University of Roehampton London

DOCTORAL THESIS

Bearing Witness to a Whole Bunch of Murders

The Aesthetics of Perspective in the Friday the 13th Films

Clayton, George Wickham

Award date:
2013

Awarding institution:
University of Roehampton

Bearing Witness to a Whole Bunch of Murders:

The Aesthetics of Perspective in the <u>Friday the 13th</u> Films

By:

George Wickham Clayton III, BA, MA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

PhD

Department of Media Culture and Language

Roehampton University

2013

<u>Abstract</u>

With twelve films released over the last thirty years, the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series has proved a popular mainstay of the slasher sub-genre of horror, in spite of negative critical reception and minimal academic engagement. The academic discourses that do address the series often frame their arguments based on socio-political function, socioeconomic platforms, psychoanalytic traditions, and cultural relevance. While there is some work that attempts to understand the generic positioning and function of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, little work has engaged with the film texts in order to understand and explain the form and structure of each instalment in the series.

This thesis not only aims to explore and describe the aesthetic form of the slasher sub-genre of horror, but also to argue the central significance of perspective on the aesthetic effect of the slasher. Perspective, a term that builds upon theories of point of view and subjectivity, permeates the formal design of the slasher film. Therefore, this relationship will be the driving focus of the analysis undertaken with regards to the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, which will include chapters focusing on specific uses of the camera, sound, editing, and sequences creating a narrative understanding of preceding films in the series.

Following this analysis, the aesthetic development of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series will be contextualised within contemporary generic trends, demonstrating to what extent this franchise is representative of the slasher, and where it proves anomalous or progressive. This will not only demonstrate the role the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films play within the slasher, but also how the slasher has aesthetically evolved over more than three decades. Ultimately, the relevance of this analysis and formal historicizing will be suggestive of the wider context of film studies and cinema as a whole.

Table of Contents

<u>Acknowledgements</u>

Without the following people, this thesis would probably be considerably different, if it would even exist at all.

My supervisors, Dr. Stacey Abbott, Dr. Michael Chanan, and Dr. Paul Sutton have all given valuable advice, tireless effort, and extraordinary commitment. They also shared a fair chunk of their knowledge with me, for which I am greatly indebted to them. Thank you to my family, who have given me lots of moral (and financial) support. Lots. The Clough family has also sacrificed much to get me to this point, and their contribution is greatly and humbly appreciated.

Many thanks to Sarah Harman and Zalfa Feghali, both of whom have provided valuable editorial comments, encouragement and support. Sarah and Zalfa also had the incredible good humour to field late night panicky texts from me. For various pieces of information and moral support, I would like to thank Dr. Todd Berliner, Dr. Kate Egan, Dr. Ian Conrich, Johnny Walker, Tom Watson, Laura Mee, Sarah Wharton, Jarkko Toikkanen, Nick Hall, Emma James, Emma Grylls, Michael Ahmed, and Dr. Gareth James. For tireless encouragement from the moment I conceived this idea, through the initial application process, and consistently throughout my research, I'd like to thank Jerry DeMario, Jason Russell, and Joe Ketchum. I would like to thank Noel Cunningham for an incredibly polite e-mail in which he declined, in lieu of his father, participating in an interview. If the Cunninghams continue making films, I will harbour no resentment.

There are numerous others to thank, and all of them are fantastic.

Finally, to my son, who has kept my spirits up while I persevered through this project, I owe a lot, and I will probably end up paying back every bit of it.

I dedicate this to my son, Wicklet,

from whom,

if Robin Wood and Tony Williams are to be believed,

I have much to fear.

The Friday the 13th Film Series

Friday the 13th (1980; dir. Cunningham)

Friday the 13th Part 2 (1981; dir. Miner)

Friday the 13th Part III 3-D (1982; dir. Miner)

Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter (1984; dir. Zito)

Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning (1985; dir. Steinmann)

Jason Lives! Friday the 13th Part VI (1986; dir. McLoughlin)

Friday the 13th Part VII: The New Blood (1988; dir. Buechler)

Friday the 13th Part VIII: Jason Takes Manhattan (1989; dir. Hedden)

Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday (1993; dir. Marcus)

Jason X (2001; dir. Isaac)

Freddy vs. Jason (2003; dir. Yu)

Friday the 13th (2009; dir. Nispel)

Introduction

The impetus for this thesis can be credited to three primary sources. In 2001 I attended the opening lecture for an Introduction to Film Studies course taught by Dr. Todd Berliner at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. After roll call, he began the lecture by saying, in effect, "My courses focus on aesthetics, which is the study of what people in fact value about art (the pleasure it gives them), as opposed to what people think they ought to value about art (its meaning)."[1] As he began to explain this position, reactions from students ranged from confusion to anger to interest. I admit to experiencing all three, in that order.

Although I have not fully adopted his position for the purpose of this thesis, I did find Berliner's approach both surprising and refreshing. His argument is that students of the arts are taught very early on to analyse works and texts to understand meaning and message, placing importance on subtext, symbolism and allegory. Berliner claimed that there is no academic value in this sort of interpretive criticism, and that most students of the arts have been deceived by this type of analysis almost since the beginning of their education. He concluded that a study of form and structure tells us more about a work of art than interpretive analysis, which instils itself with false import. Berliner also stated that searching for meaning in art makes

---

[1] This quote comes from a personal communication. However, it did appear on Berliner's personal profile webpage on the University of North Carolina at Wilmington website. Berliner says this quote is not original, and attributes it to literary scholar Stephen Booth, who taught at the University of California, Berkeley, where Berliner received all of his degrees. As I can find no references to this quote, it is reasonable to believe that this came from either personal communication, or appeared in one of Booth's course lectures or syllabuses.

the assumption that the text does not work on its own terms, and implies that meaning is the ultimate goal of art. He claims that the interpretive critic assumes the role of code breaker whose reading is "somehow deeper or more valid than the work's delivered meaning." (T Berliner 2012, pers. comm. 5 Jan) Instead, Berliner proposed that the texts be studied to understand how they stimulate the mind, so we can answer the question: "Why do people like the works of art they like?" (T Berliner 2012, pers. comm. 5 Jan).

Some students misunderstood, others vehemently opposed this method, and I found his approach undoubtedly challenging. Eventually, I found the challenge enjoyable as well as rewarding, and I now prefer this method of analysis. It also became a useful tool for understanding and evaluating my responses to film, helping me locate sources of pleasure in texts that were generally considered devoid of value by fellow film students.

One such example I discovered earlier, in the winter of 1997. I attended a late night screening of <u>Friday the 13th</u> (1980; dir. Cunningham) at James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia. Having not seen it before, but aware of the cultural significance, I expected a generic slasher film with extensive violence and nudity, which would be entertaining and ultimately forgettable. Having watched it seventeen years after its initial release, I did find it generic; it did have violence and nudity, and was entertaining. However, I didn't find it forgettable. I later found myself thinking over it, recalling images, sounds, and narrative moments that were vivid in my mind, and I considered the film ultimately haunting and atmospheric. After watching it several more times, I began watching the sequels, preparing myself for disappointment each time, as was my experience with most sequels up to/at that point. Surprisingly, I was thoroughly entertained by each one, and viewed them

multiple times. As I began studying film, I would frequently admit to liking them with a touch of embarrassment, dismissing them as a guilty pleasure. After Berliner's course, I began to ask myself why I felt the need to dismiss my enjoyment of them. If I find them entertaining, I thought, there must be a reason why. This stayed with me until I began to consider ideas for a Doctoral research project.

In 2008, after beginning my research on the aesthetics of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series, I was screening a horror film from the period that I thought might give me an indication of contemporary genre aesthetics. The film was Michael Wadleigh's <u>Wolfen</u> (1981), which tells the story of a New York policeman investigating a series of murders that look like animal attacks. It is revealed that the murders are committed by "wolfen" a pack of spirit wolves known in Native American legend. My attention was drawn to the point of view shots of the wolfen, which resembled heat-detection imagery, and the focus on some characters' attention to the leitmotif sound of diegetic wind chimes that occurs before each attack. These sequences made me aware of how much of the film's overall aesthetic hinges on the experience of the characters within the film to create suspense and tension, and noticed this tendency in the other films I researched.

These experiences are the foundations of this research: a formalist analysis of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> franchise, in order to determine the aesthetic development and effect of point of view, or a relative concept that I will call "perspective", and how this is rendered using the film's form. This will be used in order to pinpoint how the franchise is both representative of, and pioneering within, the slasher sub-genre of horror.

<u>Argument</u>

<u>Friday the 13th</u> is an extremely significant high grossing slasher film franchise and has consistently been marginalized both critically and academically. There has been much academic debate on what the term "slasher" entails, but for my research purposes, it will indicate a sub-genre of horror that isolates the detailed actions of a serial murderer and his victims. The plots of slasher films involve an aggressor, sometimes working in tandem with supernatural forces, stalking and dispatching victims. The events lead to a climactic confrontation with the killer. There is minimal concentration on plot and character development, with the focus directed largely toward the final or surviving victim and the killer. Although fear and suspense traditionally characterize horror, slasher films focus mostly on the cause of death, with particular attention to details of bodily mutilation. <u>Friday the 13th</u> and its nine sequels comprise one of the franchises central to the popularity of the slasher film over the last thirty years.

There is also a noticeable lack of formalist aesthetic analysis within horror research, which is overwhelmed by theoretical and psychoanalytical speculation concerning the themes the horror genre addresses. A link between the rareness of aesthetic analysis in the horror genre and the lack of serious research on the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series is noticeable. However, the simplicity of plot and character development in the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films creates difficulty for analysts discerning meaning, which can be seen through the frequent sideline references of the series, such as in works by Carol Clover (1992), Reynold Humphries (1991), Robin Wood (2003) and others, and fewer in-depth case studies of the series. However, the series does invite an analysis of form, despite the supposed complications that arise from

discussing the horrific as beautiful and pleasurable. There is some existing work already establishing the cultural impact of the series, represented by the work of Ian Conrich (2003/2010) and Jonathan Lake Crane (1994), while the generic significance of the first two films is highlighted by Vera Dika (1990). With these writers identifying the wide audience appeal of the series, an analysis of the aesthetic form of the series will begin to create an understanding of audience appeal towards these specific texts. While this is a step towards the understanding of the pleasure these films provide, as outlined by Berliner's research philosophy, I aim to establish a clear understanding of the form and structure of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, in order to lay the groundwork for future research on the specific pleasures these films provide.

<u>Aesthetics and Formalism- A Methodology</u>

V. F. Perkins states that "stories do not exist except as they are told, and... film worlds can be discussed only as they are seen and shown..." (1972; p. 60) It is each film world created within the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series that I will analyse within this thesis. Through this analytical approach, using a formalist framework, I aim to argue three main points:

1 – The way in which perspective is established and communicated within the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films is central to the experience of, and emotional engagement with, these texts.

2 – The aesthetic creation of perspective sees an intricate chronological development and evolution, which can show how the form of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films has gradually changed over the last thirty-two years.

3 – The <u>Friday the 13th</u> series demonstrates a significant case study for understanding contemporary slasher films, because it either reflects popular aesthetic trends or stands as exemplary texts to which its contemporaries respond, and has implications for our understanding of film texts outside of the genre as well.

To develop this formalist framework I begin with David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson's seminal textbook <u>Film Art: An Introduction</u>, which thoroughly outlines a direct approach to film analysis and criticism, arguing that films can be analysed in terms of form to understand how they create a response like those created by recognized art forms (i.e.- painting, sculpture, music, etc.). In defining their foundational attitude toward aesthetic analysis, Bordwell and Thompson state that "(t)he entire study of the nature of artistic form is the province of the aesthetician," (2004; 48) [parentheses mine], and further assert that the aesthetic elements of a film's structural form create narrative meaning and emotional effect, and are of central importance within film analysis. Using this idea, Bordwell and Thompson make a statement foundational to my methodological approach for analysis: "Artistic form is best thought of in relation to a perceiver, the human being who watches the play, reads the novel, listens to the piece of music, or views the film." (48) I have adopted this statement within my analytical approach, and this relative perceiver I will refer to throughout as the "viewer" or "spectator".

Formalism, as I call it, bears little distinction from the term commonly used, "neoformalism". Berliner describes neoformalism as "Adapted to film analysis from the works of Russian formalist literary theorists". (2010; 18) In explaining the work of early Russian formalists, Robert Stam writes, "The early Formalists were, as their name implies, rigorously aestheticist; for them, aesthetic perception was autotelic, an end in itself." (2000; 49) A key Russian formalist critic/theorist, Viktor Shklovsky,

in reflecting on his analyses of Gogol and Cervantes, states, "Compositions are made, they are developed; the author creates in them semantic knots that are correlated, intensifying the perceptibility of the composition. New structures emerge." (1970; 20) This demonstrates, in part, how significant the style and structure of a text are to the Russian formalists. Although this approach was initially applied to literary works, it has been adapted and applied to other art forms, such as painting, sculpture, music, and film. I prefer to use the term "formalism", however, as neoformalism is largely an adaptation with the intent of including other art forms. The analytic and critical philosophy is largely intact.

Utilising the work of Kristin Thompson in Breaking the Glass Armor, (1988) in his extensive exploration of neoformalism, Berliner states that "neoformalist critics use a variety of methods, depending on the particular questions posed by particular artworks." (2010; 18) He later clarifies, "Neoformalism studies the ways in which artworks stimulate spectators to perform mental operations." (19) Berliner particularly draws out, throughout the course of his text, three particular models.

Poetics is branch of neoformalist study that looks directly at the form of a work of art, and how it is pieced together. Bordwell, tracing the concept back to Aristotle[2], and highlighting its applications to other media, states "The poetics of any medium studies the finished work as the result of a process of construction – a

---

[2] Aristotle's Poetics (c. 335, BCE) outlines the methods for analysing the function and value of literary and dramatic works, primarily focusing on what he terms "representation", which appears to function in a semiotic sense: "The things that representative artists represent are the actions of people, and if people are represented they are necessarily either superior or inferior, better or worse, than we are." (1448a 2.0-2; 2013; 18) According to Aristotle, the pleasures of experiencing a work of art are derived from understanding the representation: "That is why people like seeing images, because as they look at them they understand and work out what each item is, for example, 'this is so-and-so'. Whereas if one is unacquainted with the subject, one's pleasure will not be in the representation, but in the technique or the colour or some other element." (1448b 4.14-19; 20)

process which includes a craft component (e.g., rules of thumb), the more general principles according to which the work is composed, and its functions, effects, and uses. Any inquiry into the fundamental principles by which a work in any representational medium is constructed can fall within the domain of poetics." (1989; 371) [parentheses in the original]

Barry Salt utilises a "statistical" approach[3] to poetics, saying "It should be obvious that the terms used for analyzing movies are those used by their makers in putting them together, and indeed the only rational approach in general terms is for the analysis to reverse the construction process used in creating the work." (2009; 125) This is a statement with which I identify, although my methods differ from Salt's in a sense: I utilise statistical methods regularly, as they are particularly illustrative of construction, but statistical methods do not dominate my analysis, as do Salt's. However, he acknowledges, in part, that a segment of his goal is to identify aesthetic value: "The most rational and objective criteria for evaluating aesthetic worth are, in order of their importance: 1. Originality, 2. Influence. 3. Success in carrying out the maker's intentions." (143)

I would like to momentarily differ with Salt here, by saying that I find filmmaker intention fairly irrelevant; the text is an individual source of enjoyment and experience. For example, I personally find <u>Donnie Darko</u> (2001; dir. Kelly) extremely enjoyable, though, according to the director's commentary on the DVD it deviates from his original intention. However, <u>Donnie Darko: The Director's Cut</u> (2004; dir. Kelly) is far less enjoyable, and, in my view, clumsy and dull. So, I

---

[3] Salt's statistical analysis, as it is referred to by himself, Thompson, and others, involves breaking down the aesthetic elements of a film into calculable units, such as shot length, numbers of reverse angles and point of view shots, etc. He then develops his arguments based on this research, often using charts and graphs to explicate his findings.

would argue that <u>Donnie Darko</u> has tremendous aesthetic value precisely because of

its lack of "success in carrying out the maker's intentions."

Ultimately, poetics refers to a specific type of formalist analysis, which

closely observes the elements and mechanics of a work of art. This, I feel, is the key

type of analysis within formalism, and even film studies, upon which further analysis

should be founded. The next type of formalist analysis does this in a very direct

manner, even adopting the term "poetics" within its name.

Historical Poetics, by extension, observes how the form of a work of art is

situated within its historical context, and responds to trends and stylistic precedent.

Bordwell explains it thus:

A historical poetics of cinema produces knowledge in answer to two

broad questions:

1. What are the principles according to which films are constructed and

by means of which they achieve particular effects?

2. How and why have these principles arisen and changed in particular

empirical circumstances? (1989; 371)

Bordwell then highlights the work of André Bazin in his "Evolution of the

Language of the Cinema" (1967) as an initial starting point for explicating his

concept of historical poetics. Berliner evokes the work of Alexander Veselovsky,

and defines historical poetics, which he claims, "traces the course of development of

artistic forms." (2010; 19) This differs from poetics alone as a text isn't viewed in

isolation, but within the context of its contemporaries, antecedents, and its

succeeding texts. Historical poetics shows how the construction of films can

influence other film texts, but the final type of formalist analysis situates a film within the context of its viewer.

Cognitivism is the study of the specific way in which the mental processes of a viewer are affected by the reception of a work of art. Bordwell and Noël Carroll define and categorise cognitivism thus, "We think that cognitivism is best characterized as a stance. A cognitivist analysis or explanation seeks to understand human thought, emotion, and action by appeal to processes of mental representation, naturalistic processes, and (some sense of) rational agency." (1996; xvi) [parentheses in the original] In his essay "Film, Emotion, and Genre", (1999) Carroll puts a strong emphasis on how film creates emotional affect, highlighting its significance in a cognitive approach. He claims that "it is crucial for a theoretical understanding of film that we attempt to analyse its relation to the emotions," (218) and concluding that "when it comes to analyzing the relation of film to the emotions, a cognitively oriented approach to film theory has much to offer." (232) This appears to be what Berliner is discussing when he says

> Psychology research helps us understand the workings of the mind and the ways in which people typically respond to a controlled stimulus, such as a movie. Together with this book's central activity – the analysis of narrative and stylistic devices – such methods can help us reconstruct some of the moment-to-moment experiences that attend an individual film. (2010; 22)

This thesis, much like Berliner's <u>Hollywood Incoherent</u> utilises all three, but I place a different stress on these elements. Whereas Berliner seems to heavily

favour a cognitive approach (contrary to his claim, based on my reading) weighted with historical poetics and some focus on poetics in <u>Hollywood Incoherent</u>, I tend to favour poetics, closely in view of historical poetics as the underlying drive of my argument, with some cognitivism to understand why I deem the films interesting or enjoyable. I would also like to note that my frequent references to Berliner and his methodological definitions, and placing myself in relation to his work in this section is largely due to the fact that I have been highly influenced by his work, as stated earlier, and I feel that such a comparison highlights how my personal, specific approach works – particularly guarding myself against the accusation that I am simply rehashing his claims and arguments. In short, I find Berliner's method significant and useful, but I have created a different balance of formalist analyses to suit my research aims.

I will add that, to accompany my readings of the film texts, I have studied and responded to the works of additional notable theorists, such as Noël Carroll, Michel Chion, Carol Clover, Vera Dika, Reynold Humphries, and Robin Wood who have addressed these films, this genre, and the theories surrounding specific questions of form. This has aided the understanding of why these theorists chose horror and the slasher sub-genre for analysis, and what aspects of relevant films they consider most important. The initial focus of most academic texts pinpoint key elements in the films, particularly the scenes and sequences that are discussed more frequently, that have a significant effect on the viewer. However, I have approached these scenes and sequences with my own aesthetic analysis to provide a counterpoint to the initial readings. This analysis involves a closer study of these core texts as well as a range of film reviews, essays and monographs, from academically prominent publications, mainstream publications, and dedicated online sources that

not only address the film texts specifically, but also establish relevant theories, particularly on genre and aesthetics, that aid in the contextualisation of my analysis.

Finally, I would like to address my use of certain terms. My overall method has here been addressed demonstrating combinations of poetics, historical poetics, and cognitivism. I dislike the term "poetics" based on its implication of a limited area of focus, not just on literature, but a specific type of literature. Bordwell has described its origins thus: "'Poetics' derives from the Greek word *poiêsis*, or *active making*." (1989; 371) [emphasis in the original] Despite its literal origins, its pointed implication towards poetry in contemporary semantics is not sufficiently plain or descriptive – an aim to which I strive throughout this thesis. That said, I do not offer an alternate term, but will not utilize it outside of quotation throughout this work. I will additionally state that I have regularly used the term "Formalism" over "Neoformalism". "Neoformalism" has become traditionally associated with the analysis of film, setting it somehow apart from the study of other arts. It is also indicative of the fact that formalism has been both forgotten and subsequently revived. I discuss my method as formalism, primarily because I want to demonstrate an inclusive method of artistic analysis that equates film with other media, to stress that just because a method is forgotten and subsequently revived does not mean that it has necessarily changed.

Throughout my research, I have attempted to adhere as closely as possible to a statement made by Susan Sontag in her seminal essay "Against Interpretation". Sontag writes, "The aim of all commentary on art now should be to make works of art – and, by analogy, our own experience – more, rather than less, real to us. The function of criticism should be to show *how it is what it is*, even *that it is what it is*, rather than to show *what it means*." (1964; 14) [emphasis in the original] In this

thesis, I have consistently tried to analyse these texts for what they are: films that are designed to entertain. This position is significant to a formalist approach, as it helps to preclude dismissiveness towards these texts that can be, and has been drawn from an approach based on cultural, political, and industrial contexts.

The *Friday the 13ᵗʰ* Franchise

Friday the 13ᵗʰ and its related franchise films centre on the killings that occur around a summer camp, Camp Crystal Lake, primarily executed by a seemingly invincible man in a hockey mask, named Jason Voorhees. The decision to analyse the Friday the 13ᵗʰ series to determine the aesthetic creation of perspective within slasher films was chosen because the series provides a unique opportunity to observe the development of Slasher film aesthetics, which I will here describe. This particular franchise retains qualities that few others, if any, can equal.

Firstly, the release dates for the Friday the 13ᵗʰ films range from 1980 to 2009. During this time, eight of the films were released by Paramount Pictures between 1980 and 1989. The franchise was then sold to New Line Cinema, resulting in the release of Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday[4] (1993; dir. Marcus) and Jason X (2001; dir. Isaac). New Line then released a franchise crossover of the Jason films and another New Line property: A Nightmare on Elm Street[5]. This resulted in the film Freddy vs. Jason (2003; dir. Yu). Finally, in 2009, New Line and Paramount co-produced a remake: Friday the 13ᵗʰ (2009; dir. Nispel). In other words, there have been eleven films in the Friday the 13ᵗʰ series alone, with an additional franchise crossover film, all within the span of just under thirty years. Although the space of

---

[4] From this point, I will refer to this film as Jason Goes to Hell.

[5] Original film: A Nightmare on Elm Street (1984; dir. Craven)

time between the latter films is extended considerably, the franchise allows specific opportunities to gauge benchmarks of aesthetic development, popular trends and tendencies and, in some cases, a unique sense of aesthetic progression all within the Slasher sub-genre and its relationship to perspective. The <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, as I will argue, while consistently innovative, are almost always representative of contemporary aesthetic trends within its genre. However, the implementation of these trends are made more significant and concise, making almost any given film in the series a prime example of how these contemporary trends can be made most effective.

Another reason for choosing the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series is that there is very little research done to date on this franchise. With the exception of an assortment of essays and attempts by writers like Vera Dika and Jonathan Lake Crane to provide more extensive analysis, the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films are largely peripheral within academia, and are only mentioned in passing or decried as examples of largely ineffectual filmmaking within the slasher sub-genre. Admittedly, there is a range of writing aimed at fan culture, exhaustively detailing production histories, most notably Peter Bracke's <u>Crystal Lake Memories: The Complete History of Friday the 13th</u> (2006) and David Grove's <u>The Making of Friday the 13th: The Legend of Camp Blood</u> (2005). However, these texts do not provide extensive filmic analysis, but rather recount the process of production and distribution through a series of interviews. I have therefore engaged with the film texts themselves in order to demonstrate the potential implications that the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series holds for an understanding of film form, despite, and in some cases because of, the usage of generic narratives.

The narratives for the films in the series[6] are as follows:

Friday the 13<u>th</u> centres on a group of teenage counsellors at a summer camp, called Camp Crystal Lake, and the systematic stalking and slaying of each by Mrs. Voorhees. <u>Friday the 13<u>th</u> Part 2</u> (1981; dir. Miner) follows the stalking and killing of another group of camp counsellors, this time by Jason Voorhees, the son of the killer in the previous film. <u>Friday the 13<u>th</u> Part III 3-D</u> (1982; dir. Miner) sees the return of Jason as the killer of a group of friends visiting a holiday cabin by Crystal Lake, ending with Jason's supposed demise. <u>Friday the 13<u>th</u>: The Final Chapter</u>[7] (1984; dir. Zito), introduces a young boy, Tommy Jarvis, whose family, along with a group of visiting teenagers at a nearby house are terrorised by a still-living Jason, who is verifiably killed at the end of the film. In <u>Friday the 13<u>th</u> Part V: A New Beginning</u>[8] (1985; dir. Steinmann), Tommy Jarvis, now a young man, is committed to an asylum where Jason-style murders occur after his arrival. <u>Jason Lives! Friday the 13<u>th</u> Part VI</u>[9] (1986; dir. McLoughlin) again follows Tommy, who inadvertently brings Jason back to life, and then attempts to find and destroy Jason, who has begun attacking a new set of camp counsellors. <u>Friday the 13<u>th</u> Part VII: The New Blood</u>[10] (1988; dir. Buechler) follows a telekinetic teenager who, along with her mother and a group of teenagers in a nearby cabin are terrorised by Jason. <u>Friday the 13<u>th</u> Part VIII: Jason Takes Manhattan</u>[11] (1989; dir. Hedden), follows Jason's attacks on a group of High School students who are travelling, by boat, to New York City. In <u>Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday</u>, Jason's body is destroyed, but his spirit passes

---

[6] See Appendix 1 for a more detailed description of the film narratives.

[7] From this point, I will refer to this film as <u>The Final Chapter</u>.

[8] From this point, I will refer to this film as <u>A New Beginning</u>.

[9] From this point, I will refer to this film as <u>Jason Lives!</u>

[10] From this point, I will refer to this film as <u>The New Blood</u>.

[11] From this point, I will refer to this film as <u>Jason Takes Manhattan</u>.

between people who then attempt to kill others upon being possessed. At the end, Jason is killed and his spirit taken to Hell. <u>Jason X</u> ignores the events of <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u>, and follows Jason as he is cryogenically frozen and reawakened in 2455, where he begins killing students on a scientific exploration in a space ship. <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u>, ignoring the events of <u>Jason X</u>, sees serial child-murderer Freddy Krueger, antagonist of the <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> films, bringing Jason back from Hell to kill for him, so that the residents of Elm Street will remember Freddy, thereby bringing him back to kill again. However, Jason becomes uncontrollable, resulting in a showdown between the two characters. Finally, <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u>, a remake of the first three films, and a reboot of the franchise, follows two groups of teenagers camping near Crystal Lake as Jason kills them one by one.

While the overarching strand of Jason killing people in response to his mother's death carries a large number of the films through the series, a select few, notably <u>A New Beginning</u> and <u>Jason Lives!</u> incorporate other narrative strands, such as the story of Tommy Jarvis. However, the minimalist thread of narrative continuity allows each film to create its own theme and design, which will be examined throughout my analysis.

<u>Structure</u>

This thesis is divided into six chapters, each contributing to the understanding of the aesthetic creation of perspective, as well as the contextualisation and formalist analysis of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films. The following chapters are designed to isolate and discuss a number of aesthetic devices and elements that are significant in creating a sense of perspective. This thesis is organised in order to firstly highlight the significance of perspective and aesthetics.

This is followed by a close formalist analysis of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series in order to show how different individual aesthetic elements contribute to the creation of perspective. Finally the thesis will show how this analysis applies within the context of the slasher, and how the evolution and development of the franchise's aesthetics can be consistently traced in comparison to contemporary trends over the last three decades.

Chapter 1 outlines various theories that inform my definition of perspective, which is closely linked to ideas of point of view and subjectivity, building upon the formalist criticism set out by Edward Branigan. Although these previously established theories are useful and effective, I have deemed it necessary to develop this idea of perspective which both encompasses many different approaches to point of view and subjectivity, but also extends beyond this in order to identify the unique experience and engagement that the viewer brings to a film. Hence, perspective relates both to the experience of a fictional subject within the film as well as the spectator, which individual theories of point of view and subjectivity largely compartmentalise and separate. I begin by explaining my working definition of perspective before demonstrating methods of communicating perspective in film through a range of genres and its significant place within developments of film language, showing how perspective is applied within film as a whole. This is followed by a discussion of the relationship between the horror genre and aesthetics that develop perspective using examples from cinema and literature. I then focus on the horror genre and, in particular, the slasher sub-genre of the horror film, providing examples of its significance within this smaller generic branch. After this, I move on to specific aesthetic and formal devices to demonstrate how they are utilised to create and communicate a sense of perspective within film.

The first device to be discussed will be the point of view (POV) shot, or eye/camera shot as I prefer to call it, which will be the subject of Chapter 2. This is an overt method that is used to strictly house a film's perspective. Here, I have developed and used the term eye/camera which alludes to two different terms used within film studies: I-Camera, brought to popularity by Carol Clover (1992), and Camera Eye, a term with links to Dziga Vertov (1922), and used by theorists such as Alan Spiegel (1976). I read the term I-Camera as a concept that focuses primarily on the viewer and his/her relation to the film text, while the term Camera Eye seems to address the apparatus itself, and the unique way in which the camera views the world. I therefore develop and introduce the term eye/camera, which incorporates both of these concepts; the term eye/camera reflects the viewing dynamic of compressing three visual planes: the eye of the fictional character in a film, the lens of the camera, and the eye of the viewer. The visual coding of an eye/camera shot indicates to the viewer that he or she is experiencing the eyesight of a character within the film. The discussion of the eye/camera will begin with an analysis of prevalent critical accounts its function, focusing on the tendency to interpret its use as voyeuristic. This will be followed by a historical account tracing the development of this device from early usage up to more modern and self-reflexive innovations that create greater experiential complexity within the viewer. This historical groundwork will be necessary to understand the context within which the Friday the 13th films both appear and respond.

Chapter 3 will move from historical accounts of the eye/camera to an analysis and exploration of the way in which the device relates specifically to the Friday the 13th series. Exploring the development and usage of the eye/camera within the series will provide a firmer understanding of the specific importance of perspective to the

slasher film from 1980 to the present, why this device is so consistently used, perspectives significant to specific periods within the scope of the franchise's thirty year life span, and the impact of this aesthetic development on the horror genre. I begin the chapter by highlighting the production history and production philosophy of <u>Friday the 13th</u>, and demonstrating its immediate aesthetic influences. I then analyse different uses and approaches to the eye/camera and how these different approaches affect the reading and understanding of the films, as filtered through the perspectives that are being communicated. To accompany my analysis in this chapter and those following, I have provided Appendix 2, which is a list and description of all relevant characters from each film in order to create a clear reference point for the large volume of characters, often with common, generic names. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of specific developmental milestones in the use of the eye/camera that have contributed to the overall evolution of the device.

   In Chapter 4, I analyse uses of "unverified diegetic sound" and editing to develop perspective in the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films. Unverified diegetic sound is a concept I have developed which is closely linked, but distinct from, Michel Chion's analysis and discussion of acousmatic sound. I will be using this specific approach to sound and editing to show that these elements do not function independently, but work together to create a cohesive aesthetic design and how they specifically relate to the creation of perspective in the death sequences of the films. I initially establish the foundational sound and editing elements of <u>Friday the 13th</u>, before explicating the types of perspective that can be created. First, I discuss how sound and editing can create the perspective of a victim, followed by their use to communicate the perspective of an aggressor. I then focus my analysis on cases in which perspective

shifts between characters within death sequences, cases where a death is witnessed by a third party within the film's diegesis, and rare examples of the omniscient third person rendering of death sequences. I am using this to demonstrate the significance of the relationship between specific elements of formal design, in order to explain that the overall filmic effect is dependent on a complex aesthetic interaction and cannot be attributed to a single element. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the development of unverified diegetic sound and editing use over the course of the series, highlighting the specific case of <u>A New Beginning</u>, which stands out as a unique and complex text within the <u>Friday the 13th</u> franchise, because of its particular use of narrative and aesthetic innovation.

In Chapter 5, I turn this concept of perspective away from the characters within the film, and place it upon the viewer, through an analysis of the way each entry in the series attempts to orientate the viewer within the overarching narrative. I begin this by addressing ideas of expectation and genre, which create a basic narrative understanding from the outset. This is achieved by addressing critical analysis of the genre, and examining the work of Dika, Rick Altman and Andrew Tudor among others. After this, I move to a discussion of the background and influences on <u>Friday the 13th</u>, and how this can affect a viewer's reading and understanding of the franchise. I then outline and differentiate between the "franchise viewer", the person who has more than a passing familiarity with the series, and the "new viewer", a person who has come to the film without a detailed knowledge of the overarching narrative of the series. This is an important distinction that I have created in order to understand and consider different receptions of a franchise film. The chapter then moves to a discussion of how previous narrative threads can be established; first through the use of film clips from earlier films, and

second through new footage shot to create knowledge of narrative strands. This is followed by an analysis of <u>A New Beginning</u> and <u>Jason Lives!</u>, two films that make little attempt to orientate the viewer within the overarching narrative, and how this method puts the new viewer and the franchise viewer in polarised states of informational advantage. Finally, I discuss the manner in which <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u> places itself within a position relative to the earlier films in the franchise. I analyse this applying concepts of nostalgia set out by Dika and Frederic Jameson.

Finally, Chapter 6 discusses these analytical findings within the context of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> franchise's generic contemporaries. I use this analysis to demonstrate how the development and evolution of the aesthetics of the series is either representative of, or reacting to other slasher films released at the same time. This will explicate how the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series is a useful body of texts in order to understand the function of the slasher which will demonstrate its significance for future research. This will demonstrate the individual and collective usefulness of formalist aesthetic analysis, concepts of point of view and perspective, and the importance of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films within cinematic research and discourse, all of which have much overlooked and as yet unused potential, which I aim to highlight and initiate through this thesis.

Introduction Part 2: The Historical Context of the *Friday the 13th* Franchise

To establish the context for the Friday the 13th series, it is important to understand the industrial, generic, and aesthetic conditions under which each film appeared. While, in Chapter 2, I will be addressing the aesthetic forbears of the 1980s and later slasher films, it is first relevant to show how the series functions within the contemporaneous development of the slasher. The period I aim to cover in this section will note initial influences from approximately 1960 to 1980, but will primarily focus on 1978, with the release of John Carpenter's Halloween, through to the present. Much of what will be laid out here, with regards to the specific films within the series, will be given greater detail in later chapters, but in this section, my aim is to provide a skeletal historical framework of key industrial and generic developments surrounding the Friday the 13th franchise. Doing this will illuminate the significance of Friday the 13th and its sequels within the contemporary trajectory of the slasher subgenre, giving a firm starting point from which my analysis will develop.

Friday the 13th in Context

Friday the 13th (1980) and Friday the 13th Part 2 (1981), have close ties to the Italian giallo genre[1], both owing a particular debt to A Bay of Blood (1971; dir. Bava), making them unique amongst their contemporaries, which do not appear to be drawing from this tradition at the time. While the immediate business model for

---

[1] The giallo, a genre originating in Italy, comprised of murder mysteries with graphically violent set pieces, will be described in more detail in Chapter 2.

<u>Friday the 13th</u> was <u>Halloween</u> (1978; dir. Carpenter)[2], the film only copied the

narrative structure of the film and adopted the aesthetic template of the giallo, unlike

its contemporaries' aesthetic replication of <u>Halloween</u>, which was an unexpectedly

successful independent film. An exception from this period could be made for Brian

De Palma's film <u>Dressed to Kill</u> (1980), which doesn't appear to emulate

<u>Halloween</u>'s aesthetic. However, De Palma is known for his close stylistic

emulation of Alfred Hitchcock's films[3]; <u>Dressed to Kill</u> closely mirrors <u>Psycho</u>

(1960; dir. Hitchcock) in both narrative and aesthetics. Moreover, some giallo

filmmakers, particularly Argento, owe much of their stylistic tendencies to

Hitchcock as well. One of Mario Bava's earliest films is entitled <u>La Ragazza Che</u>

<u>Sapeva Troppo</u> which can be directly translated to <u>The Girl Who Knew Too Much</u>

<u>(1963; dir. Bava)</u>, a title that alludes to Hitchcock's <u>The Man Who Knew Too Much</u>

(1934 and 1956). Argento more recently made a film for Italian television entitled

<u>Ti Piace Hitchcock?</u> (<u>Do You Like Hitchcock?</u>) (2005) in which a film student

becomes entangled in the activities of a serial killer, and during the course of the film

a large number of set pieces are transposed onto the narrative from a multiplicity of

Hitchcock films. Even John Carpenter acknowledges a debt to Hitchcock's

filmmaking as an influence, in addition to highlighting his intention to favour

cinematic suggestion of violence rather than overt portrayal.[4] Immediate

predecessors to <u>Halloween</u> (1978; dir. Carpenter) like <u>Black Christmas</u> (1974; dir.

Clark), <u>The Eyes of Laura Mars</u> (1978; dir. Kershner) and <u>The Texas Chain Saw</u>

---

[2] To be discussed in Chapter 3.

[3] This also comes by De Palma's own admission. In an interview with Richard Rubinstein, he states, "I am also a great admirer of Hitchcock and <u>Psycho</u>, and there are great many structural elements here that are in all Hitchcock's movies," (1973; 3) in reference to his film <u>Sisters</u> (1973).

[4] Both of these claims can be found in Carpenter's segments of the audio commentary in the opening sequence on the <u>Halloween</u> 25th anniversary edition DVD released by Anchor Bay in 2003.

Massacre (1974; dir. Hooper) also rely on aesthetic suggestion as a preference to graphic depiction of violence. Films such as The Toolbox Murders (1978; dir. Donnelly) and even Dawn of the Dead (1978; dir. Romero) owe more to American exploitation aesthetics, despite the extent of their artistic innovations.[5] This shows that some films that are sometimes considered a part of the slasher's developmental trajectory in fact come from an entirely different tradition. While Halloween became the template for this new wave of slasher film that includes such Friday the 13th contemporaries as Prom Night (1980; dir. Lynch), Terror Train (1980; dir. Spottiswoode), Hell Night (1981; dir. DeSimone), Happy Birthday to Me (1981; dir. Thompson), and The Burning (1981; dir. Maylam) to name a few, Friday the 13th is the only one of these films that openly acknowledges its roots in this Italian movement, its graphic depictions of violence stemming directly from this. The Burning is also included in this tendency to portray graphic violence, and this can be linked to the work of practical make up and special effects artist Tom Savini, who gained attention because of his detailed re-creations of bodily mutilation in Dawn of the Dead. The influence of Friday the 13th, along with immediate contemporaries like Prom Night, can be seen in a few of the films released in 1981, such as Hell Night and Happy Birthday to Me, and even extends to Halloween II (1981; dir. Rosenthal) which contains set pieces more closely reminiscent of these 1980 slasher films than Halloween.

---

[5] I would argue that both of these films contain unique narrative designs as well as aesthetic complexity. However, the unusual narrative structures of both use graphic portrayals of violence as spectacular set pieces, placed at suprising points in the story. This occurs in a similar way to contemporary exploitation films, where violence, action, sex, nudity, and so forth are strategically placed in surprising or provocative points. The form of slasher I am discussing generally uses violence as the climax of a suspenseful sequence.

The success of the first two <u>Friday the 13th</u> films and the return of director

Steve Miner resulted in little aesthetic difference in <u>Part III 3-D</u>, the biggest change

is the utilisation of 3-D, which led to adjustments in framing and the previously

mentioned shift to victim perspective. The process of shooting in 3-D resulted in

increased expenses, and the film's music also demonstrates an attempt at wider

appeal to young audiences[6], which is exemplary of the mainstreaming of horror

occurring at the same time. These elements show the filmmakers were aiming for a

larger investment, in hopes for a larger audience. This can be seen as a greater

tendency within other mainstream productions of the same year, such as John

Carpenter's <u>The Thing</u> (1982), which starred Kurt Russell, a growing celebrity at the

time, and Tobe Hooper's <u>Poltergeist</u> (1982), a horror film rated PG in the US and

produced by Steven Spielberg. Box office reception aside, the fact that major

studios, Universal and MGM respectively, decided it potentially lucrative to produce

and release these films shows how horror had become a large part of the filmgoing

consciousness, and it is Jason's acquisition of his hockey mask in <u>Part III 3-D</u> that

helped the film series reach iconographic status in popular culture. There were other

films released at the time that assumed elements of the aesthetic established by films

from 1980-1981, such as <u>The Slumber Party Massacre</u> (1982; dir. Jones) and <u>Pieces</u>

(1982; dir. Simón), with success linked to home video releases, but the notable trend

of this year is the movement of horror further into the mainstream, as indicated by

---

[6] The opening titles are accompanied by music that utilises synthesized keyboards and drums arranged in a way that resembles much pop music of the era, particularly Michael Jackson's performance of "Thriller" (Temperton). This music stands out in contrast to the Manfredini score which accompanies the opening titles of the first two films. The Manfredini score, although using some synthesized sound, is primarily performed by an orchestral string section.

the increased investments in horror films made by major studios at the time[7], an

effort with which the Friday the 13th series became involved.

   According to the documentary Going to Pieces (2006; dir. N/A), The Final

Chapter and its success was anomalous for box office trends at the time. The makers

of the film claim that the slasher film was in decline at this point, before being

revived by A Nightmare on Elm Street, which was released later that same year.

Although A Nightmare on Elm Street revived the slasher sub-genre for mainstream

audiences, it also reinvented the genre, bringing elements of the supernatural even

more into the slasher storylines. In films like Friday the 13th and Halloween,

supernatural elements were left either implied or ambiguous, while Nightmare

tightly bound slasher generic conventions with overt elements of the supernatural,

having a strong effect on horror film production for the next decade.

   The following year, A New Beginning was released, and the narrative itself

played upon this increased tendency toward supernatural storylines, contributing

another element to the ambiguity of the killer's identification, as suggested by the

film's opening sequence. The central question of the film becomes 'Who is the

killer?', replicating the structure of Friday the 13th. In this case, it could be Tommy,

or Jason could have come back from the dead, or it could be another less obvious

character. Though the climax reveals that it is the latter of the three, the supernatural

explanation exists as a possibility until the identity of the killer is revealed, and even

throughout the climax when Tommy is shown struggling with Jason, the

supernatural answer seems most likely. This exploitation of the trends and foregoing

---

[7] In addition to Poltergeist and The Thing, 1982 also marked the releases of Cat People directed by
Paul Scrader and starring Natassja Kinski and Malcolm McDowell, produced by Universal Pictures,
and Creepshow directed by George Romero, written by Stephen King, and featuring Adrienne
Barbeau, Hal Holbrook and Ted Danson and produced by Warner Bros. Pictures.

narrative of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series along with the contemporary tendency toward

supernatural horror again contributes to the viewing of <u>A New Beginning</u> as a unique

and complex example of the genre. The relative financial failure of the film[8],

however, demanded adjustments to the series in order to warrant its continuation,

and the strong supernatural narrative of <u>Nightmare</u> became a model for future

instalments.[9] I will, throughout the course of this thesis, make more detailed claims

about my evaluation of <u>A New Beginning</u> as a film of immense aesthetic value,

using my analyses to offer further insight into the unique style and structure of the

film, simultaneously in spite of, and resulting in, its relatively negative reception.

As <u>Jason Lives!</u> adapted elements of <u>Frankenstein</u>'s (1931; dir. Whale) use of

lightning to bring the dead to life, other horror films of the period relied heavily upon

the use of the supernatural and science fiction in their plots. While <u>Aliens</u> (1986; dir.

Cameron) and <u>The Fly</u> (1986; dir. Cronenberg) used science fiction, the supernatural

was prevalent in films like <u>Troll</u> (1986; dir. Buechler), <u>Poltergeist II: The Other Side</u>

(1986; dir. Gibson), <u>Critters</u> (1986; dir. Herek), and even Steve Miner's film <u>House</u>

(1986). Even though there were slasher films closer to the <u>Friday the 13th</u> model,

some of these used supernatural plot points, such as <u>Sorority House Massacre</u> (1986;

dir. Frank) which contains a protagonist who has telepathic-type visions. <u>The Texas</u>

---

[8] "<u>A New Beginning</u> had already turned a sizeable profit. But soon the tell-tale signs of bad word of

mouth were on the horizon: <u>Part V</u> suffered a stiffer fall-off than any of the previous instalments in

the series. By its third weekend of wide release, the film plummeted completely out of the top ten,

eventually scaring up a respectable, if far from spectacular, final take of $21.9 million." (Bracke; 143)

[9] Within this section, I will refer, in many cases, to box office reception in order to more accurately

show how the success or failure of a film utilising specific aesthetic and narrative strategies result in a

potential industrial mandate for either replication or significant change, based on success or failure,

respectively.

Chainsaw Massacre 2 (1986; dir. Hooper) used no supernatural elements, but undercut the horror with both overt socio-political statement and broad comedy. One exception from 1986 is Henry: Portrait of a Serial Killer (dir. McNaughton), which, while using elements of the horror genre, structurally differs greatly from the other slasher films from the period, and owes as much to trends in cinema verité as it does films like The Texas Chain Saw Massacre. So, while Henry: Portrait of a Serial Killer is a stand out film of 1986, it fails to represent overall trends in the genre, which the Friday the 13th series does. Jason Lives! advanced the slasher by applying supernatural elements in order to revitalise a financially diminishing franchise, but this innovation only occurred as a reactionary result of other more innovative properties, most particularly, the A Nightmare on Elm Street films.

