considering the peculiarities of a film's productional context. Focusing on an important agent in the network of film production, Núria Araüna Baró then takes the director as her vantage point to reflect on how the interpretation and production practices of remakes function in a transnational axis of power relationships where films move from one national context to another. She particularly problematises the relationship between Spanish and Hollywood cinema. The idea of going beyond the well-known binaries of Hollywood versus Europe is also central in the final chapter by Christopher Meir. He argues that the remake and remaking practices are unique tools to capture and study the extent and wide-ranging impact of the fundamental changes that the European film industry has undergone in the last two decades, bringing us full circle with the book volume's central notion of the remake as a kind of prism.

NOTES

1. One should note that the statement that the film remake's genesis coincided with the emergence of cinema itself very much depends on how one defines the term 'film remake'. Indeed, basing themselves on a different conceptualisation of the film remake, several scholars have criticised this very statement. More particularly, it is asserted that, on the one hand, in the early days of cinema, 'there was no conceptual or practical difference between the mechanical reproduction of film prints [that is, 'dupes'] and the re-photographing of similarly staged events or scenes [that is, film remakes]' (Herbert 2008: 127). On the other hand, it is argued that before 'film emerged from the veil of public domain to enter into the legal realm of the Copyright Statute' (Forrest 2002: 90), 'film remakes' that predate the specific year where film is added to copyright law should probably not be called 'remakes', as practically everyone re-used (or, arguably, pirated or stole) each other's material – which would imply that most of the films then produced were remakes. In most European countries (such as France, Belgium, Germany, or Norway), this (anticipated) legal step happened in 1910, following the signing of the Berlin Act in 1908, which revised the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works by adding cinematographic productions. Most other European countries followed over the next ten years.
2. See also the special issue of *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research* entitled 'Current trends in remaking European screen cultures' (Cuelenaere, Joye and Willems 2019b), which takes a broader approach, including television remakes.
3. Higson (2006: 23) argues that 'it would be impossible – and certainly unwise – to ignore the concept [of national cinema] altogether'; yet, simultaneously, it does not seem useful 'to think through cultural diversity and cultural specificity in solely national terms', given that 'the contingent communities that cinema imagines are much more likely to be either local or transnational than national'.
4. These have already been studied in the context of Hollywood (Loock 2016).
5. The exceptions to this rule are: '(a) a big-budget Hollywood-style action/adventure blockbuster or animation; (b) a medium-budget middlebrow quality drama based on a best-selling book and an Oscar-winning Hollywood star attached; or (c) a low-budget MEDIA-supported art-house film made by a Palme-d'Or-winning auteur' (Jones 2020: 203). However, from a broader perspective, these exceptions clearly form a minority.
6. The book is for the most part a collection of keynotes and papers presented at the symposium *Remaking European Cinema* which the editors organised on 1 June 2018 at Ghent University, Belgium. The symposium also resulted in a special issue of *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research*.

REFERENCES

Bachmann, Anne (2013), 'Locating Inter-Scandinavian Silent Film Culture: Connections, Contentions, Configurations', doctoral dissertation, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis.

Bergfelder, Tim (2005), 'National, Transnational or Supranational Cinema? Rethinking European Film Studies', *Media, Culture, Society*, 27: 3, 315–31.

Bock, Hans-Michael and Bergfelder, Tim (2009), *The Concise Cinegraph: Encyclopaedia of German Cinema*, New York: Berghahn Books.

Bondebjerg, Ib, Eva Novrup Redvall, Rasmus Helles, Signe Sophus Lai, Hendrik Søndergaard and Cecilie Astrupgaard (eds) (2017), *Transnational European Television Drama*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Buonanno, Milly (2015), 'Italian TV Drama: The Multiple Forms of European Influence' in Eva Novrup Redvall, Ib Bondebjerg and Andrew Higson (eds), *European Cinema and Television: Cultural Policy and Everyday Life,* London: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 195–213.

Cuelenaere, Eduard (2020), 'A "Double Take" on the Nation(al) in the Dutch-Flemish Monolingual Film Remake', in Michael Stewart and Robert Munro (eds), *Intercultural Screen Adaptation: British and Global Case Studies*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 222–40.

Cuelenaere, Eduard, Stijn Joye and Gertjan Willems (2019a), 'Local Flavors and Regional Markers: The Low Countries and Their Commercially Driven and Proximity-Focused Film Remake Practice', *Communications*, 44: 3, 262–81.

Cuelenaere, Eduard, Stijn Joye and Gertjan Willems (2019b), 'Current Trends in Remaking European Screen Cultures', *Communications*, 44: 3, 257–61.

Elsaesser, Thomas (2005), *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Esser, Andrea (2016), 'Challenging US Leadership in Entertainment Television? The Rise and Sale of Europe's International TV Production Groups', *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 3585–614.

Forrest, Jennifer (2002), 'The "Personal" Touch: The Original, the Remake, and the Dupe in Early Cinema', in Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos (eds), *Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice*, New York: SUNY Press, pp. 89–126.

Forrest, Jennifer and Leonard R. Koos (2002), 'Reviewing Remakes: An Introduction', in Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos (eds), *Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice*, New York: SUNY Press, pp. 1–36.

Fowler, Catherine (ed) (2002), *The European Cinema Reader*, Brighton: Psychology Press.

Garofalo, Damiano, Dom Holdaway and Massimo Scaglioni (2018), 'Introduction: The International Circulation of European Cinema in the Digital Era', *Comunicazioni sociali*, 3, 301–5.