The New Blood incorporated more supernatural plotting into the narrative by making the protagonist, Tina, a telekinetic.[10] This follows on from the story line of A Nightmare on Elm Street Part 2: Freddy's Revenge (1985; dir. Sholder;), in which Freddy kills his victims by possessing a teenage boy. While this directly translates into the later Jason Goes to Hell, it still becomes indicative of the divergence of the Friday the 13th series from the narrative slasher format of the earlier films. There is also a close link to A Nightmare on Elm Street 4: The Dream Master (1988; dir. Harlin), in which the female protagonist, Kristen, has the ability to draw others into her dreams, allowing her to assemble a group of people to defeat Freddy. This further addresses the appeal of psychic powers as they are included into slashers during this period. The New Blood was also released the year following the release of The Evil Dead 2 (1987; dir. Raimi), which similarly demonstrates the

---

[10] Caryn James's contemporary review of the film for The New York Times describes Tina, the protagonist, as "a Carrie clone" (1988), in reference to the telekinetic protagonist from the Stephen King novel (1974) and Brian DePalma's 1976 film adaptation.

simultaneous influence of <u>Friday the 13th</u> as well as the passing-out-of-fashion of the slasher sub-genre. The first film, <u>The Evil Dead</u> (1981; dir. Raimi) was released a year after <u>Friday the 13th</u>, and similarly follows a small group of teenagers who go camping at an isolated spot in the middle of the woods. While the patently supernatural element of <u>The Evil Dead</u> stands in contrast to the mainstream films released at the time, the early part of the film shares similarities in mise-en-scène and sound design with such films as <u>Friday the 13th</u>. <u>Evil Dead II</u>, however, appears in line with contemporary horror film trends, and even incorporates strong elements of comedy, similar to <u>Texas Chainsaw Massacre 2</u>. However, a film like <u>The Stepfather</u> (1987; dir. Ruben) utilises no supernatural elements, but like <u>Henry: Portrait of a Serial Killer</u> more closely focuses on the killer, and has narrative similarities to <u>When A Stranger Calls</u> (1979; dir. Walton). These films closely establish the perspective of the killer, both as aggressor and victim, while simultaneously attaching itself to the perspective of the victim of the killer's violence and terrorism. At this point, however, the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series is primarily focused on creating generic orientation, and links identification with the protagonist, placing Jason, like Freddy in <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u>, firmly in the position of the 'other' by removing pitiable aspects evinced in the earlier films. During what Ian Conrich describes as the "shocking reveal" (2010; 180), of <u>The New Blood</u>, Jason's ugliness does not incite pity, but creates an advantage for him by disarming the protagonist with shock and fear, and making him appear even more monstrous.

These pitiable elements are renewed slightly in <u>Jason Takes Manhattan</u>, as several sequences show Rennie observing Jason as a crying, deformed boy. This is shown as an extension of Rennie's clairvoyance, which is representative of the continuing use of the supernatural in the series. Additionally, the film features the

added novelty of displacing Jason from Camp Crystal Lake, which is intended as a generic rural setting to a specifically recognizable urban setting. Although this tendency is not replicated across other horror films released at the time, similar uses of psychic phenomena become intertwined with horror narratives. Halloween 4: The Return of Michael Myers (1988; dir. Little) attempts a closer return to the early 1980s slasher formula, and it introduces the character of Jaime, who is the daughter of Laurie from Halloween and Halloween II, who has died before the events of Halloween 4. Jaime, however, through nightmares, is able on a small level, to foretell the danger that Michael presents. This is followed by Halloween 5: The Revenge of Michael Myers, in which Jaime is rendered mute by the traumatic experience of the previous film, but shares a psychic connection with Michael, in a similar way to Rennie's psychic connection to Jason in Jason Takes Manhattan, released the same year. This illustrates little change in the slasher's infusion of the supernatural into its plotlines, and an increased sympathy for the killer, while favouring the perspective of the protagonists.

Two years following the release of Jason Takes Manhattan, Freddy's Dead: The Final Nightmare (1991; dir. Talalay) was released, showing evidence of the unprofitability of the running horror franchises. Freddy's Dead contains multiple elements designed to increase the novelty factor of the film, overtly aiming for mainstream appeal and high box office receipts. First, as indicated by the title, the film promises the end of the culturally significant A Nightmare on Elm Street franchise, telling viewers that they should expect to be witness to the end of this cultural institution. Secondly, the film includes cameos from U.S. television celebrity couple Roseanne Barr and Tom Arnold. Roseanne at this point had one of the highest-rated sitcoms on American television, and Freddy's Dead appeared one

year after her much-publicised, high-profile marriage to comedian Tom Arnold. The inclusion of the couple in the film following the amount of media coverage on their relationship can be interpreted as an attempt to translate into increased ticket sales. In addition to this, Freddy's Dead featured a climax that was to be shown in 3-D in the cinemas, promising a unique viewing experience. 3-D was not frequently used at this point, and the VHS home video format rarely, if ever, released films in 3-D, opting instead for 2-D transfers, as happened with Friday the 13th Part III, the title of the home video release. While The Final Chapter also promised to be the last of the Friday the 13th franchise, it did not use similar attempts at novelty, aside from featuring this finality in its title. The fact that Freddy's Dead utilised so many elements to sell itself is indicative of the large amount of effort the producers deemed necessary to attract an audience.

The attempt was successful, and Freddy's Dead turned a greater profit than its predecessor, A Nightmare on Elm Street: The Dream Child (1989; dir. Hopkins). According to J.A. Kerswell, "Freddy also lost his sparkle in A Nightmare on Elm Street: The Dream Child; it proved to be a sequel too far, taking $22,168,359, less than half what its predecessor had barely a year ago." (2010; 161) Jason Takes Manhattan also turned a low profit[11] and Paramount Pictures sold the franchise to New Line Cinema, who also owned the rights to A Nightmare on Elm Street. The success of Freddy's Dead[12] prompted New Line to develop another closing film for

---

[11] Jason Takes Manhattan took in $14.3 million in U.S. box office receipts on a $5 million production budget. This is less than its predecessor, The New Blood ($19.2 million on a $2.8 million budget) and the film that followed Jason Takes Manhattan, Jason Goes to Hell.

[12] "Just as Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter hoodwinked audiences, they fell for it again with Freddy's Dead: The Final Nightmare. Ostensibly the last in the series – it was, of course, nothing of the kind. Sadly though, audiences found Freddy more buffoon than the sinister figure he had cut in the first film. The anti-climactic, and frankly sub-par 3D used in the last 10 minutes was oddly fitting

the Friday the 13th franchise, resulting in Jason Goes to Hell. Instead of relying on cameo appearances and 3-D sequences, Jason Goes to Hell again announced the finality of the series through the title, and narratively attempted to explain the logical gaps in the overarching story by applying an explanation that Jason's essence is a demonic worm that uses human bodies as hosts, and can only be killed with a special dagger wielded by a relative, explaining why he keeps returning from the dead. This overtly supernatural development is also influenced by the Halloween sequels as well as the last two (at the time of Jason Goes to Hell's release) A Nightmare on Elm Street films, where the bloodline of the killer is his fatal weakness. As will be discussed, the Friday the 13th films alternate perspective frequently during this period, all with the apparent goal of providing generic orientation, which seems necessary considering the radical narrative experimentation.

1993, the year that Jason Goes to Hell was released, proved a low point for the release of slasher films, with the only significant addition being Leprechaun (dir. Jones), a film in which a Leprechaun kills anyone to defend and retrieve his gold. This included a centrally supernatural storyline, as well as strong ties to comedy, though structurally retaining slasher elements. Leprechaun became one of the more significant horror films from the early 1990s to begin a sequelised series that consistently released films throughout that decade, and into the early 2000s. A more 'serious' (that is, less comedic) franchise begun in the early 1990s was Candyman, which also retained structural similarities to the slasher, but remained firmly within the supernatural, with many similarities to the A Nightmare on Elm Street films, and fewer ties to Friday the 13th. A made for television sequel to When A Stranger Calls,

---

for a franchise that had clearly run out of creative steam. Still, with a box office take of $34,872,033 it was obvious that Freddy would be back to haunt dreams afresh." (Kerswell; 2010; 161)

entitled <u>When a Stranger Calls Back</u> (1993; dir. Walton) as well as <u>Maniac Cop 3:</u> <u>Badge of Silence</u> (1993; dir. Lustig) were released that year, which were sequels to previous films using the slasher formula, but the minimal success of these films demonstrates the diminishing cultural relevance of the genre. It should be noted, however, that during this year, Dario Argento, whose films will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2, released <u>Trauma</u>, which signalled a return to the murder-mystery style giallo film, in a similar vein to <u>Bird With The Crystal Plumage</u> (1970; dir. Argento) and <u>Deep Red</u> (1975), for the first time since 1982's <u>Tenebrae</u>. Between <u>Tenebrae</u> and <u>Trauma</u>, Argento returned to supernatural-based narratives, the only possible exception being 1987's <u>Opera</u> which still retained an exaggerated Gothic melodrama sensibility. This particular film was based both on Gaston Leroux's novel, and early cinematic adaptations, of <u>The Phantom of the Opera</u>. Argento's decision to return to the format that inspired and informed the <u>Friday the</u> <u>13th</u> films proves an interesting choice at this point in time, considering the manner of the slasher's evolution during this period.

Halloween: The Curse of Michael Myers (1995; dir. Chappelle) maintained the franchise's tendency toward the supernatural. However, like <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u>, it tried to fill gaps in the overarching plotline, but in the case of <u>The Curse of</u> <u>Michael Myers</u>, which Adam Rockoff described as "a film so bad and disrespectful to the franchise that it's a mystery how anyone could have even allowed it to be made," (2002; 173) the film utilised an occult fantasy narrative in which a group of people who consider Halloween a dark, holy day lionise Michael as its physical embodiment. Jamie, now a young woman, was impregnated by the cult which wishes to infuse the child with Michael's powers. This narrative contains multiple

points of contact with <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u>, and its subsequent financial failure[13] echoes that of its <u>Friday the 13th</u> counterpart.

During this period of decline, the slasher film began a period of self-referential postmodernism, pioneered within the mainstream by Wes Craven, initially with <u>New Nightmare</u> (1994), his attempt to revive the <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> series. In this film, Heather Langenkamp, the actor who performed the role of Nancy in <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u>, plays a fictionalised version of herself as she begins to have nightmares about a Freddy Krueger-type character. In order to save herself and her son from danger, Heather talks to other cast and crew members from the original film about their experiences with this mysterious figure, such as Robert Englund and Johnny Depp, and eventually asking for help from Wes Craven, who reveals that his idea for the screenplay was directly drawn from his own dreams, verifying the existence of this threatening figure. Craven here develops a narrative that acknowledges the fictitiousness of the original series, and attempts to bring Freddy Krueger into the realm of the 'real', heightening the potential horror of the situation by breaking away one element of artifice, and at the same time drawing attention to the behind-the-scenes element of filmmaking, exposing the inner workings of this process.

Although <u>New Nightmare</u> did not prove successful enough to warrant a sequel[14], Craven further developed this postmodernist design in <u>Scream</u> (1996; dir. Craven), which centres on a killer who is apparently obsessed with horror films.

---

[13] According to Muir, <u>The Curse of Michael Myers</u> only brought in $14.7 million at the box office. (33)

[14] "<u>New Nightmare</u> did not perform that poorly on its opening weekend, when it was third at the U.S. box office behind <u>Pulp Fiction</u> (which opened on the same day as <u>New Nightmare</u>) and <u>The Specialist</u> [1994; dir. Llosa] (which was in its second week), but it already closed after four weeks, grossing less than 20M..." (Fuchs; 2010; 82) [Parenthesis in the original, brackets mine]

Instead of focusing on the behind-the-scenes element of slasher films, <u>Scream</u> draws attention to the narrative formula of the genre, and certain characters manage to survive attacks through a familiarity of specific films and generic conventions, while explicating these conventions as their motivations. The success of <u>Scream</u> resulted in a sequel released the following year. <u>Scream 2</u> (1997; dir. Craven) furthered the postmodernist tendency, first, by focusing the intertextual narrative focus on slasher sequels and their generic functions, and secondly by using the narrative to reference itself specifically. In the film, Gayle, the journalist from <u>Scream</u>, has written a book about the events of the previous film, resulting in a film adaptation which is a significant reference point for both the narrative as well as an added point of self-referentiality.

In the wake of <u>Scream</u>, two other slasher film series began, both significant for different reasons, in that they both represent key trends within this period: one continues in the postmodern slasher vein of <u>Scream</u>, and the other demonstrates a return to traditional slasher formulas. A direct relative to <u>Scream</u> was 1998's <u>Urban Legend</u> (dir. Blanks), which centres on a stalker who kills people according to popular urban legends. While <u>Urban Legend</u> does not approach the level of self-referentiality of <u>Scream</u> and <u>Scream 2</u>, it still utilises the concept of stories, elements of which are assumed to be general knowledge as the *modus operandi* of a killer, and familiarity with these stories increases a person's chance of survival. Later entries in this series respond more closely to trends contemporary to their releases. The year before that, <u>I Know What You Did Last Summer</u> (1997; dir. Gillespie) was released, which signalled a return to the slasher formula of the early 1980s. The story contains similarities to <u>Terror Train</u> and <u>The Burning</u>, in which the eventual killer, in the early sequences, is directly harmed by the protagonists, and his killing spree is acting as

vengeance. The sequel, released in 1998, <u>I Still Know What You Did Last Summer</u> (dir. Cannon) retains the generic formula, displacing the surviving characters from the first film to an exotic island. This iterated formula was also adapted for <u>Halloween H20</u> (1998; dir. Miner) which also saw the return of star Jaime Lee Curtis to the franchise for the first time since <u>Halloween II</u> in 1981, as well as a cameo by Janet Leigh, who is Curtis's real-life mother and star of <u>Psycho</u>. In <u>Halloween H20</u>, Laurie Strode is now a grown headmaster of a private school after going into the Witness Protection programme following the events of <u>Halloween II</u>. In attendance at the school is her son, who is now in danger from the homicidal nepotism of Michael. While this return to formula was not as widespread as the postmodernist trend initiated by <u>Scream,</u> there were films which followed its generic reboot, including <u>Road Kill</u> (2001; dir. Dahl) and <u>Valentine</u> (2001; dir. Blanks) which both used a similar narrative structure and aesthetic form to the early slashers. <u>Urban Legend</u> resulted in a sequel that explored postmodernity more intricately. <u>Urban Legends: Final Cut</u> (2000; dir. Ottman) focuses on a series of killings on a Hollywood film set, each one based on an urban legend, with the lead character being a postgraduate student who is completing her thesis on urban legends, which closely resembles <u>Scream 2</u>, in which the killer is a film student. This not only establishes a character with a greater familiarity of the killing methods, but addresses the process of filmmaking at the same time.

Urban Legends: Final Cut was released the same year as <u>Scream 3</u> (2000; dir. Craven), which had a similar story of killings occurring on a film set. <u>Scream 3</u>, however, directly incorporates more self-referentiality, as the film being made is a sequel of the film that appears in <u>Scream 2</u> which is an adaptation of the events in <u>Scream</u>. In <u>Scream 3</u> all of the surviving remaining characters appear on this film set

to become involved in the murders that are happening around fabricated locations of events in which they participated. The film also uses the opportunity to discuss narrative tendencies of final instalments of trilogies.

Also completed and intended for release in 2000 was <u>Jason X</u>, which was not released until 2002 due to restructuring in the upper management of New Line Cinema (Bracke 263-264). Multiple self-referential elements appear in <u>Jason X</u>, which will be addressed in Chapter 5, and were it released in 2000 as intended, it would have thematically fit alongside <u>Scream 3</u> and <u>Urban Legends: Final Cut</u>. Bracke writes, "By the time New Line released the film on April 26, 2002, much had changed both in the world of digital filmmaking and in the sensibilities and expectations of the moviegoing public." (263) The advances made in special effects are then addressed by Bracke, as is the questioned potential for the <u>Friday the 13th</u> franchise to still attract audiences. A 2000 release would have been a seven year hiatus for the series as opposed to the resulting nine. Ultimately, <u>Jason X</u> was released after nearly a decade since the previous film, in a franchise that had seen no more than a four year gap between films, and this is compounded by the difficulty of being heavily reliant on special effects that had become dated.

One year after <u>Jason X</u> was finally released, <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u> acquired a large box office intake[15] by adapting the tendencies of the postmodern slasher to a deceptively straightforward formula, heightened by crossover appeal. The meeting of both the <u>Friday the 13th</u> and <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> franchises allowed the film to directly address different killing styles of the antagonists, defining their motivations to explain this, and allowing one franchise to both inform and comment on the other, without drawing as much attention to the artifice as <u>Scream 3</u> or even

---

[15] $82,622,655 according to Kerswell (178).

Scream, which overtly addresses narrative tendencies. Freddy vs. Jason used this

postmodern approach as subtext in order to heighten the antagonism between the two

killers. This crossover of horror franchises was used again a year later in Alien vs.

Predator (2004; dir. Anderson).

This period also saw the advent of two popular movements in horror that

would dominate a large proportion of the genre's releases. One film, The Blair

Witch Project (1999; dirs. Myrick and Sánchez) was released in 1999, which

demonstrated the potential for low-budget filmmaking in horror, as well as bringing

the victim-camera movement discussed in Chapter 2 into the mainstream. One

significant follower of this movement is Halloween: Resurrection (2002; dir.

Rosenthal), in which a group of students become part of an internet broadcast where

they are invited to stay in the Myers house with head-mounted and house-mounted

cameras recording the events. Much of the film is shot through these head-mounted

cameras incorporating this aesthetic device from The Blair Witch Project, but

Halloween: Resurrection also utilises a sense of postmodernity within the

framework, as Michael and his killings are not only general knowledge, but attained

a position of legend, much like the myth of Jason and the increased awareness of this

myth by the characters within the Friday the 13th series. In order to increase hits on

the webpage broadcasting this, the producer/director sets up fabricated booby traps

in the house to frighten the participants. In one unsettling moment of self-

referentiality, the viewer sees Michael from behind with a knife stalking around the

lower level of the house with everyone else upstairs, when another Michael appears

in the frame stalking behind the first Michael. The visual of seeing one Michael

following another is disorienting until it is revealed that the first Michael is the

producer/director dressed as Michael to frighten the participants, berating what he

thinks is a technician also dressed as Michael, when it is, in fact, Michael himself. Through these elements, <u>Halloween: Resurrection</u> marks the dying out of the popular postmodern slasher, and the rise of the use of victim-camera – a concept to be explored in more detail in Chapter 2.

The other film from this period that initiated a popular trend in horror is Gus Van Sant's remake of <u>Psycho</u> (1998), bringing self-referentiality to its logical conclusion, by overtly replicating known properties in their minutiae. According to the official website for the film, "Van Sant was intrigued by the notion of taking an intact, undeniable classic and seeing what would happen if it were made again-with a nearly identical shooting script-but with contemporary filmmaking techniques." (http://www.psychomovie.com/production/productionwhy.html) <u>Psycho</u> '98, while eluding financial success[16], was much publicised for its close shot-for-shot approach to remaking. Although there was not an immediate wave of slasher remakes, <u>Psycho</u> <u>'98</u> generated public discourse about the possibilities of remaking, and marks a key transition point between the tendency towards postmodernism in contemporary horror and the potential to extend this into film remakes. <u>The Texas Chainsaw</u> <u>Massacre</u> (2003; dir. Nispel) became the direct model for the trend of slasher remakes that still comprises a large part of studio output for the genre. While not precisely faithful to its source material, <u>The Texas Chainsaw Massacre</u> streamlined a film that worked outside of the formal models of its contemporaries, and applied an

---

[16] According to online Box Office Mojo, <u>Psycho</u> '98 has earned a worldwide lifetime gross of $37.1 million on a production budget of $60 million. Whether or not this is accurate, Mark Kerins alludes to the relative failure of the film, contrasting it with the success <u>Disturbia</u> (2007; dir. Caruso), a loose remake of Hitchcock's <u>Rear Window</u> (1954). Kerins writes, "It is worth noting that <u>Disturbia</u> was critically and financially successful, in sharp contrast to the negative critical reception and poor box office performance of Gus Van Sant's ostensibly shot-for-shot remake of <u>Psycho</u> from a few years earlier." (2011; 224)

updated generic formula to it. Instead of Leatherface relegated to an easily recognisable, awkward, menacing character in a family of characters equally threatening, he became the central threat, with other characters facilitating his bloodlust, and occasionally fulfilling their own. The genre's tendency toward self-referentiality and cross-generic application was removed in favour of increasingly unpleasant and dramatically tense set pieces, also discussed by Wharton. (2011)

Following this, multiple slasher properties were revived and adapted for contemporary audiences, resulting in The Hills Have Eyes (2006; dir. Aja), Black Christmas (2006; dir. Morgan), The Hitcher (2007; dir. Meyers), Halloween (2007; dir. Zombie), Prom Night (2008; dir. McCormick), My Bloody Valentine 3-D (2009; dir. Lussier), Friday the 13th 2009, and A Nightmare on Elm Street (2010; dir. Bayer), among others. Most of these films utilised more unpleasant narratives and set pieces. Wharton's paper articulates the tendency towards darker and more uncomfortable narrative elements concisely, as does segments of her forthcoming PhD thesis. Based on my analysis, some of the deaths that occur in these films linger on the extreme brutality and violence, and sometimes highlight the fragility of the body of the victim. This also tends to follow sequences that provide richer character development than what can be seen in earlier slasher films. Examples of this include many of the deaths in Rob Zombie's remake of Halloween and its sequel, particularly with regards to Annie and Lynda, whose attacks are shown with extensive graphic and visceral detail, and their pain and fear is registered in extended amounts of screen time. The deaths of Andy and Morgan in The Texas Chainsaw Massacre create a similar effect, as do the deaths of Chewie and Amanda in Friday the 13th (2009). Amanda's death is a particularly illustrative example as it reimagines and adapts a famous death sequence in the series, which I will discuss in

Chapter 5. In <u>The New Blood</u>, Jason picks up Judy while she is still in her sleeping

bag and hits her against a tree to kill her. The sequence contains a few short shots

cut together of Jason swinging the sleeping bag, the sleeping bag hitting the tree, and

then Jason dropping the bag. This was repeated for comedic effect in <u>Jason X</u>, in

long shot in a continuous take. The distance from the action and the reference to the

earlier film mutes the grotesqueness of the event. In <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u>,

however, Jason traps Amanda in her sleeping bag, and ties it to the end of a rope

suspended from a tree branch directly over the campfire. The camera cuts between

shots of the sleeping bag as Amanda screams and thrashes trying to get out, and

shots within the sleeping bag, showing the obvious panic and desperation on her face

as she struggles. The crackling of the fire and the sizzling of her flesh are heard, and

at the end of the sequence, she falls out of the bag, her body burnt beyond

recognition. The sequence is also longer than the relative counterparts in <u>The New

Blood</u> and <u>Jason X</u>, prolonging the focus on her pain and suffering, which is the

essence of this tendency of increased discomfort in recent slasher remakes.

In addition to this, other elements of these remakes can be read as adaptations

for modern audiences. <u>The Hills Have Eyes</u> updated the former narrative to address

the potential ramifications of the contemporary political climate, <u>Black Christmas</u>

took the intrinsic aesthetic theme of vision and seeing and overtly made it part of the

narrative with the killer removing his victims' eyes, and <u>Black Christmas</u>,

<u>Halloween</u>, <u>My Bloody Valentine 3-D</u>, and <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> dedicated

more screen time to character back stories than their source texts. Additionally,

many of these have resulted in again serialising these original properties, resulting in

film sequels such as <u>The Hills Have Eyes II</u> (2007; dir. Weisz) and <u>Halloween II</u>

(2009; dir. Zombie), and the prequel The Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Beginning (2006; dir. Liebesman).

A final generic trend significant to the slasher sub-genre, particularly as it runs concurrently with the recent cycle of slasher remakes, is the advent and subsequent decline of another sub-genre generally dubbed "torture porn". The term "torture porn" apparently references the simultaneous explicit portrayal of body mutilation and the resulting pain of the sufferer. This supposition is confirmed by David Edelstein who is credited with coining the term. He writes:

> Explicit scenes of torture and mutilation were once confined to the old 42nd Street, the Deuce, in gutbucket Italian cannibal pictures like Make Them Die Slowly [UK title Cannibal Ferox (1981; dir. Lenzi)], whereas now they have terrific production values and a place of honor in your local multiplex. As a horror maven who long ago made peace, for better and worse, with the genre's inherent sadism, I'm baffled by how far this new stuff goes—and by why America seems so nuts these days about torture. (2006; http://nymag.com/movies/features/15622/) [brackets mine]

The term is used derisively, and appears to make and reinforce the assumption that "porn" is a term with negative connotations. The "torture" part of the term appears to be descriptive of the narrative elements, while "porn" becomes indicative of the aesthetic. In an interview, Hostel (2005) director Eli Roth stated, "What that does though is it immediately discredits the film. You know, when you watch pornography, you watch it, you get off, and that's it. I think it's more reflective of the

critic than the film. It shows a lack of understanding and ability to understand and appreciate a horror film as something more than just a horror film." (http://www.aintitcool.com/node/32868) I will therefore use the term justified by Jeremy Morris- "Torture-Horror" (2010; 54). Morris's overarching argument is that viewing and enjoying depictions of torture is not inherently wrong, as such films attempt to push the boundaries of fear into something more upsetting. Morris asserts that "By putting the audience on the side of the torturer in some way or other, the audience is disturbed in a way that goes beyond the fear generated by bare depictions of torture." (55) This genre can be seen to initially apply to <u>Saw</u> (2004; dir. Wan),[17] which is a film about two men chained by the ankle in a single dirty industrial bathroom. This scenario intercuts between the events that brought them into this situation, and the police investigation that is trying to find the man they call 'Jigsaw', who captures people, taunts them, and forces them to race against time, risking their own bodies to find a way out. The inventiveness of the set pieces as well as an unflinching focus upon the pain and suffering of the victims become the key points of the formula for these films. This also follows closely upon the darker, more uncomfortable death scenes in <u>The Texas Chainsaw Massacre</u>, a film which some of <u>Saw</u>'s set pieces echo. Aside from similar lighting and colour palettes between the two films, the intensity of the death and dismemberment sequences are alike. Also, the scene of Erin and Andy trapped in the Hewitt's basement establish similar aesthetic design, emotional resonance and narrative impact to the framing

---

[17] Edelstein actually dates the sub-genre back to Mel Gibson's <u>The Passion of the Christ</u> (2004). I agree with Edelstein's inclusion of the film within this aesthetic tendency, however, <u>Saw</u> more closely follows the slasher tradition, while Gibson's film appropriates the aesthetic in response to the historical tradition of passion plays within Catholicism. (The film was defended by the Vatican based on statements included in John L. Allen, Jr.'s article in the <u>National Catholic Reporter</u>, Vol. 3, No. 22, 23/01/2004)

sequences of <u>Saw</u>, where Adam and Dr. Gordon are trapped in the disused industrial

bathroom, and provides one example of the mutual development of these two sub-

genres. The <u>Saw</u> series includes six sequels of varying success, one released each

year, ending with <u>Saw 3-D</u> (2010; dir. Greutert). Although very few films of this

sort are still produced, the release of <u>Saw</u> initiated a group of films retaining a

similar formula, including <u>Hostel</u>, <u>The Devil's Rejects</u> (2005; dir. Zombie)[18], <u>Wolf

Creek</u> (2005; dir. Mclean), <u>Paradise Lost</u> (2006; dir. Stockwell), <u>Captivity</u> (2007; dir.

Joffé), and <u>Hostel: Part II</u> (2007; dir. Roth). The diminished box office intake of

<u>Hostel: Part II</u> and the declining earnings in the <u>Saw</u> series verify the genre's

decrease in popularity since 2005, although the straight-to-video <u>Hostel Part III</u>

(2011; dir. Spiegel) has been released and films such as <u>The Human Centipede (First

Sequence)</u> (2009; dir. Six) and particularly its sequel, <u>The Human Centipede 2 (Full

Sequence)</u> (2011; dir. Six) borrow closely from the torture-horror formula.

However, the primary elements of this specific movement of torture-horror, have

closely informed the ongoing trend in slasher remakes with which it shares

significant aesthetic and thematic links, and can be seen in clear evidence in <u>Friday

the 13th (2009)</u>.

The following chapter will discuss "perspective" as I choose to define it,

which will then provide the conceptual framework for the succeeding analysis of the

<u>Friday the 13th</u> series. However, I find it important, within the structure of this

historical outline, to remind the reader of the following: while little has been said of

the aesthetic representation of perspective during this section, narrative analysis still

---

[18] <u>The Devil's Rejects</u> is a follow-up to Rob Zombie's film <u>House of 1,000 Corpses</u> (2003), and bears
similarities to these torture-horror films, but it both recognises and deviates from horror formulas, and
was not frequently imitated. <u>The Devil's Rejects</u> shares more in common with films like <u>Saw</u> and
<u>Hostel</u>.

proves useful within the context of my overall argument in this thesis. As the <u>Friday the 13th</u> franchise has held a significant role in the evolution of the slasher film which has both responded to and influenced contemporary aesthetic trends, it naturally follows that the apparent influence of <u>Friday the 13th</u> in terms of story would also extend to more subtle elements of how the stories are told. Also, while there is some crossover with regards to specific perspective positioning, the evolutional nature of the slasher's aesthetic demands consistent variants that are difficult to trace within overall trends. However, what this analysis does show is that it is not the specific perspective that is significant, but how this perspective is rendered through the film's form. The aesthetic similarities between the films of this genre create a picture of dominant formal trends, and the development of less solid, tenuous aesthetic elements into a fluid progression of simultaneous stylistic advance. Since the beginning of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> film series, films outside of the franchise have occasionally stood as 'classics' of the genre and have even received acknowledgement for their originality or significance. Although the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series has regularly been overlooked and frequently derided critically, it stands as a more effective barometer for developments within the genre over this thirty-plus year period.

Chapter 1: Perspective

Imagine the following film sequence. Tom Cruise plays a character arriving home to his lavish upscale New York apartment very late at night. He closes the door and goes into the kitchen, makes a drink and sits at the kitchen table to consume it. After a while, he goes to sleep next to his wife in their bedroom.

Now that the content is established, it is helpful to understand how the content is presented. When Tom Cruise enters the house, it is very dark, bathed with deep blue light, run through with even darker shadows. As he walks toward the kitchen, the background becomes punctuated with startling red and white pinpoints emanating from the Christmas lights used to decorate the home for the season. Meanwhile, we hear the rustle and flutter of his clothes as he removes his coat and slowly moves through the house, as two notes from a piano repeatedly trudge back and forth, which is the musical score to the sequence. In the kitchen, harsh white light fills the room from the overhead fluorescent fixtures. Up to this point, the camera has steadily followed Cruise's movements not swaying or distracted, keeping him central to the composition without cutting away. However, as he sits at the table, the image slowly dissolves to him entering the doorway to his bedroom. The entire room is blue with intense shadows playing against the interiors, and the space for him in bed appears extremely large.

This sequence in Stanley Kubrick's Eyes Wide Shut (1999) takes a simple scenario and makes it startling. This homely environment has become unpleasant. The shadowed area becomes frightening, the Christmas lights make this familiar location feel alien and the pleasantry of the kitchen has become cold and clinical. The slow dissolve shows the inevitable reluctancy with which he joins his wife in

their bedroom, the bed appearing at once unavoidable and closed in. Even without

the context of this situation, the viewer understands that Cruise's house, although

familiar, now seems unhomely and unwelcoming, fostering a feeling of

claustrophobia. The sequence climaxes with the greatest terror in the entire house:

his marital bed. While the events themselves are relatively banal, the sequence

becomes suspenseful and frightening, because Kubrick has used the aesthetic

elements available to him, lighting, camerawork, editing, sound, etc., to show the

viewer how Cruise's character feels and experiences these events and locations.

In his book about the film, Michel Chion addresses the function of point of

view in <u>Eyes Wide Shut</u>, and cinema in general. He states:

In the cinema, 'point of view' is only suggested. It is linked, in

particular, to the question of 'in whose presence' the scene takes place. If

a character is in almost all the scenes – as Bill is – with two or three

'exceptions', the film will be regarded as being told from his point of

view, although we see him just as we see the other characters, from the

outside. Another important question is that of knowledge: do we know

less than the character, or more, or as much? Do we share his 'secrets'?

In the case of Bill we do, since we alone follow him through different

situations whose connections are in principle known only to him (and us).

(2002; 52) [parentheses in original]

Chion draws out the manner in which a viewer can discern which character he/she

sees through, and the variety of ways point of view can be broached by the form of a

film. While this addresses key elements of point of view and is suited to the design

of <u>Eyes Wide Shut</u>, it does not address the possibility of a film to portray multiple points of view, which fluidly change between characters, as frequently occurs in slasher films like <u>Friday the 13th</u> and its sequels. However, this should not detract from Chion's argument – it is a useful starting point for exploring the complexity of point of view within cinema. Though this example successfully reveals how perspective has a tremendous effect on the relationship between content and presentation within a film, it is important to explicate the reasons why the aesthetic development of a certain point of view is an important area to research. More precisely, it is important to understand how this creation of perspective directly interacts with the experience of being a film spectator, to which Chion alludes in the previous quote.

Chion addresses the viewer's relationship to an established point of view. Speaking specifically of <u>Eyes Wide Shut</u>, he states:

> The cinema audience is in an ambiguous position: they know both more and less than each of the characters in isolation, but this knowledge is all logical speculation, which they know the film can overturn like a set of skittles from one moment to the next. Through cross-cutting they know that Alice does not have a lover she sees while her husband is at work; but the ellipses in this cross-cutting enable then to imagine that there are things they have not been shown, and will not discover until the end. The question is not what we know, but the form in which we learn it. (53)

With this statement, Chion raises two concepts central to my argument, the importance of the viewer's positioning in relation to the film text, and the importance of form to this establishment of point of view.

Primarily, the perspective created directly establishes the relationship of the viewer to a film text. With the aforementioned example from Eyes Wide Shut, the film is designed to allow the spectator to, figuratively, see the world through the eyes of Tom Cruise's character, Bill Harford. In this way, we know that the closest link into this universe is with Bill, and the action that is seen is shown because it is significant to this character. While the universe may not be an accurate presentation of reality, the subjectivism of the spectator's position provides a more clear understanding and relationship of the people, places and events to the story.

Related to this viewer-character-film dynamic, the point of view that is adopted through a film creates an understanding and empathy within the viewer. Bill Harford may not be likeable as his failed attempts at infidelity are generally unappealing. The suspense and emotional engagement of the spectator, however, depends entirely on the fact that the viewer experiences the events of the film as they relate to Bill. The sensations of fear, excitement, arousal, sadness, and so forth depend on the expressionistic utilization of aesthetic elements like sound, lighting, camerawork, editing, etc. from the relevant character's perspective.

These elements work together to create an overall aesthetic design not only for Eyes Wide Shut, but for any given filmic text. This design is entirely dependent on the choices made on the part of the filmmaker that contribute to the artistic expression of the work in question. These choices are streamlined through adopting a character with which the viewer is meant to directly relate. In the video introduction to the Criterion Collection U.S. DVD release of Akira Kurosawa's film

The Hidden Fortress (1958; DVD release 2001), filmmaker George Lucas, in
discussing the influence the film had on his own work, mentions the position from
which the story is told. Lucas attests that the film is seen through from the point of
view of two peasants: Tahei and Matakishi. Although these two characters are not
necessarily significant to the plot, the action occurs around them, placing a
distinction between the petty, mundane daily experience of the peasants and the
astounding grandeur and heroics displayed by a Samurai General and a Princess.
This, according to Lucas was where he adopted the idea for showing the action of
Star Wars (1977) from the point of view of two relatively insignificant but central
characters, C-3P0 and R2-D2. The overall designs of both films are rooted in the
decision to show the action from these perspectives, and many aesthetic choices stem
from that foundation.

These examples demonstrate, to some extent, the significance of perspective
in establishing the viewer's relationship to a film text. Appropriately defining the
term "perspective" is necessary to establish the starting position of my research. My
working definition is broad in terms of subjective and interpretive experience, but
housed within the relationship of a film's presentation to its viewer. The broadness
is needed in order to allow for the appropriate examination of the interrelationship
between filmmakers, fictional characters and spectators, but the uniqueness of this
interrelationship within the experience of viewing a film requires this necessary
limitation.

'Perspective' Defined

Edward Branigan (1984) defines subjectivity as "the process of knowing a
story – telling it and perceiving it." (1) He later rephrases his working definition for

clarity, saying, "Subjectivity, then, may be conceived as a specific instance or level of narration where the telling is *attributed* to a character in the narrative and received by us *as if* we were in the situation of a character." (73) [emphasis in the original] These establishing definitions are transposed as foundational to my definition of "perspective".

Branigan discusses two theoretical approaches to point of view: one approach aligns point of view with perception, the other with attitude. In reference to the argument for perception, Branigan writes:

> The approach seeks to expand, in a literal fashion, the 'we see' into a set of spatial and temporal *constraints* on our vision – what the film presents to us. These constraints are to be interpreted as modelling the activity of a unique perceiver: we see 'through a singular mind'. For example, it is claimed that our perception of pictorial space is related to some person's monocular vision. The lines of linear perspective are used to define a hypothetical point of vision from which the space is ordered and made intelligent (perceived). This viewing position lies outside the represented space and corresponds to that place where a hypothetical observer of the scene, present at the scene, would have to stand in order to give us the space as pictured. (5-6) [emphasis in the original]

Speaking of the argument for attitude, Branigan discusses the work of Andre Bazin: "Andre Bazin demonstrates the shift toward the statement of someone's attitude as point of view when he describes an elaborate circular camera movement in The Crime of M. Lange (1936; dir. Renoir). It creates the impression, he says, of

dizziness, of madness, of suspense." (7) In other words, the distinction between perception and attitude is where the aesthetic is housed, or more clearly, whether or not what the viewer sees and hears claims to be looking or hearing outwards from a character.

With that in mind, the term "perspective", for the purposes of this thesis, will incorporate the following criteria:

a) An elemental aesthetic formal design created in order to house and convey the point of view of a specific character, whether the character is identified or not;

b) The aesthetic design used to connect or change between the points of view of multiple characters;

c) The point of view of the spectator in terms of both advance expectation and immediate experiential viewing of the film.

Using this model, I intend to illustrate the importance of aesthetic design to the overall effect and success of the slasher film, and its significance in this particular generic viewing experience.

Perspective, in my working definition, acknowledges both perception and attitude, and aesthetic elements incorporating both will be given equal attention throughout. This grounding leads to the elements of identification of perspective. First, perspective can be identified by what the viewer witnesses or experiences. The perspective a film adopts can affect the attitude a viewer has towards specific actions or events. American Beauty (1999; dir. Mendes) is told through a character named Lester Burnham who reveals that he is deceased, but notes that the film occurs during his life. This information is revealed to us through a sweeping bird's eye view of a neighbourhood, which shows us that Lester is liberated enough to show

images and scenes in which, even though he may not have been present, the spectator can still witness events that reveal more about the surrounding characters. This differs from <u>Sunset Boulevard</u> (1950; dir. Wilder) in which the deceased narrator, Joe Gillis, discusses events that were only witnessed firsthand. The selectivity in <u>Sunset Boulevard</u> allows the viewer to experience the desperation of a struggling Hollywood writer, and the grotesqueness of the mansion and its occupants. If <u>Sunset Boulevard</u> were told from the point of view of Norma Desmond the viewer would see a film about a proud, aging star clinging to an ungrateful yet handsome young stranger. If told from the perspective of Betty Schaefer, the viewer would witness the story of a woman torn between two men, one who is stable and kind, and the other man is a mysterious character who she wants to save from squandering his talent. The significance of the events that we witness, even within the context of the same larger storyline, entirely determines the type of film the spectator watches.

The second important factor that identifies perspective is how the events and information are communicated to the spectator. <u>Dances With Wolves</u> (1990; dir. Costner) begins as a gritty civil war film, with the opening sequence taking place in a dirty medical tent. The viewer witnesses amputations, body parts caked in congealing blood, and unsanitary conditions. As Lt. John Dunbar rejoins the battle to attempt suicide instead of losing a limb, the film still retains the washed out muted colours of the opening sequence. The spectator understands the horrifying elements of war and the overall Western "civilisation" of the Americas, based on the events witnessed by Dunbar. Once he moves out to the frontier, <u>Dances With Wolves</u> reveals the sweep of the landscape, using compositions that encompass large masses of land, along with vast expanses of sky. As Dunbar befriends the local native tribe,

the landscape becomes more colourful. The choice to switch from muted

compositions to epic landscapes with a wider range of colours is apparently

conscious, made in order to convey a sense of overwhelming wonderment at the land

and culture of the native people. For <u>Dances With Wolves</u>, the events, while

important, do not provide the spectator with sufficient information to understand the

events from Lt. Dunbar's point of view, but his perspective is communicated through

the representation of his surroundings.

A basic, but significant element of perspective is who the viewer experiences

the events through. Daniel Frampton, perceiving a film as the thinking entity as

opposed to the characters within the film, limits the definition of the point of view

aesthetic, but the elements of exclusion are central to this point of perspective

identification. Frampton writes, "In thinking 'for' a character the film can give an

impression of their mental state, perhaps, without aligning itself point-of-view-style.

We may in fact be looking at the character while seeing what they are feeling."

(2006; p. 86) I would position this scenario within my definition of perspective. In

such a case, the events are still filtered through a specific character's perceptive

position, creating subjective development.

<u>Uses of Perspective Without and Within Horror</u>

The previous example from <u>Sunset Boulevard</u> illustrates how the adoption of

different perspectives within a film can affect the story that is told, but understanding

the character is a significant part of the overall effect of a film. Martin Scorsese's

film <u>Taxi Driver</u> (1976), for instance, functions almost entirely to understand the

perspective of Travis Bickle. Removed from Bickle, the events within the narrative

are almost entirely, excepting the final shootout, ineffective, anticlimactic and

muddled. Experiencing these events through Bickle creates the necessary dramatic tension and plot construction to enhance the film's emotional affect and render the narrative understandable. In a different way, the events of <u>All About Eve</u> (1950; dir. Mankiewicz) are seen through the eyes of, and narrated by, theatre critic Addison DeWitt. DeWitt is involved in the action of the film, but is not a central character, like the previously discussed examples of <u>The Hidden Fortress</u> and <u>Star Wars</u>. This allows him to view the events from the inside, but simultaneously at a distance. DeWitt's critical perspective is adopted by the spectator, so that the events and characters, while seen as complex, are viewed sceptically. In this way, the tension experienced by the viewer is derived from the simultaneous ability to understand the characters and the cynicism with which the viewer interprets their physical actions and spoken dialogue. It is through DeWitt that the events witnessed become complex and entertaining.

Among the examples already provided, <u>Eyes Wide Shut</u>, <u>Sunset Boulevard</u>, and <u>Taxi Driver</u> all have a few significant elements in common. First, they demonstrate extreme examples of filmic perspective where the story circulates almost wholly around the events happening to one character specifically. Secondly, these perspectives are often fashioned in order to enhance the presentation of their subjectivity, exaggerated by extreme uses of lighting, sound, camerawork, editing, and other aesthetic devices. Finally, because the viewer sees the events from such closely attached perspectives, many of these exaggerated aesthetic elements contribute to a sense of the grotesque, of terror and of fear, although they are not horror films. It is from this that the horror genre benefits. Horror is a genre that relies almost entirely upon the use of perspective to create the desired emotional

response from a spectator – fear – and it is because of this that horror demands an analysis incorporating aesthetics, spectatorship and its relationship to perspective.

As shown, any number of different perspectives can be used to drive a film. Horror, however, displays a heavy reliance upon perspective in order to create the genre's intended effect, fear, more often than others. I will use an example from literature to illustrate. The M. R. James story "The Story of a Disappearance and an Appearance" (1919) contains an example of perspective used to horrifying effect. The story is told through a series of letters written regarding the eponymous disappearance and appearance, centring on a supernatural Punch and Judy show. In one letter, the character recounts a dream, dreams being a subject which Branigan repeatedly addresses in the context of extreme character subjectivity. This dream centres on a fantastical and brutal Punch and Judy show, involving dramatic and graphic violence climaxing with a cloaked figure appearing in and emerging from the painted background to give the Punch character his comeuppance. After the cloaked figure lunges for Punch, James writes:

Everything on the instant grew dark. There was one long, loud, shuddering scream, and I awoke to find myself looking straight into the face of – what in all the world do you think? but – a large owl, which was seated on my window-sill immediately opposite my bed-foot, holding up its wings like two shrouded arms. I caught the fierce glance of its yellow eyes, and then it was gone. (1919; 395)

The communication of fear and horror is demonstrated through James's use of adjectives and simile. The "long, loud, shuddering scream", "the fierce glance of its

yellow eyes", and the owl "holding up its wings like two shrouded arms" all indicate the first-person perspective of the character writing the letter. These specific aesthetic choices not only communicate that the story is being told from a character's perspective, but they are also designed to elicit a horrified response in the reader. By condensing this sudden occurrence into the space of three sentences, James communicates the speed and immediacy of the event. However, by briefly delaying the revelation of the owl by saying "what in all the world do you think?", James attempts to create a sense of tension and suspense, similar to the experience of gradually taking in one's surroundings after being woken by a loud scream like the one mentioned. James, in a short passage manages to convey a sudden shock while still infusing it with suspense, by connecting the scene to the experience of the character within the story. The story's success or failure in eliciting these emotions largely depends of the effectiveness of these aesthetic choices. This example from M. R. James very clearly shows the experience of an event shown from the perspective of a specific character, and this can be seen in the horror stories of many writers, such as Sheridan LeFanu's "The Room in The Dragon Volant" (1872), Daphne Du Maurier's "Kiss Me Again, Stranger" (1952) and Stephen King's "Autopsy Room Four" (2002). But other examples of literature demonstrate the ability of perspective to highlight the limitations of this form of storytelling and allow the reader to question how the experience of the individual character who is telling the story differs from the actual events. This can be seen in the Henry James novella The Turn of the Screw (1898) in which a governess insists upon seeing ghosts and although there is no overt confirmation of this, she perceives other characters' similar beliefs through her interpretation of their body language. This ambiguity also becomes a source of tension in Niki Valentine's recent novel The

Haunted (2011), in which the narrating protagonist, gradually suffering from starvation, begins to see things which she can only attribute to the supernatural, though her weakened condition creates a sense of scepticism within the reader. All of these examples demonstrate how perspective can be used to limit the scope of a story that is told, create an immediacy of experience for the reader of a text, and/or pinpoint the weaknesses in the experience of a protagonist, by making us question the narrative, as the point of view is suspect.

German expressionist cinema and its frequent depiction of horror stories provides the earliest and most significant examples of the close link between perspective and horror. According to Susan Hayward, "The word expressionism means 'squeezing out', thus making the true essence of things and people emerge into a visible form." (2006; 192) In other words, expressionism is the projection of the subjective experience of the world outward, creating an aesthetic that is reliant upon character perspective. The strange sets of The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (1920; dir. Weine), and the exaggerated movement and performances as well as the disorienting editing in Fritz Lang's M (1931) prove this point. The sets of The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari consist almost wholly of painted backdrops which exaggerate the angles and features of the surroundings, and even include painted shadows which can directly oppose the lighting of the characters in the foreground. Peter Lorre's performance in M changes from a mysterious sinister figure, to a panicked man being chased, and in the final sequences to a manically gesticulating madman of monstrous proportions. The editing likewise is disorienting, providing a disjointed effect on the viewer, making sudden, jolting movements between similar conversations in different locations. One example can be seen in the sequence linking the police with the mob discussing how to handle the killer, making the

viewer unsure of the specific location and thematically connecting the two seemingly disparate organisations. Thomas Elsaesser states that, in German expressionist cinema, "the editing often obscures rather than expresses continuity and causal links between segments or even between shots." (Elsaesser in Nowell-Smith, 1996, p. 143) Rick Worland, writing on <u>Nosferatu</u> (1922; dir. Murnau), argues, "Murnau creates expressionist stylization through careful shot composition and lighting rather than distorted sets, as in the vaulted chamber where Hutter discovers the monster resting in his rotten-topped coffin, wide eyes staring up at the terrified man." (2007; p.48) These are just a few of the key examples of the intricacy between German expressionism, horror and perspective.

<u>Perspective in Horror to Perspective in the Slasher</u>

Films within the slasher sub-genre of horror are no exception to the strong usage of perspective. Since slasher films usually have sparse, streamlined plots, perspective is often used not only to provide the appropriate emotional response, but also to propel the film through the narrative. This calls for an examination of the perspectives that dominate the horror genre.

While most films tend to quickly establish both a protagonist and an antagonist, slasher films often initially establish the antagonist, and slowly develop the protagonist, as secondary characters fall by the wayside. This makes sense when one considers the issue of perspective. Sensing the immediate terror of the victim of a violent act would be almost entirely eradicated if a slasher film adopted the perspective of a singular protagonist that meets the antagonist in the climax. This is why a film such as <u>Terror Train</u> (1980; dir. Spottiswoode) benefits from slowly developing the characters, as the perspective can move fluidly between them,

depending on who is experiencing a violent act. In this case, however, the viewer correctly suspects early on that the primary protagonist to be Alana Maxwell, who is played by the most recognizable actor in the film, Jamie Lee Curtis, the star of Halloween. In doing this, Terror Train benefits simultaneously from attachment to a potential protagonist, and free movement of victim perspective. This movement between protagonists is taken to its most extreme in Wolf Creek (2005; dir. Mclean), where all the victims are developed equally and simultaneously, until they are divided. Here the film stays with each potential protagonist for an extended period of time until they are dispatched, or survive.

The perpetrator of the violent acts is another character to which many slasher films attach perspective. To return to a previously mentioned film, Taxi Driver, while traditionally considered a drama or sometimes action, despite the small number of action sequences, shares more generic traits with the horror film than any other genre. The bulk of Taxi Driver follows Vera Dika's well-designed definition of a stalker film. Dika ultimately maintains that the sub-genre commonly called "slasher" should be given the new moniker "stalker" as the dramatic tension of the films derives from the viewer's awareness that there is a threatening presence stalking characters. This stalking is then punctuated by violent acts, but the bulk of the film is committed to acts of stalking. This is true of Taxi Driver. Three major characters in the film: Betsy, Iris and Charles Palantine are all direct objects of Bickle's stalking, and between these sequences he is generally prowling the streets, watching the people of New York City, and training himself to become a killing machine. Bickle's stalking of Betsy ends in an uncomfortable near fistfight in her workplace, the stalking of Palantine ends with an assassination attempt by Travis and the climax of the film is the culmination of his stalking of Iris, when he storms a

seedy hotel where she, as a prostitute, is with one of her clients. In this sequence, he shoots her pimp boyfriend, the hotel owner, and Iris's client, and each confrontation is bloodier than the last, until the entire room is splattered with blood. Whether called "stalker" or "slasher", <u>Taxi Driver</u> adheres quite closely to the generic formula.

This is important to establish, as <u>Taxi Driver</u> is an example of a film that houses the film's perspective tightly within the perpetrator of violent action. In fact, only one scene in the entire film does not include Travis. Throughout <u>Taxi Driver</u>, Scorsese creates unpleasant compositions using a grainy film stock mostly depicting dark, grimy streets and harshly lit interiors. These compositions provide a sense of Travis's initial and increasing discomfort in New York City. The climactic shootout in the hotel stands out from the rest of the film, particularly through its extreme use of overhead and back lighting. The colours in that scene are also more saturated than in the rest of the film, making the blood more striking. In the hotel scene, the viewer gets a sense of Travis's anger, intensity, madness and determination. The shocking new compositions enhance this emotional reaction, and reflect the perspective of Travis.

As discussed, <u>Taxi Driver</u> has retained a certain amount of generic ambiguity, largely because of its close attachment to a character that is typically understood as an antagonist. The same could be said of <u>Peeping Tom</u> (1960; dir. Powell), which has consistently been labelled a horror film, and takes great pains to not only assume the perspective of Mark, the killer, but to also create a tremendous amount of sympathy for him within the viewer, largely through developing a relatable and tragic back story. One significant difference between <u>Taxi Driver</u> and <u>Peeping Tom</u> that may account for the former's generic ambiguity is that in <u>Taxi</u>

Driver, all of the graphic violence comes at the climax of the film, whereas the

violence in Peeping Tom is used to punctuate key moments in the film. Also, due in

large part to the actors' performances, Mark is more sympathetic and knowable

while Travis is complex and impenetrable. A large majority of slasher films or even

horror films in general present the perspective of an aggressor without situating the

entire film from their perspective. This is more typical within the genre, as fluid

perspective change is conducive to viewer pleasure within horror narratives, because

it can be used to create different sorts of tension within the viewer when changed

between victim and aggressor, or if changing between victims, it can be used to

sustain similar forms of tension throughout a film and create ambiguity over who

will survive. Examples of this can be seen in Alien[3] (1992; dir. Fincher), where the

camera assumes the point of view of the alien, distorting the image using non-

anamorphic compositions projected through an anamorphic lens, creating a sense of

an alternate perspective. Predator (1987; dir. McTiernan) and Predator 2 (1990; dir.

Hopkins) assumes more than a visual point of view and alters the sound to provide a

heightened sense of experiential perspective within the predator. As in Wolfen, the

image is colour-coded to resemble electronic heat detection as the predator would

see through its mask, as well as provide an electronically distorted soundtrack, so

that the words spoken by characters being watched are not understood, but there is a

sense of auditory comprehension accompanied by the frustration of the failure to

understand specific content.

Impartial omniscience is a rare form of perspective used within slasher films.

It is more frequently used in other genres, as horror as a whole depends largely upon

the effect provided by housing the viewer within the sensations of a character close

to the narrative. One example of impartial omniscience within a slasher film can be

seen in <u>The Hills Have Eyes</u> (1977; dir. Craven). Although the entire film does not

retain omniscience, especially as the climax relies heavily upon the attachment of the

spectator to some of the characters, the first half of the film remains aloof. Through

doing this, director Wes Craven is placing the viewer in a position that seems rather

uncaring as to the apparent danger in which the protagonists are being placed. This

also provides a direct contrast to the later sequences, but Craven manages to blend

omniscience into character perspective by degrees, so that by the end of the film, the

viewer may reflect on the distinct difference between their aloof position at the

outset of the film and their intense involvement at the end. This further demonstrates

the extent to which perspective is integral to the overall experiential effect of

consuming horror texts.

<u>How is Perspective Created?</u>

The question of how perspective is created within horror cinema specifically

now arises. Peripheral elements of this have already been discussed, but a focus on

this question is important to understand the significance of the aesthetic design of

this genre. Primarily, and this is true of any film that opts to explore the perspective

of a character, perspective portrays events and experience close to a character. Like

the examples provided of <u>Taxi Driver</u> and <u>Sunset Boulevard</u>, the choice of character

perspective limits the scope of a story, and dictates how the viewer is to respond to

the events portrayed. Significantly, horror's tendency to fluidly change perspectives

allows, depending on the design, for either added simplicity or complexity to linear

narrative structure. For an example of simpler structure, most mainstream[1] slasher

---

[1] "Mainstream" is a term that can have variant definitions based on use. I will be using it to describe

films that are either produced by a major studio with the apparent aim of capitalising on the popularity

films can be used. The Slumber Party Massacre (1982; dir. Jones), which is
thematically complex in its own right, is exemplary of a film that uses changing
perspective to create a more straightforward episodic narrative. The events are seen
through a progressing series of victims, where the escalation of violence and the
deaths of increasingly more significant characters are the impetus that drives the film
from sequence to sequence, as opposed to a cause-and-effect plot structure. Psycho
(1960; dir. Hitchcock) uses this episodic structure, but the changes in perspective are
less comfortable for the viewer, requiring the transitions between perspective to be
more rigidly and intricately designed. The much-written-about shower sequence
shockingly removes the object of viewer identification, Marion Crane, whose
perspective has dominated the film. After this occurrence, the camera is left to
wander the hotel room, focusing on certain potentially significant details. Norman
Bates then enters the scene, and after a seemingly protracted absence of any object of
identification or perspective, the film immediately assumes his point of view. The
locations and events are experienced through Norman until the car containing
Marion's body sinks into the swamp. After a dissolve to black, the story resumes in
a very jolting manner, immediately assuming the perspective of Marion's sister
Lila.[2] While the film's movement to Detective Arbogast is fairly seamless, his death
is jolting, making the transition back to Lila still uncomfortable. Psycho is also an
interesting case due to the fact that the episodic nature of the plot is also driven by a

---

of talent, genre, or another factor that appears marketable, whether the film was successful or not. I
will also use it to describe films that have exceeded in either profitability or cultural significance as
compared to other films with similar production costs within a comparable genre.

[2] Although the shock provided by this change in perspective has been written about at great length by
many theorists, it was first brought to my attention by Berliner in the previously discussed
Introduction to Film Studies course. His lesson on Psycho is regularly cycled in and out of his
curriculum for that as well as other courses.

cause-and-effect structure. This is particularly unique as episodic films generally hinge on similar concepts or interrelated characters, but within <u>Psycho</u>, the seemingly unrelated set pieces are all connected by progressive developments in the search for Marion Crane and/or the money she has stolen. Because of these changes in perspective the events seen and the overall film structure is entirely affected.

Horror films also create perspective through the distortion of space. A sense of a character's perceived relationship to an object, or specifically a threat can heighten a viewer's emotional response by adjusting the images seen to reflect this perception. In an early scene in <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> the character Tina is, in a nightmare, approached in a dark alley by the menacing Freddy Krueger. As he slowly moves towards her, he stretches his arms out, but his arms have grown to be several meters long. While his arms may not actually be that long, the film communicates Tina's feeling that his arms are overwhelming and inescapable; her perception of space within the dream is distorted, and the viewer is given the opportunity to experience Tina's perspective. While this is a more apparent example, slasher films frequently employ devices like wide angle lenses that enhance swift movement towards the camera, low angle shots that make the subject look big, high angle shots that make the subject look small, and disproportionate subject/sound relationships that create an unsettling and indeterminate sense of distance.

The final key way that perspective is created in horror is through an accentuation and distortion of time. Slow motion, rapid editing and cross cutting between simultaneous events all are devices that distort time, and within horror, their usage is relative to the experience of a particular character; slow motion provides a feel of a slowly moving but impending and inevitable action, fast editing creates a

sense of swift unexpected movement and cross cutting between simultaneous events can create tension by protracting the time before an anticipated event.

Having addressed the slasher sub-genre, the deviations between this sub-genre and horror as a whole should be noted. There is very little deviation between the two. Across the sub-genres of horror, all of them almost universally create and adapt a sense of perspective in order to achieve the appropriate viewer response. Ultimately, the sub-genres approach horror in two ways: either horror is rooted in realism or horror is based in the supernatural. The only difference between the two is that horror rooted in the supernatural tends to use more elaborate aesthetic means to create this sense of perspective. Supernatural horror films such as The Haunting (1963; dir. Wise) employ the use of camerawork, sound, lighting, editing, art design, etc. to create a threat that is rarely seen. This threat's presence is only apparent by the use of abnormal aesthetic coding. Slasher films largely work within a horror realism aesthetic. In these films, a threat is apparent and physically present, so an additional development of perspective is useful in making a threat seem more imposing, but there is generally less of a reliance on the aesthetic devices to create a sense of threat. When adhering to this form, slasher films intensify a spectator's experience of horror by creating a fictional universe with natural laws familiar to the viewer, and thereby creating a relatively plausible situation that could occur within one's own experience.

In terms of perspective, the more complex slasher films tend to incorporate elements of the supernatural, both thematically and aesthetically. The A Nightmare on Elm Street series manages to retain elements of both. Freddy Krueger is dead, but is haunting children in their dreams, which should firmly place the series within the supernatural. The dream sequences highlight the supernatural nature of Freddy's

existence. However, the overarching theme of the films is the interplay between

dreams and reality, and in the first film's climax, Nancy is attempting to bring this

killer into reality in order to face him on ground more familiar and comfortable to

her. It still lies within the realm of the supernatural, but its overt acknowledgement

of the difference between the supernatural and reality makes it a significant case

study. Long running franchises such as the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films and the <u>Halloween</u>[3]

films eventually resort to supernatural explanations in order to retain the popular

killers Jason Voorhees and Michael Myers, respectively.

Perspective ultimately becomes a valuable tool for understanding aesthetic

design, and an appropriate starting point for initiating a formalist analysis of the

slasher sub-genre. However, slashers are not an autonomous offshoot of the horror

genre; the slasher is a branch of horror that holds aesthetic similarities to the genre

dating back to early cinema, and even elements drawn from outside the genre from

primitive cinema. I will therefore trace the aesthetic forbears of the slasher film, and

particularly the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series, by demonstrating it through the history of a

concentrated visual form of perspective: the first person, or point of view shot.

---

[3] Original film: <u>Halloween</u> (1978; dir. Carpenter)

Chapter 2: The Eye/Camera Defined and Established

One recognizable trope of the slasher genre is a direct representation of character perspective: the first-person camera. The first-person camera shows a moving image from the point of view of a character, and attempts to replicate movement and positioning that would connect the audience to the experience of active human viewing. This is a device that has been the subject of academic discourse, particularly in regards to horror and has been theorized and interpreted in a variety of ways in terms of function and implication. Over the course of this chapter, I first aim to describe the theoretical eye/camera model to be used in my argument, and then clarify the significant academic discourses surrounding this aesthetic device. I will then explore how, and to what effect, the point of view shot has been utilised throughout the history of cinema particularly within the horror genre and finally describe how it has evolved both technically and in terms of representation. This will provide a historical grounding that will contextualize the Friday the 13th films, demonstrating the franchise's positioning within a greater aesthetic evolution.

Eye/Camera Definitions and Critical Understanding

"I"-Camera is a term brought to academic prominence by Carol J. Clover and used regularly in relation to the slasher sub-genre of horror in her book Men, Women and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film (1992). This term is used to describe a composition indicating a first-person perspective within the film. The function of the "I"-Camera is to compress three visual planes so that they inhabit the

same space: the eye of the viewer, the lens of the camera and the eye of the character within the film.[1] The dynamic of two sets of eyes, one real, one imagined, conjoined by the camera leads me to alter the term slightly according to my definition and perception. Therefore, instead of referring to this device as the "I"-Camera, I will refer to it as the "eye/camera," to reflect the model described.

The element of the eye/camera diagram that is least reliable and subject to uncertain variation is that of the character eye. While the perception and personal experience of the viewer is prone to change, the composition of the image as captured by the camera lens is constant. The camera codes the eye/camera composition, and the audience viewer decodes these elements to perceive a first-person point of view. The character eye is subject to character perspective, which creates distinctive differences in eye/camera coding from film to film. To simplify, the term "eye/camera" can be defined as a cinematic device whereby the camera inhabits the specific positioning of a character eye. How this is represented visually is subject to small changes, particularly as the cinematic coding of these shots has evolved since the origins of cinema.

---

[1] A similar concept has recently been used by Jarkko Toikkanen in his essay "Between the Sky and the Bestial Floor: Monstrosity in W. B. Yeats's 'The Magi' (1916)", presented at The Monster Inside Us, The Monsters Around Us: Monstrosity and Humanity conference at De Montfort University. He refers to "space sharing", wherein the writer evokes the experience of a storyteller present within the fictional universe, which is intended to create a similar sense of experience within the reader. In a personal communication, he attributes the origin of this idea to "Kant and his notion of 'subjective universality' -- the idea that each aesthetic judgment is made in such a way that calls for universal recognition..." (J Toikkanen 2011, pers. comm., 30 Nov) He specifically directs me to Kant's Critique of the Power of Judgement, Chapter 7 of the Introduction entitled "On the aesthetic representation of the purposiveness of nature", as well as the section entitled "Second Moment of the judgement of taste, concerning its quantity" in the First Book of the First Section, which is called "Analytic of the Beautiful". This is using the 2000 Guyer and Matthews translation. Toikkanen is using a slightly more abstract philosophical application to his approach, but agrees that it shares the same essence as my model of three compressed visual planes.

Overall, the eye/camera contains very specific compositional elements, which make the audience aware that it is witnessing a first-person point of view. One element is that of the shaky movement created by filming the sequence with a handheld camera. A shaky image creates an unsteadiness that is usually associated with personal eye, head and body movement. This unsteadiness is also created through another element generally attributed to the hand-held camera, which is the swish pan/tilt. A swift movement of the camera upwards or downwards or side to side also mimics human head and eye movement. The swish pan/tilt has become more regularly used in the last ten years, coinciding with the mainstreaming of digital video in films such as Jason X and Ali (2001; dir. Mann), and the popularity of The Blair Witch Project (1999; dirs. Myrick and Sánchez). Saving Private Ryan (1998; dir. Spielberg) advanced the aesthetic of eye/camera shots by enhancing them with hydraulic platforms and attaching the camera to mechanical devices to create an unsteadiness unusual for a mainstream film. The recent usage of the swish pan/tilt is indicative of the continuous evolution of eye/camera codification. While shaky hand-held eye/camera shots can be found in early cinema, the early period eye/camera is usually stationary or fluid, as though shot from a tripod or dolly, respectively. More inventive approaches involve wire-guided cameras, as seen in The Last Laugh (1924; dir. Murnau), and, closer to the cinematic focus of this research, Suspiria (1977; dir. Argento). This technique suggests a first-person perspective from positioning but the movement of the camera, while suggestive of a point of view, is more swift and fluid than other eye/camera shots. This can often suggest a supernatural subject as in Suspiria, which tells the story of an American girl who discovers her dance school is run by a coven of witches who use magic to achieve their nefarious designs. Stationary eye/camera shots still appear in modern

cinema, such as in <u>The Talented Mr. Ripley</u> (1999; dir. Minghella), where, on a yacht, Tom Ripley watches through a small hatch, the feet of Marge and Dickie as they make love. These sequences are part of an aesthetic tradition seen in the "Through the Keyhole" shorts of primitive cinema, and take on this tradition's notions of voyeurism, which I will come to later in this chapter.

Another significant element of eye/camera composition is that of relatable or understandable height. The camera typically shoots the action from a height of about six feet with a variation of approximately six inches. This height variant is meant to reflect the standard height of an adult human, which becomes instantly recognizable to the viewer, as the average viewer usually sees the world from this perspective. In all, these basic elements are used to reflect standard human experiential vision. While variations on these elements occur, the variants tend to be exceptions that prove the rule. Examples of this will be discussed where relevant.

The critical stance of the eye/camera is varied, but consistently returns to an acceptance of the device as a form of voyeurism. Laura Mulvey's significant essay "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" (1999; 833-844) argues that voyeurism and scopophilia are central to the pleasures of watching films. Mulvey discusses the first-person camera within the explication of her analysis of the cinematic gaze. The "cinematic gaze" is the theory that what the camera shows, or looks at, reveals personality and identificatory traits, which can reveal what sort of person the viewer is meant to be seeing through. Mulvey argues that, in most cases, the cinematic gaze is overwhelmingly heterosexual and masculine, which can frequently be revealed through the use of lingering and voyeuristic shots of desirable female subjects. This essay is emblematic of, and in many cases the basis for, the analysis of the eye/camera.

As voyeurism is itself the pleasure derived from illicit viewing, connecting the concept of voyeurism to an uninvited usurpation of a character's vision is a reasonable conclusion to draw. The definition of voyeurism provided by Jill Nelmes (2004; 99) closely follows her discussion of the first-person camera, and is contained within the same subheading entitled "The evolution of film spectatorship in Early Cinema". Although the two are never directly connected, the relationship is strongly implied by Nelmes, who ends the section describing a viewing experience close to the arguments already stated by Laura Mulvey.

In her book Cinema Studies: Key Concepts, which is encyclopaedic in structure, Susan Hayward makes a similar connection in her discussion of the subjective camera (2006; 404) and voyeurism/fetishism. (480-2) Hayward's language in the latter entry is reminiscent of that in the earlier entry which is an attempt at a more technical, rather than theoretical, definition. Compare the first two sentences of each entry. For subjective camera, Hayward writes, "The camera is used in such a way as to suggest the point of view of a particular character. High- or low-angle shots indicate where she or he is looking from; a panoramic or panning shot suggest she or he is surveying the scene; a tracking shot or a hand-held camera shot signifies the character in motion." For voyeurism/fetishism, Hayward writes, "Voyeurism is the act of viewing the activities of other people unbeknown to them. This often means that the act of looking is illicit or has illicit connotations." (480-1) In both entries, Hayward gives clear and concise definitions, followed by how these can be framed either formally or within the context of the narrative. The voyeurism/fetishism entry contains references to five specific films, four of which are horror films and two, Psycho and Peeping Tom are well known for their themes of voyeurism as well as their eye/camera shots. This in itself is significant, but when

Hayward makes the following statement in her discussion of the psychological theory of cinematic voyeurism and the male gaze, the connections to the eye/camera, specifically within horror, become apparent:

> Voyeurism, at its most extreme can lead to sadomasochistic behaviour. The man watches the woman, she may or may not know that he is looking at her, she cannot, however, return the gaze (because it is he who has agency over it and thus over her). Ostensibly, she is his victim and he the potential sadist who can violently attack or even kill her. (481)

The description of this scene can be directly linked to specific sequences containing eye/camera shots in each of the Friday the 13th and Halloween (excluding Halloween III: Season of the Witch [1982; dir. Wallace]) series. Hayward does not mention a first-person positioning of the camera, but considering the mention of films that popularly highlight eye/camera shots and as the eye/camera places the audience in the position of a character that is watching, the reader is indirectly guided into connecting the theme of voyeurism to the eye/camera. In these instances, while the link is never directly made, the cognitive understanding of both concepts invariably connects the two.

Connections between the use of the eye/camera shot and voyeurism in Halloween have been made by numerous critics. In discussing eye/camera shots in Halloween, Steve Neale describes "a voyeuristic gaze at the female victims in a state of semi-nudity..." (1996; 338). J.P. Telotte writes of the opening eye/camera shot: "After this initial, disturbing 'eye contact,' Halloween, following the pattern of Alfred Hitchcock's Psycho, places its audience in a voyeuristic position to begin that

task of exploring and revealing their relationship to the events here depicted." (1987;
116) Telotte's statement demonstrates that not all critics agree as to whether or not
this voyeuristic camera positioning is negative. However, while Telotte chooses to
examine voyeurism as aesthetically created to challenge the viewer, Humphries takes
an opposing stance on voyeuristic design, which, he argues, results in casual
audience complicity. In a discussion of <u>Halloween</u>, Humphries says, "the spectators
can both enjoy the earlier sight of the girl undressing and later feel safe from any
danger insofar as we can identify with her, while knowing we are safe [...] Spying on
girls undressing is fine, provided the looker is not a psychotic." (1991; 143)
[brackets mine] Humphries then discusses the absolution the eye/camera provides
the audience through enjoying the sadistic elements of the film: a viewer can enjoy
watching a vulnerable subject by proxy, while being able to condemn the actions of
the character that is looking (143-144).

    <u>Halloween</u> is often centralized in discussions of the eye/camera and vice
versa. This is largely due to the distinctive and iconic opening sequence which is a
shot designed to appear as a single extended eye/camera shot, making it a significant
film particularly where this device is concerned. Because of its importance, that
sequence will be analysed in detail later in this chapter. However, the eye/camera's,
and often the basic act of seeing's, relationship to voyeurism regularly appears
within writing about film. James Marriott's guide <u>Horror Films</u>, which is aimed at a
non-academic audience, discusses the film <u>Deep Red</u> (1975; dir. Argento). In this
overview, Marriott addresses the roots of the giallo film (to be discussed later),
writing about "the themes of voyeurism and eyewitness from <u>Psycho</u>, <u>Rear Window</u>
(1954), and <u>Peeping Tom</u>..." (168) as primary examples of influential foregrounding

of voyeurism in film plots. The mention of voyeurism in a film guide directed at

non-specialist audiences demonstrates the widespread exposure this topic is given.

Robin Wood writes about the eye/camera, reaffirming this negative reading,

but recognizing a greater complexity:

> A simple alternative explanation for the device, which in fact works with
>
> rather than against (the critical accusation that the eye/camera is an
>
> invitation to sadism), is the need to preserve the secret of the killer's
>
> identity for a final "surprise." The latter motivation might be seen merely
>
> as supplying a plausible alibi for the former: the sense of indeterminate,
>
> unidentified, possibly supernatural or superhuman menace feeds the
>
> spectator's fantasy of power, facilitating a direct spectator/camera
>
> identification by keeping the intermediary character, while signified as
>
> present, as vaguely defined as possible. (Wood, 2003; 177)

Here, Wood takes the time to examine this device in terms of narrative function

before moving on to discuss the psychological issue of viewer sadism. He neglects,

however to address the complex emotions that derive from combining sadistic

pleasure with suspenseful disorientation, particularly in his statement regarding a

"plausible alibi". While there may be an element of truth to this argument, Wood

fails to acknowledge a greater informational intricacy working within the framework

of the device. The eye/camera is a complex device, providing an intricate

interworking of information, sensation and viewer response, and reducing this device

to a few abstract concepts fails to address its popularity and prevalence within

cinema. Wood also refrains from mentioning the tension and suspense created

through use of the eye/camera, which, combined with sadism, results in a type of shot that contains very complex emotional and informational coding. In fact, Wood seemingly contradicts much of his own argument in his discussion of point of view in relation to the work of Alfred Hitchcock. Wood states:

> The power of the POV shot in constructing identification has been greatly exaggerated (by myself, among others): it is simply not true that to stick in a shot from a given character's point of view automatically identifies the spectator with that character, beyond the obvious enforced identification with a physical position (we see what the character sees). (1989; 308) [parenthesis in the original]

If this was written after his previous discussion regarding the eye/camera in relation to the slasher film and he was in the process of re-evaluating his opinion, then Wood could justify his change of position. In Hollywood from Vietnam to Reagan... And Beyond, however, he revisits his writing in Hollywood from Vietnam to Reagan (1986) after having written Hitchcock's Films Revisited (1989), and fails to account for his change in interpretation of point of view shots. This inconsistency creates difficulty when establishing Wood's ultimate position, but it should be noted that his statement about the complexity of the point of view shot is more thoroughly established, as he uses more detail to support the latter claim than he does the former, which is reduced to a few generalized statements. While this does not necessarily reflect the quality of the argument, the fact that Wood deemed it necessary to commit a greater amount of writing to the development of the point of view complexity argument as opposed to the alibi for sadism argument could be

considered indicative of the consideration given each statement. This disparity in the two explanations also raises questions regarding Wood's consideration of "worthiness": he seems to consider Hitchcock's films more worthy, artistic and complex than the 1980s slasher films he addresses in Hollywood from Vietnam to Reagan... And Beyond which he only considers sadistic. In discussing the problematic ideologies expressed in mainstream horror from the 1980s, Wood uses and attempts to justify similar problems in Hitchcock's work: "...the films obliquely express what Hitchcock's films, for example, have consistently dramatized – the anxiety of the heterosexual male confronted by the possibility of an autonomous female sexuality he can't control or organize." (2003; 174) By asserting that 1980s horror "obliquely expresses" these anxieties, Wood implies that these are, either unconscious or conscious, reflections of the ideologies of the filmmakers, yet by stating that Hitchcock's films "dramatize" the anxieties, Wood suggests that this is knowingly portrayed, and is therefore more complex.

Lucy Fischer and Marcia Landy take a position similar to Wood's argument about the complexity of point of view. In response to James Monaco's analysis of Eyes of Laura Mars (1978; dir. Kershner) in which he accuses the film of being more stylistic and less substantial, Fischer and Landy write that "the problem is not, as Monaco indicates, that the film says nothing but that it says everything." (1987; 71) This statement, while pointing out a primary weakness in the film, indicates the complexity of eye/camera usage in both the narrative and visual design of Eyes of Laura Mars. This particular summary of the film succinctly indicates that, while the film itself may inadequately develop the very points it raises through using the eye/camera, the eye/camera is such a complex device that it becomes difficult for an entire film narratively centring around its usage to comprehensively and

satisfactorily address the aesthetic and psychological implications of the device. Fischer and Landy ultimately argue that <u>Eyes of Laura Mars</u> begins with a very complex approach to addressing the first person shot, but that the film's approach becomes increasingly reductive until the end, revealing the film to be an inadequate discussion of the device, due to the combined nature of the first person shot and the flaws in the film. They continue to discuss the film's approach to issues of vision and seeing providing a focus on the first person camera within the film. This essay is one of the more detailed discussions of the intricacies of the eye/camera within the scope of voyeurism. While Fischer and Landy do not discuss aesthetics outright, they do acknowledge that these themes and the eye/camera provide a complex and conflicting set of emotional viewer codes. Although Fischer and Landy detail the intricacies of the eye/camera, their argument too closely attaches the eye/camera to voyeurism to advance my argument, which aims to move away from this attachment.

The assessment of the use of the eye/camera within horror as a voyeuristic and/or sadistic device is not always considered negative. One significant example of this is a quote from the back cover of a VHS release of <u>The Burning</u> (1981; dir. Maylam). This is a UK video release of the film distributed by Vipco in 2000, which features an excerpt from a review of the film in <u>Time Out</u> that says "Gruesome... It's the teenage girls who are the chief victims of both the murderers (sic) savage cuts and the cameras (sic) leering gaze." While the camera does linger on titillating compositions of women within the film, the eye/camera used in the film promotes more significant aesthetic results. The original review of the film from the <u>Time Out</u> website reveals the reviewer's initial argument:

In the tradition of such horror pix as <u>Halloween</u> and <u>Friday the 13th</u>, this portrays the gruesome extermination of a group of charmless adolescents by a bogey man. This time it's a hulk of burnt flesh wielding garden shears and terrorising a summer camp; and true to cycle, it's the teenage girls who are the chief victims of both the murderer's savage cuts and the camera's leering gaze. Presented as provocative teasers, they're despatched while the mini-machos laugh, lust, bully, build rafts and, finally become heroes. Suspensewise, it's proficient enough, but familiarity with this sort of stuff can breed contempt. (http://www.timeout.com/film/reviews/68628/the-burning.html; accessed 29-01-2010)

While the promotional material edits the original review, the chosen quote still references the gaze of the camera, despite the original's negative angle. The most revelatory element of the original quote is the implication of the entire genre's tie to the eye/camera. The reason that I place this quote in relation to the VHS cover and not the article itself is to identify the acceptance of this voyeuristic claim even within the film community. After so much critical reference to the eye/camera as a source sadistic pleasure via voyeurism, distributors have moved to using this element to promote the films they sell, due to the profitability of titillation. Arguments against the exploitation of sexuality aside, the distributor has recognized consumer demand for titillation, thereby catering to the market.

Clover, in an attempt to reconcile the negative critical stance with positive viewer reception, approaches the use of the eye/camera from a seemingly negative standpoint initially, but through the course of her argument, explains that this

negativity becomes more complicated once received by the viewer. After introducing the idea of the phallic gaze, where the dominating visuals are coded as masculine, Clover moves to the modern slasher with an analysis of the eye/camera at the beginning of <u>Halloween</u>. She writes:

> But far and away the most conspicuous sort of 'assaultive gazing' hollows the 1978 lead of John Carpenter's <u>Halloween</u>, in which we adopt the vision of an entity that stalks a house, peers in windows, enters and goes to the kitchen for a carving knife, then proceeds upstairs, opens a door, and stabs a young woman to death – all without knowing who 'we' are, and all without direct reference to the mediation of a camera. (185)

After continuing this analysis, however, Clover notes the separation between critical analysis and viewer reception. Beginning with the writing of Mick Martin and Marsha Porter, Clover establishes the typical critical response to the eye/camera, writing:

> Mick Martin and Marsha Porter echo the common response to such first-person camera horror movies of the <u>Halloween</u> or <u>Friday the Thirteenth</u> [sic] sort when they write that the director 'uses a subjective camera in the stabbing scenes, which, essentially, makes the viewer the killer. The camera moves in on the screaming, pleading victim, "looks down" at the knife, and then plunges it into chest, ear, or eyeball. Now that's sick.' (Martin and Porter, *Video Movie Guide*: 1987, p.690) What Martin and Porter and others like them fail to note, however, are the shortcomings

and ultimate failure of that gaze. For one thing, it does not see well – at

least not since 1978, when John Carpenter popularized the use of the

unmounted first-person camera to represent the killer's point of view.

Although critics tend to assign a kind of binding power to marked first-

person cinematography, the fact is that the 'view' of the first-person killer

is typically cloudy, unsteady, and punctuated by dizzying swish-pans.

Insofar as an unstable gaze suggests an unstable gazer, the credibility of

the first-person killer-camera's omnipotence is undermined from the

outset. One could go further and say that the assignment of 'real' vision

to 'normal' characters draws attention, in the hand-held or Steadicam

sequences, to the very item the filmmaker ostensibly seeks to efface: the

camera. (186-187) [parenthesis in the original]

These comments clearly draw out two significant observations: firstly, an

acknowledgement of the criticism that the eye/camera generally receives, and

secondly, that the function of the eye/camera inherently produces a much more

complex set of receptive codes than these criticisms suggest. To support this, Clover

continues by quoting John Carpenter as he discusses the attention drawn to the

apparatus through trying to ignore it, or, by pretending the camera is not there, the

audience is even more aware of its presence. (187) In other words, the jerky

movements and quick pans only manage to expose the use of a camera in capturing

these images, as the human eye doesn't see events in that manner.

Vera Dika discusses the eye/camera very early in her writing, but makes no

statement nor allusion as to the moral positioning of the device. Instead, Dika reads

the eye/camera as a distinct generic signifier. Dika notes:

...this horror formula is best identified by a predominately *off-screen*

killer who is known primarily by his/her distinctive point-of-view shots.

Although many of the films identified in this way have been called

'slasher' films (this placing the defining characteristic on the central

narrative action) the term 'stalker' film (which will be used here) alludes

instead to the act of *looking* and especially to the distinctive set of point-

of-view shots employed by these films. Distinguished in this way, then,

the resultant body of films displays an impressively coherent set of

characteristics. (1990; 14) [emphasis and parenthesis in the original]

Here, Dika shows that the eye/camera is not only important to understanding the

genre, but is a central driving factor to the narrative, without which the films could

not operate. This idea was briefly discussed almost twenty years earlier by Dennis

L. White who argued that point of view shots are an essential element to the generic

orientation of horror not to be overlooked when considering the artistic value of the

films of the genre (1971 ; 1). Similarly, Marriott, in his survey of Halloween writes

of "the killer's point of view (POV) shots that came to characterise the genre." This

comment is immediately followed by a discussion of voyeuristic identification,

however. (182)

While this is a small cross-section of critical writing about the eye/camera, it

represents a vast body of work that has come to haunt the technique and has

influenced the way many critics respond to it. Even writers like Wood and Fischer

and Landy that discuss the basics of the eye/camera's relationship to narrative

replace detailed formalist analysis for an observation of the problematic

psychological and social implications of the device's positioning within a film. Clover responds to this negative critical stance, and provides an alternate reading, while Dika ignores such criticism and seeks to understand why the eye/camera predominates within the genre. While these approaches are each useful, as a whole they display a preoccupation with understanding the overall complexity of the eye/camera, and do not address the reductive base of the device. Following on from Dika's work, the essential question I seek to address is: why is the eye/camera used so often within the slasher film? The simplest answer is that it is frightening by showing precise proximity between victim and threat. When building upon this proximity fear, it is important to understand the history of the eye/camera to see how perspective is developed through this element which is essentially designed to create suspense and fear, or at minimum, dramatic tension.

Early Cinema and the Evolution of the Eye/Camera

The eye/camera appeared quite early in the history of cinema, although the modern visual coding does not firmly appear until the early 1940s, and the device itself evolves along with cinematic technology development. Two films from George Albert Smith provide the opportunity to examine the early history of the eye/camera as they both house the camera within the theoretical position of a character's eye. Grandma's Reading Glass (1900) assumes the point of view of a child looking through a reading glass, highlighting this eye/camera shot through a wide black iris.[2] This is also evidentiary of the establishment of early film language,

---

[2] Stephen Bottomore, tracing the history of film editing, acknowledges that Grandma's Reading Glass is generally considered "the first film to divide a scene up into separate shots," (1990; 108) although he points out that this is inaccurate. Bottomore writes, "This idea, using the cut-ins as a kind of 'stunt', seems to have been taken from a lantern original." (108) Lantern shows were a form of

particularly concerning editing. By showing somebody looking, followed by a cut to his/her point of view, a consistency of visual representation and image juxtaposition facilitates the flow of the narrative. This is also demonstrated in <u>As Seen Through a Telescope</u> (1900), which also employs the iris to accentuate the eye/camera, and specifies the source of the iris through an establishing shot of a man looking through a telescope. He proceeds to watch a man tying a woman's shoe, lifting her skirt and fondling her ankle. The illicit viewing of this contact anticipates the connection between eye/camera and voyeurism, but uses this to also create a basis for the comical use of eye/camera, as the ankle fondling is apparently inappropriate. The same year, Hepworth Manufacturing Company released <u>How it Feels to be Run Over</u>, where the eye/camera is used to show someone getting hit by a car. In this, the people in the car acknowledge the camera as a person, and wave for it to move out of the way. These films demonstrate that the eye/camera has roots very early in cinema.

Although Edwin Porter's <u>The Great Train Robbery</u> (1903) does not contain an eye/camera shot, it opened the narrative possibilities to the camera, past unobtrusively capturing action. The closing shot confronts and challenges the audience directly. <u>The Great Train Robbery</u> ends with a shot of a character, removed from the setting of the film, pointing a revolver and firing it at the camera. This cannot be referred to as an eye/camera shot because of the lack of an existing character eye. This is different from the early Georges Méliès magic films such as <u>Escamotage d'Une Dame au Théâtre Robert-Houdin</u> (1896; dir. Méliès), in that these

entertainment that used a series of image slides projected through a lantern which was developed in the 17th century, and still appearing in the 19th century (see Gunning; 2005). Although Bottomore has discovered uses of intra-scene cutting in cinema as early as 1899, he maintains that "The first genuine cutting within a scene had to wait until 1901 or 1902." (108-109)

early shorts are framed and composed like a stage show, and Méliès addressing the camera is meant to remind the audience of a theatrical experience. The final shot in the Porter film, however, is framed as a medium shot, and in terms of the audience eye, the action is aimed directly at the viewer. While this is not an eye/camera shot, it does contain a direct address to the camera, which is a common trope of the eye/camera – it combines point of view, mise-en-scène and the apparatus itself to directly involve and engage the audience in the narrative events.

While it is by no means the first horror film, F.W. Murnau's <u>Nosferatu</u> is a significant early horror film, and contains an instructive example of the way the genre uses the eye/camera, while marking compositional variations of its development. This can be revealed through an examination of one of the most recognizable scenes in the film: Hutter's first night in the castle of Count Orlock. When the clock chimes midnight, Hutter moves to the bedroom door, opens it a crack and peers out. At this point, the image cuts to Hutter's perspective: at the end of a long, dark hall, in an extreme long shot, Count Orlock is standing, looking directly at the camera. This image dissolves to a long shot of Count Orlock, filling the centre of the screen still looking directly at the camera. There is a cut to Hutter shutting the door. He runs to the window to look for a way out, but the climb down is impossible. Hutter gets in his bed and watches as the door to the room opens on its own. He looks away. There is then a cut to the doorway. On the opposite side, we see in long shot Count Orlock walking directly towards the camera, looking straight ahead the whole time. The image cuts to Hutter as he looks toward the door, and then he covers his head with a sheet. The image cuts back to Count Orlock in a long shot standing in the doorway. He gazes steadily at the camera as he steps inside the room. While this sequence seems to engage the audience without drawing the

viewer into the first person, I would argue that Murnau is using the eye/camera in a way that plays with perspective and subverts typical spatial relationships. Nosferatu is an example of expressionism, where unusual portrayals of perspective and space, such as the "abstract and primarily two dimensional" (196) mise-en-scène noted by Hayward, are typical.

The purpose of this type of perspective development is also made clear when one understands that it is at the service of the genre. While expressionism specifically uses its aesthetic to distort perspective to show the monstrousness of the modern world, the aim of horror as a whole is to scare and frighten, so the viewer must ask how the eye/camera aids in this sense of fear. The dissolve that occurs between the two shots of Count Orlock standing at the end of the corridor is the first occasion that seems to take the viewer out of the eye/camera. This however functions in much the same way as the snap-zoom in modern eye/camera shots. The snap zoom is a quick, unexpected zoom that takes place within the camera usually indicating instantaneous realization and focus within a wider view. This dissolve captures Hutter's mental realization not only that Count Orlock is at the end of the hallway, but that Count Orlock is a vampire that is looking at and waiting for him. This realization is a horrifying moment for Hutter, and the use of the eye/camera coupled with the dissolve makes this a horrifying moment for the viewer. When Hutter shuts the door, he runs to the left of the image to check the window, and then moves forward to the bed, still keeping him to the left of the doorway. When the doorway opens and Count Orlock approaches, however, it is shot straight on, making a direct eye/camera shot impossible. However, this is a way for Murnau to distort and subvert spatial relationships. As Count Orlock approaches, he looks into the camera, and seems to be coming for the viewer, and we know within the context of

the scene, he is coming for Hutter. However, before the first shot of the doorway,
Hutter looks away, and before the second shot of the doorway, Hutter covers his
head with a sheet. There is no possible way for these to be direct eye/camera shots,
but we become aware of perspective. We are seeing this from Hutter's point of
view, if indirectly. Although Hutter may not be looking, he knows Count Orlock is
coming for him slowly and steadily. The striking image is made more powerful
because we see what Hutter feels. We understand this image from Hutter's
perspective. He is terrified of this unavoidable encounter and by filming this as an
eye/camera shot, the viewer fears it as well. So while this sequence does not contain
visually direct representations of the eye/camera, we are presented with a first person
perspective, the viewer eye shares space with the camera lens and the volatile
character eye.

The example from Nosferatu is emblematic of a clever creation of an
eye/camera shot which exploits the limitations of the apparatus for a greater benefit.
Murnau, however, managed to exceed these limits and explore greater possibilities
through moving eye/camera shots in The Last Laugh, where camera postioning and
movement appears limitless, and the compositional movement became a spectacle in
its own right. The early appearance of such moving eye/camera shots as the wire-
guided technique already mentioned in order to create an establishing view of the
hotel at the film's opening significantly advanced the manner in which perspective is
created within film. By doing this, Murnau moved away from traditional
expressionist perspective techniques, such as exaggerated set design and lighting, to
provide a sense of immediacy and experience. Whether or not the audience
identifies with the body they inhabit, the action around the character becomes more
palpable.

In films such as <u>The Wolf Man</u> (1941; dir. Waggner) and <u>Dracula</u> (1931; dir. Browning), eye/camera shots are conspicuously rooted to the tripod. In <u>Dracula</u>, Count Dracula approaches a girl selling violets immediately after he arrives in London. As he walks up to her, she looks at him and the scene cuts to an eye/camera shot from her point of view: Count Dracula from a low angle, looking directly at the camera, before he moves in for the attack. The camera does not move at all, keeping Count Dracula in the same position within the frame for the entire shot. In the climax of <u>The Wolf Man</u>, Gwen, the love interest of Larry, the protagonist and eponymous wolf man, runs into the forest in an attempt to help Larry. The Wolf Man/Larry sees her and begins stalking her until she turns around and sees him. The Wolf Man is then seen from Gwen's eye/camera, and as he moves forward and attacks, the camera moves only through a tilt upward, and The Wolf Man stays centred in the frame, and there is a vertical movement of the camera. While this tendency to keep the camera bound to a tripod, including movement, is typical of the majority of eye/camera shots of the period, <u>The Last Laugh</u> helped the development of moving eye/camera shots. An innovative example can be seen in Rouben Mamoulian's <u>Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</u> (1931). In the opening sequence, and throughout the film, the camera assumes extended one take first person shots, in which the character, Dr. Jekyll, moves through rooms, watches himself pick up objects and look into a mirror. <u>Lady in the Lake</u> (1947; dir. Montgomery) is another notable film that uses extensive and intricate eye/camera shots. The film is shown entirely through eye/camera. Another example can be seen in Fritz Lang's film <u>You Only Live Once</u> (1937), when the heroine, Joan Graham, in tears sees a pay phone and through a bleary lens, the viewer sees Joan's point of view with the camera moving toward the telephone as she prepares to make the phone call that

inadvertently gives away the whereabouts of herself and her fugitive husband. All of these examples demonstrate the use of the eye/camera in an attempt to establish cinematic specificity, or, an aesthetic unique to cinema, and indicating a movement away from the theatricality of early American cinema. Filmmaker Brian De Palma addresses the issue of cinematic specificity, saying:

Film is one of the only art forms where you can give the audience the same visual information the character has. I learned it from Hitchcock. It's unique to cinema and it connects the audience directly to the experience – unlike the fourth wall approach, which belongs to the Xerox school of filmmaking. (Pally, 1984; 100)

Hitchcock provides consistent examples of the eye/camera as it changes throughout early and classical cinema. While maintaining the expressionistic sense of experiential perception, Hitchcock manipulated elements internal and external to the camera, creating a greater sense of movement more closely acquainted with the modern eye/camera. In Vertigo (1958), Hitchcock used the zoom out/push in camera technique to enhance spatial differences between compositional foreground and background elements. Jimmy Stewart's character, Scotty, has a fear of heights, and in a key scene, he climbs an open spiralling staircase and intermittently looks downward. When he does so, the stairway seems to elongate and drop beneath him, enhancing the sense of height. The push-in portion of the camera movement keeps the figures in the foreground in place within the composition, while the zoom out separates the distance between the compositional elements. The viewer is experiencing Scotty's fear of heights through his own perception in this eye/camera

shot. This use of perspective is also used by Hitchcock in drunken driving sequences in both <u>Notorious</u> (1946) and <u>North by Northwest</u> (1959). In both of these films, the experience of driving after drinking heavily is shown through eye/camera shots, filmed from the driver's seat of a car. The movement of the composition reflects the movement within a car. The shutter speed of the camera is slowed down to create a more disjointed and shaky image, and the image is not clearly focused.