Gundle, Stephen (2013), *Mussolini's Dream Factory: Film Stardom in Fascist Italy*, New York: Berghahn Books.

Hake, Sabine (2002), *German National Cinema*, New York: Routledge.

Harrod, Mary, Mariana Liz and Alissa Timoshkina (eds) (2014), *The Europeanness of European Cinema: Identity, Meaning, Globalization*, London: I. B. Tauris.

Harvey, James (2018), *On the Visual Cultures of the New Nationalisms*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Herbert, Daniel (2008), 'Transnational Film Remakes: Time, Space, Identity', doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Higson, Andrew (2006), 'The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema', in Elizabeth Ezra and Terry Rowden (eds), *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 15–25.

Higson, Andrew (2018), The Circulation of European Films within Europe', *Comunicazioni sociali*, 3, 306–23.

Hjort, Mette (2009), 'On the Plurality of Cinematic Transnationalism', in Natasa Durovicova and Kathleen Newman (eds), *World Cinemas: Transnational Perspectives*, London: Routledge, pp. 12–33.

Horton, Andrew and Stuart Y. McDougal (1998), *Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes*, Berkeley: California University Press.

Jones, Huw (2017), 'Remapping World Cinema through Audience Research', in Rob Stone, Paul Cooke, Stephanie Dennison and Alex Marlow-Mann (eds), *The Routledge Companion to World Cinema*, London: Routledge, pp. 467–81.

Jones, Huw (2020), 'Crossing Borders: Investigating the International Appeal of European Films', in Ingrid Lewis and Laura Canning (eds), *European Cinema in the 21st Century: Discourses, Directions and Genres*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.187–205.

Kaklamanidou, Betty and Ana Corbalán (2018), 'Introduction: Contested Terms, the European Union Contribution, and a Financial Crisis', in Betty Kaklamanidou and Ana Corbalán (eds), *Contemporary European Cinema: Crisis Narratives and Narratives in Crisis*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–19.

Kantar Public Brussels and European Commission (March 2018), *Standard Eurobarometer 89* (report), available at: http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/ResultDoc/download/DocumentKy/83538 (last accessed 10 August 2019).

Kanzler, Martin and Simone Patrizia (2019), 'The Circulation of European Films Outside Europe', European Audiovisual Observatory, Strasbourg, available at: https://rm.coe.int/the-circulation-of-european-films-outside-europe-key-figures-2017/168094629e (last accessed 2 August 2019).

Kelleter, Frank and Kathleen Loock (2017), 'Hollywood Remaking as Second-Order Serialization', in Frank Kelleter (ed), *Media of Serial Narrative*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, pp. 125–47.

Labayen, Miguel Fernández and Ana Martín Morán (2019), 'Manufacturing Proximity Through Film Remakes: Remake Rights Representatives and the Case of Local-Language Comedy Remakes', *Communications*, 44: 3, 282–303.

Leitch, Thomas M. (1990), 'Twice-Told Tales: The Rhetoric of the Remake', *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 18: 3, 138–49.

Loock, Kathleen and Constantine Verevis (2012), 'Introduction: Remake/Remodel', in Kathleen Loock and Constantine Verevis (eds), *Film Remakes, Adaptations and Fan Productions*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 1–15.

Loock, Kathleen (2016), 'Sound Memories: "Talker Remakes", Paratexts, and the Cinematic Past', in Sara Pesce and Paolo Noto (eds), *The Political of Ephemeral Digital Media: Permanence and Obsolescence in Paratexts*, New York: Routledge, pp. 123–37.

Loock, Kathleen (2019), 'Remaking Winnetou, Reconfiguring German Fantasies of Indianer and the Wild West in the Post-Reunification Era', *Communications*, 44: 3, 323–41.

Mazdon, Lucy (2000), *Encore Hollywood: Remaking French Cinema*, London: British Film Institute.

Meir, Christopher (2019), *Mass Producing European Cinema: Studiocanal and Its Works*, London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Mueller, Gabriele (2019), 'Boy 7 in Double Exposure: European Genre Cinema Between Transnational Industry Practices and National Consumption', *Studies in European Cinema*, 1–13.

Paris, Thomas (2014), *New Approaches for Greater Diversity of Cinema in Europe*, Technical report, European Commission, available at: https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/library/studies/cinema-diversity-report_en.pdf (last accessed 1 August 2020).

Puttnam, David (1997), *The Undeclared War: The Struggle for Control of the World's Film Industry*, London: HarperCollins.

Rolling Stone (16 July 2019), '"Perfetti sconosciuti" nel Guinness dei primati: è il film con più remake della storia', *Rolling Stone*, available at: https://www.rollingstone.it/cinema/news-cinema/perfetti-sconosciuti-nel-guinness-dei-primati-e-il-film-con-piu-remake-della-storia/468955/ (last accessed 3 September 2019).

Smith, Iain Robert (2016), *The Hollywood Meme: Transnational Adaptations in World Cinema*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Smith, Iain Robert and Constantine Verevis (eds) (2017), 'Introduction: Transnational film Remakes', in Iain Robert Smith and Constantine Verevis (eds), *Transnational Film Remakes*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 1–18.

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

Verevis, Constantine (2017), 'New Millennial Remakes', in Frank Kelleter (ed), *Media of Serial Narrative*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, pp. 148–66.

Wood, Linda (1986), *British Films, 1927–1939*, London: British Film Institute.

Zanger, Anat (2006), *Film Remakes as Ritual and Disguise: From Carmen to Ripley*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.