<u>The Development of the Eye/Camera in the Slasher Film</u>

These examples of Hitchcock's approach to the eye/camera lead to his work in <u>Psycho</u>. <u>Psycho</u> is a significant predecessor to the modern slasher film with regards to both theme and aesthetics. In this film, Hitchock very clearly associates the eye/camera with voyeurism in the sequence prior to the killing of Marion Crane. After eating with Norman Bates in the Bates Motel parlour, she retires to her room. Norman removes a picture from the wall, to reveal a hole that provides visual access to Marion's room. We see an extreme close up of his eye as it looks through the hole in the wall, which is followed by an eye/camera shot. This shot captures the action from the same perspective of the character we know we inhabit, including height and direction. Additionally, this shot is framed by black to reflect the hole in the wall that we have already witnessed. Although Hitchcock does not use the shaky handheld camera, the framing of the hole along with the awareness of the character perspective identifies this clearly as an eye/camera shot, similar to those of René Clair's keyhole spying sequence in <u>And Then There Were None</u> (1945), or <u>As Seen Through a Telescope</u>. This shot and its close tie to voyeurism has, among other examples, guided critical analysis of the eye/camera within the modern horror film.

The visual design of <u>Psycho</u> is itself centred on voyeurism, which narratively exemplifies Robert B. Ray's analysis of Hitchcock's entire style as "duplicitous and voyeuristic." (1985; 156) Kenneth Johnson analyses the opening shot of the film, which entails an aerial shot of Phoenix, Arizona as initially establishing location, but through movement and dissolves brings the camera through the window of the hotel room where Marion and her boyfriend are engaging in post-coital banter (1993; 49). Johnson borrows the term "wandering camera" from Seymour Chatman to describe a camera that moves of its own volition, seeming to have a personality of its own. This is exemplary of the voyeuristic design of <u>Psycho</u>, of which the eye/camera is a significant and notable extension.

Although this film provides a strong template for the modern slasher film, a different genre is responsible for many of the aesthetic qualities of the slasher, particularly those of the late 1970s and early 1980s. These films owe a debt to the Italian giallo film, particularly those of Mario Bava and Dario Argento as well as some of their gothic horror films. In general, Italian giallo films are murder mysteries that feature a series of graphic, brutally violent death sequences. "Giallo" is the Italian word for yellow, which refers to the colour of the pulp novels that frequently featured this type of narrative.[3] Bava and Argento are widely regarded as two of the great masters of the Italian giallo film, and both directors tell mystery stories which include inventive set pieces that involve gruesome and creative death sequences. The early films of each director, <u>The Girl Who Knew Too Much</u> (1963; dir. Bava) and <u>The Bird with the Crystal Plumage</u> (1970; dir. Argento), are examples of the standard giallo narrative conventions of murder mysteries with sometimes elaborate and often graphically violent death sequences, and retain a more

---

[3] See Mikel Koven (2006; 2) for a more detailed explanation of the term "giallo".

stylistically straightforward approach to presenting the narrative. There are notable occasions of a stalking camera, without seeming to challenge the boundaries of visual understanding. The Girl Who Knew Too Much contains a sequence in which the threatened female character, alone in the house, fears that someone may try to attack her during the night. The lights are low, and she is unable to sleep, and this fear is exaggerated by compositions that frame her through barriers such as ornate open partitions that provide limited visibility and the camera moves in a slow, stalking manner, without literally reflecting an eye/camera perspective. The Bird with the Crystal Plumage, while still taking a more direct approach to the eye/camera, involves the device in the narrative, as the mystery driving the plot is shown through the eye/camera. The main character witnesses an attempted murder, while isolated from the sound of the event. The audience views the event from the eye/camera of the witness. As the mystery unravels, the viewer becomes aware that the eye/camera provided such a limited perspective on the event witnessed that it was completely misunderstood, which ties in to Clover's argument of the unreliability of the point of view shot. Before discussing Argento's and Bava's most important contribution to the eye/camera, it is important to explicate the previously addressed concept of proximity fear.

One of the most important functions of the eye/camera seems to be repeatedly ignored by critics and academics. If the purpose of a horror film is ultimately to scare the audience, then what does the eye/camera do to contribute to that sensation? Certainly Wood's idea of voyeurism implicating the audience in sadism could contribute to this fear, but it turns the fear inward as a shock at the viewer's own dark tendencies. The essential fear element provided by the eye/camera is more basic and superficial than this, but extremely important to the

overall effect of the horror film. The eye/camera as used in horror provides a sense of proximity to the subject of the camera's gaze. Whether we see the stalker's eye/camera with the victim as the subject or the victim's eye/camera with the stalker or killer as the subject, the audience is provided a clear sense of the distance from one to the other. When we see Michael Myers's eye/camera in the opening shot of Halloween, the viewer is unsure who the stalker is until just before the murder, but this disorientation does not alter the fact that we are aware that the young couple is being watched, and separated from an ominous presence, as indicated by the music, by only a window and a few feet of space. In the opening sequence of My Bloody Valentine (1981; dir. Mihalka), the first victim's eye/camera reveals the killer filling the frame and lunging even closer to the victim in a threatening way. The audience becomes frightened by the fact that, in those few moments, the threat is too close to run away from or defend against. This proximity fear is much more tangible. While the eye/camera embodies many subtle complexities involving the character watching, the subject and the viewer, the primary effect that this device provides is one of character and object relationship.

An extension of the proximity fear is the visceral effect of the experience. Steven Shaviro writes of the visceral effect of watching cinema:

The antimony of cinematic perception is the following: film viewing offers an immediacy and violence of sensation that powerfully engages the eye and body of the spectator; at the same time, however, it is predicated on a radical dematerialization of appearances. The cinematic image is at once intense and impalpable. On one hand, film (even more than other visual forms, and in sharp contrast to the articulations of

language) is inescapably literal. Images confront the viewer directly, without mediation. What we see is what we see; the figures that unroll before us cannot be regarded merely as arbitrary representations or conventional signs. We respond viscerally to visual forms, before having the leisure to read or interpret them as symbols. (1993; 26) [parenthesis in the original]

Shaviro later writes that the visceral impact of film viewing "disrupts the traditional, historically sedimented habits and expectations of vision..." (32) Philip Brophy similarly addresses the visceral impact in the aesthetic design of contemporary horror. Brophy suggests that "Perhaps what has been an even more prolific trend is the destruction of the Body. The contemporary horror film tends to play not so much on the broad fear of Death, but more precisely on the fear of one's own body, of how one controls and relates to it." (2000, 280) It reasonably follows that the visceral experience of watching through a character's eyes in cinema – watching as an immediate participant watching – compounds the visceral impact.

With this proximity fear in mind, each director exploits this device to expectationally subversive effect. Mario Bava's A Bay of Blood (1971) is a stripped-down, bare bones giallo film that takes place in an elaborate estate on a desolate lake. The opening sequence shows the event that incites the narrative, which is the murder of an old lady in a wheelchair. The camera not only stalks her, but moves towards and away from her at unusual speed and from strange angles. We see the killer's hands in black gloves so we are aware that he/she is human, and the familiar shaky handheld camera is used, and despite the unusual angles and speed, the audience distinctly interprets the images as eye/camera shots. Argento exploits

the proximity fear created by the eye/camera in <u>Deep Red</u> in a more deceptive way. In a pivotal sequence, Marcus is searching an old house he suspects to have clues to the killings that are taking place. As he searches, not only does the camera stalk him, but it takes on the coding of the eye/camera a few times, including one sequence in which Marcus is searching through a flooded basement. While he is in the basement, the camera moves toward him through the hallway leading to the basement, through the doorway and down the stairs. It is slow and deliberate, at average height and reflects the speed and movement of a human. As the scene progresses, the camera continues using elements of eye/camera coding, revealing a design to suggest to the viewer that there is another person nearby as Marcus searches, even though another person is not revealed to be present. This is never answered nor referred to again throughout the course of the film. Whether or not another person is present during this scene is not known, and by the end of the film it is usually forgotten. The point is that while we watch the scene there is an added element of fear instilled in the audience by using this device, subverting its meaning, but exploiting its effect. An argument regarding voyeurism would be only marginally useful in a discussion of this scene, but when the fear of proximity is discussed, the question of the ambiguity of presence becomes more transparent.

With the giallo film placed into consideration, the immediate predecessors to the modern slasher film become elemental prototypes of what is to come. <u>The Texas Chain Saw Massacre</u> (1974; dir. Hooper) is a film that contains the narrative elements of the slasher film, using a unique stylistic approach. The film is shot with a detached stalking camera, without using any eye/camera coding. This conspicuous absence of the eye/camera, which by this point has become a mainstay technique in horror films, leaves the audience with a heightened fear of proximity, because it fails

to give precise spatial relationships. The film does not tell us where the stalker or killer is, or even if there is one. What the audience *does* know is that the setting, an old run down house or an empty forest at night, is a standard horror set piece, and that there is a threat somewhere. We do not have an eye/camera to tell us where the threat is in relation to the potential victim. In contrast, another significant modern slasher predecessor is Bob Clark's Black Christmas (1974), which places heavy aesthetic and thematic emphasis on seeing and vision. Here, the eye/camera plays a prominent role, and is the only way to identify the stalker. Everything that is shown of the stalker is taken from his point of view. The composition is slightly distorted, using a wide angle lens, and is captured with a handheld camera. The image is accompanied by the sounds of loud breathing swallowing and muttering, furthering the illusion of being inside the eye of the character. The one time that the stalker is seen, he is standing in complete darkness, with light shining only on a single eye. Black Christmas gives us no bearings as to the identity or motive of the killer, and for all intents and purposes is simply a pair of eyes, by which we know the location and proximity of the threat to the victims at all times.

Eyes of Laura Mars is a film released at the height of this pre-modern slasher cycle and is emblematic of the movement toward a newer, but more formulaic approach to the horror film. Eyes of Laura Mars, which was criticised as "an inept exercise in voyeurism and 'punk-chic.'" (Gupta, 1978; 60) is an example of a mature aesthetic approach to the eye/camera. The film, scripted by John Carpenter, is the story of a photographer named Laura Mars who sees visions of the first-person perspective of a stalker and killer. This film does not simply contain the eye/camera, but the plot entirely revolves around it. This is distinctly different from Black Christmas in that the eye/camera is not simply used to indicate and identify the

killer, but is needed to be seen by another character in order to drive the plot forward. Eyes of Laura Mars even breaks from Peeping Tom, a film about a cameraman who is a serial killer, which I will discuss in more detail later, by not involving a literal camera and compounding the character eye. Fischer and Landy explore the theme of seeing, eyes and vision that runs throughout the film, but contributes to the sociocultural analysis of the eye/camera. As Fischer and Landy note, "Again, what is provocative about this narrative/stylistic device is the way it can be read to literalize an issue in the ideology of vision." (66) They go on to discuss the power of the male gaze, dominating the female gaze and how the film reinforces this. Although the argument that Fischer and Landy make proves an important contribution to the discourse on sociopolitics and the gaze within cinema in addition to bringing serious critical attention to Eyes of Laura Mars, they ignore fascinating elements of the eye/camera as used in the film, and how it is exploited to inventive aesthetic ends. The eye/camera limits itself even more by blurring the edges of the composition to create an almost indecipherable frame. The clear image is almost contained within an iris that all but eradicates the periphery. While this asserts a distinct perspective, it proves the eye/camera to be extremely limiting and frustrating, which reflects the experience of Laura Mars, not knowing whose eyes she is seeing through as her own vision is usurped and becomes subject to this more restrictive and mysterious viewpoint. The eye/camera manages to bring with it the same sense of proximity fear as we watch victims we are increasingly more familiar with become the object of stalking and killing. But this proximity fear takes a unique turn when Laura Mars, overcome with the sight of the attacker, sees that the stalker is coming up the stairs to her studio where she is at that very moment. Laura is aware of the proximity of the threat to her, and with this knowledge is able to

escape the threat. Occasionally she will see herself just leaving the visual scope of the stalker as she runs away. This sequence manages to use the viewer's experience of the eye/camera to benefit the protagonist and create a new dimension to the suspense created with the device. A similar event occurs during the climax of the film, when Laura confronts her would-be attacker. She watches as she stares back at herself, trying to prepare for and second guess any coming attack. When the killer is finally dispatched, the vision leaves, and the film ends. The film is framed by Laura's initial vision and her final vision, but it is never explained. The audience is only given a reason for killing, but not for Laura's assumption of another first-person perspective, and by the end this question is almost entirely moot. The viewer has come to accept this viewpoint as next to natural.

Considering the significance of Halloween to the rise of the slasher film – its financial success providing a generic template for the cycle of slasher films succeeding it – it is important to consider what it brings to our understanding and analysis of the eye/camera. J.P. Telotte argues that the opening credit sequence, as the camera track into the eye opening of a jack o lantern, initiates the theme of vision and seeing (1987; 116). While the visual accompanying the credits establishes theme, the opening shot translates this theme into narrative. The opening shot, which has been written about at great length by Clover, Telotte, and Steve Neale to name a few, is an extended eye/camera shot beginning with an establishing view of the Myers house. The sequence is shot with a hand-held camera, similar to Black Christmas, obviously codifying the perspective as first person. Unlike Black Christmas, the edges are not blurred, and the sequence is not shot with a wide angle lens. In fact, Halloween is shot with an anamorphic lens creating a widened panoramic field of vision, separating its eye/camera shots from the extremely limited

perspective of <u>Black Christmas</u>. The technical aspects of the frame combined with the immediate presentation of the eye/camera overwhelm the viewer from the outset of the film, entirely drawing the audience into Michael's perspective.

The viewer is initially unaware of the person whose perspective he/she experiences, as significantly noted by both Clover (185) and Neale (1996, 333). There is no musical accompaniment to begin with, only diegetic sounds and dialogue, so the viewer has no information at the outset as to the viewer's relationship to the person he/she sees through. Is this his house? Is this the house of someone the seer is stalking? Is something happening or already happened that we are about to witness? This creates an unnerving sense of disorientation, as the viewer is given no emotional or narrative basis with which to read the shot, only an indication towards genre. Eventually the viewer discovers that the answer to all three questions is "Yes", but first the eye/camera moves to the side of the house and looks in a window where a teenage girl and boy are seen kissing. "We are alone, aren't we?" the boy asks. Through the use of eye/camera, the film implies that they are not, but it is not until the girl answers, saying "Michael's around someplace," that the viewer is provided with a potential identity for the subjective seer. This is not confirmed until the end of the sequence, so the audience is still left with questions about the safety of Michael and the ultimate identity of the stalker and his relationship to the people that are onscreen. The teenage boy then suggests going upstairs, and they do.

After the couple is seen running up the stairs, the eye/camera moves backwards and tilts up to see the light from a window on the top floor turn off. At this point the eye/camera moves to the back of the house, and into the kitchen, where we see a child's hand as if it were our own reach into a drawer and remove a butcher

knife. We (the viewer/the child/the camera) watch the teenage boy leave and we proceed upstairs. The stalker then places a mask over the camera, so that the field of vision is limited to two small eye holes, an aesthetic tool used to create a sense of frustration in the viewer.

The scene climaxes as the eye/camera moves into the teenage girl's room, and the hand of the seer stabs her. This sequence, however, is not so simple. It is aesthetically designed assuming the audience knows that the seer is masked and carrying a knife, and the eye/camera views the teenage girl, and likely victim, through the frame of the doorway, we linger for a moment while the eye/camera simply watches her brush her hair topless. She is mostly naked, vulnerable and completely unaware of the stalker's presence. As the eye/camera moves closer, bringing the girl's face into close-up, she turns around quickly, looks at the camera, yells "Michael" and is then stabbed. This is the moment where the eye/camera helps create a greater emotional impact than a third person camera would, by providing two of a sequence of four immediate surprises. The girl's quick turn, and the stabbing could easily be captured by a third-person camera, but the other two can only be given maximum effect through the eye/camera. First, the girl looks right into the eye/camera. As Michael has been moving about inconspicuously, this sudden direct address is designed to surprise and unsettle the viewer. The omniscient third-person camera, the most commonly used perspective in the whole of cinema, creates a sense of non-participation and observation. In the case of the eye/camera at the beginning of Halloween, the audience is placed into the position of a voyeur similar to a third person camera. The eye/camera moves around, witnesses action, but does not interact with the events on screen. When the teenage girl looks

at the eye/camera, the viewer becomes instantly involved with the characters in the film, causing an unexpected shock.

The second surprise that the eye/camera affords us in the sequence is that of identity. Immediately following the girl's swift movement and the viewer's sudden involvement with the narrative, she yells "Michael" and at that point, the audience knows who they are, or rather, who they have been seeing through. Michael is not only physically unharmed, but also the person who the young couple felt no threat from earlier. The two were happy to let Michael roam around, without suspecting that he could be a threat. We are known to the victim, and the victim apparently does not even sense danger, but is more upset that we have invaded her privacy. The stabbing that follows is aided by the sense of proximity provided by the eye/camera. Not only does the audience feel involved with the violence, but we know exactly how far we are from the victim: arm's length.

J. P. Telotte writes that the opening eye/camera shot has a greater significance within the film, pointing out that while the opening shot is firmly situated within the first person, Carpenter then uses a different approach to the subsequent stalking of later victims. Telotte says, "Instead of once again subjectively forcing us to identify with the murderer, Carpenter opts for an ambiguous camera placement, consistently locating it slightly behind or just to the side of his 'boogeyman'..." (120) According to Telotte, this shift places the viewer in the position of a voyeuristic accomplice, essentially retaining the subjective sensibility of the camerawork but moving from an existing character to a more abstract participation. Significantly, however, the opening eye/camera shot establishes a subjectivity which permeates the entire film. Whether the shot is housed within Michael or near Michael, the viewer understands the overall

perspective established in the film is closely related to that character, <u>Halloween</u> reveals in a concentrated way how the eye/camera can establish the perspective of a film, without being used consistently.

The use of the eye/camera from 1979 to the present will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, but at this stage it is important to provide a brief summary of the device's usage in this period in order to contextualize the device's development and evolution. Giallo films had a significant influence on the eye/camera in mainstream horror cinema from the late 1970s as previously mentioned. Whether films drew directly from the giallo movement or imitated films that had the co-opted giallo form, the influence is palpable. <u>Hell Night</u> (1981: dir. DeSimone), <u>Happy Birthday to Me</u> (1981; dir. Thompson), <u>Maniac</u> (1980; dir. Lustig) and <u>My Bloody Valentine</u> are only a small representation of a body of genre films that, like giallo, use the eye/camera to facilitate suspense and proximity fear in addition to providing a means of disorientation in terms of distorting time and space, an effect which will be discussed in the next chapter.

By 1984, a year which, as noted in the documentary <u>Going to Pieces</u> (2006; dir. N/A), is generally considered the declination point of the substantial popularity of the slasher sub-genre specifically, use of eye/camera had largely become habitual. For horror films, the using of this particular device largely became a manner of generic orientation: use of the eye/camera informs the viewer that they are indeed watching a horror film. The fact that generic declination coincided with eye/camera standardization is particularly significant, as it works precisely against a long-held misconception by theorists regarding genre audiences: expectation and familiarity with aesthetics and structure is central to the enjoyment of horror. These factors illustrate that precise anticipation and repetition only appeal to genre fans, and the

more successful horror films tend to subvert expectation. Barry Keith Grant writes that film genres "encourage certain expectations on the part of the spectators, which are in turn based on viewer familiarity with the conventions." (2007; 21) Grant later states, "Familiarity with a generic field of reference allows spectators to enjoy variations, however slight, in a given film." (21) Steve Neale further argues that "Genres do not consist solely of films. They consist also of specific systems of expectation and hypothesis which spectators bring with them to the cinema and which interact with films themselves during the course of the viewing process." (2000; 31) Edward Buscombe notes that, "a genre film depends on a combination of novelty and familiarity." (2003; 22)

This can account for the success of <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> in 1984. <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u>, while applying the slasher formula, infuses it with more of a supernatural horror element than was common at the time. The killer in the film is Freddy Krueger, a child killer who has returned from the dead to haunt and kill children in their dreams. The significance of dreams in the film itself is related to writer/director Wes Craven's awareness of academic discourse on psychology and its relationship to horror stories.[4] Within this film and its first couple of sequels, the eye/camera retains giallo eye/camera aesthetics, much like the slashers of the late 1970s-early 1980s, with its stress on proximity fear and disorientation. These films adapt Italian horror's aesthetic distortion of perspective like that in <u>Suspiria</u> and <u>Black Sabbath</u> (1963; dir. Bava) to create the dream worlds of the characters in the <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> series.

---

[4] This can be deduced from Craven's proficiency in the horror genre combined with the fact that he obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree with majors in both English and Psychology from Wheaton College in Illinois (Muir; 1998; 8). During this time, "Craven became obsessed with dreams and their origins," (8). This provides a direct link to his eventual creation of <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u>.

Aside from the case of <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u>, the slasher films of the 1980s retained the tendency of the eye/camera to be used as generic orientation. <u>Sorority House Massacre</u> (1986; dir. Frank) for example, while revealing a striking and rich approach to developing the intertwining perspectives of two characters to be addressed in the discussion of the middle <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, uses the eye/camera in its most streamlined form.

While I have attempted to create a reading of the eye/camera that establishes the device's purpose apart from voyeurism, the films appearing in the late 1980s and early 1990s seem to use the eye/camera in a knowingly voyeuristic manner. While this shift is difficult to account for, themes of overt voyeurism in horror films and thrillers like <u>Peeping Tom</u> and <u>Rear Window</u>, the previously discussed review of <u>The Burning</u>, Udayan Gupta's review of <u>Eyes of Laura Mars</u> and aesthetic awareness of the filmmakers as evinced by the interview with Brian De Palma already quoted[5] are all indicative of knowing aesthetic trends within the genre. Screenwriter Paul Schrader writes of <u>Peeping Tom</u>, "Through the maze of Powell's gamesmanship emerges a true character: Mark Lewis, a secretive, lonely, passionate young man for whom voyeurism, cinema, and violence are the same." (1979; 62) Marcia Pally states that "voyeurism has always been basic to cinema, but while directors have assumed, milked, and satirized it, only recently have some made a point of demonstrating the similarities between ostensibly ingenious observation and traditional viewing of porn. And only recently have they used the gaze that ends in sexual arousal as a symbol for the gaze that incites action." (1985; 60) Later, Pally directly addresses the eye/camera function in context with her argument: "No wonder Hitchcock used first-person perspective so relentlessly. Leading us by the

---

[5] Also see below Muir's quote about Wes Craven.

nose along corridors and up stairways, he makes voyeurism inescapable." (61) I would hypothesize as such: the slasher films released during this period were largely based on established properties, whether sequels within a greater franchise or remakes. In order to replicate the success of the former related properties, the films were designed aesthetically to reuse elements specific to the genre, the eye/camera being one. With criticism of the eye/camera retaining the argument of the inherent voyeurism of the device, the repetition of this argument appears to have had an affect on the filmmakers who, using the eye/camera as a form of generic establishment, designed the shots to be overtly voyeuristic. Unlike the opening sequence of Halloween, where the eye/camera first watches then becomes involved with the action, these films largely foreground the positioning of the viewer as a watcher, in many cases a watcher of people undressing, and less as that of an active participant.

With regards to this tendency, the Halloween franchise is a particularly illustrative example of the development of the eye/camera within slasher films. Halloween 4: The Return of Michael Myers (1988; dir. Little), while released near the end of the 1980s, uses the eye/camera minimally, only to ground expositional scenes within the genre, acting as a consistent reminder that the audience is viewing a horror film. Halloween 5: The Revenge of Michael Myers (1989; dir. Othenin-Girard), however, when compared to the previous instalment of the series displays a progression in eye/camera usage in spite of the regressive nature of its purpose. Halloween 5 mostly isolates the eye/camera within the aggressor, Michael Myers, and is entirely voyeuristic as the eye/camera is used as he watches girls move in their home surroundings, undress and briefly as he attacks them. In this, the eye/camera is used largely to recreate a viewing of the illicit, instead of emphasising the killer's unseen presence or distorting space to represent a character's state of mind as the

giallo-influenced slasher films of the late 1970s-early 1980s do. The prevailing first-person exploitations of sex and violence can be seen, with notable exceptions such as Candyman (1992, dir. Rose), Wes Craven's New Nightmare (1994; dir. Craven) and The People Under the Stairs (1991; dir. Craven) in the decreasing numbers of slasher films released in the late 1980s to the mid 1990s. The later films from the initial The Texas Chainsaw Massacre series, such as Leatherface: Texas Chainsaw Massacre III (1990; dir. Burr) and The Return of the Texas Chainsaw Massacre (also titled The Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Next Generation) (1994; dir. Henkel), as well as Halloween: The Curse of Michael Myers (1995; dir. Chappelle) all display useful examples of this voyeuristic tendency.

In the mid-1990s, the slasher sub-genre experienced resurgence in popularity due to Wes Craven's successful film Scream (1996), where the killer is apparently someone obsessed with slasher films. In order for the characters to try to prepare for attack or defend themselves, a familiarity with generic standards and tendencies is necessary. Using this plot, Craven is able to take the aesthetic elements commonly used in horror and make them self referential, causing it to be categorised as postmodern by critics. In her discussion of the significance of the home video market to horror, Linda Badley says, "'Horror 101' was inspired primarily by the 'master classes' already embedded within the self-reflexive textures of the genre and particularly the course's capstone text, Scream, in which media, horror video in particular, played the leading roles." (2010; 55) Davinia Thornley writes specifically of Scream's self-reflexiveness, saying, "The Scream series is perhaps the granddaddy of contemporary reflexive horror, leading the way for films such as The Blair Witch Project and forcing the audience to question their own pleasures and assumptions even as they watch." (2006; 140) Valerie Wee claims that the Scream

franchise advanced film postmodernism, placing it as the first in a new genre, saying:

> The Scream trilogy (Scream 2 [1997], Scream 3 [2000]) also marks a
> later phase of postmodernism than the early postmodernism highlighted
> by Collins. I have labeled this more advanced form of postmodernism
> 'hyperpostmodernism' and in the Scream trilogy it can be identified in
> two ways: (1) a heightened degree of intertextual referencing and self-
> reflexivity that ceases to function at the traditional level of tongue-in-
> cheek subtext, and emerges instead as the actual *text* of the films; and (2)
> a propensity for ignoring film-specific boundaries by actively
> referencing, 'borrowing,' and influencing the styles and formats of other
> media forms, including television and music videos – strategies that have
> further blurred the boundaries that once separated discrete media. (2005;
> p.44) [emphasis and parenthesis in original]

The eye/camera, however, is problematic as it has, to this point, been used as a tool of generic awareness and standardization. However, this is circumvented by a well constructed sequence near the film's climax, where people in a television crew van are observing the goings on at a house party through a remote camera positioned on top of the television in order to spy on the occurrences within the house. The camera acts as their eyes while they watch on their monitor as a teenager, who is himself watching a horror film, is attacked by the killer. We are, in essence, watching a horror film in the position of someone who is watching horror on a TV screen as someone is attacked watching a horror film on a TV screen. At this point,

the people watching the monitor realize there is a delay between the events captured and their viewing. Here, an attack occurs, as we, the audience, watch on our own screen, be it cinema or television. This example highlights two important points regarding the development of the eye/camera during this stage of its evolution. Firstly, audiences are aware of the aesthetic formula of the slasher sub-genre, and have at least a vague understanding of how the eye/camera functions within a generic narrative. Secondly, filmmakers know that the audiences have an awareness of this function, and are presented with the challenge of creating a more complex set of eye/camera codifications in order to retain the horrifying, visceral and suspenseful effect it provides. For example, John Kenneth Muir discusses Wes Craven's understanding of the point of view shot in his discussion of Craven's film Deadly Blessing (1981). Muir says,

> On the surface, the film apes the style of Sean Cunningham's Friday the 13th or John Carpenter's Halloween. Point-of-view shots of intruders entering a darkened home and watching the beautiful protagonist disrobe dominate the film, but rewardingly Craven has pulled another fast one on his viewers and again defied their expectations. The P.O.V. shots represent not one intruder but three! Louisa, Faith and William Gluntz are all obsessed with Jensen's Martha, and at various times are all stalking her. (1998; 81)

Muir's analysis demonstrates Craven's knowing utilization of the eye/camera and the potential it contains for the subversion of expectation.

This approach to the eye/camera has spawned a greater thoughtfulness and effective minimization of the use of the eye/camera in slasher films. Because of this period of awareness and development, an approach to this device only used a few times previously then saw a notable increase two years later.

Victim-Camera and *Peeping Tom*'s Eye/Camera / Victim-Camera Integration

The current wave of victim-camera films that are regularly in production is a significant link in the developing visual aesthetic of horror as the current use of the eye/camera within horror films now being produced owe much to the mainstreaming of this style. Although very little of this method actually appears in the Friday the 13th series, the influence of the camera usage filters into the aesthetics of the franchise, beginning with Freddy vs. Jason.

This wave of victim-camera films was spearheaded by the success of The Blair Witch Project, but this was not the first appearance of this method. A primary precursor to this phenomenon is Cannibal Holocaust (1980; dir. Deodato), in which a film crew travels to the territory of a South American cannibal tribe and become their victims. This, however, is not the plot of the film. The film centres on the search for these missing filmmakers, and the audience discovers their fate through the footage that was discovered in the jungle. Only a few shots in Cannibal Holocaust involve people watching the found footage. The viewing of the found footage acts as the film's climax, which is framed by the story of a man going to their last known location to find the crew shot using a traditional narrative aesthetic. While the found footage is a 'film within a film', this becomes Cannibal Holocaust's central focus, and is the advertising selling point of the film seeing firsthand potentially real footage of death in the film, and although the only real death

captured is that of a turtle killed for food, the acknowledgement of the camera within the film text creates a heightened sense of "reality." Acknowledging the artifice is a recognizable element of documentary and amateur film/home movies, both of which include the camera within the universe being represented. Although the violence witnessed is fictitious, it is presented convincingly enough so that a film sharing a documentary or amateurish awareness of the artifice strikes the viewer as, at minimum, slightly more real than in mainstream narrative filmmaking.

The victim-camera's stylistic acknowledgement of the artifice fractures the eye-camera-eye model. When the camera acts as eye, this creates a comfortable transition for the viewer to unknowingly create this eye/camera compression. With victim-camera films, however, the viewer is aware or made overtly aware from the outset that they are watching images captured by the camera. This removes one of the eyes from the eye-camera-eye model, leaving not an eye/camera, but two separate visual filters: an eye and a camera. The eye of the intertextual character is no longer factored, because the character by way of an eyepiece or a digital viewscreen becomes a viewer, like the audience. In fact, there are sequences in The Blair Witch Project and Cloverfield (2008;dir. Reeves) where the fictional characters are running with camera in hand, and the images captured are quickly penduluming shots mostly of the ground, during which time, the characters are almost certainly not watching what they are recording.

This style acts as a directly exaggerated extension of the eye/camera in terms of effect. The audience is viewing events from an extremely limited perspective-even more so, as the camera does not move on its own, and lacks the swiftness of the human eye. The events captured are a few fractions of a second behind what the firsthand viewer sees. This enhances the proximity fear, as a swift move of the

camera could easily mean a slow response to a violent attack, and the person holding

the camera could be fatally injured by the time the audience sees the threat as is

proved by the final moments of <u>The Blair Witch Project</u>. This type of closing shot

has become a generic trope and can be seen in films as recent as <u>TrollHunter</u> (2010;

dir. Øvredal) and <u>Apollo 18</u> (2011; dir. López-Gallego). Additionally, victim-

camera films generally retain this positioning throughout the duration of the whole

film, which is not the case with the eye/camera in the modern slasher.

Michael Powell's film <u>Peeping Tom</u> approaches the theory and practice of

the eye/camera in a wholly unique and sophisticated way, and it is because of this it

will be used here as a concluding example in order to demonstrate how the combined

theory and execution of the eye/camera can be used to its densest effect. <u>Peeping

Tom</u> advances the complex informational coding of the eye/camera while

simultaneously presenting aesthetic innovations that fuses the aggressive eye/camera

with a predecessor to the victim-camera aesthetic. This fusion not only provides a

succinct summary of the theory and formal elements described to this point, but

effectively demonstrates the eye/camera's and victim-camera's potential for extreme

complexity.

The initial critical reviews of the film were extremely negative, as noted by

Kevin Heffernan. Heffernan writes:

Unlike its Anglo companions, which were dismissed as mere genre

programmers unworthy of serious consideration, <u>Peeping Tom</u> received

scalding reviews from an outraged British middlebrow press. However,

contrary to Powell's later statements and the received wisdom of film

historians, the film was a modest commercial success in the United

Kingdom, largely because of the highly publicized nude scene with

famous pinup model Pamela Green. (2004; 128-130)

Heffernan notes that it even managed modest success in the United States (his

overarching geographic focus) as an "art film" with primary promotional focus on

the sexual elements. Marriott, in his survey of <u>Eyes Without a Face</u> (1959; dir.

Franju), likens its reception to <u>Peeping Tom</u>, saying that in both cases "nobody could

understand why a highly respected filmmaker should sully his hands with such a

trashy genre." (2004; 62) Andrew Tudor writes about the negative initial reception

by critics, saying, "So extraordinary were [<u>Psycho</u> and <u>Peeping Tom</u>], in fact, that

they provoked even more critical abuse than had been levelled at Hammer's big

successes with <u>Dracula</u> and <u>The Curse of Frankenstein</u> two years earlier. In a now

infamous observation, one British critic (Derek Hill in *Tribune*) claimed that 'the

only really satisfactory way to dispose of <u>Peeping Tom</u> would be to shovel it up and

flush it swiftly down the nearest sewer'." (1989; 192) [parenthesis in the original,

brackets mine]

Some exceptions decried its negative theme but praised its technical prowess,

such as the review in <u>Monthly Film Bulletin</u>, which said: "Accepting that the thing is

done, it is not too badly done, cinematically speaking... Carl Boehm must be credited

with a portrayal whose discretion has probably saved the film from its own worst

excesses of morbidity." (1960; 65) A review in <u>De Linie</u> is even more positive, only

negatively criticizing the film on a small number of aesthetic issues:

The film is well-made, although one could point to a few peculiarities

which are, seen from a strictly technical viewpoint, not acceptable...

What is important though is the psychological structure of the entire

product and that is certainly interesting. The film offers a nice

representation of the boundaries between utter madness and normal life...

It is a pity that Powell has not succeeded in keeping his film entirely free

of melodramatic effects, especially towards the end... Despite these

weaknesses and mistakes the film succeeds in presenting the main issue

of pain through mental illness. And doing that <u>Peeping Tom</u> distances

itself a long way from the average exciting thriller. (Ouwendijk, 1961)

    While not all of the contemporary film reviews are negative, the majority

were particularly scathing. The <u>London Evening News</u> published a review saying, "I

am only too sorry to see Powell's fine technical qualities and some good acting

lavished on such a dreary idea of entertainment as this is." (Harman, 1960) Len

Mosley of the <u>Daily Express</u> writes, "I am a glutton for punishment, and I never

walk out of films or plays no matter how malodorous. But I must confess that I

almost followed suit when I heard my distinguished colleague Miss Caroline

Lejeune say "I'm sickened" just before her indignant exit." (1960) The reviewer for

the <u>Sunday Dispatch</u> writes that <u>Peeping Tom</u> "is not only drivel, it is crude

unhealthy sensation at its worst." (Anonymous, 1960) For a thorough account of the

initial reception of <u>Peeping Tom</u>, see Ian Christie's "The Scandal of <u>Peeping Tom</u>"

in <u>Powell, Pressburger and Others</u> (Christie; 1978).

    Few critics and analysts of horror would now disagree with the consideration

of <u>Peeping Tom</u> as a sophisticated and unique example of the genre. <u>Radio Times</u>

featured it as film of the day on 10 October 2008, giving it the highest possible

rating: 5 stars. The review by Tom Hutchinson explains, "Only recently has it been

recognised as a risk-all masterpiece from a great filmmaker." (44) Many elements of the film lend themselves to such a conclusion as it is a rather detailed and intricately designed piece of cinema. A great deal of writing has been committed to <u>Peeping Tom</u>'s approach to seeing, sight and voyeurism. Leading film scholars such as Laura Mulvey (1999), Raymond Lefevre (1968), Catherine Zimmer (2004) and Carol Clover represent a fraction of the critics and academics who have written about <u>Peeping Tom</u> in this manner. These scholars have reclaimed <u>Peeping Tom</u>, bringing it to a level of greater prominence, and filmmaker Martin Scorsese famously promoted and re-released the film for Powell, because of Scorsese's personal appreciation for it. Scorsese says, "I have always felt that *Peeping Tom* and *8½* say everything that can be said about film-making, about the process of dealing with film, the objectivity and subjectivity of it and the confusion between the two." (in Thompson and Christie [eds.], 1996; 20) As voyeurism is the basic theme of the film, it is unavoidable that so much analysis would go into this subject. The approach that <u>Peeping Tom</u> takes toward the eye/camera model of viewer-camera-character relationship is particularly dense and complex, with multiple varieties and models attributed to a single shot.

Catherine Zimmer pinpoints the central convergence between theory and practice when critiquing Clover's analysis of the film. Zimmer writes "While Clover's analysis of the film is extremely illuminating, the fact remains that in her analysis, as well as the great majority of analyses of the cinematic gaze, there is little distinction made between the process of looking, and the process of looking *through a camera*." (35) [emphasis in the original]

Initially, it could be viewed as an extremely early example of the victim-camera film, replacing the victim with the perpetrator. In the opening sequence, the

audience sees the camera hidden in Mark's jacket, before the perpetrator-camera

footage is shown. We then see the action from the point of view of the camera we

have just seen, and the artifice is made apparent by the crosshairs which are

prominent in the frame. This provides the compression of the viewer eye to the

camera lens, with a fracture created in the two from knowledge of the artifice.

      Once the audience witnesses the murder committed, Powell inserts a shot of

an 8mm film projector showing a film. After this, the credits are shown over the

same footage in black and white projected onto a screen, with a rolling projector and

a lone viewer seen from behind. Aside from the colour to black and white film

transition as well as sound to silent, the image also lacks the crosshairs from the

previous sequence. Here we view the same image from a different context, making a

practical presentation of Clover's observation, that "the first-person sequence that

opens the standard slasher duplicates, without the cross hairs, the opening sequence

of Peeping Tom [...]" (186) If the opening sequence with the crosshairs had been

removed, the audience could assume that the film being seen on the 8mm projector is

showing an eye/camera shot unrelated to the events in the film. The aggressor-

camera contextualizes this sequence. As the frame begins to isolate the film image

itself, removing the surrounding projector and screen context, the film is designed to

make the viewer forget the fractured compression, and the film mends the

relationship between viewer eye and camera lens, and even establishes a character

eye to complete the structure. We do not know who is watching the film, but after

seeing him from behind, there is a cut to his point of view. The audience is viewing

an eye/camera shot of someone watching aggressor-camera footage. Gradually, the

camera pushes in, completely filling the frame with only the black and white film,

seamlessly attributing the eye/camera structure to the aggressor-camera footage

being watched. The perpetrator-camera shot has now become an eye/camera shot. Gradually, however, the camera pulls back, reiterating the homemade cinema framing of this eye/camera shot, which is exacerbated by the cut to the previous framing, including the projector and the viewer, who is now standing and leaning toward the screen. Through this opening sequence, the viewer has participated in a fractured perpetrator-camera shot, a compressed eye/camera shot, and most uniquely, an eye/camera shot viewing a perpetrator-camera shot as an eye/camera shot. This final complex model is as follows: (viewer eye) – (camera lens) – (character eye) – (camera lens) – (imagined character eye), however, when the film image fills the frame, it bypasses the second and third sight elements, and seems to merely compress the (viewer eye) – (camera lens) – (imagined character eye). This all occurs within the first five minutes.

As Powell continually plays with the eye/camera and perpetrator-camera format, a thorough analysis of Peeping Tom would be excessive within this chapter. However, an important element of the film in terms of the audience/camera/character relationship is the device Mark has developed simultaneously for murder and filming it. The camera has been attached to a tripod with a sharpened leg. This sharpened leg is the murder weapon itself. This leg is positioned parallel to the direction of the lens, so the camera can capture the subject's face as the victim is fatally penetrated. The camera is also fixed with a mirror just above the lens, faced toward the subject, in order to show the victim their own murder.

This contraption creates a closed cycle of audience/camera/victim interaction. Like the opening sequence, the viewer is aware of the aggressor-camera system, but is drawn into an eye/camera reading of the image. This, however is further complicated with the inclusion of the mirror used for the victim to witness his or her

own demise. Within the story the victim, typically female, seems to be more transfixed on the reflective surface above the lens than the weapon or the killer. While watching the footage from the perpetrator-camera, the victim appears to be looking into the lens, because the proximity between the mirror and the lens is so close, and to the victim, the mirror acts as a lens of sorts, showing her an event in which she is immediately participating, but from the perspective of the other. We can assume that the victim is also aware of the artifice of the contraption, but the image itself becomes a stronger focal point of involvement than the mirror itself. In effect, the viewer is witnessing perpetrator-camera footage that feels like eye/camera footage of a subject who is witnessing the same event as the viewer and from the same perspective through similar sensations of artifice awareness. Essentially, the viewer and the participants of the action all see the same images, locking the viewer into a structural equivalent of electronic feedback. In this way, through Peeping Tom, Michael Powell has drawn the audience into a more inclusive and participatory position than any other film to date.

Raymond Lefevre argues that Peeping Tom is a film solely about seeing. Near the beginning of the essay "From Voyeurism to Infinity," Lefevre says that "All of this revolves around a singular concept: the eye." Lefevre continues, "The details of set decoration, staging, and casting, lines of dialogue, color, plot line, editing, all come together to express a world captured by a gaze." (87)

While audience identification with film characters, as Robin Wood maintains, is a difficult and complex relationship to understand and analyse, it is important to understand the overall creation of perspective and point of view, and horror proves to be a genre with a tremendous density of perspective. The eye/camera as a device takes large steps towards defining the perspective a film

takes, and the large number of examples that exist within the genre, as well as the continuous evolution and uses of the device display its central importance to horror. With this evolution and the variety of approaches to the eye/camera discussed, along with the possibility of extreme sophistication and complexity in using the device as seen in <u>Peeping Tom</u>, the simultaneous inventiveness and mainstream incorporation of eye/camera tendencies, used to develop perspective over the last thirty years, can be seen through an examination of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films.

Chapter 3: The Eye/Camera in the *Friday the 13th* Series

Having established the ubiquity of the eye/camera with the horror film and the slasher film specifically, I will now discuss its use within the Friday the 13th films. This chapter aims to demonstrate the different uses, applications, and adaptations of eye/camera aesthetics and models, and how they function within the Friday the 13th franchise. In order to do this, I will analyse the contexts in which eye/camera shots appear, including the scenarios in which they predominate, and the characters that the eye/camera inhabits. To demonstrate the intricacies of this device, I will discuss significant anomalous variants in usage, alterations in standard usage, and the effect created by these changes. This will be framed within the aesthetic evolution and development of the device throughout the series, distinguishing the recurring trends that have become standardised and the anomalous variants. Finally, this chapter will develop a discussion of aesthetic intent, showing the overall function of the eye/camera for the individual films. This chapter will then show how this creates a model for the franchise's development, and will respond to the previously established negative criticism of eye/camera uses in slasher films of this period.

Adapting and Utilising the Eye/Camera in *Friday the 13th*

Friday the 13th screenwriter Victor Miller remembered that producer/director Sean S. Cunningham "called me up and said, 'Halloween is making a lot of money at the box office. Why don't we rip it off?'" (Bracke, 2005; 17) Associate producer Steve Miner similarly explained:

I loved the original <u>Halloween</u>. It was a breakthrough for American

cinema really. It pioneered several concepts, of the independent film

having mainstream success, and of a certain type of horror film as a

genre. And it was really well done, a really terrific film. It relied on

classic suspense and situations, and not gore. With <u>Friday the 13th</u>, we

tried to copy the success of <u>Halloween</u>, clearly. (Bracke 2005; 17)

Cunningham further describes the inspiration for <u>Friday the 13th</u>, saying, "Obviously,

from a financial standpoint, which was the most important factor at the time of

making <u>Friday</u>, the success of <u>Halloween</u> was the main inspiration. I think Bava

certainly inspired me. His films were shocking and really visually-stunning and they

made you jump out of your seat, which was what I wanted <u>Friday</u> to be all about."

(Grove, 2005; 11-12) Kevin Heffernan discusses this business model as well,

saying, "Paramount's <u>Friday the 13th</u> series follows the time-honored fifties and

sixties tradition of a major studio knocking off the genre success of an independent

production (in this case, John Carpenter's independently produced <u>Halloween</u>)..."

(2004; 223) [parenthesis in the original]

While <u>Halloween</u> is a direct influence on the economic model as well as the

formal aesthetic design of <u>Friday the 13th</u>, Cunningham's acknowledgement of Mario

Bava's films as an inspiration points to the film's aesthetics derived from a

combination of influences. As Dika writes:

<u>Friday the 13th</u> was the first film to reproduce the success of <u>Halloween</u>

by copying its intrinsic elements. Although Friday the 13th is a

minimalization or reduction of <u>Halloween</u>'s essential structure, it

incorporates elements from other successful films (e.g., <u>Dawn of the</u>

<u>Dead</u>, <u>Last House on the Left</u>) and so is an amalgam of visual and

narrative motifs that significantly add to the formula. (64) [parenthesis in

the original]

It is important to keep in mind the effect of preceding films as recognised by Dika

and made apparent through the admission of the filmmakers when undergoing a

formal aesthetic analysis of <u>Friday the 13th</u> and its sequels. By acknowledging the

cinematic genealogy covered in the last chapter, the context of <u>Friday the 13th</u>'s

aesthetic design and its receptive effects becomes apparent.

The eye/camera in <u>Friday the 13th</u> is featured from the start of the film, and

remains prominent throughout. The basic function of the eye/camera aligns with

Wood's "alternative explanation," being the need to disguise the identity of the

killer. Clover elaborates on the misleading quality of the eye/camera to enhance the

climactic revelation of identity:

Again, <u>Friday the Thirteenth I</u>, in which 'we' stalk and kill a number of

teenagers over the course of an hour of movie time without even knowing

who 'we' are; we are invited, by conventional expectation and by

glimpses of 'our' own bodily parts - a heavily booted foot, a roughly

gloved hand- to suppose that 'we' are male, but 'we' are revealed, at the

film's end, as a woman. (56)

Clover's assessment identifies <u>Friday the 13th</u>'s debt to <u>Psycho</u>, <u>Black Christmas</u> and

<u>A Bay of Blood</u>, other films which hide the killer's identity, often using the

eye/camera, to create a final surprise.[1] As the killer, Mrs. Voorhees's identity is hidden until the end, structurally the film resembles a mystery story, similar to And Then There Were None. A Bay of Blood is structured in the same way, but issues a surprise in that the killer is not *one* of the central characters, but two, with the eye/camera acting, as discussed by Wood, as a method of disguising the identity of the killer. However, Mrs. Voorhees is not a central character in Friday the 13th. In fact, she does not appear in the film until Alice is the only living character remaining. In this way, Friday the 13th follows the structure of Black Christmas, where the killer, dubiously attached to the name "Billy", is never fully identified. "Billy" is only identified as such by the repetition of that name by himself in the muddled personalities of his garbled phone calls that always follow a murder he has committed. The only part of him that is ever seen is his eye. Black Christmas acknowledges the mystery structure by revealing Peter as the only other person near the house, who has already been identified as an emotionally volatile character. Jess kills him, suspecting he is "Billy", but the film ends with Jess sleeping under sedation alone in the house, and as the camera shows the outside of the house, the repeated, unanswered ringing of the phone indicates the high probability that "Billy" is still alive, and has just killed Jess. Black Christmas, therefore, attaches the eye/camera to a character who is never properly identified throughout the course of the film. Friday the 13th develops Mrs. Voorhees similarly to the way "Billy" is developed, and although she is eventually identified as the killer, and her motivation

---

[1] Black Christmas proves a significant variant to the murder mystery formula of these earlier films, in that there are, in fact, two final surprises. In the climax, the 'final girl', Jess, comes to the conclusion that her temperamental artist boyfriend, Peter, is the killer, as he appears at the house before the police have been able to arrive. He is framed in a very sinister and imposing manner, and Jess suddenly kills him to defend herself. The end of the film, however, reveals that he was not the killer.

is explained, there is no previous sequence that would allow the potential for the viewer to guess "whodunit", resulting in the killer's identity being fundamentally enigmatic.

Clover also identifies the misleading gender game played by Friday the 13th, which can be traced to both Psycho and A Bay of Blood. Psycho establishes a killer that dresses as a female, but is anatomically recognised as male, though Norman Bates's psychological gender identification is something wholly different. Either way, the gender identity is a way to mislead the viewer from guessing the identity of the killer. Friday the 13th works this structure in reverse by coding the visual glimpses of the killer as male: masculine hands, heavy boots on the feet, androgynous camper clothes. The revelation that the killer is female replaces the surprise that traditionally comes with the revelation that a trusted character is the killer in mystery stories. A Bay of Blood tends to remove itself from creating gender assumptions within the viewer, but the revelation that there are two killers, one of each gender, justifies this ambiguity.

The uncertain foundation of identification in Friday the 13th creates a distinct challenge to the issue of character perspective and its relationship to the audience. The eye/camera shots intentionally distance viewer perspective, without excluding the viewer from complete understanding. The eye/camera shots are designed to prevent complete audience identification as the viewer does not know who he/she is seeing through, but the banality of the events viewed combined with the menacing score provides an understanding of the seer's motivation. These qualities, through this particular perspective positioning encompass the narrative drive of the film.

The opening sequence, depicting what Dika categorises as the "Past Event" (59) is reminiscent of the single-shot eye/camera opening of Halloween, as noted by

Cunningham: "Working on a limited budget, there wasn't much choice other than doing it that way. I'm hoping that people can take it as sort of a tip of the hat to Mr. Carpenter." (Quoted in Martin, 1980; 64) Unlike <u>Halloween</u>, the opening of <u>Friday the 13th</u> breaks up the eye/camera shots with third-person shots that establish the location and potential victims in more detail.

The film begins by establishing Camp Crystal Lake in 1950 populated by a number of campers, and a group of counsellors singing "Michael Row the Boat Ashore" and "Tom Dooley" at night by a fire, two of which are attracted to one another and sneak off to be alone. Within this establishing sequence, an eye/camera shot is included, taking the first person perspective of someone stalking through the cabin of the young campers, asleep in their beds. The proximity fear is immediate, as we know that all of these young children are vulnerable to attack specifically due to the sinister music accompanying the shot, along with the fact that it is night and they are asleep. Although nothing happens, tension is created by the device.

The two counsellors that have been making eye contact with each other sneak off to a nearby barn, go to the upstairs room and begin to make love. The eye/camera stalks them, following the sounds of their voices up the stairs until they come into view. The two counsellors notice the stalker and quickly stand up to straighten their clothes, embarrassed. The eye/camera pushes toward the boy, who is stuttering trying to explain what they were doing, and then lunges toward him as he doubles over, apparently struck in the stomach. After this long continuous eye/camera take, the film suddenly cuts to a long shot of the boy, who stumbles backwards, holding his bleeding stomach as he falls over. The audience is presented with the attack and death of the boy from two perspectives: first person and third person. Through this moment, <u>Friday the 13th</u> challenges the audience to decide

which perspective is more frightening to present a horrific event. The film answers its own question in two ways, first through creating a detached and ambivalent third-person camera shot that is shocking in its lack of intensity of movement in comparison with the previous shot, and secondly through an immediate return to the eye/camera. This transition between perspectives, and the juxtaposition of these shots is designed to feel disjointed and create a sense of disruption. The sequence ends with this eye/camera shot, slowly chasing the terrified surviving girl around the room into a corner, ending in a gradually enlarging and fading freeze-frame of the girl's final scream. The entire sequence gives the audience the very important first fright of the film, setting the mood almost entirely through the first person perspective.

The dissolve on the freeze frame leads directly into the opening credit sequence, which begins with the title Friday the 13th in a large three dimensional font moving quickly from a point in the distance toward the audience. As unsettling as the swift movement of the title may be, the film behaves as though the viewer feels protected by the cinema screen, or does not anticipate a scare from the credits. Cunningham, however, uses the eye/camera from the previous sequence to his advantage, as the eye/camera shot functions to make the viewer feel directly involved with the action within the film. When the title has filled the screen, it stops suddenly, and a pane of glass seeming to separate the audience from the title unexpectedly shatters with a loud crash on the soundtrack. The viewer is confronted by the least likely element of the film, the opening title, and the eye/camera compression model breaks apart; the film interacts with the viewer directly, without utilising the point of view of a character within the film. This specific moment does not function to make the viewer feel involved through a mediating character, but

directly involves the viewer within the action. Although the film does not provide a direct address throughout the rest of the film, creating such an effect so close to the start of the film pointedly attempts to draw the viewer closer to the action by breaking through the limitations of the eye/camera and engaging him/her directly.[2]

While these elements demonstrate the unique and aggressive approach that Friday the 13th takes with the eye/camera, critics such as Wood and others insist upon describing the eye/camera of the film in the same negative way as other slasher films of the period, as discussed in the previous chapter. Preceding an analysis of eye/camera sequences in Friday the 13th, Reynold Humphries deconstructs the eye/camera's function by discussing the effect alternating perspectives has on the viewer. In essence, Humphries sees the eye/camera as infusing the viewer with the illusion of power while simultaneously creating empathy for the victims of this power. With these sensations juxtaposed, Humphries argues that the negative aspects of both are blunted; the viewer is both excused from relishing in sadism of the aggressor while protected from the experience of being victimised. He then summarises by saying that this ultimately places the viewer in a position to experience an event where, in reality, he/she is more likely to be the victim. (143-4) Despite his critical view of the eye/camera, Humphries defends Friday the 13th's innovative use of the eye/camera through the examples of two sequences:

---

[2] This use of the opening credits to create visceral impact has since been re-created and adapted. A recent example is Final Destination 5 3-D (dir.Quale; 2011), where the titles are apparently printed on transparent glass. Objects that appear in the background move toward the viewer, such as lead piping, nails, dismembered body parts and charred corpses. As these items reach the titles, the glass panes shatter, and the objects as well as small shards of glass appear to move toward the spectator.

It is here that <u>Friday the 13th</u> fails to play the game. At one point a girl at the camp goes to the toilet after having sex. The camera tracks in slowly towards her from our point of view, as if someone is/we are approaching her. She looks up, not into the camera but off-screen left in the direction of a sound. This is repeated in an almost identical fashion shortly after where another girl goes to the toilet: the character does not look into the camera and there is no shot-reverse shot indicating some menacing figure about to stab her. Thus the film places the spectator in a position of potential aggressor, only to reveal that the danger lies off-screen. By so doing it suggests that the danger exists for us too – the off-screen being the favourite place for lurking monsters – and that our supposedly homogenous subject position is in fact a split one, a split which corresponds to our split position as spectators outside the text and as spectators inscribed within the text by various modes of identification. (144)

While the overall focus of his argument does not stay within formal analysis, Humphries does acknowledge the challenging use of the eye/camera within the film. His observation creates a stronger sense of how <u>Friday the 13th</u> uses the eye/camera in an aesthetically unique and innovative manner, and implying its significance to the development of slasher aesthetics. The sophistication of eye/camera usage in <u>Friday the 13th</u> provided a strong aesthetic foundation for the following films in the franchise.

Direct Eye/Camera

Although Cunningham proved inventive with the eye/camera structure, the earliest eye/camera shots in the film, including the pre-credit sequence, are representative of what I will call "direct" eye/camera shots. These are shots that clearly correspond with the viewer eye/camera lens/character eye model that has been laid out, and the image is designed to precisely correspond, subject to aesthetic variants, with the precise eye position of a character. These direct eye/camera shots continue to appear throughout the Friday the 13th films, and while the aesthetic variants tend to be minor, the ultimate usage suggests a specific developmental arc, or even cycle.

Steve Miner's subsequent entries in the franchise, Friday the 13th Part 2 and Friday the 13th Part III 3-D[3] (as well as the 2-D version) developed a more challenging approach to the eye/camera, particularly in regards to audience positioning and perspective. Additionally, the two films utilize the eye/camera in very different ways. Friday the 13th Part 2 predominately places the eye/camera in positions of power, over both the characters and events in the film as well as the audience. The eye/camera's power over the characters and events is overtly recognizable, positioning the viewer in the place of an acknowledged character, whether the killer or one of the many victims, in a situation where they are actively controlling the action. In one of the more banal eye/camera sequences, the viewer sees through Jeff's point of view as he drives the truck into the woods, and approaches a rotting log in the middle of the road. As we see through him, Jeff is controlling the vehicle and is advancing toward the log. Jeff, Sandra and Ted get out

---

[3] The 2-D version of Friday the 13th Part III was the only version available on home video and DVD until 2009.

of the truck, pondering the object as Ted asks "What's that?" Jeff responds, "Where'd that sucker come from?" and Ted replies "I don't know. Let's move it." As this exchange occurs, the viewer is placed in a stalker's, most likely Jason's, eye/camera, watching the unsuspecting characters as they move about, placing this viewer in a more powerful position than the characters he or she is watching. Later in the film, Deputy Winslow, chasing Jason through the forest comes upon his makeshift shack. We see through Deputy Winslow's eye/camera as he explores the cabin, actively looking around this location. Although he is actively investigating the premises, the fact that he is killed in the process implies limited control; his death indicates that there is something he did not see. His actions may be proactive, but his perspective is fallible.

With Friday the 13th Part III 3-D, Miner often reverses the inhabiting perspective of the eye/camera to the victim, which is further enhanced by the 3-D effects. This exposes the vulnerability of the 3-Dimensional cinema viewer, thereby, through different means, places the film in a position of power over the audience. Regarding the decision to shoot Friday the 13th Part III using 3-D devices and aesthetics, Miner said, "With the Friday the 13th films, we had always made a conscious decision to make the same movie over again, only each one would be slightly different." (Bracke; 74) Miner continued, "So it occurred to me that a Friday the 13th Part 3 and 3-D would be a perfect combination." Utilising 3-D provides the impetus for taking the formula established by the first two films in the series, but aligning the perspective with the victim, unlike the tendency to place the eye/camera in positions of power in the first two films. Thomas M. Sipos directly compares 3-D to victim-orientated point of view shots: "Like 3-D photography, a victim's POV helps audiences experience scary events firsthand." (2010; 83) Frank Mancuso, Sr.,

Vice President of distribution at Paramount Pictures at the time of production, said, "The idea for the 3-D was born out of the fact that the process is so visceral, and horror movies are so visceral." (Bracke; 74) The connection between the horror film and 3-D also extends to the tendencies in the genre's narratives, according to Kevin Heffernan: "The generic norms of the horror film were uniquely suited to achieving a balance between integrated narrative and scenes of shock or spectacle, an obsession of industry discourses on 3-D during the period of House of Wax's (1953; dir. De Toth) production and reception." (27) Miner utilizes such "scenes of shock or spectacle", or novelty shots which involve objects leaping out at the viewer[4], in Friday the 13th Part III 3-D to reinforce expectations created by previous 3-D films, thereby creating a sense of comfort in familiarity.[5]

After the flashback sequence which consists of a condensed version of the last fifteen minutes of Friday the 13th Part 2, the opening credits, consistent with the 3-D illusion appear from a distance, moving toward the viewer, but Miner plays with this in order to shock the audience. The final shot of the flashback sequence, as in Friday the 13th Part 2, is a close-up of Mrs. Voorhees's severed rotting head on the homemade shrine surrounded by candles. The first title, "Friday the 13th" comes out of the eye to the left of the viewer, and stops at a moderate distance, and then from the eye to the right of the viewer, "Part III" comes toward the audience. As the title reaches the same distance as the "Friday the 13th" title, they both come out at the viewer, and stop at what appears to be a close distance. As Miner has created the

---

[4] An example of such a novelty shot from House of Wax, features a man demonstrating a paddle-ball game to people standing in a queue to enter the House of Wax. In a sequence of little narrative import, he spends a large amount of time demonstrating the paddle-ball game, bouncing the ball directly at the camera.

[5] To simplify the description of 3-D imagery, I will discuss the viewing experience of 3-D in terms of proximity to the viewer, although this proximity is entirely illusory.

expectation for the "Part III" to stop at the same distance, the continued movement of both titles is meant to be a surprise to the viewer. The rest of the titles come toward the viewer, and then recede to make way for another set of titles, creating a consistent rhythm of expectation which is not subverted for the rest of the opening credit sequence.

The first scene centres on a couple, Harold and Edna, who run a convenience store and live in the same building. This is established first through a crane shot that descends on the convenience store and then moves to the side of the building where there is laundry drying on clotheslines, flapping in the wind, the corners of bed sheets coming within close proximity to the viewer. Harold walks through the laundry and knocks over a supporting pole, and Edna immediately yells at him for being clumsy. He picks up the pole and in the process of re-positioning it conspicuously points the end of the pole toward the viewer, which comes out at the spectator. As this is not an eye/camera shot, nor does it code itself similarly, it creates an audience awareness of its positioning in relation to the film. There is no narrative significance for this shot, and its superfluous nature coupled with the obvious usage of the 3-D technology for the benefit of the viewer can create an emotional distance from the characters in the text, as opposed to the text being a spatial extension of the viewer's universe, even if imagined. Despite this emotional distancing, this shot does create a visceral effect designed to make the viewer flinch at the illusion of the pole's close proximity to the viewer. In a similar shot, Edna, while watching news reports of the deaths that occurred in the previous film, turns the aerial antenna on top of the television for a better reception, stopping it in a position close to the audience. Other shots in this opening scene are similar in effect, despite the fact that they are specifically eye/camera shots, such as a snake striking at

the viewer and a mouse walking on a plank in close proximity to the viewer. Even with the eye/camera positioning included, the narrative irrelevance of these shots creates a sense of separation between the characters and the viewer, but provides a visceral spectacle.

This scene is designed to create the expectation of 3-D as an obvious novel device used solely for spectacle, which is gradually subverted as the film continues. The eye/camera in the rest of the film alternates between characters, both Jason and the victims, watching events from a distance, and the position of a victim of an act, usually violent. This overtly links the camera to the viewer. Miner occasionally uses this position of victimisation, or more appropriately the object of an action, to highlight the difference between character and audience perspective. One of these sequences involves Debbie lying on the ground sunbathing as Andy sits above her, playing with a yo-yo close to her face. The audience sees the yo-yo coming toward them through Debbie's eye/camera from an extreme low angle, looking directly upwards at Andy. This combines the novelty 3-D effect of an object coming within close proximity and simultaneously inhabiting the perspective of someone lying horizontal, in direct opposition to the vertical seating position of the cinema viewer, creating a disorienting effect. The same disorientation occurs in a shot where Chuck, making popcorn, removes the lid of the kettle and tries to catch the popcorn in his mouth as it flies upward. The viewer sees through Chuck's eye/camera looking directly downward into the kettle as the popcorn jumps towards the audience. This effect occurs again after Debbie notices blood dripping on the magazine she is reading; the viewer experiences her eye/camera as she looks directly up and sees Andy's bisected body dripping blood. These are extreme examples of positional disorientation, but the victim's eye/camera provides the expected visceral shocks that

are narratively significant, and highlights viewer vulnerability. Examples of these shots include Harold's eye/camera as a butcher knife comes toward him, Shelly's eye/camera as Ali punches through the car window toward him, the harpoon coming toward Vera, stabbing her through the eye, and Jason as books from a tipped bookcase fall on him. The notable exception to this victim positioning is the eye/camera of Chris in the climax. At one point, we see through her eye/camera as she advances and slashes at Jason in the hallway of the cabin, and also as she swings the hatchet into his head. This final act is immediately followed by Jason extending his arms and slowly lumbering toward her, turning Chris, and therefore the audience, from aggressor to victim.

Many eye/camera shots in The Final Chapter are directly attributed to an existing character. These shots are framed in three different ways: a character from a singular position watching either other characters or examining surroundings, such as Tommy looking around the basement with a flashlight or Trish examining the bathroom after Doug's murder, a character actively moving forward, such as Pam and Paul individually swimming toward the raft in the lake, or Tommy walking downstairs in the dark, and Jason specifically looking at a character as he kills them, such as his first stroke with the saw as he kills Axel. In contrast to Part III, there are no instances of eye/camera shots inhabiting a character as he/she is being violently attacked.

A New Beginning proves a significant turning point in the use and development of the eye/camera within the series. The film begins with an eye/camera shot moving through a forest trail in the rain at night. The uncertain positioning is initially disorienting as the viewer does not know who he or she is seeing through, nor aware of the location or intent of the character. In this way, the

shot functions to clearly establish genre from the outset: eye/camera, forest, night and rain are all elements frequently used in horror films, and this visual generic positioning accompanied by the music familiar to the franchise is designed to provide generic orientation for the viewer.

The character eye is revealed to be that of young Tommy Jarvis, played by Corey Feldman reprising his role, Tommy, from The Final Chapter. Young Tommy walks through the forest and looks from the trees into a clearing where a tombstone stands, with "Jason Voorhees" written on it. He sees two men dig up the coffin underneath, and Jason rises from the grave killing the two men and advancing on young Tommy. As Jason strikes, there is a cut to a young man in the back of a car, who we discover is Tommy. He sits up swiftly and opens his eyes, indicating that the previous sequence was a dream. This positioning within Tommy's dream initially establishes the perspective as belonging to Tommy. This is verified through subsequent eye/camera shots belonging to Tommy, as he looks out of the window from the van, going to the halfway house where most of the film takes place, and watching from his bedroom window as Joey is killed. Even though the film's aesthetics indicate Tommy's perspective, the mechanical and silent movements of Tommy coupled with traditional perceptions of the eye/camera inhabiting the stalker[6] cause the viewer to suspect Tommy of either being or eventually becoming a killer.

Subsequent eye/camera shots complicate this supposition. The eye/camera later moves away from Tommy, and is next seen from Pete's perspective. Pete's eye/camera can be seen as he looks around, suspecting someone is behind him, and

---

[6] This has been demonstrated through the popular examples of Halloween and Friday the 13th. Chapter 2 includes other examples.

sees a rabbit hopping in the woods behind him. Although he is actively searching

during this shot, this is the point where the eye/camera begins to firmly inhabit the

victims, although he is not killed immediately. This sequence is followed by

Vinnie's death, where we see from his eye/camera as the killer shoves a road flare

into his mouth.

Until the climax of the film, all of the eye/camera shots are victim orientated.

Lana's eye/camera appears first as she sees the killer's feet appear behind the car

door, and again as a hatchet swings toward her. The spectator sees the eye/camera of

Raymond as he watches Tina and Eddie have sex in the forest. Tina's eye/camera is

shown as she looks at the trees while she is lying on the blanket, and then again as

the garden shears are plunged into her eyes, followed by Eddie's eye/camera as he

approaches Tina's nude body, thinking she is resting, before he is killed. Junior's

and Ethel's deaths are both shown through eye/camera shots. Robin's eye/camera is

seen as she turns over in bed to find Jake's dead body before she is herself killed.

These eye/camera shots of the victims provide a direct contrast in technique to the

same effect to those in Friday the 13th: the eye/camera inhabits the victims instead of

the killer, but in both cases they perform the function of hiding the killer's identity.

The eye/camera shots of victims in A New Beginning focus on the impending death

blow instead of the identity of the attacker. The immediacy and close proximity of

whatever weapon is used also creates a directly visceral interaction between the film

text and the viewer.

The final two eye/camera shots that take place in the climax move away from

the film's tendency to use the eye/camera of the victims. After 'Jason' (who is

actually Roy the paramedic in a noticeably different hockey mask) begins attacking

Pam and Reggie in the barn, Pam discovers and advances on him with a chain saw.

As she does so, we see her eye/camera during the attack. Although she is the victim, Pam is actively pursuing 'Jason' with violent intent. In this case, the eye/camera shifts from victim being attacked to retaliating victim. This is followed by 'Jason''s eye/camera after Pam and Reggie hide as he looks around the barn. This eye/camera shot takes the position of a violent attacker who has less knowledge of his victims' whereabouts than the viewer, in a sense making him weaker than the people he is stalking, especially when compared to the aggressive positioning of the victim in the previous eye/camera shot, and in contrast to other established uses of the eye/camera.

Although the perspective created by the eye/camera varies, there is a consistency to its gradual adjustment. The viewer is initially positioned closely to Tommy while revealing him to be a suspect, and as the killing begins, the viewer is subjected to the immediacy of the death blows inflicted on the victims. This gives way to creating first the perspective of an aggressive victim followed by a weakened attacker. This progression of positioning and perspective within the eye/camera is more varied than preceding films in the franchise, and is not replicated for the succeeding sequels or the remake.

Jason Lives! contains few eye/camera shots in comparison to other films in the franchise released during the Paramount years. Although there are different approaches to the eye/camera, few shots are directly taken from a character's immediate positioning.[7] These eye/camera shots seem to have little design in the

---

[7] The first direct eye/camera shot is of Lizabeth after she falls out of the car and reaches into her wallet to give Jason money as he approaches her. After she looks up, he has disappeared and we see through her eye as she looks around the area for him. Secondly, we see from Roy's eye/camera as Jason throws him roughly into a tree. Next, the viewer is shown an eye/camera shot of unknown origin as Jason slashes a machete through three executives at once. The seer is unidentified, though no suspense is derived, as the view is essentially the same for any of the three characters. Fourth, there is an eye/camera shot of a policeman as he looks at Roy's severed limbs, and another

form of development and progression, aside from the earlier ones are linked to

victimised characters, followed by characters that are observing and searching, and

ending with Jason's eye/camera. Loosely, this could be interpreted as a victim to

aggressor progression, but there is no other evidence to support this.

By contrast to the minimal use of direct eye/camera shots in Jason Lives!,

The New Blood frequently uses clearly identified eye/camera shots, numerically

favouring the protagonist, Tina, and Jason, against the antagonist. The seer is almost

consistently a character in a position of power over the vulnerable object of his/her

sight. Describing all of the eye/camera shots is not necessary, so I will explain, with

a few examples, how the eye/camera shots are generally framed within the relevant

sequences, and note significant variants.

In the case of most of the eye/camera shots in The New Blood, the character

the eye/camera inhabits is clearly identified during the sequences in which they are

contained, through the use of shot/reverse shot.[8] The use of eye/camera within the

---

eye/camera shot from a policeman as he looks around the camp for Jason. The final eye/camera shot
is from Jason, as he walks through the lake toward Tommy in the boat in the climax.

[8] After the opening flashback sequence where the film shows Tina as a young girl and the death of her
father, we see her wake up in the passenger's seat of a car, riding down the road. This is followed by
an eye/camera shot from the passenger's seat of a car riding down the road, clearly identifying this as
Tina's positioning. During a few sequences where Jason is chasing victims, such as Michael, Maddy,
Dr. Crewes and Mrs. Shepard, the viewer is shown Jason's eye/camera as he follows them, and a
reverse shot showing Jason following the victim, usually repeated two or three times. During Eddie's
death, we see Jason's eye/camera walking up on him, and within the shot, we see his shadow, firmly
identifying the shot as direct eye/camera positioning. Even eye/camera shots from the position of the
victim clearly identify the seer. Kate's death, for instance, climaxes with an eye/camera shot as Jason
kills her by shoving a party horn into her left eye. We see in her eye/camera as Jason forces the horn
toward the camera, so not only can the viewer identify the character whose eye/camera is seen, but the
spectator can precisely locate the eye that is seen through: Kate's left eye.

narrative structure of the film fluidly moves mostly between Tina, who is the final girl of the film, and Jason, linking the two. Though the centre of the film favours Jason eye/camera shots, the audience is initially presented with Tina's perspective before experiencing Jason's perspective extensively. In this way, the film is developed in order to initially attach the viewer to the protagonist before closely witnessing the atrocities committed by the antagonist. The climax, in which Tina and Jason meet in a series of battles, alternates frequently between Tina's and Jason's eye/camera, creating a sense of perspective confrontation. In this way, the viewer does not only witness the showdown between the two characters, but the film also attempts to develop a struggle between two opposing perspectives, which is concluded as the eye/camera of Tina's dead father is seen as he sneaks up on Jason from behind and drags him into the water.

Jason Takes Manhattan has a more consistent eye/camera design than its predecessor, indicating that any sense of standardisation in aesthetic design has become tenuous at this point. The use of eye/camera between The New Blood and Jason Takes Manhattan is different to the extent that it appears to be less evolutionary and more reactionary; the design of Jason Takes Manhattan appears to be less of a development of the design of The New Blood, and instead an attempt to create a design distinct from it, where the eye/camera is concerned. There are only three eye/camera shots from Jason's vantage point, but providing a counterpoint to the victim eye/camera shots are misleading shots of a character approaching another character or characters, framed in an aggressive or stalking manner. As the character is initially unidentified the viewer is meant to think he or she is seeing through Jason, which is usually not the case. Examples of this include two sequences shot from Charles's eye/camera: first, as he walks up on Tamara and Eva with drugs in a

cargo room, and second as he slowly approaches Rennie from behind as she drops

the anchor. Another example happens as Sean, Rennie, Charles and Miss Van

Deusen escape in the life boat. As they are floating away, an apparent eye/camera at

water level moves steadily towards the life boat. As it approaches, there is a reverse

shot inside the life boat, and from the previous shot's eye/camera position, Julius

leaps suddenly from the water and into the boat. These shots contrast directly with

victim eye/camera shots, such as Suzy's as Jason hits her with her guitar, Tamara's

eye/camera as she looks through the crack in the bathroom door, watching as Jason

wanders the corridor in search of her, and Eva's eye/camera as she stands on the

dance floor looking around and seeing Jason almost everywhere she looks,

intercutting her eye/camera with reverse shots of her looking around the room in

panic.

Once the remaining group arrives in New York City, Rennie's perspective is

dominant, eye/camera inclusive. Exceptions include the junkies watching the group

before attacking them, and an eye/camera shot based within Julius after Jason

decapitates him. We see through his eye as his head spins through the air and lands

in a dumpster.[9] After that, all but one significant eye/camera shot originate within

Rennie. We see Rennie's eye/camera as she is walking down the alley after escaping

from the junkies, images in the frame blurred to indicate the effect of the drugs

forcefully administered to her, as well as Rennie's eye/camera as she drives toward

Jason, verified by the fact that the previous and following shots show her in the

---

[9] The first of these examples proves consistent with the eye/camera design to this point. While the
junkies are identified as the source of the eye/camera, this shot still inhabits an aggressive perspective,
in a manner similar to the stalking eye/camera shots from the perspectives of Charles and Julius. The
eye/camera shot from Julius's decapitated head can be identified as a form of spectacle within a film
with a premise that hinges on spectacle: displacing a familiar, iconic character, Jason, to a familiar
iconic location, Manhattan.

driver's seat. The spectator sees through Rennie's eye as she looks into a flaming puddle, which turns into a flashback from her childhood, further situating the film's perspective within Rennie. We later see her eye/camera as she is running through the sewers in an attempt to escape Jason, but there is an eye/camera shift to Jason, as Rennie throws toxic waste at Jason, showing his perspective only as a victim at this point. One further eye/camera shot from Rennie places her as a victim as Jason leaps from the flood of toxic waste in order to grab her, an attempt that is unsuccessful. A final eye/camera shot comes from a low angle moving quickly towards Rennie and Sean as they are standing on the sidewalk looking around. They turn and look at the camera, and in a reverse shot, we see Toby the dog leaping towards Rennie in a friendly manner, undercutting the previously built tension.

Using these examples from Jason Takes Manhattan, it can be seen that the film, with few exceptions, positions the audience within and adopts the perspective of victim. The only eye/camera shots within Jason occur when he is watching or looking, and at the very end, as the victim, but not performing aggressive action against a victim. By contrast, in Jason Goes to Hell, the eye/camera, at different points, inhabits most of the characters central to the narrative, and other minor characters as well, without demonstrating consistence in utilisation. The eye/camera shots are used through people as they watch events from a distance, through people who are the victims of violent action, and through people who are the perpetrators of violent action. This disparity between Jason Takes Manhattan and Jason Goes to Hell again demonstrates that there is no standardised aesthetic design where perspective is concerned. This point in the development of the eye/camera in the slasher reflects the tendency to vary aesthetics in order to discover a successful formula to revive the success of the genre.

One demonstration of the variety of experiential positioning in <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u> can be demonstrated through one of the earliest eye/camera shots. After Jason has been blown up, the security officers close off the area for examination. This is seen in extreme long shot from an eye/camera. In reverse shot, we see Duke, the bounty hunter, watching from this position. This shot cuts to another initially unidentified eye/camera shot wandering through the crime scene. The eye/camera approaches an officer talking in a relaxed manner to the woman used as bait in the investigation. This shot is designed to highlight the characters as potentially vulnerable. The relaxed posture of the characters reveals their lack of concern to a threat, and the noisy, crowded surroundings become a potential camouflage for a character with sinister intent. However, the officer then turns to address the eye/camera saying, "Good shooting Mahoney, now clean up all this shit, huh?" Mahoney has not been introduced as a character until this point, and does not re-appear in the film. This sequence places <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u> as a film in the franchise that re-introduces the eye/camera as a device to be used to create identificatory disorientation.

<u>Jason X</u> contains a more consistent design with regards to the eye/camera, but still varies distinctly from <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u>. With one significant exception, the eye/camera does not inhabit characters as violent action occurs. Instead, <u>Jason X</u> alters eye/camera shots between those of stalking or searching and vulnerable passivity, evenly divided between Jason and other characters.

The opening credits appear over images representing the inside of Jason's brain, both in physical and abstract ways. Aside from extreme close ups of brain matter and blood vessels, sparks of electricity, fire, and images of people and events are shown. The image tracks backwards, blending into a representation of Jason's

cognitive thought, and moves outwards to show his eye, before returning to his cognitive thought, which then includes eye/camera shots of doctors examining Jason. These images then become a reflection in Jason's eye. By doing this the viewer sees the world as Jason, as well as into Jason. The spectator is shown that it is, in fact, Jason they are seeing in and through at the end of the sequence. The image cuts to bloody medical instruments, and then cuts between an eye/camera shot and a reflection of Jason's eye/camera in his eye as a doctor with a harness moves larger in the frame and leaves the harness when he steps backwards, intercut with images of chains attached to the harness. After this sequence cuts, the viewer is shown Jason suspended by a harness and chains in the middle of a warehouse-sized room. This is representative of further eye/camera shots from Jason's eye in the film in which he is relatively passive. In this opening scene, we see through his eye/camera as the guard approaches him with a tarpaulin saying, "Why don't you stare at this a little while, you bastard?" before throwing the tarpaulin over his head. After this, we only see Jason's eye/camera as he walks up behind Crutch without killing him, and then as he wanders the corridors of the space ship before Geko's death. The final eye/camera shot from Jason occurs as Kay-Em 14 fires a small rocket at his head, which decapitates him, before he becomes regenerated as "Uber-Jason".

The eye/camera shots from other characters are very similar to those of Jason. We see Kay-Em 14's eye/camera as the group initially finds the cryogenic facility, and they are looking around the room. As Brodski is searching the ship for Jason, we see him examining the area as he tries to track Jason, and we also see Crutch's eye/camera as he and Ray look at the severed limbs of a crew member on the bridge of the ship. In more active sequences, the viewer is shown the eye/camera of Condor, and one of the two VR Teen Girls as Jason stands over them about to

attack at different points in the film. Another instance of the eye/camera used to highlight vulnerability is as Rowan is revived, we see her eye/camera as she looks at the people standing around observing her, her naked body covered only by a sheet and disoriented.

A significant break from this tendency to situate the eye/camera within a vulnerable or relatively passive position occurs as Kay-Em 14 kills Jason before he is regenerated. She appears holding several guns, firing them at Jason for an extended period of time, shown through multiple angles cut at a rapid pace. Many of these shots are from Kay-Em 14's eye/camera, including many showing on the left and right sides of the frame, her arms extended firing the guns toward Jason, and representing the only scene involving the eye/camera inhabiting a character during immediately aggressive violent action. These eye/camera shots from Kay-Em 14's point of view are reminiscent of first-person shooter video games. This is designed to provide the audience with the experiential catharsis of killing Jason, as well as maintaining elements of the science fiction genre by incorporating this modern video game aesthetic to create a sense of interactivity. Ultimately, Jason X utilises few eye/camera shots in comparison with most others in the franchise, and again reveals less consistency in aesthetic design.

Freddy vs. Jason, however, returns to extensive eye/camera usage, and initially appears to be indiscriminate in the characters the eye/camera inhabits. Freddy, being initially in control of Jason, who is far more powerful than the people he stalks and kills, often subjectively talks to the audience in voice-over and drives the narrative forward. Jason, a mute character, becomes the visual narrative drive and this is shown through many eye/camera shots based within Jason. Jason's visual perspective is established early, after Freddy tells the audience he will resurrect him.

A shot is shown of Jason's hockey mask, and the camera pushes into the left eye of the mask, where an image appears of a girl standing on a dock, undressing to go into the water. She turns, and although this appears to be a false eye/camera shot[10], revealed as such because she turns to look at the camera and sees nothing, the use of eye/camera coding combined with the fact that this shot appeared in the eye of the hockey mask demonstrates this sequence as inhabiting Jason's perspective. We see the girl undress fully in long shot from an eye/camera framed through branches on the edge of the forest and then dive in. Even though we see the girl's eye/camera from the water, looking back at the dock, the camera stays close to Jason as he chases her, and goes back to his eye/camera once he has killed her and pinned her to a tree. We see through his eye/camera as she lifts her head and says, "I should have been watching them. Not drinking. Not meeting a boy at the lake." In the same shot, the girl transforms to a dead boy, who continues talking, "I deserve to be punished." Then the boy turns into a different girl saying, "We all deserve to be punished." Though this girl did not actually transform, this is meant to indicate Jason's perspective, and explain his justification for murder, without him speaking. Like the opening credits sequence of Jason X, this becomes a representation of Jason's cognitive thought as opposed to direct vision. While more extensive than the eye/camera, this, along with the early narrative establishment of Freddy's control over Jason, demonstrates how Freddy vs. Jason creates some identification and sympathy with Jason.[11]

---

[10] This type of shot I will call a "mimic" eye/camera shot, a concept I will explore in more detail later in this chapter.

[11] Jason is not the only character that the eye/camera inhabits. There are multiple eye/camera shots from other characters, primarily the central group of girls: Lori, Kia and Gibb. Most of these consist of walking, searching and exploring, such as Lori in her dream in the police station, walking through

The remake, <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u>, becomes problematic to an eye/camera reading. While eye/camera shots are often identified through the use of hand-held camera and relatable height, the majority of <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u> is shot in this way without being located within the eye of a fictional character. This is a practical presentation of the fact that this use of the camera has become a visual signifier of the genre without needing to be an actual eye/camera shot. Even mounted steady shots are often partially obscured by objects in the foreground, as in the scene where Whitney and Mike are exploring Jason's house, which does inhabit a voyeuristic positioning. While this stylistic use of the camera creates an overall visceral impact and kinetic sensibility to the narrative, it can also communicate a simultaneous sense of victimisation and vulnerability, as well as aggressiveness. As Mike and Whitney run through the forest away from Jason's house and toward their own campsite, the handheld camera from approximately Jason's height intercuts moving at their pace both in front of and behind them. The shot in front reveals that there is nobody immediately behind them, and the shot behind them could appear to be chasing them, but is also close enough to appear to be escaping with them. This ambiguity creates difficulty in defining the film/spectator perspective relationship, as it can vary from one viewer to another. In this way, spectator reading of <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u> can be that of voyeur, victim, or aggressor, or shifting from all three at different points. The frequent use of the camera to create an ambiguity between

---

the corridor and approaching a door that says "Authorized Entrance Only". The eye/camera shots that break from previous franchise films occur as two different characters facing each other are seen in eye/camera shot/reverse shot situations. One primary example is a scene where Lori confronts her father about the truth of her mother's death. We see through Lori, standing above her father who is talking to her, and by way of reverse shot, Lori's response is captured through her father's eye/camera. Other examples will be provided later in this chapter.

eye/camera shots and objective shots is a reflection of the evolution of the genre's aesthetic, and also a quality of these remakes that borrow visual style without the meaning behind it.

In spite of this, eye/camera shots can be detected through defining space and character positioning outside of eye/camera locations. For instance, after hearing someone outside, Amanda, assuming it is Wade watching her have sex, tells Richie to go and tell him to leave. After Richie exits the tent, Amanda waits a few moments and then looks out of the tent flap for Richie. From her defined position, we see her eye/camera, which is partially framed by the edge of the tent opening. Later, Chelsea, seeing Jason on the shore of the lake watching her, goes underwater and swims under the dock, waiting for him to leave. We see a medium shot from her, and long shots of Jason's location where they are in relation to each other, and Chelsea's eye/camera reflects this position, revealing it to be a true eye/camera shot. There are also many eye/camera shots from Jason's position. As the young worker in the attic of the barn where he works looks around at the different artefacts, the camera approaches him from behind, and moves very close to him. Then, in reverse shot, we see Jason from this position just before he attacks. Jason's eye/camera is also seen as he walks up to Trent's house and looks into the window where Trent and Bree are shown having sex. As the camera gets closer, the light from inside the window reflects off the hockey mask which reflects off the window, revealing Jason's position, informing the viewer that he/she is witnessing an eye/camera shot.

Although Friday the 13th (2009) contains more victim eye/camera shots than Jason eye/camera shots, the numeric difference is small. Ultimately, the nearly equal appearance of both enhances the sense created of perspective ambiguity, and either adapts the film to individual viewer perspective or creates disorientation. Again, in a

similar way to <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u>, the aim of the visual aesthetic can be attributed to an attempt to create visceral impact, and filmmaker desire for a kinetic design, in line with director Marcus Nispel's earlier films, <u>The Texas Chainsaw Massacre</u> (2003) and <u>Frankenstein</u> (2004). This is a potential response to the rising popularity of the victim-camera movement mentioned in Chapter 2, by utilising a similar aesthetic without limiting what is seen to a camera within the diegesis. This replicates the visceral aesthetic of the victim-camera without creating subjective limitations.

<u>Manipulations of the Eye/Camera Model</u>

Direct eye/camera shots are often transparent in their application, clearly identifying that the shot is coming from the eye position of a character within the film. When it is not, a film can at least create an implication that there is a character the viewer is seeing through. However, the model and coding of the eye/camera can be used to create the same visceral impact of a direct eye/camera shot, while simultaneously disorienting or creating suspense without the need of another character. In some cases, it is left ambiguous whether or not a shot is, in fact, an eye/camera shot, and in other cases, it is made apparent that the device cannot be trusted to denote character presence. Likewise, eye/camera coding can be used, but altered from a direct character perspective to either distort or clarify the experience of the character.

The most complex use of the eye/camera in <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> are shots that create a distinct advantage over the audience, which is done through the viewer's lack of knowledge of what character they are looking through, or even if they are witnessing an eye/camera shot at all. The example given by Humphries of the eye/camera coded shot that is not housed within a character preceding Marcie's

death sequence in <u>Friday the 13th</u> is an example of this, and demonstrates that <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> is not the first such example.

This sort of mimic-eye/camera occurs frequently in <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u>. In the opening, Alice, the surviving character from <u>Friday the 13th</u>, after waking up from a dream in which the events from the previous film are shown in order to inform the audience of the narrative, walks about her house as the camera follows her, coded very much like an eye/camera shot. It is shot at head-height, handheld, and largely positioned within shadow. At one point, Alice goes into her bedroom, closes the door all but a crack, and removes her clothes before putting on a bathrobe. We do not see this undressing and dressing process, but the camera watches through the crack in the door as her clothes are thrown one at a time onto her bed, and Alice emerges in a bathrobe. As she walks to the shower, she moves toward the camera and even looks at it. If the audience were viewing an eye/camera, Alice would reasonably see the character the audience is seeing through, due to direct eye contact with the camera and the close proximity. Even as she goes into the shower, the camera keeps its distance, and moves into the bathroom only after the shower starts. The camera moves slowly toward the shower, still very reminiscent of an eye/camera shot. The lights are very bright in the room, and as the camera reaches the shower curtain, it is suddenly pulled aside to show Alice in close up looking straight at the camera, although no one is there. This sudden encounter has no apparent effect on the events, as the image cuts to similar camera movement following Alice as she walks to pick up the ringing telephone.

This misleading use of eye/camera coding provides three functions in <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u>. Initially, it creates a sense of Alice being watched, even if the shot is not from the point of view of a character that is actually watching her. Secondly, the

continued use of eye/camera coding, even after it becomes apparent that it is not an eye/camera shot is designed to put the audience at ease, by informing them that they are no threat to the character they are watching. In fact, because we do not watch Alice undress or see her in the shower, she maintains a sense of modesty, and the audience is provided with a sense of propriety and respectability. The audience does not see Alice's nudity, and her lack of apparent physical vulnerability guards her against the viewer being a threat. This sense of ease the mimic eye/camera provides places the audience in a vulnerable position, as the viewer becomes unable to tell when they are a threat or benign. In this way, eye/camera coding in <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> puts the film in a position of power over the audience.

In <u>Friday the 13th Part III 3-D</u>, Miner, repeats, although less frequently, mimic eye/camera shots like those in <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u>. One notable example is the sequence in which Debbie is in the shower. As she showers, an eye/camera coded shot moves toward the shower, and we can see her outline through the shower curtain. She opens the shower curtain and it turns out to be Andy, walking on his hands. Although this is the perspective of a character, it is not that of the character's eyeline, but of the character's footline. This shot is repeated a few moments later after Andy's death, but as Debbie opens the curtain, there is nobody there. This shot is repeated again in direct eye/camera as Chris comes back to the cabin to investigate the tap running in the bathtub. There is no silhouette of a person behind the shower curtain as Chris approaches, but the same movement and positioning is repeated. In all, <u>Friday the 13th Part III 3-D</u> is an example of Miner's continued experimentation and unique usage of eye/camera coding, extending the experiential element into a three dimensional aesthetic. With mimic eye/camera shots appearing briefly in <u>Friday the 13th</u>, and the repetition across the following two sequels with increased

frequency, it can be deduced that mimic eye/camera shots, at this point in film history, have become a new generic convention for the slasher – it acknowledges audience recognition and expectation of this shot.

There are two significant mimic eye/camera shots in The Final Chapter. The first is Jason's attack on the nurse in the hospital. In this sequence, a handheld camera approaches the nurse, first moving around a set of shelves containing medical equipment, then slowly moving straight towards her. She quickly turns around and Jason appears from the right of the screen and attacks her within the shot, causing a shock stemming from an unexpected direction of attack. The second of these significant mimic eye/camera shots takes place during Tina's death. We see her in the rain getting her bicycle to leave. The camera steadily moves in her direction, but instead of going straight toward her, the camera moves behind her. At this point, the shot could still conceivably be an eye/camera shot as it is out of her line of sight, and the camera tracks in to a window of the house, potentially in an attempt to view the goings-on inside. The camera stops, and lightning flashes, revealing in shadow Jason stabbing Tina with a long object, and we hear the death blow and her scream. The position of Jason in relation to the shadow and the camera location reveals that the image is in no way connected to his sight, causing a disorienting shock derived simultaneously from the discovery that the viewer is not seeing an eye/camera shot and the unexpected stabbing of Tina, who is assumed to be relatively safe once the camera has passed her.

The significance of these shots stems from the play on expectation based on previous use of the eye/camera and mimic eye/camera shots. Both eye/camera and mimic eye/camera shots are designed to create the same form of tension and

suspense, and while an eye/camera shot can be revealed as such as it plays out[12], the nature of a mimic eye/camera shot is not revealed until the end of the shot or after, to sustain the tension created. The primary difference with The Final Chapter is one of timing. The mimic eye/camera shots in the previous films in the series climax in the revelation that there is no threat from the location of the camera, allowing the viewer a chance to process this information before an attack occurs or before the film moves to another sequence. The Final Chapter creates mimic eye/camera shots which climax in violence, but the violence is shocking as it occurs from an unexpected direction, allowing no time for the viewer to process the fact that the camera is no threat. In this way, the film has created the double advantage of utilising eye/camera aesthetics and framing, providing the tension and suspense that comes with such camera usage, but also reaps the benefits of a shock provided by a shot that records a sudden violent action from a third person perspective.

Both A New Beginning[13] and Jason Lives![14] offer minimal usage of the mimic eye/camera shot. However, one unique eye/camera use introduced in Jason Lives! is what I will call the off-model eye/camera shot. In off-model eye/camera

---

[12] One example of this is the hand of Mrs. Voorhees appearing in frame to remove a branch during an eye/camera shot in Friday the 13th.

[13] In A New Beginning, there is brief shot moving behind Ethel before she is attacked from the front, and a shot following Pete, before he turns around, and looks at the camera briefly before looking at other areas off screen, indicating that the camera is not inhabiting a character. This sort of manipulation of the eye/camera model is not unusual for the series, and can be seen in earlier films.

[14] Jason Lives contains two mimic eye/camera shots. One occurs outside the camper van where Cort and Nikki are having sex. The camera establishes the camper van and the frame conspicuously swish tilts up slightly and then to the left, looking like a hand-held image. After this, Jason steps into the frame in profile from the right, and the shot remains completely still until it cuts to the next shot. Later, as the policemen are looking around the camp for Jason, a shot using eye/camera coding appears behind a policeman moving slowly towards him, just before a little girl runs into the frame and grabs him. At the point that this happens, if it were an eye/camera shot, both characters in the frame would see the seer, but they do not.

shots, the viewer witnesses a shot very close to the eye of a character, but based on the other shots within the sequence, knows that the camera does not inhabit the space of the character eye, even if it is only shifted a couple of inches, shown from eye/positioning when the character is not looking, or rotated slightly, in one case. During Lizabeth's death, Jason apparently stabs her through the mouth with a long pole. However, in the off-model eye/camera shot, Jason appears in the top of the frame as she is lying down, but when he thrusts the pole downwards, the end disappears above the frame. If it were a direct eye/camera shot, the pole would have gone from the top of the frame, the end disappearing in the bottom of the frame. In this case, the camera is positioned just below Lizabeth's mouth. During the business executives' paintball game, Katie jumps out of the brush, and shoots Stan then Larry, each with a paintball pellet. A shot that appears to be an eye/camera shot shows Katie aiming and shooting at the camera, cutting as the paintball hits the bottom of the frame. The cut, however, is to a reverse shot, where it is clearly shown that the paintball pellet strikes Stan's chest, placing the off-model eye/camera shot also on his chest. As Tommy and Megan are running away from the police in a car chase, Megan thrusts Tommy's head into her lap so that they will not see him in the car. The spectator is then shown an off-model shot of Megan's crotch from Tommy's position, however, Tommy's eyes are perpendicular to the seat of the car, whereas the off- model eye/camera shot is rotated ninety degrees, parallel with the seat, and Megan's crotch is shown upright, instead of sideways as a direct eye/camera shot would indicate. The most interesting off-model eye/camera shot precedes Cort's death. After Jason kills Nikki in the camper's bathroom, he moves toward Cort who is driving. There are two shots showing Jason approaching in the rearview mirror from what would be Cort's eye/camera, if he were looking. When he does look, he

screams, but McLoughlin does not cut to a direct eye/camera shot in that moment. These off-model shots are used to create a visceral effect or proximity fear (or excitement, in the case of Tommy) by positioning the camera close to the victim's eye, but adjusting it slightly to maximize its effect, allowing the viewer to process the typically swift events without the problem of disorientation. As used in <u>Jason Lives!</u>, the off-model eye/camera shot serves a range of purposes. In the cases of Lizabeth's death and Tommy looking at Megan's crotch, the off-model shot is designed to decrease the disorientation that would occur by showing the same images from a direct eye/camera. For Lizabeth, Jason would appear upside down, and for Tommy, Megan's crotch would appear with her thighs parallel with the top and bottom of the frame. By rotating the camera 180 degrees and 90 degrees, respectively, each shot frames the subject in a way that makes it easier for the viewer to process the visual information. The off-model eye/camera shot involving the female executive repositions the camera to provide the visceral shock of an object moving directly toward the camera lens, which would be lessened were the object aimed a foot below the camera lens. For Cort's attack, the off-model eye/camera shot creates the tension of an eye/camera shot, but intensifies the suspense of the impending attack by establishing his ignorance of Jason's presence. <u>Jason Lives!</u> ultimately utilises the off-model eye/camera for either clarifying visual information or enhancing a potential emotional effect.

<u>Jason Takes Manhattan</u> does introduce one shot not seen before in this series: the victim-camera. As Wayne searches for Jason in the engine room, he is trying to film the events with his video camera. As he is walking, steam comes out of a nearby valve knocking off his glasses. This is followed by a blurry eye/camera shot used to re-create his faulty vision. To compensate for this he looks through his

camera. We then see through the victim-camera, complete with artificial frame and time-counter. Wayne uses the camera to identify one of his fellow students who he just shot due to his bad eyesight. The camera tilts up and Jason appears in the frame, smashing the camera, which is where the victim-camera shot ends. This is an additional aesthetic device used in order to vary the experiential positioning of victim. The use of the victim-camera in Jason Takes Manhattan is a device not frequently seen in the slasher film at this point. Although films like Peeping Tom and Cannibal Holocaust have used it before this point, Jason Takes Manhattan precedes The Blair Witch Project by ten years, which popularised this form of perspective as a dominant aesthetic positioning. Therefore, Jason Takes Manhattan serves as a significant precursor to the later victim-camera trends, particularly as it uses what was, for that time, more accessible home video recording equipment instead of the film cameras used for Peeping Tom and Cannibal Holocaust. This also brings this specific home video aesthetic to a mainstream film that was used effectively three years earlier in a sequence in the independent horror film Henry: Portrait of a Serial Killer (dir. McNaughton).

Freddy vs. Jason utilises an off-model eye/camera shot at a significant point in the narrative. In a sequence similar to the eye/camera shot reverse shot conversation between Lori and her father, Gibb, in the dream-world boiler room, hides from Freddy in a locker. After a few moments, the locker door opens, and Freddy is in front of her, suspended upside down in the air. Gibb screams, and Freddy laughs, which we first see through Gibb's eye/camera, then through Freddy's off-model eye/camera, as Gibb appears with her head at the top of the frame, body below, instead of her head at the bottom, body above as would be seen from

Freddy's direct perspective. Gibb still looks at the camera and screams, shot from the position of Freddy's eye.

This shot, however, along with an eye/camera shot at the beginning from Freddy looking at a young female victim in flashback are the only eye/camera shots from Freddy's position. The additional consideration of the eye/camera shot at the beginning as occurring before Freddy's first death and the one involving Gibb being off-model is significant. The "Dream-master" Freddy's direct eye/camera being excluded from the film's aesthetic whereas Jason's and the central characters' eye/cameras appear frequently, isolates Freddy, identifying him as the film's ultimate antagonist, victimising not only the teenagers in the films, but Jason as well. While director Ronny's Yu's ultimate aesthetic attempts to foreground visceral impact as in his earlier films Bride of Chucky (1998) and The 51st State (2001), with the eye/camera playing an important role in this, it is additionally used to identify the absolute antagonist, and present him as an "other". Bordwell has identified an increased inclination towards a more visceral aesthetic, such as that utilised by Yu, in Hollywood in general, which he claims came to prominence particularly in the 1980s. This can be found in his writing on what he calls "intensified continuity." (2006; 121-138) The general aesthetic qualities he attributes to intensified continuity are "rapid editing, bipolar extremes of lens lengths, reliance on close shots, and wide-ranging camera movements." (121)

The variety of eye/camera usage in these examples demonstrates that the eye/camera can contribute to a complex aesthetic effect, and that the context of the shot can alter emotional response and engagement with a film text. However, eye/camera shots have not been used in a consistent manner, and more intricate visual codes have been developed for the eye/camera over time.

Developing Effects of the Eye/Camera

Eye/camera usage in the first three films in the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series sets the franchise apart from other slasher films released between 1980 and 1982. Although other films such as <u>Hell Night</u>, <u>My Bloody Valentine</u>, <u>Terror Train</u> and <u>Happy Birthday to Me</u> all make use of the eye/camera and strict character perspective in ways similar to <u>Halloween</u>, the dominant eye/camera positioning is directly that of the aggressor, with slight shifts to victim eye/camera. The opening of <u>Terror Train</u>, as described by Dika is a significant example, wherein a group of girls, including the protagonist are instructed to humiliate a boy, the film's eventual antagonist, for initiation into a fraternal organisation. Dika writes, "We watch from the heroine's point of view as the boy bashfully undresses near a bed surrounded by veils." (94-95) The subsequent humiliation is not entirely seen through this shot, but the eye/camera is placed within a character with power over a victim, even if that dynamic shifts later in the film. The immediate positioning is placed within the character of an aggressor.

In contrast, <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> and <u>Friday the 13th Part III 3-D</u> both contain a large number of eye/camera and mimic eye/camera shots unique to their contemporaries. Although shots like the one in <u>Friday the 13th Part III 3-D</u> in which a mimic eye/camera shot moves toward Debbie in the shower, but nobody is there when she opens the curtain is a staple of slasher film misdirection,[15] sequences like the opening of <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> where a mimic eye/camera follows Alice around her house are extremely rare. Even slasher films from that period such as

---

[15] Isolated mimic eye/camera shots within different contexts from the period can be found in <u>My Bloody Valentine</u>, <u>Halloween</u>, and <u>When a Stranger Calls</u> (1979; dir. Walton), among others.

Fade to Black (1980; dir. Zimmerman) sometimes contain no more than two or three eye/camera shots in the entire film. This may explain the more economical, if still occasionally inventive approach to eye/camera coded shots in subsequent Friday the 13th films.

While there is not a decrease in the number of eye/camera shots in Parts VI, VII and VIII, the approach to them tends to be more streamlined and direct with less ambiguity. The ultimate aim of the shots in the final three Paramount-produced Friday the 13th films appears to be generic orientation and immediate perspective positioning at the service of the narrative, diminishing suspense caused by distortion and uncertainty of perspective. A significant commonality between the three films is the early introduction of and consistent attachment to a protagonist that drives the narrative development: Tommy in Jason Lives!, Tina in The New Blood, and Rennie in Jason Takes Manhattan. The eye/camera in these films establish the centralization of these characters and of Jason as antagonist, which differs from A New Beginning in which Tommy, though the central character, is not clearly identified as protagonist or antagonist until the end. The following three films, however, use the eye/camera in very different ways in order to highlight the protagonist/antagonist relationship. However, the eye/camera shots in Jason Takes Manhattan only use generic orientation as part of the device's developmental continuum within the film. Jason Takes Manhattan presents the viewer with eye/camera shots initially to create generic orientation and visceral shock by moving between victim and aggressor positioning, but gradually aligning the film with Rennie's perspective, with a few exceptions.[16] In this way, the eye/camera does not contribute to the overall perspective of the film, but instead, from moment to moment, presents a variety of

---

[16] These exceptions, as discussed, include the junkies watching the group and Julius's decapitation.

perspective experience, and ultimately defining generic orientation and providing momentary visceral shock.

In Jason X's sparing use of the eye/camera, it specifically develops generic definition, which is significant to the inter-generic nature of the narrative. The film largely utilizes science fiction genre aesthetics, and the eye/camera is only used in sequences when a horror aesthetic is appropriate to the narrative, as in Jason sneaking up on Crutch, which reminds the viewer of the potential threat Jason represents, both to individuals and to the entire ship, as Crutch is the pilot. It is therefore significant that, aside from the overt iconography of the series[17], the eye/camera is the primary aesthetic device used to orientate the viewer within the horror genre while the dominant aesthetic belongs to the science fiction genre. These eye/camera shots provide an extreme sense of contrast to the science fiction sequences of the film, strictly shot from an omniscient third person perspective[18]. The horror and science fiction sequences are set apart largely by the use of the eye/camera in Jason X, and the vulnerable eye/camera positionings, through this contrast, are intensified by the relative rareness of eye/camera usage.

Eye/camera usage and design in these films becomes a primary example of design based on monetary and business consideration, as initially pointed out by Sean Cunningham. Based on the success of the first film, which adapted an aesthetic to model the financial success of Halloween, the eye/camera became a prominent

---

[17] It is important to note that the iconographic elements of the Friday the 13th franchise are filtered through the science fiction genre: Jason's hockey mask is made metallic with a design reminiscent of Futurism, and the Camp Crystal Lake sequence is placed within the context of a virtual reality hologram.

[18] One example of third person perspective in Jason X can be seen in the sequence involving his DNA reconstruction, which is shot through a series of tripod mounted close ups and medium shots, along with smooth tilts and tracking shots.

method of establishing viewer perspective. The similarity of eye/camera usage of the first two sequels can be attributed to creative control maintained by significant creators of the original film. The third sequel, adapted the initial aesthetic along with a more direct and less ambiguous eye/camera usage, although influence from the first three films is apparent. The final four Paramount Pictures films in the franchise reveal a repeated attempt at varied experimentation to different narrative purposes, reflecting the desire to develop a successful formula in the light of declining box office receipts. This experimentation continued through the first two "Jason" films released by New Line Cinemas, with <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u> and <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u> being used simultaneously as a utilisation of contemporary generic trends, but also in a distinctly auteurist fashion.[19]

Ultimately, this analysis of the eye/camera in the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films leads to a couple of significant points. First, the overall effect of the eye/camera in the individual films indicates a specific design that often reflects the development of a cycle of intent and effect, which can be observed through a look at the developmental continuum of the franchise as a whole. Secondly, the range of approaches and alternate framing of eye/camera aesthetics solely within this film series problematises a sociocultural or psychoanalytical generalisation of the device.

In the first instance, an observation of the overall approach to the eye/camera in each individual film demonstrates a precise progression of development, with <u>A New Beginning</u> acting as a significant pivotal text. Although I have just used the term "cycle" to describe the progression of intent, this is not wholly accurate. This continuum more closely resembles a spiral, where the return or repetition of a

---

[19] As discussed, a comparison of Ronny Yu's films to <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u> and Marcus Nispel's films to <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u> reveal similar visual aesthetic trends in camerawork across the films of each director.

tendency of a previous group of films undergoes a specific mutation, which replicates these previous tendencies with a stylistic alteration.

With regards to the second point made earlier, the regularity and frequency of alternating eye/camera perspectives problematises claims addressed in Chapter 2 of the eye/camera acting as a vehicle for voyeurism or sadistic pleasure. While three of the first four films favour perspectives of aggression and power, there still exist examples of victim perspective, and the frequent use of mimic eye/camera challenge the viewer's reading of perspective, inviting him/her to actively engage with the film, which works contrary to arguments arguing for the eye/camera as invitations to passive sadistic pleasure. As mentioned, the following films, in an attempt to create generic orientation or to develop an overarching visceral aesthetic, frequently alter the perspective between victim and aggressor, and including passive witnesses, undermines such arguments again, as voyeuristic or sadistic pleasure can only be garnered through experiencing the perspective of an aggressor. Indeed, the final two films, through their development of an overarching visceral perspective, in a sense victimise the viewer, establishing a design that creates tension and suspense, as well as disorientation.

Ultimately, the eye/camera proves to be a device that has multiple functions, which can be developed with nuance as well as providing a design that is integral to the narrative, specifically within A New Beginning, Jason Takes Manhattan, and Freddy vs. Jason. When applied to the characters within the Friday the 13th films, whether Jason[20] or the victims can act as a signifier of power or vulnerability. However, the eye/camera shots from any of these characters can indicate power or

---

[20] I use Jason here as the predominant antagonist in the series, though this statement includes Mrs. Voorhees for Friday the 13th, Roy for A New Beginning, any of the people possessed by Jason's spirit in Jason Goes to Hell, or even Freddy in Freddy vs. Jason.

vulnerability, such as the passive eye/camera shots from Jason in <u>Jason X</u> or the

eye/camera of Deputy Winslow as he pursues Jason in <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u>. Most

significantly, though there can be dominant uses of the eye/camera tending towards

either power or vulnerability for any given film, these positions can alternate not

only within a film, but at times within a sequence, as occurs in <u>The New Blood</u>. The

examples from the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series demonstrate both a cohesive aesthetic

continuum as well as the variety provided within films with a wide range of writers

and directors, reflecting theories of pleasure through repetition that genre viewing

provides that were discussed in Chapter 2, including work by Grant, Buscombe and

Neale. Dika accurately describes this tendency in her writing about <u>Friday the 13th</u>

as a model for recombining generic elements to a successful end:

> (The) overall tendency in <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> toward the replication of
> material while supplying a suitable level of variation serves two purposes
> for the film-viewing audience. It facilitates the film's game by supplying
> the known ground rules, while the innovations supply the film's interest
> and shocks. This technique allows the viewer to feel secure in his
> knowledge of the formula, distanced by the formulaic predictability of
> the events, while nonetheless excited by the surprises and variations.
> (84)

The evolution of the eye/camera within the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films is exemplary of this

statement. With the eye/camera established as a generic convention on the release of

<u>Friday the 13th</u>, the sequels include it as a staple of the genre while altering how the

eye/camera is framed, contextualised and used over the course of the franchise. The

eye/camera, however, is only one aspect of the entire visual design of these films,

and the image is only one element of the aesthetics of each film.

Chapter 4: Unverified Diegetic Sound, Editing and Overlap

As shown, the eye/camera can directly develop perspective by housing the visual element either within a character, or acting in a manner reminiscent of a victim, aggressor, or observer. Other aesthetic elements are equally effective in the creation, development and communication of perspective, and I will now look at uses of sound and editing in order to show how these elements function both individually and in conjunction with each other to this same end. Ultimately, this will demonstrate the way in which aesthetic devices interact and rely on each other to create narrative meaning and emotional resonance within a sequence. This will provide a broader understanding of the relationship between aesthetics and perspective.

Sound and editing are two primary sources of aesthetic design in cinema, and while it would be impossible to analyse and detail the whole of the sound and editing developments within the Friday the 13th series, I will focus my analysis on specific uses of each within the death sequences in the Friday the 13th films. I have chosen these particular sequences as they comprise frequent, consistent set pieces throughout each film in the series, and these are generally designed to elicit the most intensive emotional responses, as central features with the genre. For a slasher film, death sequences are particularly significant as they provide climactic spectacles to punctuate key moments in the narrative. It is also these sequences which contribute to defining the genre, and therefore utilise the aesthetic elements with an aim to effectively elicit the appropriate emotional response within a viewer. Conrich explains that "The relationship that the Friday the 13th films has with its audience is also dependent on exploiting a visceral curiosity; a desire to view the body modified

and pushed beyond the limits of normality and acceptability." (2010; 183) This, he argues, is similar in effect to Grand Guignol stage shows, serving as essential sequences in defining each genre. Considering the significance of these sequences to the films, research on them is limited, leaving death sequences as a heretofore ignored aspect of the slasher genre. Even Dika's analysis centres on the stalking element of the narrative. One exception is Jonathan Lake Crane, who writes detailed analyses of death sequences, only to explain what they say about or fears as a culture (1994). As death sequences are significant to the slasher film, they provide a rich body of smaller sequences for an analysis of aesthetics and form.

I will do this to demonstrate how sound and editing design function to individually communicate perspective, and an analysis of how these two elements work together to create a rich understanding of perspective. Therefore, the death sequences in <u>Friday the 13th</u> are here explained in order to show how what is seen, how it is edited, and what is heard, can, in different combinations impact on the perspective experienced in a death sequence. This also demonstrates the complex dynamic that occurs when a death blow is heard but not seen in one of these sequences, as opposed to any other approach. It is for this reason that this chapter will focus on occurrences of sound representing offscreen death blows combined with uses of editing in the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series. To do this, I will discuss the specific perspectives that are developed during these sequences: victim, aggressor, and omniscient/other. The sections on victim and aggressor perspective discuss these very specific positionings, while the following section will address both instances of omniscience and sequences in which the action is experienced from a character within the film that is not directly involved with the action. Finally, the chapter will end with a discussion of the way these elements developed in the series,

and the specific role that <u>A New Beginning</u> plays within this development. This

approach will highlight the evolution of preferred perspective and aesthetic

approach, and will reveal the increasing aesthetic complexity within the series.

Robynn J. Stilwell writes of the manner in which sound in cinema contributes

to viewer/character identification, saying:

> Experiencing a strong identification with a character in the film places us
>
> in another's subject position, creating an emotionally empathetic
>
> response. Film has many ways of coaxing the audience into that position,
>
> from character development, narrative discourse and events, to the more
>
> 'visceral' point-of-view shot compositions and sound design. Because of
>
> its intimate relationship to our real, physical bodies, via the vibrating air,
>
> sound seems more immediate. (2005; 51)

Stillwell effectively asserts the close link between sound and its impact on the

emotional engagement of the viewer, which is useful when establishing perspective.

Little work has been done to date concerning sound in the horror film, even

less with respect to the slasher film. Of the work that has been done, Michel Chion,

in his writing on the acousmêtre and acousmatic sound in <u>The Voice in Cinema,</u>

identifies the significance of sound in creating offscreen space occasionally using

examples from horror films such as <u>The Invisible Man</u> (1933;dir. Whale) to illustrate

his theories. Chion writes, "Acousmatic, specifies an old dictionary, 'is said of a

sound that is heard without its cause or source being seen.' We can never praise

Pierre Schaeffer enough for having unearthed this arcane word in the 1950s." (1982;

18) Chion's writing on acousmatic sound highlights occurrences when the sound is

diegetic in nature, with an unseen original source. Chion's acousmêtre specifically relates to the voice that is heard, but the viewer has not seen its source, with the anticipation of expecting, however, to see the source at any given point in the film. Chion puts his thesis forward in order to stress the significance of sound in cinema, and how it not only informs and enhances its visual counterpart, but also how it can be used, with the sound of the voice providing the major thrust of his examples, to frustrate, heighten, and complicate the experience of viewing a film where sounds do not have an immediate visual source.

There has been some renewed interest in the use of sound in horror, and Chion's work is frequently at the forefront of this discussion. K. J. Donnelly addresses Chion's work on cinematic voice (2009; 103) before breaking off into an argument regarding the integral use of music to the sound design in the Saw films (103-104). Donnelly acknowledges that "Michel Chion points to technological developments in cinema that have had a notable impact on film aesthetics." (104) This sets up his analysis of the Saw films, claiming that the series "demonstrates a situation where film music has an intimately close relationship with the film's overall sound design: where there is a convergence of sound effects, ambient sound and music." (104) This argument contains strong links into the Friday the 13th series as well.

While Chion's writing on the acousmêtre, which is inherently concerned with the voice as per his central thesis, proves a useful tool to understanding sound design in the slasher film, it is the root of the acousmêtre which initiates my analysis: acousmatic sound. However, in order to clearly articulate my analysis of sound, I will be using a very specific variation of the acousmatic sound. Particularly, I will be discussing sounds used to represent something (an action, an event, an object) in

the off screen space of a film. However, as the sound is not visualised, it retains

some ambiguity as to the sound's diegetic reliability. As this deviates slightly from

Chion's interpretation of "acousmatic", I will call this an unverified diegetic sound.

René Clair, writing on the potential of sound to enhance cinema, details a

sequence from <u>Broadway Melody</u> (1929; dir. Beaumont) which articulates my

concept of unverified diegetic sound:

> For instance, we hear the noise of a door being slammed and a car driving
>
> off while we are shown Bessie Love's anguished face watching from a
>
> window the departure which we do not see. This short scene in which the
>
> whole effect is concentrated on the actress's face, and which the silent
>
> cinema would have had to break up in several visual fragments, owes its
>
> excellence to the "unity of place" achieved through sound. In another
>
> scene we see Bessie Love lying thoughtful and sad; we feel that she is on
>
> the verge of tears; but her face disappears in the shadow of a fade-out,
>
> and from the screen, now black, emerges a single sob. (1929; 94)

This chapter will discuss alternating uses of visualized and unverified

diegetic sound as they appear in the death sequences in the <u>Friday the 13</u>[th] films,

with a particular focus on the sound used to indicate the death blow or blows,

contextualizing this within the overall sound design of the sequences. The

visualization of the death sequences has been partially addressed in the previous

chapter, however, the overall visual design analysis that accompanies the

visualized/unverified diegetic sound comparison in this chapter is demonstrated

through an explication of the editing of these sequences. By doing this, I will

demonstrate that not only does the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series utilise varied aesthetic techniques to create death sequences outside of explicit and graphic visual depictions of bodily mutilation, but the combined use of unverified diegetic sound and editing is an effective way of communicating perspective within such sequences.

In his brief handbook on editing theory, Roy Thompson states, "An important element of the edit can be the sound. Sound is not only more immediate than visuals but also more abstract. The very experienced editors have a saying, 'You don't have to see what you hear.'" (1993; 46) This statement effectively stresses the relationship between not only sound and editing, but sound and vision, which the above quote by Clair achieves as well. While visual depictions of bodily mutilation can provide spectacular set pieces for slasher films like <u>Friday the 13th</u>, a wholly different effect can be provided by including the death within the film space without being graphically depicted.

Death sequence editing in the <u>Friday the 13th</u> franchise displays a distinct development from the inception of the series to the present, with shot framing, shot length and number of cuts being a major determining factor in the tone and pace of a sequence. Juxtaposing this with the proposed sound analysis will both create a more detailed analysis of the construction of death sequences in the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, and will demonstrate the interconnectivity of these two aesthetic devices, showing how formal devices, while analysed individually allow us to understand a microcosm of aesthetic design, work together to create emotional and visceral effect. Finally, I will demonstrate how this emotional and visceral effect is created in the service of understanding the dominant perspective of a sequence, leading to an understanding of the overarching perspective of each film, whether it is an individual character,

general victim perspective, general aggressor perspective, or an equally dispersed movement between characters inhabiting different functions of aggressor or victim.

The connection between a moving, changing image and sound design is addressed by Chion in his book Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen. Chion writes:

> Sound and image are not to be confused with the ear and the eye. We find proof of this in filmmakers who infuse their images with what may be called the auditive impulse. What does this mean? Cinema can give us much more than Rimbaudian correspondences ('Black A, white E, red I'); it can create a veritable intersensory reciprocity. Into the image of a film you can inject a sense of the auditory, as Orson Welles or Ridley Scott have. And you can infuse the soundtrack with visuality, as Godard has. (1994; 134) [parenthesis in the original]

He goes on to explicate:

> I have said elsewhere that the ear's temporal resolving power is comparably finer than that of the eye; and film demonstrates this especially clearly in action scenes. While the lazy sphere thinks it sees continuity at twenty-four images per second, the ear demands a much higher rate of sampling. And the eye is soon outdone when the image shows it a very brief motion; as if dazed, the eye is content to notice merely that something is moving, without being able to analyze the phenomenon. In this same time, the ear is able to recognize and to etch

clearly onto the perceptual screen a complex series of auditory

trajectories or verbal phonemes. (134-5)

Although this discussion relates directly to a singular largely indecipherable image

accompanied by a complex sound design that can be seen, for instance, in many of

the boxing sequences in <u>Raging Bull</u> (1980; dir. Scorsese), I would argue that this

same theory can be applied to a sequence where fast, disorienting editing is

accompanied by a series of clearly designed or distinguished sounds. I will also

attribute this argument to a scene where precisely designed sound parameters

accompany a clear image, but with the significant event (in this case, the death blow)

occurring off screen, while the image and sound acutely evoke this unseen

singularity. This connection will be revealed early in my analysis. John Belton

explains another dimension of this argument saying, "Though off-screen diegetic

sound – whether dialogue of sound effects – will, with few exceptions, ultimately be

tied to the seen (or unseen) sources and thus be "explained" or "identified," we

experience that sound *through* what we see on the screen." (1985; 65) [emphasis in

the original] Although Belton, contrary to Chion, argues that image is the

foundational element which the sound design is entirely reliant upon, his statement

can be indicative of a situation where an image of implication juxtaposed with a

sound clearly reflecting an occurrence creates a precise understanding of the unseen

event.

The analysis of the audio design of these sequences is based on obtaining

answers to a series of questions, and developing an understating of the response

cross-section. The foundational question of my analysis is: What do we hear? The

answer of this question then leads to a series of other questions: Is the sound of the

death blow on or off screen? How closely does the sound resemble the action it is

meant to represent? (i.e.- Does it sound like an equivocate sound effect – a sound

constructed to directly resemble its realistic counterpart, or is the death blow

represented by a noticeably artificial sound effect created to elicit a specific response

from the viewer?[1]) Is this death blow accompanied by other sounds? Ambient

noise? Voices? Non-diegetic sounds standing in place of other apparent noises?

Does the sequence have a musical accompaniment? Answering these questions is

the starting point of the sound analysis in this chapter.

The analysis of the editing in the death sequences is dependent on a shorter

series of questions, which are used to quantify editing speed and shot duration.

These questions are: How many shots does the sequence contain? How long does

the sequence last? Does the sequence favour a certain camera positioning, either

specific or general? If so, what? Using the answers to these questions, I will

determine whether the death blows are either on- or off-screen, and further

examining whether editing stands as a visual equivalent of the death blows.

Sound design plays a crucial role in Friday the 13th and the subsequent

instalments in the franchise. Writing of a different franchise, Donnelly states, "Saw

evinces a unified and complex field of music and sound effects. This inspires a

certain sonic (and audiovisual) complexity, while the more self-contained nature of

the soundtrack inspires less in the way of extended passages of synchronization."

(106) Donnelly's argument is strong and convincing, and while Saw demonstrates

---

[1] An example of a noticeably artificial sound effect can be seen in Stanley Kubrick's A Clockwork Orange (1971), as Alex delivers the blow that kills Catlady. Catlady is lying on the ground, and Alex stands over her with a giant sculpture of a phallus poised to strike. Music is loud on the soundtrack, Catlady screams, and Alex thrusts the phallus toward her head. At the moment he strikes her, there is a quickly edited montage of paintings and the sound that is heard is a loud cymbal crash, instead of a sound that would communicate something solid hitting flesh, meat and bone.

this use of sound design in a manner rarely approached in preceding films, elements

of this method appear in Friday the 13th. Donnelly explicates further, "The

convergence of music with ambient sound and sound effects contravenes the film

tradition of solid demarcation between such elements." (107) Friday the 13th does

not use this as fully as Saw, the integration of sound elements still appears within the

composition of the score. Composer Harry Manfredini describes the unusual

methods taken in recording the score: "I was also not a big fan or user of electronic

instruments at the time. I wanted to stay orchestral. So things that you might think

were synthesized were just me making sounds. I spent a lot of time scraping and

hammering on the piano of the poor studio owner, and playing screeching sounds on

an Irish tin whistle." (Bracke; 39) The unconventional sounds serve to blur the lines

between ambient noise, sound effects, and score much in the way Donnelly describes

the use of soundscape in Saw. Observations of this use of sound have appeared more

than once in the short history of the journal Horror Studies. In this journal, James

Wierzbicki has lamented the fact that Hollywood remakes of Japanese horror films

have removed the context for use of specific sounds on the soundtrack leading to a

less cohesive narrative (2010), and Sarah Reichardt has written about the way Dmitri

Tiomkins's score for Mad Love (1935; dir. Freund) brings added layers of narrative

to the film, making it useful not only in terms of emotional resonance but also

contributing to the development of plot and characters. (2011) This is representative

of a renewed interest in the aesthetic use of sound in horror, and the depth of

significance that modern critics attribute to sound in film.

A significant addition to this discussion would be that of the killer's theme

which began in Friday the 13th, and became an iconic trademark of the film,

continuing throughout the series. It is currently recognized as a repeated time delay

voice that sounds like a whisper of "Ch-ch-ch-ch Ha-ha-ha-ha", which signifies the presence of the killer. The original intent and design is discussed by Sean Cunningham: "Harry (Manfredini) is an equipment junkie, and he has something called an echo reverb machine. I don't know what Harry was saying, but it is like guttural sounds, hard sounds. The two words that he used were 'kill' and 'mother.' 'Ki, ki, ki. Ma, ma, ma.'" (Bracke; 39)[2] These words specifically reference the climactic revelation that Mrs. Voorhees feels compelled and possessed by Jason, urging her to kill the counsellors. Although this is not immediately apparent upon hearing it, it is still exemplary of how the score's design is intended to blur the lines between not only sound effects and score, but also inner monologue (or dialogue, even) and score, demonstrating a distinct blend of narrative and emotional resonance and impact.

Friday the 13th, unlike the mainstream American slasher films preceding it features brief but explicit sequences of graphic bodily mutilation to punctuate its death sequences. Although in-shot bodily mutilation was not new[3], key death sequences generally combine sound and editing in a way suggestive of a violent attack. The shower scene in Psycho combines frequent fast cuts with a harsh, dissonant score of high strings, and sounds of the knife swishing through the air, the knife penetrating the skin, the water from the shower falling, the rings of the shower curtain grating on its support bar, and Marion Crane's screams. Both the knife and Marion appear in 2 or 3 shots, the most indicative of violence being a medium shot of her naked torso, with Mother's hand holding the knife stabbing downwards just in

---

[2] Verified by Manfredini in Grove (39).

[3] The death scene of Detective Arbogast in Psycho is one instance. The camera shows Arbogast in medium shot as he stumbles backwards down the stairs, beginning with a nonfatal knife slash at his face, which is multiplied in the 1996 remake of Psycho (dir. Van Sant).

front of her body without touching it. The opening sequence of <u>Halloween</u> as previously discussed culminates in Michael stabbing Judith, which is shot in a single take. However, with the frame largely blocked by the surrounding mask, all that is seen is the flash of the knife, Judith recoiling, and a simultaneous pan right and tilt up to the knife stabbing without Judith in shot, the high, dissonant keyboards accompanying the sequence, and the sounds of Judith screaming and the knife penetrating flesh. After this, the camera simultaneously pans left and tilts down to Judith, bloody, falling to the floor but no body penetration is seen. This tendency of unseen bodily penetration is repeated throughout all the death sequences in <u>Halloween</u> with the exception of the climax as Michael revives after collapsing behind the sofa. He stabs at Laurie, and the knife rips her sleeve and scratches her arm, accompanied by an instrumental sting and the sound of Laurie screaming and her sleeve ripping. <u>The Texas Chain Saw Massacre</u> also combines editing and sound to imply violent body penetration. The seminal sequence of Leatherface placing Pam on a meat hook exemplifies this. This sequence begins from behind the meat hook, large on the right of the frame with Leatherface carrying Pam toward it, beginning in long shot. As he moves into close up, he places her back to the camera and lifts her. All that can be heard is Leatherface's breathing and Pam's screams. The camera cuts to a reverse long shot, as Leatherface lets go of Pam and she apparently catches on the hook. There is no sound of the hook going into flesh. There is a shot of the blood-splattered wall behind Pam, and then a close up of her moaning in shock, mouth open and reaching for the meat hook.

Tom Savini, who was recognized for his work with director George Romero, and particularly for his special make up effects in <u>Dawn of the Dead</u> (1978; dir. Romero) was hired to do special make up effects for <u>Friday the 13th</u>. Savini applied

his skill to create in-shot effects infusing Friday the 13th with an aesthetic similar to Romero's zombie films, but more importantly, connecting Friday the 13th to the aesthetic tradition of much Italian horror, including the giallo film.[4] Suspiria, as an Italian horror film for example, contains a close up of a girl's heart being stabbed. In Deep Red, Professor Giordani is killed after a close up his face being smashed and ground onto a solid desk. These visual interpretations of death and mutilation became a featured element and a spectacular draw from a marketing standpoint. This can be seen in Annie's death in Friday the 13th, as she is backed against the tree by the killer, the score tense, but quiet and subdued. In a medium shot, the killer steps between the camera and Annie, slashes the knife across her throat accompanied by a relevant sound effect and a sudden increase in the volume of the music. As the killer steps away, we see the wound in her throat open and blood stream down her front. Similarly, during Jack's death sequence, we see bodily penetration from two angles. He is laying on the bed smoking, and Ned's blood drips on his forehead from the bunk above him. He wipes the blood off and looks at it and as he begins to sit up, a hand comes from underneath the bed and holds his head down. The image cuts to a close up of Jack in profile, with a hand on his head as the point of an arrowhead stretches the skin underneath, then breaks through the skin, and blood

---

[4] Mikel Koven directly connects Friday the 13th to the narrative tradition of what he calls "the terror tale". Koven includes Friday the 13th along with Halloween and The Burning in a set of examples "in which the killer was *always* the killer and the action was motivated largely by trying to avoid this monster..." (2006; 163) However, he argues that Friday the 13th is amongst the slashers that do not share similarities with the giallo film, unlike Terror Train, My Bloody Valentine, and Prom Night (1980; dir. Lynch). Koven makes this claim based on specific narrative intricacies that are validated through his overarching argument towards generic identification. My argument is that the Friday the 13th series is linked to the giallo tradition by the already demonstrated formal and stylistic similarities, as well as through the overt acknowledgement by the filmmakers (Cunningham particularly) of the influence giallo had on the films.

flows onto his throat and chest. This shot cuts to a high angle shot looking down on him as more blood comes out and the arrow emerges even more. This is shown with high, loud strings on the score at the moment the hand comes from underneath the bed, the rustling of the bedclothes, and Jack gurgling through the blood. Finally, Mrs. Voorhees's death is not only shown in-shot, but also in slow motion. Alice is shown in long shot and slow motion with a machete moving to strike Mrs. Voorhees. There is a cut to Mrs. Voorhees's mouth dropping in surprise, and then a cut to Alice in close up as she swings the machete. There is then a reverse shot as the machete passes through Mrs. Voorhees's neck in slow motion, and the head comes off rotating in the air and blood shoots out of the neck wound. There is the sound of the machete swishing through the air, and the score contains strings holding a tremulous high note. The slow motion and the tremulous note on the score highlight the violent action, while the swish of the machete punctuates the point of mutilation.

While these images become central features of the film, the other deaths use comparatively simple methods of implication in order to convey violence. The deaths of the girl counsellor in the pre-credit sequence, Ned, Brenda, and Bill are not shown at all. Ned is shown dead with his throat slashed in the top bunk where Jack and Marcie are having sex, Brenda's mutilated body is thrown through a window to scare Alice, Bill is shown with multiple arrows piercing his body, going into the wooden door, leaving his body suspended in the air, and the girl counsellor is not shown in death at all, the image freezes and dissolves to white on her screaming face in close up.

The remaining deaths – the boy counsellor, Steve and Marcie – all are shown either just outside the frame or through implied editing and sound. Béla Balázs, writes of "Sound-Explaining Pictures", explaining thus, "The close-up of a listener's

face can explain the sound he hears. We might perhaps not have noticed the significance of some sound or noise if we had not seen its effect in the mirror of a human face." (1985; 119)   The sequences depicting the deaths of Steve and the boy counsellor are exemplary of this statement. The boy counsellor's death is shown through three shots. The eye/camera moves toward him, as he retains eye/contact trying to explain what he was doing. As the boy appears in close up, the eye/camera lunges forward accompanied by a sound effect indicating a knife penetrating flesh and an orchestral sting. The boy doubles over as there is a cut to a long shot of him falling over, holding his stomach and bleeding. The image then cuts back to the eye/camera shot as it begins to pursue the girl counsellor. Steve's death is seen through a single eye/camera shot. The killer shines a flashlight in his face, and Steve walks toward the camera saying "Oh it's you! What are you doing out here?" His voice and the rain are the only sounds heard, but as he moves into close up, like with the boy counsellor, there is an orchestral sting and a knife penetrating flesh sound as he is apparently stabbed just below the frame, and he doubles over as the image cuts to the next sequence.

Marcie's death is more structurally complex. In the bathroom, she hears a sound over by a row of showers. She opens one curtain that she has seen moving, with nothing inside. From inside the shower, Marcie is shown in medium shot as the shadow of a hatchet is seen on the wall behind her, rising into the air. We hear her talking to herself as the score grows in intensity. As she turns around, there is a cut to a slightly high angle medium shot as she looks at the hatchet above her. As the score continues to increase in volume, there is a cut to a low angle shot of the hatchet being raised. There is another cut to the same high angle shot of Marcie, her face contorted into a cry, which we hear, and another cut back to the hatchet as it swings

downward grazing the hanging light, causing it to swing and moving shadows around the wall. In this shot, we hear the clink of the hatchet against the bulb, and then a thud, implying the hatchet striking Marcie over the music's gradual swell climaxing at the impact of the hatchet onto Marcie's head. After this sound there is a cut to Marcie, slumping to the ground dead with a hatchet buried in her face. As I will later demonstrate, this sequence is structured to create a fluid exchange of perspective between the killer and Marcie.

The three categories listed – on-screen mutilation, out of frame mutilation, and unseen death – all utilize sound and editing in different ways to establish perspective. The on-screen mutilation sequences all use sound and editing to highlight victim perspective. After running away from an apparent threat, Annie is finally pinned against a tree, and the fact that the frame holds without editing echoes Annie's immobile position. The slash sound the knife makes against her throat, while strictly an unverified diegetic sound, precedes the opening of the wound in her throat, which initiates a visceral identification with the viewer: although the victim would not see the wound, the viewer imagines the sensation of this mutilation, creating a direct connection with the victim.[5] The deaths of Jack and Mrs. Voorhees utilize sounds of mutilation that have a visual counterpart to attain a similar visceral effect, while editing reflects the unique position in which each character is placed.

---

[5] This is an example in which I would agree with Shaviro's claim that "...in horror films, our primary excitement and involvement is with the victims, not with the monsters or murderers. Our 'identification' or investment is with the very bodies being dismembered, rather than with the agents of their destruction." (1993;60-1) In this instance, the visual depiction of bodily mutilation creates a visceral connection with the viewer. I argue, at the very core of this thesis, an analysis that deviates from Shaviro, which is, simply, that viewer attachment or "identification" depends largely on how each sequence is framed, although I admire Shaviro's aim to defend horror films against negative socio-political criticism, as he later claims (61).

The attack on Jack, in timing and in source, is sudden and unexpected for both the viewer and the character. As he is pinned down, his facial expression communicates shock, and different shots of varying lengths and ranging from long shot to close up echoes Jack's mental panic as he tries to understand what is happening while being violently attacked. By contrast, Mrs. Voorhees's death is shot in slow motion, using shots of roughly the same length, without much variation in positioning: Mrs. Voorhees is positioned the same in each shot of her, as Alice moves toward the stationary camera. This timed steadiness of editing and camera positioning echoes Mrs. Voorhees's expression of shock as she sees the attack coming but is too stunned to do anything about it, communicating her sense of unavoidable impending death. Although the slow motion and protracted shots focusing on the act and gory aftermath of Mrs. Voorhees's decapitation are included for spectacle, they are still aesthetic decisions that contribute to the creation and establishment of perspective in the sequence.

The unseen deaths function in different ways where perspective is concerned. Ned and Bill are both unaware that they are in danger, and the last time the audience sees them alive, Ned is walking by the lake and sees someone by the cabin and begins to walk toward it, while Bill is trying to repair the generator. Brenda, however, is following distant cries for help and walks onto the archery range where the lights turn on suddenly and she is unable to see anything but the lights. Although in Ned's case there is a character that appears far in the distance, and Brenda is following the source of what Chion would deem an acousmêtre, they are both the primary figures of viewer attachment in their respective sequences, and Bill is the only character that is either seen or heard in the last sequence in which he is seen alive. Bill and Brenda's deaths, however, are necessary, post-mortem, to contribute

to Alice's perspective during the climax. Alice discovers Bill's dead body as she is looking for him, and Brenda's body is thrown through the cabin window in order to frighten Alice. This is designed to increase the sense of danger that both Alice and the viewer experience. Ned's body, however, is never discovered by any characters in the film. As Jack and Marcie have sex, they are shown in medium profile. If it were an eye/camera shot, Jack and Marcie would be able to see the character it inhabits, but as they do not interact with the camera, especially in such an intimate moment, it can be read as an omniscient shot. There is no musical score accompanying the sequence, just the sound of the rain and thunder outside the cabin, heavy breathing, and Marcie's high moans. The camera then cranes upward to the bunk above them, where Ned is shown with his throat slashed and bloody in close up, without any changes to the sound of the sequence. No character discovers Ned's body at any point, and his corpse is shown solely for the benefit of the viewer, for both grotesque spectacle as well as to create tension surrounding Jack and Marcie's lack of knowledge of the danger they are in. The absence of music also foregrounds the fact that this sequence lacks character perspective and directly engages the experience of the viewer in the narrative, making this sequence particularly unique within the film. The girl counsellor's death, by contrast to the other unseen death sequences, communicates the perspective of the aggressor. Aside from the firmly situated eye/camera shot with no other shots edited into the sequence once she becomes the focus of the aggressor, the volume of her voice increases based on her proximity to the eye/camera, producing an aural connection to the aggressor as well. The sequence ends with a freeze frame and enlargement of the girl counsellor's face, visually focusing on the fear of the victim as opposed to the bodily mutilation of the victim.

Visually, the sequence preceding the girl counsellor's death is similar to that of the deaths of the boy counsellor and Steve. All of these sequences are shot using the eye/camera. The boy counsellor and Steve are both stabbed below the frame, but it is implied that these are fatal blows. Although Marcie is not seen as the fatal blow is struck, the editing and sound create an understandable rendering of the violent act even before the viewer sees Marcie with the hatchet buried in her face. The compared quotes between Chion and Belton here become important to the reading of these sequences. Though on-screen bodily mutilation is not seen in the case of the boy counsellor and Steve, their faces are shown as it occurs. They both lurch forward as a sound effect and an orchestral sting indicate aurally the bodily penetration. Although, as Belton would claim, the motion of the characters is the visual element to which the sound is tied, creating complete meaning, the sound establishes a more complete sense of the action happening offscreen, and designed to cause a visceral response in the viewer. Chion's argument that the inability to see the source of the sound creates a tension in the viewer, who is predisposed to desire a visualization of what is heard[6], is applicable to the experience of viewing these sequences. Generic expectation allows the viewer to anticipate the forthcoming deaths, a knowledge shared by the killer whose eye/camera is seen as the boy counsellor and Steve are each killed. The visual is not necessary in eye/camera because the perspective of the aggressor is apparent, and this shared knowledge of the event occurring offscreen solidifies the aggressor perspective. The fact that the events are shown in single shots with no edits echoes the steady gaze of the attacker.

---

[6] Chion's argument specifically applies to the acousmêtre, and supports his claim of the importance of the voice in cinema. However, in the case of horror films, death becomes the central generic focus, and the sound of someone being physically penetrated, as the cause of death, achieves an importance close to, if not equal to, that of the voice, due to the spectator's relationship to generic expectation.

The sounds indicating the stabbings solidify our knowledge of the unseen events, even if the viewer experiences tension caused by the desire to see the sources of the sounds. Steve's death, however, is complicated by the sudden cut to the next sequence that occurs after he is stabbed. While his death is anticipated through generic codes (i.e.-eye/camera, dark and rainy night, flashlight limiting the victim's eyesight), the sudden change of scene echoes the surprise Steve experiences as he is being killed, causing a double perspective, beginning with the aggressor up through the moment of the stabbing, and immediately followed by victim perspective created through the shock and visceral impact of the edit. The edit following the boy counsellor's death, which was written about in the last chapter, only briefly changes the visual point of view, while retaining temporal continuity within the sequence. Thus, the boy counsellor's death is not completely removed from the perspective of the aggressor, and the edit merely contributes to the visceral impact, compounded by the sound design without changing character perspective.

Marcie's death is structured differently from those of Steve and the boy counsellor. The sound is altered by three primary elements. Firstly, the music gradually crescendos throughout the sequence, climaxing as the hatchet strikes Marcie in the face, unlike the soft music accompanied by a sharp orchestral sting as Steve and the boy counsellor each are stabbed. Secondly, Marcie sensing her impending death, lets out a high pitched cry before she is killed, and this contributes to the music's gradual swell. Finally, the change of weapon, from knife to hatchet, leads to the sound of a death blow of a different timbre to that of the stabbings of Steve and the boy counsellor. As the hatchet strikes, there is a low heavy thud with a slight crunch and squish, as opposed to the high swish and squish sounds indicating a stabbing. This sequence also contains a larger number of shots of shorter length than

the death sequences of Steve and the boy counsellor. This results in change from the perspective experience of viewing Steve's death. The first thing we see in Marcie's death sequence is the shadow of the hatchet being raised on the wall behind her as she, unaware, is looking into the shower cubicle. Thus, the viewer shares the knowledge of her impending death with the aggressor, in a steady unwavering shot. As Marcie turns around and sees the hatchet above her, the cuts occur more frequently, and the music proportionally increases to hear dread of the occurrence, mingled with her cry. The frequent cuts reflect Marcie's surprise and disorientation, focusing more upon the hatchet, being the instrument of her destruction, than the person controlling it. As such, the sequence begins briefly establishing aggressor perspective and changing quickly to victim perspective, playing out this key sequence from that positioning. These examples demonstrate the recognised potential for aesthetic complexity in the use of sound and editing at the outset of the Friday the 13th series, as well as the use of fluid perspective shifts which would be further developed over the next thirty years.

Creating Victim Perspective

As seen in Chapter 3, the perspective of a victim of violent action is frequently used to create a visceral response from the viewer. Stillwell's statement, linking sound to response and empathy, can be extended to this understanding of victim perspective and its centrality to the reading of slasher films. The analysis of Friday the 13th demonstrates how perspective is created in the earliest entry of the series, and using this, it can be seen how later films develop the perspective of the victim.

Friday the 13th Part 2 only contains one death sequence which is rendered through unverified diegetic sound and editing. Vickie, looking around the main cabin comes into a room where a white sheet is covering something on the bed. As she comes close, the sheet is pulled down, revealing Jason who then sits up and looks at her. Vickie begins to back away, and becomes trapped in a corner. There is a long take of the knife in Jason's hand in sharp focus with Vickie out of focus in the background, and the camera moving with the knife steadily toward Vickie. As the knife and camera stop advancing, a rack focus to Vickie occurs within the same shot, and she appears in a slightly high angle close up, the knife out of focus in the foreground. The music retains a consistent volume during this shot, with discordant strings playing in tremolo throughout, along with the thunder outside and Vickie's breathing and occasional cries of "No". At the end of this shot, there is a cut to a low angle close up of Jason lasting no more than a second, as he stabs downwards. As this is shown there is an orchestral sting which is carried over to the next shot, of Vickie in close up, as the knife swings downwards, below the frame. As it does so, there is a slight ripping sound and a thud that accompanies her cry, indicating the death blow. After this, the tremulous strings continue, and the shot holds for a few seconds longer, as blood begins to appear on her lower lip and her eyes glaze over. This sequence retains Vickie's perspective throughout, with the visual focus on the knife leading up to the stabbing, the swiftness of the two cuts as she is stabbed echoing her surprise, the sound of her voice and the penetration of the knife as she is stabbed punctuating the suspenseful music, and the long hold on the shot as she dies capturing the pain registering on her face.[7]

---

[7] I have excluded the sequence in Part 2 containing the double pinioning of Sandra and Jeff, as every sound used has an onscreen source. The editing between three shots, the spear held aloft, Sandra

Friday the 13th Part III 3-D demonstrates an evolutionary development in death sequence aesthetics through its utilization of editing, piecing together an increased number of shots of shorter length. This can be seen during Chili's death sequence, which also incorporates unverified diegetic sound. After watching Shelly die in the doorway, she runs upstairs to check on the others in the house. Chili finds them dead, and in a single full shot, comes down the winding staircase, moves toward a closed door which is blown open by a gust of wind, backs away from it moving closer to the camera and turns around, and registers an expression of shock in close up as Jason's hand grabs her shoulder. Throughout this shot, the score dominates the soundscape of the entire sequence, in the background Chili can be heard muttering to herself and whimpering. The sound of the wind which blows the door open is heard followed by a scream from Chili just before a loud bang as the door hits the wall, and she squeals as Jason grabs her shoulder. After Chili squeals, there is a brief pause and the image cuts to a close up of a red-hot poker held by Jason as he thrusts it toward the camera (in 3-D), which is still accompanied by the dominant score, and an increasing hiss as the poker moves closer to the camera, signifying distance from the viewer and the heat of the implement. This is an example of an observation made by Bordwell and Thompson: "One characteristic of diegetic sound is the possibility of suggesting the *distance* of its source. Volume is

---

screaming, and the spear emerging from the mattress and hitting the floor, while appearing swift due to the brevity of the second shot, still provides an opportunity to show where all the sounds are coming from. There is nondiegetic music, but aside from that, all that is heard is the moaning of the couple as they have sex, Sandra's scream which is shown in the second shot, the spear ripping through the mattress at the beginning of the third shot, immediately followed by the thud of the spearhead hitting the wooden floor underneath. There is no sound used to render the unseen violent bodily penetration.

one simple way to give an impression of distance. A loud sound tends to seem near; a soft one, more distant." (1985; 194) [emphasis in the original] The image cuts back to the close up of Chili, looking downward and screaming. Chili is thrust backwards slightly when she is stabbed by the poker, as she screams and the hissing grows even louder with the penetration. This cuts to a close up of the poker, held by Jason's hand on the left hand of the frame, running through Chili's midriff at the right of the frame, the red tip emerging from the other side of Chili and smoke coming from the wound, the hissing suddenly louder at the beginning of the shot. The image then cuts back to the close up of Chili looking downward, with smoke rising in front of her face, eventually sinking below the frame. Her scream and the music both fade to a lower volume at the end of the shot. The source of tension in this sequence is the overbearing music, functioning in a way similar to the music in Suspiria. This in combination with the editing of multiple short shots and with the spatial volumization relative to Chili's position within film space, seen and unseen, all indicate Chili's perspective throughout the sequence.

Another relevant sequence in terms of creating the perspective of a victim, or in this case victims, in Friday the 13th Part III 3-D is the end of the climactic confrontation between Chris and Jason. After a surprise attack by Ali, Jason cuts off his arm and hacks at him with a machete. Jason is framed from behind in medium shot, striking below the frame, with each sound of his machete entering Ali's body being entirely unverified diegetic. In a reverse medium shot, Chris, holding a hatchet she picked up off the ground, slowly stands, moving toward Jason with the nondiegetic score playing steadily and rhythmically, creating a slow crescendo, while Jason's hacking continues. There is a cut to the reverse shot of Jason from behind, the camera keeping Jason in medium shot as he stands up and turns to face

the camera, looking at Chris. He pauses, and the shot cuts to a close up of Chris as she swings the hatchet toward the camera. During this shot, she grunts, starting low, increasing in both pitch and volume. This grunt and the music carry over to the next shot, which is positioned over Jason's shoulder, with Chris in medium shot as the hatchet moves toward Jason's head. There is a crunch as Jason's head jolts backward, but the actual point of penetration has not been captured by the camera, and is only implied by the sound.[8] At this point, the strings on the score hit a high sustained wavering note, and as Jason's head swings forward in compensation for the backward motion, there is a cut to him in close up, the hatchet sticking out of his head as he snaps his head upright, pauses and reaches his arms forward. This sequence is notable for alternating between two perspectives at two different points. For the first part of the attack, Chris's perspective is predominant as she approaches Jason. He is unaware of her approach, but as he turns around, the pace of editing quickens, and her grunt increases with volume placing the viewer in his spatial position, the editing indicative of his surprise. The final shot, as he reaches out to Chris, returns the editing pace to longer shot lengths, and doubled with Chris's eye/camera, returns the film to her perspective.

The Final Chapter continues to advance the stylistic tendency of utilising faster-paced editing and unverified diegetic sound in order to simultaneously communicate perspective and to manipulate the cognitive reading of the viewer to create the visualisation of the death sequences and bodily penetration without

---

[8] This functions as an unverified diegetic sound in very much the same way as the first appearance of Marcellus Wallace in Pulp Fiction (1994; dir. Tarantino) can be considered as acousmêtre. Although Marcellus is seen from behind in close up and his voice can be heard, the source of the sound, his moving mouth, is just out of sight. As in Friday the 13th Part III 3-D, though we see Jason react to the blow from the hatchet, and the sound informs the viewer that it has occurred, the actual penetration remains unseen.

explicitly showing it. The first and most concise example of this is in the first death to appear in the film: Axel, the orderly. He is shown in a medium shot watching television in a dark room. He takes a sip of coffee, spills a bit on himself, and leans forward to set the cup on a table in front of him. Nothing can be heard on the soundtrack, until he whispers "Shit" after spilling the coffee. The camera follows his movements in a single shot. As he leans back, Jason's hand grabs his forehead from screen right accompanied by loud, high strings on the nondiegetic score as well as the sound of Axel's struggles and grunts, as the rest of Jason's body moves behind Axel. Once he is in position, the other hand at screen left brings a hacksaw up to Axel's throat. The image is then replaced by a darkly-lit high angle eye/camera shot from Jason; the light and camera focus draw out the shining hacksaw. The music continues as Jason pulls the saw from left to right from this new vantage point, and this is accompanied by a grating and gurgling sound combined. The silhouette of Axel's head prevents the viewer from seeing the details of this first motion of the saw. The film cuts back to the medium shot of Axel, now with the saw in his throat, and blood running from the wound. The grating, gurgling, grunting, and music continue as his head and the saw both turn to the right. This shot soon cuts to a close up of the television in front of Axel, showing a close up of the sexy aerobics instructor, as she looks at the camera. This shot holds for longer than the length of the previous two shots combined, the editing of the three together coinciding with the rhythm of the score. The volume of the diegetic sounds remains consistent. This shot then cuts to the close-up of Axel, his throat mangled and bloody, with Jason's hands on both sides of his head. The shot, less than a second long, ends as Jason twists Axel's head to the right, accompanied by a crunch, gurgle and grunt, leading to a match on action cut to a medium shot from behind Axel, as Jason finishes

twisting his head around 180 degrees, all sounds continuing in tone and volume. This final shot is still less than a second long, but lasts slightly longer than the previous shot. In addition to the consistent volume of the sounds in the sequence and the fast pace of the editing reinforcing the victim's perspective,[9] the match on action cuts between the first stroke of the saw and the twisting of Axel's head and the clarity of the sound effects create a concise conceptual understanding of the specific actions taking place. This allows the viewer not only to understand what is happening without being seen, but the cumulative effect of the editing, cinematography and sounds cognitively creates a clear visual conception of the events, resulting in a design that aims to create a strong visceral response in the viewer.

One significant sequence in Jason Lives! actually shows the bodily penetration that accompanies the sound, but frustrates the viewer's visual connection to the sound through the extremely short shot length showing the mutilation. Cort's death, starting from the moment he sees Jason in the rearview mirror, rapidly cuts a few shots together. The primary sound heard is the rock music playing on the radio as he sings along, and calls occasionally to Nikki, who is now dead. In medium shot, he looks into the rearview mirror, and his expression falls. Jason grabs his hair and pulls his head back. There is a low angle shot behind Cort, with him out of focus in the background, Jason's hand holding a knife as he thrusts it toward Cort moving from the top of the frame to the middle background. This shot, which lasts twelve frames, is accompanied by a whooshing sound of the knife speeding through the air. This is followed by a return to the medium shot of Cort, with Jason's knife

---

[9] This includes the deceptively irrelevant shot of what Axel is watching on the television as the event occurs. This shot further solidifies Axel's perspective.

moving from the left of the frame to the right and entering Cort's temple. This shot, however, is only six frames long, and would only appear on screen for 1/4 of a second, the actual penetration only shown in two of those frames, before cutting to a close up of Jason. There is a crunching sound that accompanies this visual penetration, but due to the brevity of its onscreen exhibition, its visual impact is imperceptible. Instead, the impact of the sequence hinges on the editing cuts and the sound used to indicate the stabbing, which appears to occur at the same time as the cut to the final shot, although it begins simultaneously with its visual counterpart, and drowns out the loud music, making it the focal point of the soundtrack for that moment. Usage of these elements in this way not only contribute to the experiential alignment with Cort's perspective, but also render the visual of penetration subordinate to the manner in which the sound and editing communicate the event.

The attack on Michael in The New Blood is the only sequence which distinctly uses unverified diegetic sound and editing to create perspective in an unusual way. As Jason follows him through the woods, the score is loud with the instruments each creating their own steady pulse. The shots cut between Jason's eye/camera following Michael through the forest, and a low angle shot of Jason pursuing Michael. The sounds alternate between what is being shown onscreen: in Jason's eye/camera the crunching of leaves in time with Michael's footfalls can be heard at a distance, and in the low angle shots of Jason, his footfalls can be heard instead in close proximity along with the jingling of the chains around his neck. These shots and sounds all indicate a close alignment with Jason's perspective. Jason's attack uses a technique that has been used in the previous film, as well as others in the series. Jason, in one shot, throws a tent peg, and there is a swish pan, during which time there is a whooshing sound followed by the sound of the tent peg

entering Michael's back. A moment later the swish pan ends, showing the tent peg lodged in Michael's back. However, in this sequence, Jason is shown to throw the knife in a close up low angle shot of his face, which then cuts to a long shot of Jason out of focus in the background as the tent peg comes toward the camera from the middle background swiftly toward the middle lower frame, moving below the frame. The whooshing sound grows louder based on the distance from the tent peg to the camera. This cuts to a shot in the middle of the swish pan, so the camera is moving at the moment the shot begins. During this swish pan, the crunch is heard as the tent peg enters Michael's back, the loudest sound on the soundtrack, appearing spatially close to the hearer, despite the fact that when the camera stops showing the tent peg in Michael's back, he is in full shot from behind. The sequence then returns the camera and sound in close proximity to Jason. Over the course of these two shots, the visual and the soundtrack indicate Michael's perspective in order to heighten the visceral impact on the viewer by not only aligning them with the victim, but by creating the unexpected and brief shock of changing perspectives, before moving back to the initial perspective alignment.

Friday the 13th (2009), while more frequently showing on-screen mutilation, prioritizes editing in a manner resembling Cort's death sequence in Jason Lives!. Because of this, unverified diegetic sound is only used occasionally, and the most significant aesthetic advance is the continued increase in the number of shots that comprise death sequences. During Donnie's death, the moment of the death blow includes four cuts linking five shots in less than two seconds. One sequence within Friday the 13th (2009) that provides a key distinction from the other films in the franchise is the death of Wade. The sequence cuts between two shot setups: Wade's eye/camera as Jason attacks him, and a tracking shot set up in front and to the left of

Wade following him as he backs away from Jason stopping against a tree. The

percussion heavy score is dominant on the soundtrack, Wade's voice, just

underneath it, yelling and telling Jason to stop. There are three cuts between these

shots, and the final shot, consisting of a darkly lit close up of Jason swinging his

machete toward the camera, coincides with the final note and beat on the score.

Immediately after the final note and beat, there is a swish sound of the machete

cutting through the air, a metallic grind immediately followed by a splattering sound

which precedes the image dissolving to black. All of these noises are very loud on

the soundtrack, and after this, the only remaining sound is the resonance of the final

note of the score. This sequence demonstrates not only the use of unverified diegetic

sound, but the sound creating the moment of climax for which all other sounds cease.

Additionally, this sound, preceding the fading resonance of the score and the

dissolve to black all indicate the victim's perspective, recreating the experiential

positioning of someone who hears the sound of their death blow before slipping into

unconsciousness. With the evolution of genre aesthetics, <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u>

becomes exemplary of the increased sophistication of the use of sound and editing to

align perspective with a victim.

Aggressor Perspective

The technique of rapid editing already mentioned in the earlier analysis of

<u>The Final Chapter</u>, as it appears in death sequences in the rest of the film, contains

shots of a weapon entering the body, maximizing the visceral impact of the

sequences. The remainder of the sequences utilizing unverified diegetic sound for

death blows, contain fewer shots of longer length, indicating aggressor perspective,

and is a useful point of introduction for the analysis of the use of sound and editing in death sequences to indicate the perspective of an aggressor.

The shots leading up to and including Samantha's death are comparatively long, with a steady, deliberate editing pace. After her perspective is initially established through Samantha's eye/camera shot approaching the raft, the image cuts to an extreme long shot of her climbing into the raft and lying down on her stomach. The score plays quiet, suspenseful music, and the sounds of her body against the water as she swims and leaps into the raft are very hushed and distant. The shot holds long enough for her to settle into the raft, squirming to get comfortable and gradually relaxing. With the shot still holding, the sound of a twig snapping and leaves rustling is heard slightly louder than her own movements, and she calls, "Paul! I know you're out there!" Despite projecting her voice for Paul's benefit, her voice sounds far away from the spectator. The shot then cuts to a close up of her looking out over the lake, the music still soft, but she then calls for Paul again, this time, her voice louder and clearer. After a long pause, she splashes the water with her hand and says "Screw you, Paul." This statement along with the splash retains the volume of her previous line in the shot. She settles back onto the raft, and after a few moments, the sudden sound of movement in the water along with a sting from the score accompany a sudden cut to a full shot of Jason leaping out of the water beside Samantha in the raft and placing his hand on her back. At the moment he touches her, she screams, with the music on the score loud and tense, and there is a cut to a medium shot of Samantha, her head lying screen left, Jason's hand on her shoulder in the middle of the frame. The music and her scream are sustained, but there is a ripping and a wet slicing sound, just before a spearhead emerges from Samantha's lower back at the right of the frame. This shot remains steady, and holds

for about four seconds, before cutting to a close up of Samantha from the front, shaking and jerking in response to the action. Her scream retains the same volume, but the volume of the score increases with this shot. The length of the shots along with the deliberate pacing of the editing, combined with an increase in the volume of sounds based on visual proximity to Samantha echoes Jason's positioning. Although his exact location is ambiguous until his appearance, visually and aurally the viewer is provided information reflecting a stalker and aggressor's perspective through watching steadily, and the sounds she makes increasing based on proximity to the victim.

Another significant sequence is the mock eye/camera shot depicting Tina's death, mentioned in the previous chapter. The sequence is captured with this one shot, so editing is not used to communicate the mutilation, instead the sounds of the sequence work together with the mock eye/camera to establish atmosphere and mood, as well as to communicate the events and perspective. There is a soft dissonant chord produced by the violins on the score, sustained and wavering slightly. The sound of rain on the ground punctuated by the sound of thunder creates the ambience of the sequence. As Jason's shadow can be seen stabbing Tina with a spear, there is a crack of thunder to accompany the lightning that reveals the event. Also, there is a loud orchestral sting as well as a loud, wet crunch to indicate the body penetration. This is immediately followed by Tina's scream, which is comparatively quieter from the penetration sound effect, placing importance on the mutilation as opposed to her reaction. In relation to Jason, this would be spatially accurate, though perhaps not to the extent presented. Once this has occurred, the shot does not cut away immediately, but continues to push in to the window of the cabin for a few more moments. The relationship of the sounds to the two characters

in this sequence, as well as the continuation of visual mobility after Tina is killed all indicate, in spite of presenting a mock eye/camera shot, the sequence presented from Jason's perspective.

While other sequences in <u>The Final Chapter</u> also utilize unverified diegetic sound and editing to communicate death and mutilation, their design largely replicates these sequences as well as others in previous films.[10] These sequences, while retaining some similarities to design presented in earlier films, demonstrate a significant development in the advancement in the usage of editing and unverified diegetic sound, an evolution which continues throughout the series.

<u>Perspective Shifts Within a Sequence, Omniscience, and Witnesses</u>

Instances of perspective shifts have already been discussed, particularly with the deaths of the boy counsellor in <u>Friday the 13th</u> and Michael in <u>The New Blood</u>. The incorporation of the whole aesthetic design in terms of cinematography, sound and editing in order to create shifts in perspective demonstrates an intensified form of aesthetic intricacy and complexity, and has developed over the course of the series. However, as the series progressed, sequences involving omniscient third person and diegetic third person witnesses to events were also incorporated, both as intricate to fluid perspective shifts within sequences as well as isolated instances of third person viewing.

The most unique usage of unverified diegetic sound and editing in a death sequence in <u>Jason Lives!</u> is that involving Paula. In the lead up to her actual death, she is shown in medium shots and close up shots as she moves around her cabin

---

[10] For example, Sara's death is aesthetically executed in a similar way to the final sequence discussed in <u>Friday the 13th Part III 3-D</u>.

toward open windows and doors, bracing herself for something or someone to scare her. The viewer is led to share this suspense, and the low, steady music from the score helps facilitate this. The editing is steadily measured in pace with her deliberate steps through the cabin. When she sees nothing at the window, she moves to the door, which suddenly slams shut, which is accompanied by a loud sound effect and an unexpected swift series of edits. She relaxes as she realizes the wind blew the door shut, but as she reaches to open it, Jason appears just outside, steps in and slams the door as she screams. The score begins to combine loud, pulsating low notes with fast, sharp high notes. At the moment the door slams however, the image cuts to a full shot of the cabin door from the outside, the score decreasing in volume, and Paula's screams slightly muffled by the separation between her and the spectator by the cabin wall. There are sounds of nondescript items being thrown and torn, as well as glass breaking. There is then a cut to an extreme long shot of the cabin from the outside, and all the sounds that appear in the previous shot decrease in volume. This shot holds for four seconds before cutting to a close up of one of the cabin windows from the outside. The sounds raise slightly in volume, and there is a sudden loud splattering sound that accompanies a splash of blood that sprays on the window, before the shot cuts to the next sequence. Every one of these shots is steady and tripod mounted, and in the case of the doorway and the window, geometrically symmetrical, aside from shifts in lighting. This distancing position, both in terms of camera positioning and sound positioning as well as the length of the shots all indicate a rare occurrence of an omniscient perspective used during a death sequence.

While an omniscient perspective, in this case, shares certain points of contact with the perspective of an aggressor, they are distinct perspectives that are important

to differentiate. In both cases the editing generally involves longer takes and fewer

cuts, and the sound is generally more subdued and consistent. The key difference

between omniscience and the perspective of an aggressor is the distance from the

action both in terms of visual and aural space. If the visual and aural space retains

close proximity to the killing taking place, then it can be identified as the aggressor's

perspective, but if the action is removed from the spectator, either in terms of

distance, as is the case of the previous example, or in terms of actual separation in

the following example, it can be interpreted as an omniscient perspective. The

differentiation is subtle, but important to the reading of the aesthetic creation of

perspective. Clarifying the distinction between the two is also significant to

understand the affect of each film. The use of omniscience, and removing the viewer

from the action, creates a frustration in terms of expectation. With the slasher

traditionally engaging the viewer in the events on screen, as is done by the use of a

stolid aggressor in these films, omniscience deliberately removes the viewer from the

primary action of the sequence, creating a tension between providing sufficient

information and lack of complete emotional engagement.

  While Jason Takes Manhattan favours the visual depiction of mutilation as

opposed to creating it through implication, two sequences stand out as adapting

death sequences shown in previous films in a more economical manner, and relying

heavily on unverified diegetic sound over editing to communicate perspective. The

death of Tamara occurs during a single take, despite being preceded by several shots

cutting between her in medium shot cowering in the shower and Jason walking up on

her from full shot to close up. The nondiegetic score plays steadily at a moderate

volume, while her screams and cries overwhelm it slightly on the soundtrack. Once

Jason walks into a slightly low angle three quarter close up shot, he raises a sharp

shard of broken mirror above his head, and in a single take, plunges it from the top right of the frame to the bottom left and then below the frame. There is a slashing sound to indicate the penetration, followed by a louder scream from Tamara. The image cuts after the slashing sound to coincide with her final scream to a shot of the boat's horn, sounding, blending in with her scream and drowning out the score. The shot lasts four seconds, making Jason the primary focal point of the death sequence without tying the visual element directly to Tamara. Through this, the perspective of that moment is ambiguously placed between Jason's and an omniscient positioning. Following this is the death of Mr. Carlson, the first mate on the ship. In a single shot, the camera is positioned outside the bridge, looking into the front windows. The rain and thunder are the only things heard on the score. The camera pushes in slowly, keeping Mr. Carlson in the right of the frame. Jason comes up the stairs on the left of the frame, the score playing the hushed "Ch-ch" theme indicating his presence. He then uses a harpoon to stab Mr. Carlson in the back, an event obscured by a structural separation between two of the windows as well as the rain dripping down the glass, and accompanied by a crunching sound, as a sustained orchestral sting coincides with the death. The rain and thunder still dominate the soundtrack, and the viewer is consistently separated from the event by the windows. This is designed to create a distancing effect from the event, providing another instance of omniscient perspective.

Despite its extensive use of unverified diegetic sound and editing for death sequences, Jason Goes to Hell largely recycles the structural elements of sequences from the previous films in the franchise. One exception is the death of Officer Ryan, which adapts the technique used in the death of Mr. Carlson. At the left of the frame, Sheriff Landis is talking on the telephone in close up. It is shot in deep focus,

and clearly shown in the background at the right of the frame, through the window of Sheriff Landis's office, Officer Ryan can be seen trying to comfort Jessica. The focus of the soundtrack is on Sheriff Landis's voice, saying "You find her and you find her quick! Yeah, well I will hear from you." The fast, steady dissonant music of the score plays softly below it, and muffled in the background the voices of Jessica and Officer Ryan can be heard yelling and screaming as Robert, now possessed by Jason, grabs Jessica with one arm and struggles with Officer Ryan using the other. Robert takes Officer Ryan's head in one hand and pushes her toward a metal locker. There is a hollow metallic thud which links the cut between this shot and the following one, with Robert covering Jessica's mouth in close up at the left of the frame, and Officer Ryan behind Robert at the centre of the frame, her back to the camera and her face against a locker, splattered with blood before falling to the ground. The metallic thud increases in volume once the shot changes from Landis's office to the room behind, and the second shot also introduces a splattering squishing sound to indicate her face being crushed and the blood splattering. The first shot, while in close proximity to Sheriff Landis, depicts an event he does not see, using the deep focus lens, guiding the viewer to a direct awareness of the occurrence. This is indicative of omniscience, but the second shot is closely aligned with Jessica's proximity to the action, placing perspective with a witness of an event rather than with a victim or an aggressor. In this way, the perspective of the sequence is not fully attached to the violent act, but moves closer in proximity on the basis of sound and character alignment.

In the same vein as Jason Takes Manhattan, Jason X favours the explicit depiction of violent bodily penetration and off screen deaths to aesthetic implication. Of the death sequences that do utilise editing and unverified diegetic sound, none

demonstrate an advance in depiction and aesthetic technique, aside from the general tendency to use a faster pace of editing. For example, during Janessa's death sequence, lasting approximately two and a half seconds, there are a total of five shots cut together. The only significant difference in depiction is through off screen deaths, which have an auditory resonance in the location visually depicted. One such sequence, when Jason approaches Condor and draws back his machete before the shot cuts to the other characters listening to the communication of the security team on a loudspeaker, ends with the sound of Condor's scream through the speaker with no sound effect indicating bodily mutilation. This technique, however, can be traced at least as far back as the sequence depicting the death of Dallas in <u>Alien</u> (1979; dir. Scott), where in one shot he shines the flashlight on the Alien that reaches for him, before the shot cuts to the crew listening to the hiss of white noise from the broken communication link between them. This connection between <u>Jason X</u> and <u>Alien</u> is understandable considering the narrative similarities (an outside threat, introduced by scientific and economic profiteers, terrorises a crew on board an expansive space ship, for example) between the two films.

  <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u> uses unverified diegetic sound and editing more frequently than <u>Jason X</u> for death sequences, balancing this method with on screen mutilation and off screen death. There is also a notable decrease in the length of shots, resulting in a higher number of shots per second in these death sequences. The death of the skinny-dipping girl at the beginning of the film, for instance, contains eight shots over the course of three seconds, an increase from the five shots in two and a half seconds for Janessa's death in <u>Jason X</u>. This increase in the pace of editing for these sequences continues to replicate the visceral shock and surprise of either the victim or a victimised witness, such as the death of Officer Ryan in <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u>.

This sequence contains a cut between two shots which attaches perspective to Jessica who is also being attacked by Robert.

The death of Linderman not only uses the perspective of a victimised witness, in this case, Kia, but also withholds the unverified diegetic sound of penetration to make both Linderman's death and the source of Linderman's death a surprise to both her and the viewer. Linderman, attacking Jason with a flagpole to no avail, keeps stabbing him. The score is playing intense, fast paced music, just below the volume of the crackling flames surrounding them which is burning down the cabin in which they are struggling. Below the score, Linderman's screams of attack can be heard, and above all the other sounds, the wet crunch of Linderman repeatedly stabbing Jason predominates. During this confrontation, Kia is shown in a low canted angle sitting on the floor, watching them. This cuts to a high angle shot over Jason's right shoulder of Linderman in full shot still attacking and stabbing Jason with the flagpole with no changes in sound design to this point. Jason then grabs the flagpole, pulls Linderman towards him, at which point the image cuts to a continuation of this action from a low canted angle in medium shot, showing Jason over Linderman's left shoulder. Jason then grabs Linderman and throws him to the right of the frame, at which point the image cuts to a medium shot of Linderman being thrown toward the wall behind him. The film cuts to a shot of Linderman flying swiftly through the air from the right of the frame in medium shot into the wall at a farther distance from the camera at the left of the frame, placing Linderman in long shot. As he hits the wall, there is a thud indicating his body simply hitting the wall, with no bodily mutilation implied by the sound. This cuts to a close up of Linderman's stomach as he bounces off the wall, but in his movement toward the camera and down below the frame, a squishing sound can be heard. As Linderman

disappears below the frame, a jagged metal wall fixture dripping with blood can be seen where Linderman was. The camera pushes in to show this in extreme close up, before cutting to a long shot of Linderman falling on the floor from the left of the frame to the right of the frame, before cutting back to the blood dripping off the fixture. This sequence of eight shots lasts nine seconds, with the length of the shots gradually decreasing toward the climax of the sequence. This fast editing, again, recreates the shock of a victimized character in the sequence, but the low angle shot of Kia, indicates a perspective alignment with her, as opposed to Linderman or Jason. In this way, the sequence depicts Kia's surprise at witnessing the death of Linderman, and by reserving the sound indicating bodily mutilation until the point where the metal fixture leaves Linderman's body as opposed to presenting it when the fixture enters the body, the film is designed to instil the viewer with the same surprise. Through these examples, Freddy vs. Jason represents a simultaneous culmination and innovative development of the Friday the 13th franchise's sound and editing aesthetic relative to a third person perspective. In this way, the death sequences not only shock in terms of visceral impact, but also unsettle the viewer by creating no basis for expectation, thereby resulting in a tension created through consistent unanticipated perspective placement.

Series Development and The Case of *A New Beginning*

At this point, I would like to turn my focus onto A New Beginning, a film with a particularly sophisticated aesthetic palette, in order to consider the relationship between unverified diegetic sound and editing and their use in the rendering of perspective. A New Beginning uses both of these elements, working in conjunction, within the majority of its death sequences. This differs in part from the

previous films in the franchise which attempt a balance between this approach, explicitly visualised penetration and off screen deaths. Although production documents[11] indicate that the film was originally designed with more explicit depictions of bodily mutilation, the final product, which has never been released in an 'Uncut' or 'Director's Cut' format, displays this balance of approaches. This film, however, incorporates into this method shorter shot lengths, more densely layered soundtracks, and an increased use of eye/camera and off-model eye/camera positioning, as well as distinctive approaches to camera movement.

A New Beginning proves an illustrative example of how not only unverified diegetic sound and editing work together to establish perspective, but how these elements along with the eye/camera can do this in an effective and innovative manner. As mentioned in Chapter 3, three deaths occur during an eye/camera or off-model eye/camera shot. Tina's off-model eye/camera shot shows garden shears plunging toward the camera disappearing out of the top of the frame, ending with a sound to indicate bodily mutilation. After this sound there is a cut to a high angle shot of the garden shears moving out of frame, with her lying on the ground, eyes missing from their bloody sockets. Junior's eye/camera is shown as he rides his motorbike around the yard, the loud buzz of the engine, and his screaming dominating the soundtrack, until a butcher knife swings from behind a tree from the right of the frame, disappearing below the frame. The appearance of the knife is

---

[11] A letter to the production team from the Motion Picture Association of America dated 8 February 1985, containing the results of an initial screening of an early cut list sixteen requested cuts, nine of which are highlighted because they would lead to an 'X' rating. Bracke writes that "The film would ultimately require nine trips to the board before it would be granted an R rating." (MPAA letter and quote, 134) I should point out that in the USA most mainstream cinemas will only screen films with an 'R' rating or less, therefore an 'X' rating would result in less exhibition and a lower box office take.

accompanied by a swish sound of the knife cutting through the air, and a wet crunch the moment it disappears below frame. This is followed by a cut to a shot of the motorbike's wheels moving from right to left, the sound of the engine following its onscreen position and Junior's head dropping from the top of the frame, with a crunching sound as his head hits the leaves. The most elaborately structured of these is Ethel's death, which starts with a close up of her face, which cuts to her eye/camera which shows the shattering of the window in front of her by a quickly moving blurred arm. There is a loud orchestral sting accompanying the sound of the glass shattering, and there is a cut to the knife's point of view, demonstrated by the previous close up shot, Ethel looking at the camera, which snap zooms into an extreme close up of her eyes as they widen, accompanied by her gasp. This shot lasts only a moment before cutting back to her eye/camera which shows the butcher knife stopping just above the frame accompanied by a wet crunching sound, and blood flowing and dripping from the top of the frame all the way to the bottom. This then cuts to a shot of her hand spasmodically squeezing a tomato, which is also indicated by a squishing sound. This is followed by a return to her eye/camera as the butcher knife is withdrawn with a similar sound to that of its penetrating her head, and then a cut to her head falling into the pot of stew from the upper left of the frame into the middle of the frame with a splash. All of these sequences involve camera positioning and sound to indicate victim perspective, Ethel's incorporating editing as well, but uniquely also includes an omniscient visual epilogue. The medium shot of Tina's mangled face as Roy walks away, the full shot of Junior's head dropping after his decapitation, and the close up just behind Ethel's right shoulder as her mostly obscured face falls into the stew all are framed indifferently to the onscreen characters, and in the cases of Tina and Ethel, appear after the killer has moved on, a

style which is replicated later in the series, but largely unused to this point. By using concentrated forms of perspective in establishment in all quarters of the film's aesthetic, A New Beginning not only stands out as unique within the series, but also, in some ways, becomes a template for future instalments.

Pete's death uses a snap zoom as an alternative to editing to indicate his perspective. He is seen in profile facing left trying to start the car, and once the engine starts, as indicated by the soundtrack, a hand reaches between him and the viewer, grabs his forehead, pulls it back and places a knife in front of his throat. This cuts to a medium shot of Pete from the front, the knife in position, and as the arm begins to drag the knife across his throat, there is a snap zoom[12] to an extreme close up of his eyes, occurring while the score plays a sustained high note, and there is a slicing and squirting sound heard. Although the precise event has been foreshadowed by the score and the visual appearance of the knife placed at his throat, the actual mutilation remains unseen, the sound acting in lieu of the visual. There is then a cut back to the profile shot of Pete, as the knife moves away from his now bloody throat and the hand lets go of his forehead. Despite the steady pace of the editing of this sequence, the snap zoom is an unexpected visual occurrence that moves contrary to the steady pace of the editing. This is designed to create a shock in the spectator which reflects Pete's surprise at this sudden attack, in addition to the MPAA requirements for removing graphic bodily mutilation, as the zoom masks the graphic violence.

---

[12] This shot is technically not a snap zoom, but an image freeze and frame enlargement created to resemble a snap zoom, much like the closing shot of The 400 Blows (Les Quatre Cents Coups) (1959; dir. Truffaut). However, the enlargement begins at the moment the frame freezes in order to cover the fact that it is a freeze frame, giving the sensation of consistent motion. As this is done to create the illusion of a snap zoom, I will refer to it as such.

Robin's death sequence contains a form of surrogate visual penetration which immediately precedes her own bodily penetration, and further solidifying the viewer's cognitive visual conception of the incident. In terms of perspective, the film aligns with Robin through the use of close ups on her and the erratic editing pace of shots of varied lengths. Significantly, the shot preceding the death blow is a medium shot of underneath her mattress. She is lying on the top of a set of bunk beds, and a hand moving from the left of the frame, holding a machete upright, places the tip of the machete against the bottom of the mattress. The hand then pushes up as the machete cuts through the fabric accompanied by the sound of cloth ripping and the singing of the metal grating against something solid. This is followed by a cut to a medium shot of Robin, laying on her back, her head at the left of the frame, her midriff at the right, and a wet slicing sound is heard as she screams, before the machete eventually emerges from her chest. Although the source of the wet slice is seen through the exit wound, the point of entry remains unseen. However, the previous shot of the machete tearing through the mattress enhances the implied visual that is completed through the exit wound that is created, the mattress acting as surrogate for her back being penetrated by the weapon. This uniquely differs from the death of Jack in Friday the 13th, as the emergence of the arrow from his throat is a surprise to the viewer as the entry point is neither seen nor implied beforehand, and the double pinioning of Jeff and Sandra, which shows the spear emerging from the mattress, without showing their bodies upon entry or exit of the weapon.

Jason Lives! retains A New Beginning's tendency to favour the depiction of death sequences through unverified diegetic sound and editing, and is shot with eye/camera and off-model eye/camera shots. This occurs in Lizabeth's death

sequence as well as in the triple beheading of the paintballers Stan, Katie and Larry. Lizabeth's death sequence is similarly designed to Tina's death in <u>The Final Chapter</u>, and the sequence involving Stan, Katie and Larry is similar to Jake's death sequence in <u>A New Beginning</u>. There is no utilisation of the snap zoom as in the previous film.

Following the aesthetic shift discussed in Chapter 3 with <u>Jason Lives!</u>, the three succeeding films do little to advance the structure of death sequences using unverified diegetic sound and editing, although they each use this method to varying degrees. While <u>The New Blood</u> balances this method equally with on screen mutilation and off screen deaths, <u>Jason Takes Manhattan</u> uses it sparingly, favouring physical special effects to show bodily penetration on screen. <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u> primarily uses unverified diegetic sound and editing to convey the death sequences in the film.

This, along with the other films in the franchise demonstrates the gradual development of unverified diegetic sound and editing and their use in death sequences. Although they are occasionally used to align perspective with the aggressor, the evolutionary element of faster editing during these sequences, and the increased prioritization of unverified diegetic sounds to create the death blow, point toward a tendency to favour victim positioning and the visceral impact experiencing these sequences through a victim provides. Even the later films that begin to align perspective with a victim witness still places the viewer in a vulnerable position, which uses a different method to facilitate this visceral impact. Ultimately, this places the viewer in a precarious position of alternating sensations of power, vulnerability, and frustrated distancing, resulting in the complication of generic expectation in order to facilitate shock and surprise.

While this chapter has placed focus upon the death sequences of these films, it should be noted that these films do not solely rely upon the graphic display of bodily mutilation. The foundation of Dika's analysis of the genre is the assertion that these films are constructed around the process of stalking, which is why she has changed the categorical description to "stalker" for her purposes (13-14). However, the death sequences are spectacular set pieces that, by their extreme nature, attract focus and attention, even if they only consist of a fraction of a film's run time, and are consistent narrative elements present in all of the films in the series. As these sequences are designed to draw focus, an analysis of their aesthetics is important to understand the way these films attract and engage the viewer. In terms of unverified diegetic sound and editing, these sequences demonstrate a more complex aesthetic construction of horror which is designed to generate a range of emotional responses. The consistent development of this method to depict death sequences and its integral evolution to the overall aesthetic of these films reveals that sound and editing are significant elements to creating emotional affect within these films, and that they are useful tools for creating perspective. However, the perspective created in a film is only one part of the viewing experience of a film. The perspective of the viewer and how it influences the overall affect of the film is also an important subject for the understanding of the aesthetics of the Friday the 13th films.

Chapter 5: Viewer Perspective, Serialisation and Nostalgia Aesthetics

A dedicated viewer of slasher films, particularly those in a franchise, can potentially forget the importance of removing each film from its context to understand how it functions as an individual film. Although the narratives are largely developed as part of a serial continuum, each film is created as an individual film text, with its own aesthetic design and selective attachment to the other films in the series. A film with a title such as <u>Halloween 5: The Revenge of Michael Myers</u>, does firmly situate itself within a serial continuity while <u>Halloween: Resurrection</u> (2002; dir. Rosenthal) removes this precise narrative positioning in favour of evoking elements of previous films and narrative expectation.

It is also important to assert the significance that individual viewer experience and perspective before viewing a film has upon a reading of the narrative and aesthetics of a film, particularly a sequel or remake within a larger franchise. The simplest way to demonstrate this is to describe the opening sequences of the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, in as much as they are designed to initiate a singular story within a larger framework, from the perspective of two groups of viewers. First, there is what I will call the franchise viewer: the person who has seen at least enough of the preceding films in the series in order to have a contextual grounding for the characters and narrative of the overarching storyline. These are the viewers Anant Zanger writes of, saying, "The act of repetition is performed by both the sender (the cinematic institution) and by the receiver (the audience) – who is ready to consume the same or a similar product again and again – and it is anchored in the selection of the texts being repeated." (2006; 15) Secondly, I will address these

sequences from the perspective of the new viewer: the viewer who is screening the individual instalment as his or her introduction to the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series. While there are greater and subtler divisions of viewers, these are two polarities that can most clearly elucidate the significance of individual perspective on viewing a film within the franchise. This approach will be used in order to demonstrate how the films aesthetically dictate and define the perspective of the viewer in relation to the film text, how this affects understanding of the individual film narratives, and to pinpoint the evolving devices used to inform this viewer/text relationship.

Jason Mittell writes of the ways in which serialised television narratives play with memory when relating information from previous narrative strands. Mittell argues that "complex serials strategically trigger, confound, and play with viewers' memories, considering how television storytelling strategies fit with our understanding of the cognitive mechanics of memory..." (2009; n.p.) Following this, Mittell, as I intend to do here, identifies different ways in which series address and adjust elements of the overarching narrative in order to make a connection for individual instalments. In his conclusion, he justifies his method: "The significance of this poetic catalog of techniques is to highlight the importance of underlying cognitive processes in the seemingly simple act of narrative comprehension."

The main focus of this chapter is to show the relationship between different kinds of viewers and the narratives of the films placed within the context of serialisation, and how this is facilitated aesthetically, however, it should be noted that such texts are rarely experienced in a cultural vacuum. Familiarity with the slasher sub-genre, particularly beginning in the mid-1980s, based on the financial success of the films as well as merchandising relating to the franchise, was widespread. Ian Conrich has addressed these elements of marketing in his writing on

A Nightmare on Elm Street (2000)[1] and Friday the 13th (2010).[2] The iconographic

elements of the key franchises were placed within mainstream consciousness, and

the age range of consumers in the genre was wide at this point.[3] According to Rick

Altman, "To accept the premises of a genre is to agree to play within a special set of

rules, and thus participate in a community precisely *not* coterminous with society at

large. Choosing to view a film of a particular genre involves more than just an

agreement to purchase, consume and construe in a particular manner." (1999; 158)

[emphasis in the original] This highlights the unique role that the viewer of a genre

film inhabits and expands upon the writing of Grant, Neale, and Buscombe discussed

on page 58 of this thesis, wherein these theorists all assert that expectation, repetition

and novelty are central to the experience of viewing genre.[4] The pleasures of generic

repetition are a major focus of Steve Neale's writing, and he succinctly summarises

the desire for repetition thusly: "It is founded in the difference between on the one

hand the initial experience and of pleasure, the mark established by that experience

and which functions as its signifier(s), and on the other, future attempts to repeat the

experience, future repetitions of the signifier(s)" (1980; 48). The "signifiers"

discussed by Neale not only refer to elements of narrative and iconography, but also

to film form; the previous chapters demonstrate how the aesthetics of the series rely

upon both repetition and innovation in order to create a developmental continuum,

---

[1] "Spin-offs from the Nightmare films were the number one selling merchandise of 1987..." (232)

[2] "The iconic status of Jason led to Friday the 13th related merchandise which began in the mid 1980s with poster images of the hockey-masked killer." (183)

[3] Conrich (2000) writes of the fact that a large amount of the marketing materials centering on A Nightmare on Elm Street were aimed at children, and some mainstream horror films were marketed toward families, with ratings from the MPAA suitable for children, at the discretion of parents, such as Poltergeist (dir. Hooper; 1982)

[4] See Cherry 2009, pp. 19-36 for a comprehensive summary and analysis of genre theory as applied to the slasher.

steeped within genre theory. However, this can also be applied to the pleasures and appeal of film sequels, and can be easily transposed, as the link between repetition in genre films is in increased effect when considered between films within the same franchise. Within this same piece, Neale writes at length on narrative elements of the genres, and is thorough in his overview of the horror film (20-25). However, it should be noted that, though the veneer of narrative continuity may prove thin, particularly after repeated attempts at sequelisation following a film text that was created with little forethought as to the specifics of the narrative of succeeding films, there is a specific narrative continuity between films, and it is this continuity which I intend to explore within this chapter.

"While Classic Hollywood had relegated outright sequels to the B-movie ranks..." writes Robert B. Ray, "the New Hollywood appeared far less flexible, depending to an extraordinary extent on 'continuations' of successful films. Thus, between 1967 and 1977, nearly one-third of the 220 leading money-makers were either sequels themselves or films that prompted sequels..." (1985; 262) Although Friday the 13th appears after this period Ray denotes as the advent of "New Hollywood", it remains the origin of a franchise that continued to regenerate itself in order to increase capital, and to develop an established property more likely to attract viewers.

Paul Budra makes a presumptuous statement explicating this tendency: "Though financial argument obviously justified the first sequels to Halloween, A Nightmare on Elm Street, The Howling, and even Friday the 13th, by the time these films reached their seventh instalments many film-goers were simply baffled at their

persistence. And we must remember that only a handful of horror films have ever been big office draws." (1998; 190)[5]

By contrast, there are critics that have noted that sequelisation can itself be a question of generic tendency. Sheldon Hall writes, "One can even argue that the sequel, once more common among Poverty Row 'programmers' than major-studio A-movies, has itself become definable as a genre in its own right. Repeatable story formulae are certainly a mainstay of blockbuster production with their guaranteed pre-selling of a 'high concept'." (Hall; 2002; 23) Similarly, Andrew Tudor asserts that sequelisation can viewed as a generic trope of horror:

> While it is true that the horror movie has always worked with clearly marked cycles (consider, most obviously, the Frankenstein, Dracula, werewolf and mummy cycles which have recurred throughout the genre's history), the recent reliance on rapid sequences of sequels which, in their marketing, are offered as precisely that, does appear to be a genuinely distinctive feature of 1980s and 1990s horror. It is as if the concept of a

---

[5] Budra provides no research to support his first point of audiences being baffled by later franchise films, and I have been unable to find any concrete evidence of this. Box office receipts, both net and gross, can be found in the appendix of Bracke's Crystal Lake Memories: The Complete History of Friday the 13th, which demonstrates a cycle of alternating incline and decline of profits, as opposed to a steady decline. In fairness to Budra, however, this was written in 1998, which, at least with regards to Friday the 13th, marks a point of low interest based on box office, between the releases of Jason Goes to Hell and Jason X.

No research is provided for his second point, "that only a handful of horror films have ever been big box office draws." Again, see Bracke's appendix which indicates substantial box office success for at least five Friday the 13th films, see Kevin Heffernan's work on box office patterns of horror and science fiction films from 1953-1968, and see Richard Nowell's work on the marketing and finances of the early teen slasher film (2011).

'sequel' – or, if you like, the process of 'sequelling' – has itself become a major convention of the genre, a phenomenon fully understood and, more important, expected and embraced by a generically competent horror audience. (2002; 106-107)

Whatever the basis of or motivation for these film sequels, they also exist as individual films, that can be rented, sold, or even upon cinematic release, consumed individually. Because of this, these films have the potential to be analysed on their own merits, and also as individual narratives existing within the overarching framework of a film series.

Despite its close emulation of the generic formula made popular by Halloween, and its strong ties to the giallo film, Friday the 13th does little to link itself to other films. Dika writes, "Friday the 13th has no artistic pretensions, no film-school 'allusions' or 'homages'; instead, its elements have been unambiguously combined for their maximum impact and profitability." (64) There are two significant exceptions, however. Firstly, as Dika notes, "The title Friday the 13th again specifies, if not quite a holiday, as did Halloween, at least a recurring occasion of sinister significance." (66) Secondly, contrary to Dika's claim about the lack of allusions or homages, Friday the 13th is heavily influenced by A Bay of Blood. With Halloween's financial success in 1978, the title itself became a major factor in raising the production budget for the film. According to Sean Cunningham:

I took out this ad in Variety over the Fourth of July weekend of 1979. A full-page ad that said 'Friday the 13th' in great big block letters, crashing through a mirror. And underneath it read, 'The Most Terrifying Film

Ever Made! Available December 1979.' I started getting all of these

telexes from different foreign distributors all around the world, who said

they'd love to see this picture. (Bracke; 18)

David Grove writes, "Fundamentally, <u>Friday the 13th</u> began with its title and no

more." (2005; 16) He later writes, "In truth, the ad in *Variety* was necessitated by

the fact that Cunningham was terrified that someone else would take the name

<u>Friday the 13th</u>, or indeed might have taken it already." (16) The resulting

excitement over the title itself can be attributed to the similarity in title to <u>Halloween</u>

noted by Dika.

<u>Friday the 13th</u>'s relationship to <u>A Bay of Blood</u> (U.S. title- <u>Twitch of the

Death Nerve</u>) is also discussed by David Grove. "No one at that time, certainly not

Cunningham, knew that <u>Twitch of the Death Nerve</u> was destined to become an

acknowledged classic, or that the film was destined to be identified as a major

influence upon <u>Friday the 13th</u>." (11) Cunningham confirms this, stating, "'I think

Bava certainly inspired me. His films were shocking and really visually-stunning

and they made you jump out of your seat, which was what I wanted <u>Friday</u> to be all

about.'" (Grove; 11-12) Grove further explains:

The similarities between <u>Friday the 13th</u> and <u>Twitch of the Death Nerve</u>

are obvious, although Bava's film could be described as a black comedy-

horror film with its phantasmagoric story of greedy couples meeting their

grisly ends while trying to steal a piece of lakefront property. The death

scenes in both films rely on throat-cuttings, stabbings and sundry other

'in your face' type shocks for their visceral impact. <u>Twitch of the Death</u>

Nerve was not just a prototype slasher film: it used its kills to punctuate

the flow of the story at carefully-timed intervals, amazing the audience

with a flurry of shocking images, much as Friday the 13th would do a

decade later. Is the violence contained in Friday the 13th or Twitch of the

Death Nerve grounded in reality? No. The violence in these films is the

stuff of pure fantasy. But does it really matter as long as the audience

screams? (12)

This final sentiment is echoed by Bob Martin during his interview with Sean

Cunningham promoting the release of Friday the 13th:

Whatever influences and inspirations are detectable in Friday the 13th, it

is apparent that Paramount Studios agrees with Cunningham about the

film's commercial potential – Paramount's decision-makers have decided

to release the film nationwide, in over 700 theaters, this May, a

distribution plan that requires a major investment in the production of

film prints. (1980; 64)

Martin's contemporary anticipation for the release of Friday the 13th

demonstrates, from its appearance in *Fangoria*, the position of a horror genre

fanatic's expectation. Through the information garnered in an interview with the

director and a summary of the film, Martin creates an expectation based upon genre

tropes, the previous work of the talent involved, and the declared influence of the

filmmaker(s). If this article is to be taken as a representative example, it can be

deduced that these elements hold great import for establishing expectations for a viewer interested in the horror genre.

With these connections in mind, however, as well as the eye/camera usage in the opening sequence as mentioned in Chapter 3, there is little else to intentionally connect Friday the 13th to an existing work or body of work. It is best viewed, as described by Dika, as "the first film to reproduce the success of Halloween by copying its intrinsic elements." (64) Dika's own term, "recombination" in terms of Friday the 13th's adaptation of Halloween's generic and aesthetic elements, is indicative of contemporary reception and reading.

Film Clips Establishing Narrative

Dika describes Friday the 13th Part 2 as a "recombination" of the successful elements of Friday the 13th: "As Miner's directing debut, Friday the 13th Part 2 is not so much a sequel as a replica, or remake, of Friday the 13th. He and screenwriter Ron Kurz copied the Victor Miller script so closely that not only is the story structure identical, but most of the formal, narrative, and visual elements have also been repeated." (78) Verevis succinctly echoes this through quoting in one sentence points from Tom Pulleine's reviews of Friday the 13th and Friday the 13th Part 2 from Monthly Film Bulletin: "Friday the 13th was described as a 'bare-faced duplication of Halloween,' and the sequel Friday the 13th Part 2 was seen as 'a virtual remake of the earlier movie'." (2006; 64)

Pulleine's comment seems to refer to Friday the 13th Part 2's close attention to an established strict generic form which was partially created due to the success and influence of Friday the 13th. The Evil Dead 2 (1987; dir. Raimi) is an example of a sequel which acts more closely to a remake, as it uses the same situation, with

some of the same characters (including the use of actor Bruce Campbell to play the role of Ash in both films) performing similar functions with no awareness or acknowledgment of the events of <u>The Evil Dead</u> (1981 ; dir. Raimi) , with a slightly deviated narrative from the previous film. However, with the slasher, which is developed around a very strict formula, an analysis of a sequel can result in disparate readings, with those seeing the replication of elements as a form of remaking, and an opposing view describing adherence to generic codes. Unless, as in the case of <u>The Evil Dead 2</u>, a sequel demonstrates an ignorance of all previous events in the series,[6] I will read its similarities to previous films as reflecting an adherence to generic tropes. While <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> retains this strict generic form proven successful by its predecessor, it still attempts to provide a relative position for viewers who have either seen <u>Friday the 13th</u> or are viewing <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> without having seen the first film, indicating a continued narrative. This is achieved through incorporating clips from the previous instalment, framed as narrative exposition, which is a method designed to inform the viewer that the rest of the film is a segment of a larger, ongoing narrative.

After the production and distribution credits and logos, the film begins with a close up tracking shot of a child's feet splashing in puddles along the curb of a suburban neighbourhood street. The child's voice is heard singing "Itsy Bitsy Spider" along with the splashing, and he stops as his mother calls him inside. The camera remains stationary, focusing on a puddle, as he runs off. Adult feet wearing black boots step into the puddle after the child leaves, an action which is

---

[6] I have phrased it this way, because later <u>Friday the 13th</u> instalments sometimes ignore selective elements of previous films, as in the case of <u>Jason X</u> which does not mention the fact that Jason went to Hell, nor that his soul can possess the body of others. However, there is still an acknowledgement of previous narrative strands and therefore, according to my definition, acts as a sequel.

accompanied by an ominous music cue. The camera tracks the adult feet walking along the street, which is intercut with an eye/camera shot, here serving as a generic cue, from this character looking at the facade of one of the suburban houses as he approaches it, eventually focusing and holding on a lit window. This dissolves to inside the house, and Alice, the "Final Girl" from Friday the 13th, is asleep on a bed in a lit room, and apparently having a bad dream from her moans and unsettled movement. Her appearance is the first reference point in this film for viewers who have seen the previous film. For those who have not seen it, her appearance would have little meaning, aside from the first character whose face can be seen, applying significance to this character. The image goes to soft focus and dissolves to clips from the end of Friday the 13th, showing Alice's confrontation with Mrs. Voorhees, Mrs. Voorhees's revelatory explanation of herself as the killer, Alice decapitating Mrs. Voorhees, Alice being pulled out of the boat by young Jason, and her discovery, in hospital, that no boy was found in the lake from where she was retrieved.

This series of clips simultaneously provides sufficient background information to explain who this focal character is, while retaining an awkwardly inconsistent aesthetic to the few previous shots, and the rest of the film. The aesthetics of this expositional montage, with specific regards to editing, share more with film trailer aesthetics than narrative film aesthetics. The colour hues and general visual template provide a contrast to the rest of the film, standing out significantly, informing the viewer, intentionally or not, that this sequence comes from a different film altogether. At the conclusion of this montage, the viewer of Friday the 13th is reminded of a previously formed attachment to Alice, solidifying his/her perspective on the forthcoming film, and the viewer that has not been

previously introduced to Alice or the events of <u>Friday the 13th</u> is given sufficient information to attach him/herself to the plot and characters of <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u>. However, the new viewer, being one who has not seen the previous film, can be expected to retain less attachment to Alice, but is placed on (near) even ground with the franchise viewer, one who has seen previous instalments, once Alice is killed and the new characters are introduced. The franchise viewer will hold a higher significance to the appearance and despatch of Crazy Ralph, who appears in the previous film, while the new viewer will only register his function as the "prophet of doom" and victim.

Friday the 13th Part III 3-D also uses footage from the previous film to indicate narrative continuity, but discards the framing device used in <u>Friday the 13th</u> <u>Part 2</u>. The film begins *in medias res*, with final girl Ginny on the run from Jason, and discovering his shack. This is followed by her confrontation with him and the appearance of Paul which helps Ginny ultimately despatch Jason. The editing of this sequence is designed less as a clip montage and more as a fluid narrative progression. Even though the sequence is truncated, the sound and cinematography retain consistency so that the shots in the sequence cut together smoothly. Thus, the climactic encounter between Ginny and Jason is shown, but the final sequences showing Ginny and Paul returning to their cabin, Jason leaping through a window and grabbing Ginny, and Ginny being removed from the camp the next morning on a stretcher. Since the reappearance of Jason is significant to the plot of <u>Friday the 13th</u> <u>Part III 3-D</u>, a shot with a similar visual aesthetic shows Jason, shot from the chest down standing up from where he was left for dead and taking his machete from the ground. The sequence ends with the final shot from <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> of Jason's

shrine to his mother: Mrs. Voorhees's rotting dismembered head sitting on a table surrounded by candles.

The added shot of Jason getting up off of the ground serves two functions. First, it reduces the amount of time necessary to set up the significant narrative plot points for the understanding of the rest of the film. This creates a more manageable preface that contributes to the narrative flow instead of interrupting it. Secondly, this eliminates the facial reveal, which Conrich attributes great significance to: "I would argue that in the slasher film, more frightening than the mask is the concealed face, which is often revealed in the climactic conflict (and sometimes in the prelude)- the 'face shot' that audiences expect. The Friday the 13th series is no exception with the mask never able to impart the ultimate horror of what lies beneath." (2010; 180) [parenthesis in the original] Through this method, Friday the 13th Part III 3-D retains the shock value of not revealing the concealed face until the climax.

This sequence is also designed to be set distinctly apart from the rest of the film. Friday the 13th Part III 3-D, being the film's original theatrical release title, hinges the film's aesthetic on a 3-D visual design. The sequence applied from Friday the 13th Part 2, while cropped to fit the 2.35:1 aspect ratio from its original 1.85:1 aspect, is not adjusted to 3-D, retaining 2-D cinematography. The 3-D dramatically stands out against this as the opening titles "Friday the 13th" comes out of Mrs. Voorhees's eye socket toward the viewer on the left of the screen, "Part III" comes out of the socket at the right of the screen.

The characters directly identified in the sequence are Ginny, Jason and Mrs. Voorhees who is referred to as "Mother". This is the pivotal point of the viewer's perspective and relationship to Friday the 13th Part III 3-D. The franchise viewer has a defined understanding of who these characters are and their relationship to one

another, with a certain amount of depth. The new viewer, however, only receives a

superficial understanding of these elements. Ginny can be understood as a central

victim, Jason as the primary antagonist, and "Mother" as Jason's dead mother whom

he idolizes. While this information is all that is necessary to understand the

remaining film, the new viewer can potentially be disoriented by the sudden

appearance of these characters in action, who are depicted as previously established

characters. The franchise viewer could view this sequence comfortably from the

beginning because of a previously defined relationship with them. In this way, the

opening of Friday the 13th Part III 3-D behaves more as a serial continuation than a

loosely attached sequel, as the beginning of Friday the 13th Part 2 functions.

The introduction to The Final Chapter, a title which directly alludes to a serial

narrative, returns to the framing device used at the beginning of Friday the 13th Part

2. This time, the frame is a clip from Friday the 13th Part 2 in which Paul is telling

the other counsellors the story of Jason as they sit around a campfire. Relevant clips

are shown from Friday the 13th through Friday the 13th Part III 3-D, including death

sequences to punctuate the story. For instance, Steve Christy's death from Friday

the 13th is shown after Paul says, "Some folks claim they've even seen him right in

this area." Following Paul's statement that, after seeing his mother beheaded, "He

took his revenge," film clips from the deaths of Vickie, Sandra and Jeff as well as the

first attack on Ginny are cut into the sequence. The campfire story framing needs

little context, as the story of Jason sounds like the sort of myths and urban legends

that are typically passed around the campfire, as described by Stephen King:

> The story of The Hook is a simple, brutal classic of horror. It offers no
>
> characterization, no theme, no particular artifice; it does not aspire to

symbolic beauty or try to summarize the times, the mind, or the human

spirit. To find these things we must go to 'literature' – perhaps to

Flannery O'Connor's story 'A Good Man Is Hard to Find,' which is very

much like the story of The Hook in its plot and construction. No, the

story of The Hook exists for one reason and one reason alone: to scare the

shit out of little kids after the sun goes down. (1981; 35)

Mikel Koven describes the function of urban legend narration within its oral context

as "to connect the audience, hearing about something in the past, with their

immediate present." (2008; 126) Where the story of Jason appears as an urban

legend in the Friday the 13th films, Koven's observation can be attributed to both the

listener within the diegesis and the film viewer. In this particular case, the campfire

story is verified through the inclusion of the other film clips. In this way, the

audience is briefly informed as to Jason's backstory, leading up to the point where he

is killed at the end of Friday the 13th Part III 3-D.

     This sequence proves problematic to the narrative pacing, as the beginning of

the campfire story comes in the middle of a longer sequence from Friday the 13th

Part 2. Because of this, and despite the inclusion of a shot of the moon to preface

this sequence, the aesthetic build up to the sequence is lost, creating a discomforting

shock, demanding full attention at the outset. At the conclusion of this sequence and

the opening titles, however, a crime scene is re-created from the closing sequence of

Friday the 13th Part III 3-D. As discussed in Chapter 3, the camera roams around the

crime scene, which is closely reconstructed from the final shots of that film.

     As in Friday the 13th Part 2 and Friday the 13th Part III 3-D, the new viewer is

now provided with enough contextual information to understand the forthcoming

narrative, although it is apparent that there is a significant amount of information that has been missed. Franchise viewers, however, may recognize characters and events, but will be drawn into the franchise experience more by the crime scene sequence, which creates a reminder of setting and precise positioning, particularly where the body of Jason is concerned, despite being played by a different actor, and this sequence being shot after the completion of the previous film, Jason's dead body lays in precisely the same position as it did at the end of Friday the 13th Part III 3-D. Again, the perspective of the franchise viewer is rewarded by having seen the previous films, while the new viewer is placed in a disorienting position until the narrative pacing demonstrates a fluidity and aesthetic equilibrium absent from the pre-credits clip sequence.

The New Blood returns to the use of film clips in order to establish the prior narrative of the series. The clip sequences used in Friday the 13th Part 2 and The Final Chapter, as noted, retain close similarities to the aesthetics of cinema trailers, and the opening of The New Blood more closely adopts this aesthetic than either of these previous films. After the production titles, there is a long high angle shot of a graveyard seen through a thick sheet of rain, the camera lowering as if on a crane. This is a shot filmed for The New Blood, and is used as a repeated visual to tie the film clips together. At this point, a voice over accompanies the image, saying "There's a legend 'round here. A killer buried, but not dead." It is a deep male voice, and slightly gravelly. The latter of the two sentences runs over a cut to a clip of Jason's hand holding a machete as he walks through the woods, and then breaking through a window to grab Tommy in The Final Chapter. The film then cuts back to the lowering crane shot of the graveyard, the spikes of a high iron fence rising up from the bottom of the frame. The voice over accompanies this shot again, saying,

"A curse on Crystal Lake. A death curse." This echoes Crazy Ralph's warning about Camp Crystal Lake from Friday the 13th: "It's got a death curse!" The camera continues to lower, showing the graveyard through the bars of the iron fence, then tracks forward through the opening in the fence, into the graveyard, bringing into frame a tombstone marked "Jason Voorhees". The voice over says, "Jason Voorhees' curse. They say he died as a boy, but he keeps coming back. Few have seen him and lived. Some have even tried to stop him. No one can." These lines of voice over are accompanied by clips of deaths that occur in Friday the 13th Part 2, and ending with young Tommy swinging the machete into Jason's head from The Final Chapter. After this, the tombstone, still filling the screen is struck by lightning and explodes. This cuts to shots from Jason Lives!, where lightning strikes the metal post Tommy has rammed into Jason's body which brings him back to life. This starts a series of clips from that film, showing and explaining Jason's return to life, his violent rampage thereafter, and Tommy struggling with and sinking Jason with a large rock attached to a chain placed around Jason's neck to the bottom of Crystal Lake. The shots of Jason sinking are accompanied by a return of the voice over, saying, "People forget he is down there, waiting." And the final shot of this sequence shows air bubbles disturbing the surface of the water above Jason and then dying out. This is followed by a series of lights shining into the camera, positioning themselves in the pattern of the holes of Jason's hockey mask. The front of the hockey mask is gradually illuminated, until a streak of light cracks the mask from the middle simultaneously upwards and downwards. The mask breaks apart, and falls aside, with the words "Friday the 13th" appearing behind it in red. As the title grows larger in the frame, the subtitle "Part VII – The New Blood" appears underneath. The full title then increases in size more quickly, until it moves around the frame,

returning the screen to black. The time it takes for this to elapse is approximately

three and a half minutes, which is the standard length of a full theatrical trailer.

Other elements stand out as similar to contemporary film trailers. The voice

over using vague narrative summary can be seen in trailers around that time, such as

in the trailers for <u>Beetlejuice</u> (1988; dir. Burton), <u>Die Hard</u> (1988; dir. McTiernan),

and is very similar to the voice over in the trailer for <u>Psycho III</u> (1986; dir. Perkins)

Also, while the graveyard framing is shot specifically for this segment, specially shot

footage has been used in teaser trailers especially. Such contemporary film teasers

that use footage exclusive to advertising materials include those for <u>Masters of the</u>

<u>Universe</u> (1987; dir. Goddard), <u>The Gate</u> (1986; dir. Takács), <u>The Fly II</u> (1989; dir.

Walas), and many others. These teaser trailers also use voice over similar to the

voice over at the beginning of <u>The New Blood</u>.

Half of the previous films, namely the three immediately preceding <u>The New</u>

<u>Blood</u>, have focused on Tommy as a central character, but this film introduces "new

blood" in Tina. This provides a distinct advantage to new viewers as the filmmakers

need only communicate the background of Jason and identify him as a primary

antagonist. In the most basic terms, this opening accomplishes this, in the same way

the campfire-framed opening of <u>The Final Chapter</u> did. First, the voice over tells the

viewer that the story of Jason is a local legend, and that he is an indestructible killer

that has returned from the dead. This legend is used in lieu of explaining Jason's

precise background, his relationship with his mother and so on, that the franchise

viewer would be aware of. Second, the film clips used verify the truth of this legend,

demonstrating that it is not an exaggeration. Finally, the clips used from <u>Jason</u>

<u>Lives!</u> explains why, at the start of <u>The New Blood</u>, Jason is chained to a rock

underwater. In this way, the new viewer is provided with sufficient information to

understand and anticipate the narrative to come, in much the same way a trailer would communicate similar information. Additionally, this opening sequence runs close to three and a half minutes, similar to the length of a full film trailer. The franchise viewer will find little of this information illuminating, and the introduction will manage to provide a crude, rudimentary way to establish the mood of the film, by providing mostly dark compositions, visual depictions of violence, and menacing, tense music.

This method of contextualising a film within a larger franchise narrative by using film clips from previous films in the series can effectively communicate this information. However, the variety of ways in which this information can be framed can contribute to an enhancement of the film's aesthetic, and an articulation of some of the film's themes. Alice's nightmare in Friday the 13th Part 2, the campfire story in The Final Chapter, and even the trailer-like opening of The New Blood all establish the sense of the horrifying experiences portrayed in the previous films, and Jason's status as legend. Even the truncated climax of Friday the 13th Part 2 at the beginning of Friday the 13th Part III 3-D informs the viewer not only of his violent potential but also of his obsession with his mother, conveying within the film clip enough character information to create a sense of Jason's motivation, and begins to establish the myth surrounding Jason. While this is useful, these sequences stand out aesthetically in contrast to the rest of the film, and other films in the series have created alternatives to this in order to maintain its individual aesthetic continuity.

Ongoing Narrative Implied Through New Footage

The New Blood became the final film in the franchise to use film clips to establish the running narrative of the Friday the 13th films. An alternative to this is

shooting new footage that can be used to contextualise new films within the running narrative. <u>Jason Takes Manhattan</u> is one film that foregoes the use of film clips to establish this. The film begins by showing establishing shots of New York City's evening skyline featuring the World Trade Center, accompanied by timely late 1980s pop/rock. Along with this, a voice over is heard, saying, "It's like this: We live in claustrophobia, a land of steel and concrete, trapped by dark waters. There is no escape, nor do we want it. We've come to thrive on it and each other. You can't get the adrenaline pumping without the terror, good people. I love this town." From the Manhattan skyline, there is a cut to a high angle shot of Times Square, which then cuts to young punks on the street. This then cuts to a shot of an alley with an open steaming sewer, and then a close up of the open sewer. After this, a pair of hoodlums are shown mugging a man for his wallet, and as they run away, one of them takes the money and throws the wallet away. There is a match on action cut to the wallet falling into a barrel filled with waste water, causing a rat to crawl out. This is followed by shots of a busy diner, the subway escalator, inside a subway train, two junkies shooting up in an alley, and finally the ambiguous eye/camera shot of the Statue of Liberty ending with the camera sinking under the surface of the water. All of this establishes the focal location of Manhattan, using the voice over and the seedy events, such as the mugging, the rat in the waste water barrel, and the junkies, to provide a dark tone to the forthcoming narrative. This also encapsulates the narrative outline of the film, which moves from tourist New York to the seedier, darker side of the city. The opening credits of the film are shown over this sequence.

The following scene, which opens with the camera emerging from underwater, showing an establishing shot of a houseboat, provides the background information from previous instalments. Inside, a teenage boy and girl are dancing

and kissing, accompanied by the same music as the credits playing on the radio. The same voice as the voice over comes in, revealing that the speaker is the Disc Jockey on the radio station, saying, "You've been listening to WGAZ, the electricity of Manhattan. This request has gone all the way out to Crystal Lake and the Senior Class of Lakeview High." The girl then exclaims, "That's us!" establishing Crystal Lake as the new location after the Manhattan opening. The boy goes to lower the anchor, which lands near some electrical cables. He then goes in to the bed, where the girl is naked under the covers. She asks what is bothering him, and he says that nearby is the summer camp where "all those murders" took place and that "The guy's dead now, somewhere at the bottom of this lake, if you believe the stories." This introduces the similar introduction of Jason as part of myth and urban legend. There is a cut to the anchor at the bottom of the lake, slowly dragging toward the electrical cables. The boy then explains that Jason was a boy who drowned in the lake thirty years ago because the counsellors weren't paying attention and the murders started once people had forgotten about it. This is the first time since The Final Chapter that Jason's back story of being a child that drowned at the camp is introduced as narrative context, which is accompanied by a shot of Jason drowning, shot specifically for this film, instead of using a clip from Friday the 13th. It later becomes significant, as the boy Jason is who Rennie sees when her uncle is teaching her to swim, making her afraid of the water, so extending this far back in Jason's history is important to understanding the narrative. The boy then describes the conclusion of Friday the 13th, in which it is revealed that Jason's mother, seeking vengeance killed the counsellors until one of them decapitated her. There is a cut again to the anchor underwater still dragging closer to the electrical cables, as the boy says, "Legend has it that Jason came back to get even, vowing to kill every

teenager in the area, and every now and then the murders just start up." The camera

continues past the cables to a piece of the dock that collapsed on Jason at the end of

The New Blood, with his legs and hand sticking out from underneath it, using the

method of re-staging the crime scene, as also occurs after the film clips in The Final

Chapter. The boy concludes with, "Forget about it, Suzi, they're just stories." It is

at this point that the anchor cuts into the cables, and the electricity produced in the

water brings Jason back to life.

As in the previous film, this story provides all the information necessary to

understand who Jason is, including the part of being a young boy that drowned

which was omitted from the beginning of The New Blood. The franchise viewer is

aware throughout the boy's story that everything he is saying is true within the world

of the franchise, and creating the anticipation of how Jason will come back to life, as

he, a supernatural creature, in turn met a supernatural death at the end of the previous

film. Also, providing a new format for telling Jason's story is a method designed to

retain the franchise viewer's interest without showing them images they have already

seen. To the new viewer, the story provides enough information to understand the

narrative, without implying that there is much information lost by not viewing the

previous films. In other words, it truncates the information from previous

instalments to suit the narrative for Jason Takes Manhattan. The only thing that may

create curiosity in the new viewer, as in the three previous films, is why Jason is

wearing a hockey mask in the first place, but as it is part of the popular

contemporary iconography, this may not have even been an issue.

Jason Goes to Hell begins the film without establishing the previous films.

However, while Jason Lives!, which I will discuss later, gradually places context

clues as to the characters and backgrounds of Jason and Tommy, as well as

establishing an idea of the relationship between the two, <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u> not only does less of this, but in some ways creates an account of events that have not previously been shown in the series.

The film begins with an establishing shot of Crystal Lake at night, and then cuts to a woman driving a convertible through the forest, past a sign noting that Crystal Lake is four miles away. The sequence involving the woman at the cabin, Jason's chase of her and the attack by the FBI has been discussed in Chapter 3, and throughout, there is no indication of back story or context, aside from the apparent fact that Jason has been sought and tracked by the FBI. It is not until the shots interspersed throughout the opening credits showing parts of the autopsy, that his name, "Jason Voorhees" is spoken into a tape recorder for the coroner's report. After the coroner eats Jason's heart and becomes possessed, killing his assistant and the armed guards, there is a cut to a television show called "American Case File". This is the first time that any background on Jason is given. The voice over by Robert, the show's presenter, reveals that Jason is a known serial killer. Robert reports, "For over twenty years, the mere mention of the name Jason Voorhees has been enough to send a shudder of fear through the hearts of an entire nation. Born in 1946 to Elias and Pamela Voorhees, Jason was believed to have drowned in Camp Crystal Lake at the tender age of eleven. Sadly, he did not. Since then he has been responsible for eighty-three confirmed murders and speculated scores of others." After this, Robert interviews Creighton Duke who is introduced as a bounty hunter and tells of Jason's ability to move in and out of other people's bodies. This manner of establishing Jason is the culmination of an increased presentation of him as a folk hero, or folk monster, throughout the series.

The only elements of the information provided that appear in the previous films are his name, his mother's name, the fact that he drowned at Crystal Lake as a boy, and that he is a serial killer. Aside from that, the other information is created to resemble a precise journalistic report that is not verified in the earlier films, and Duke's revelation about Jason changing bodies sets up both an explanation for his incessant returns from the dead and a driving plot point to create an alternative to the strict narrative forms developed by the series. This manner of introduction becomes disadvantageous to both the new and the franchise viewer. The new viewer is given a thin grasp onto the character and significance of Jason. The story of his drowning sounds only peripheral and the simple fact that he is a killer is all the motivation provided. The possession of the coroner and Duke's description of Jason changing bodies provides them enough information to glean that Jason kills because he is a supernatural form of evil. The franchise viewer can potentially be disoriented by this sudden change in mythology. While the franchise viewer may be more thoroughly familiar with the character of Jason, the revelation that he can change bodies has the potential to undermine the franchise viewer's loyalty by reinventing the mythology and the format of the narrative. Jason X, however, removes this new mythology established in Jason Goes to Hell, returning to the narrative established by previous films.

I have written about the opening credits sequence to Jason X in Chapter 3, and aside from establishing mood and setting, namely a dark mood used to show medical experiments and detainment of Jason, there is no background information provided. Following the credits, Jason is shown in extreme long shot on a platform in chains in a large, dimly lit, open room. This is followed by a series of close ups of the chains on his body, finally revealing his masked face. At the bottom left of the

frame, words appearing as though typed on the computer screen spell out, "Location, Crystal Lake Research Facility". The text then disappears, replaced by, "Subject, Jason Voorhees," and finally, "Status, Awaiting Cryogenic Suspension". These captions are the only initial information provided, and the fact that he is restrained using chains and leather straps indicates that he is dangerous. The following sequence shows Rowan discussing Jason with Dr. Wimmer, who reveals that he is cancelling cryogenic suspension in favour of researching his ability to regenerate tissue. This is a piece of information, like that of Jason changing bodies in Jason Goes to Hell, that is new to the franchise viewer. However, this does not entirely alter the narrative history of the series, but instead attempts to explain it. After this exchange, the fact that Jason despatches all of the armed guards verifies that he is, in fact, a dangerous character. It is not until later, when Jason and Rowan are found in cryogenic hibernation and Rowan is eventually revived that Jason's back story is revealed over thirty minutes into the film. The back story, however, is only discussed after the events of the previous films. The professor tries to sell Jason as a specimen, and his potential buyer reveals that he has killed over two hundred people, far greater than the confirmed eighty-three mentioned in the previous film. Later, Rowan says that he was a notorious murderer, executed for the first time in 2008. Rowan says, "We tried everything. Electrocution, gas, firing squad, we even hung him once. Nothing worked. Finally it was decided that if we couldn't terminate him, we could at least contain him – cryogenic stasis – freeze him until we could figure out what to do." This is all the background information provided, which becomes beneficial to both the franchise viewer and the new viewer, as it informs both of the unseen previous narrative.

After this, while a familiarity with genre tropes proves beneficial to understanding the humour in <u>Jason X</u> for both new and franchise viewers, a familiarity with the series itself becomes a source of humour for the franchise viewer. In one of the climactic sequences, Jason is lured into a holographic projection of Camp Crystal Lake circa 1980 in order to distract and confuse him. The projection also creates two young girls who ask Jason if he wants to smoke pot and have premarital sex, as that is what they enjoy doing, before removing their tops and getting into their sleeping bags. Familiarity with the slasher sub-genre after the release of <u>Halloween</u> will inform the viewer that these things tend to result in the violent deaths of those that participate in such activities, and by bringing to the forefront these elements, a self-referential humour is derived. However, in order to enact his anticipated violent approach to these characters, Jason is shown swinging a sleeping bag containing one of the girls into another sleeping bag containing the other girl, crushing their bodies against each other, before finishing by swinging the sleeping bag into a tree. This is a direct reference to a death sequence in <u>The New Blood</u>, in which Jason kills a girl by swinging her in her sleeping bag into a tree, breaking her back. This specific self-referentiality which director Jim Isaacs refers to as an "homage" to <u>The New Blood</u>[7], but more suitably settles into Frederic Jameson's definition of "parody" (1984; 64-65). This is one example of the ways in which <u>Jason X</u> references both the genre and the series for the amusement of both the new and franchise viewer.

In crossing <u>Friday the 13th</u> with the <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> franchise, <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u> inherently deals with the challenge of introducing, defining, and combining two serial narrative storylines and their respective focal characters. This

---

[7] Audio Commentary, U.S. DVD of <u>Jason X</u>

is done, as I describe in my own contemporary film review, "through narrative voice-overs, which sound more like the soliloquies of an even more demented and much less intelligent Hamlet." (2003) Freddy tells the viewer from the outset that the children gave him his power, that he killed them, and that he was killed by the parents of Springwood out of vengeance. This is told over a staged sequence depicting pre-death Freddy menacing a young girl, looking at children's photographs and newspaper clippings of the murders, and ending with shots of the parents setting him on fire. There is then a cut to a black screen, panning left to right, and emerging from the right of the frame is Freddy's t-zone, his eyes the primary focus, in extreme close up, moving past the left edge of the frame, and apparently moving his mouth along with this voice over. This is significant, because though it is still an acousmêtre, it is implied that it is not solely Freddy's disembodied voice, by looking closely directly into the camera while his cheeks appear to form the words that are heard, the viewer is aware that Freddy is speaking directly to the viewer. This is followed by a series of film clips from the earlier A Nightmare on Elm Street films, demonstrating the extent of Freddy's powers as he explains that he comes to his victims in dreams, and that his powers come not from being alive, but from being remembered and feared, which allows him to return repeatedly.

Freddy explains that the people of Springwood have forgotten him, and he has no way to take revenge. At this point, the film cuts to an extreme close up of Freddy's mouth, centred in the frame, again speaking directly to the viewer. He says, "But I found someone. Someone who'll make them remember." There is then a cut to Jason's hockey mask lying on the muddy ground, a visual which is accompanied by the Friday the 13th theme music. The camera pushes in to its right eye hole, as Freddy is heard to say "He may get the blood, but I'll get the glory," and

inside the eye hole can be seen a dock on Crystal Lake, which eventually fills the frame. Here, director Ronnie Yu exploits the aesthetic conventions of the slasher film, using expressionistic lighting, mostly dark, with predominately blue moonlight and small splashes of white light coming from the lamps overhanging the dock. A young woman is standing on the dock, about to get undressed, and turns around when she hears a noise. Thinking it is somebody named Mike, she turns around and teases him by opening her shirt, and baring her breasts. When nobody responds, she fully undresses, and goes for a swim. Becoming nervous, she returns to the dock and starts to dress, when Jason begins to chase her through the forest, which is shrouded in mist and fog. She backs against a tree to hide, and Jason suddenly appears, running her through with a machete which also goes into the tree, and she dies stuck in a standing position. The entire scene acts as an exaggeration of familiar tropes from previous Friday the 13th films, but presented in a more generic way than similar sequences in Jason X, which tends to reference specific set pieces in the series. This is followed by the girl morphing into various victims, claiming responsibility for not watching the campers as discussed in Chapter 3. After this, a female voice is heard, saying "Jason." At this, Jason turns around, and his mother stands behind him and says, "My special, special boy. Do you know what your gift is? No matter what they do to you, you cannot die. You can never die. You've just been sleeping, honey. But now, the time has come to wake up. Mommy has something she wants you to do." There is a cut to Jason's decomposing body in the mud again, with his heart still beating, indicating that the previous sequence was a fantasy. Jason's mother's voice is still heard: "I need you to go to Elm Street. The children have been very bad on Elm Street. Rise up, Jason! Your work isn't finished!" There is then a dissolve to Jason's hockey mask, as his mother says, "Hear my voice and live

again!" At this point, his eyes open, and he is show climbing up off of the ground and walking away into the forest. There is a dolly in to Jason's mother after this, and she says, "Make them remember me Jason. Make them remember what fear tastes like!" Here, her face morphs into Freddy's revealing that he has controlled this vision for Jason. Freddy then looks in the camera and says, "I've been away from my children for far too long," and this is followed by the opening credits.

For the purposes of this chapter, <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u> proves problematic, as the distinction between the franchise viewer and the new viewer becomes blurred, as two separate franchises are now attributed to a single film. Therefore, I will create an analysis retaining my original definitions, with both categories relative to the <u>Friday the 13th</u> franchise, assuming the viewer is moderately aware of the cultural significance and iconography of the character of Freddy Krueger, an assumption the film appears to make of its viewer.

With the character of Freddy, his background and motivation established, the introduction of Jason is directly linked to Freddy's existence as a supernatural being who returns from the dead, explained in the opening. The significance of Jason's rotting corpse being shown on the ground with the hockey mask in primary focus may not be directly apparent to the new viewer, but to the franchise viewer, Jason's death can be linked to the conclusion of <u>Friday the 13th Part III 3-D</u>, <u>The Final Chapter</u>, <u>The New Blood</u>, <u>Jason Takes Manhattan</u>, or <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u>, depending on the individual franchise viewer's immediate connective memory. Whether viewed by a franchise or new viewer, the fact that Jason is dead is clearly established at this point. The fantasy sequence for Jason establishes a generic, however exaggerated, death sequence in the style of the other <u>Friday the 13th</u> films. The design can be used to establish this generic tone for the benefit of the new viewer, to

attain a familiarity with the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, and due to the exaggerated

elements, the franchise viewer could potentially see this sequence as a form of self-

referential parody. The morphing teenagers claiming responsibility for their

inattentiveness to the campers establishes Jason's motivation, and the appearance

and identification of Jason's mother, and his immediate obedience to her further

develops his character and motivation. For the new viewer, this is a succinct way of

providing enough information to create a character identification with, and even

empathy for Jason, while the franchise viewer is provided with an artistically

rendered summation of familiar back story elements, and Freddy's appearance at the

end of the sequence establishes the premise of the narrative for all viewers.

These films demonstrate how the creation of new footage to place a film

within an ongoing narrative provides a unique opportunity to adjust and direct the

previous storylines to serve the purposes of the individual film. In addition to

providing aesthetic cohesion, this method creates a concise reflection of the

significant characters and narrative strands as they apply to each film. The films

sometimes omit strands of narrative, such as the case with <u>Jason X</u> ignoring the

events of <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u>, but they ultimately retain the core elements of previous

instalments in order to appropriately inform new viewers and to comfortably remind

and connect with the new viewer. However, there are films that do not fully explain

the ongoing narrative, creating disparities of experience between both the new

viewer and the franchise viewer.

<u>Transition and Subversion of Familiarity in *A New Beginning*, Safely Adapted by *Jason Lives!*</u>

<u>A New Beginning</u> breaks from the tendency of providing backstory through the use of clips taken from previous films in the series. Instead, the film opts to re-introduce a familiar character played by the same actor as in <u>The Final Chapter</u>.

The film begins with a tracking shot following a figure in a yellow raincoat through the forest during a thunderstorm. A reverse shot shows that this character is Tommy Jarvis, the young boy from <u>Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter</u>. The character of Tommy is performed by Corey Feldman, by this point a recognizable child actor due to television appearances and the mainstream success of <u>Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter</u> and <u>Gremlins</u> (1984; dir. Dante). Tommy walks into a clearing containing a grave with a wooden marker with 'Jason Voorhees' written in white paint. Soon after, two young men appear with shovels and torches and begin to dig up Jason's grave, while Tommy runs to hide amongst the trees. As the young men find and then pry open Jason's coffin, Jason comes to life, kills both of them and emerges from his grave as Tommy watches on. Jason then turns and sees Tommy watching him and walks over to him. Jason raises his machete, which he was buried with, and in slow motion brings it down towards Tommy. There is a cut to a zoom shot framing Tommy centrally, first in medium shot, moving into close up, also shown in slow motion. This shot cuts to Tommy, now older waking up with a gasp in a moving car. The use of slow motion imposed on the film during editing and this sudden cut indicates that the person waking up is, in fact, Tommy, and the preceding sequence was a dream. There is then a cut to Tommy's eye/camera, where it is shown that he is in the backseat of a vehicle, two people sit in the front seat and there is a metal mesh separating the front and back seats of the car. After this, there

is a cut to the logo on the outside of the vehicle that says "Unger Institute of Mental Health," and the camera pulls back as the vehicle, now shown to be a van, drives away and the shot dissolves to the opening titles.

The information this sequence provides differs little based on experiential positioning. The key variable element for reading is character identification and recognition. The central character of this sequence is young Tommy, who, due to the appearance of the same actor as the previous film, will immediately draw the attention of the franchise viewer. The new viewer, however, even if they do not recognize Corey Feldman by his appearances in other films and television, is drawn to him visually, because of his bright yellow raincoat.

The franchise viewer, however, is at a disadvantage, as the familiarity of the character and context of Tommy would lead them to believe this opening sequence is an actual occurrence within the world of the film, as opposed to a dream, and is occurring at a time contemporary to the original release. The music, dress and fashion of Friday the 13th Part III 3-D and The Final Chapter heavily imply that it is contemporaneous to the film's release. A New Beginning, on the other hand, leaps forward to the 'present' of the film after Tommy awakes, potentially disorienting the franchise viewer, because of his/her familiarity with and attachment to Corey Feldman in the role of Tommy. The new viewer lacks this contextual baggage, conceivably understanding the earlier sequence to occur in approximately 1975, as the fashion is not time-specific, and the only music playing is the orchestral score. This allows the new viewer to shift from young Tommy to 17-year-old Tommy more easily without being confused by the quantum leap between the two films. Although the adjustment to this temporal disparity is not likely to last long, this change along with the potential for familiarity and attachment to Tommy demonstrates at least a

lack of concern for attachments made by viewers of the previous film, at most a design to place the franchise viewer at a disadvantage. In this way, although the franchise viewer has the advantage of knowing Tommy's and Jason's backstories, this knowledge becomes a hindrance in continuity that does not affect the new viewer.

Although the pre-titles sequence of Jason Lives! contains similarities to A New Beginning, it heavily rewards the franchise viewer at the risk of isolating the new viewer. Like A New Beginning, there is no series of clips to explain the background and context of the film. Jason Lives! begins with a series of tripod-mounted establishing shots of a cloudy sky with flashes of lightning, Camp Crystal Lake, and the surrounding forest at night shrouded in fog. Then an old pickup truck is shown driving down the road in the middle of the woods. The first cut after this shows Jason's hockey mask in close up held by someone, as a male voice says, "I don't know how you talked me into this, Tommy." There is then a cut to a three-quarters shot of a young man riding in the passenger's seat of the car, talking, so that the voice heard in the previous shot is attributed to him. The mention of the name Tommy will likely conjure a familiarity with the franchise viewer, as Tommy was one of the central characters in the previous two films. The male character that is onscreen then says, "Hell, I must be crazy. You know, if the institution ever found out about this, they would haul our butts back in straitjackets. Permanent." Another voice is heard, saying, "You didn't have to come, Hawes." There is then a cut to a three-quarters shot of a blond young man who looks similar to 17-year-old Tommy from A New Beginning driving the truck. He speaks again, connecting the voice from the previous shot to him, saying, "This is between me and Jason." Hawes then says that he does not understand the therapy in what they are about to do, and that

seeing Jason's corpse will not destroy the hallucinations, to which Tommy responds, "Seeing it won't, but destroying it will." Hawes then looks in the back of the truck and sees a canister of gasoline.

This exchange becomes more rich and informed from knowledge of at least the two previous films. The establishing shots begin the film suitably, defining the location of the action, but a combination of action, music and the speed of the dialogue inside the truck all has the momentum of a sequence that could fit in the middle of a film. The words spoken between Tommy and Hawes reveal three things. First, Jason is dead, or at least buried, second, Hawes and Tommy have been living at an institution, likely subjected to psychiatric treatment, and third, Jason plays a significant part in Tommy's background and mental condition. This information follows accurately from the background of the previous two films, and the franchise viewer is then comfortably positioned within the overarching narrative of the series.

The new viewer, on the other hand, would have a nebulous grasp on at least two of these three elements. First, the indication that Jason is probably dead or at least presumed dead from the outset is suggested in the title, Jason Lives!, which indicates that he was either not dead when last seen, or he will be brought back to life from the dead. Between the two it is uncertain, as opposed to the franchise viewer who will most likely have seen the machete enter halfway through Jason's head at the end of The Final Chapter or even know from A New Beginning that somebody had to pretend to be Jason, further verifying the fact that he is dead at the outset. The second element, Hawes and Tommy coming from a psychiatric institution, has the potential to misinform the new viewer. Hawes, a new character to the franchise appears paranoid and scared to both the new and franchise viewer, but with good cause, which makes his exact mental condition ambiguous. Tommy is

staring straight ahead as he drives, looking focused and determined. His expression and the delivery of his dialogue draw the viewer to his assuredness, but again his mental condition is questionable, and his trustworthiness as a character is called into question. The franchise viewer will be familiar with Tommy, and in spite of the final shot of A New Beginning, where it implies that he is the next Jason-style killer, this has apparently not come to pass, and he appears more talkative and stable than the mute 17 year old Tommy from the previous film. Because of this, the franchise viewer is more likely to invest trust in Tommy and identify with him more readily. Finally, both the franchise viewer and the new viewer are made aware that Jason is a part of Tommy's past, but the new viewer is not given enough information to know the exact relationship between the two. The franchise viewer will likely be aware that Jason has killed Tommy's mother and has terrorised him and his sister, and later the thought and memory of Jason is closely linked with the killings during the events of A New Beginning. The new viewer is left with little context as to Tommy's history and motivation, which again hinders identification.

This lack of defined motivation on Tommy's part is never fully resolved, but identification becomes easier once Jason is brought back to life in the following sequence. The new viewer knows that Tommy is potentially a victim, and wants to destroy the antagonist so that he does not hurt anyone again, but the fact that he digs up Jason's grave in the first place because he has "gotta be sure," will appear to be motivated by paranoia to the new viewer, though it will seem at least somewhat reasonable to the franchise viewer, considering Jason's penchant for coming back to life. The only clip from a previous film in the franchise comes as Tommy stares at Jason's decayed corpse in the coffin. The camera is framed tightly on Tommy's face in close up, and the audio track from the end of The Final Chapter, with Tommy

hacking at Jason with a machete and screaming "Die! Die! Die!" is heard faintly over this shot. It is at this point that some empathy for Tommy can be elicited from the new viewer, even if he immediately stabs the corpse repeatedly with a metal fencepost. This empathy is reinforced after this incident, where Hawes notes, "Oh boy, he must've really messed you over." Ultimately, the cumulative effect of these contextual clues is not as powerful as foreknowledge of the events of the previous films.

The examples of A New Beginning and Jason Lives! reveal how the reduction of narrative context creates a disparity of experience and perspective between the franchise viewer and the new viewer. Jason Lives! initiates the narrative with little indication of the previous characters and plotlines in the franchise while continuing from the events of the previous films, and therefore creates a challenge for orientating new viewers into the narrative. A New Beginning, however, subverts knowledge of previous films, which can potentially disorientate the franchise viewer without creating difficulty for the new viewer. While establishing an ongoing narrative for both new and franchise viewers, a reboot of the franchise presents the opportunity to create and develop its own orientation for a narrative.

Remake and nostalgia

To this point, each of the films in the series retain a semblance of selective serial continuity, even if the overarching mythos of the backstory is altered to suit the narrative of each text. However, Friday the 13th (2009) does not need such narrative links to the previous series, as the point of the film, as a remake, is to reconfigure the initial narrative in anticipation for potential re-serialisation. The

film, however, does not discard the narrative of the earlier series, but re-imagines and reconfigures its origin, again, presenting specific, selective links to narrative continuity. Where Friday the 13th (2009) proves a significant case study, is in the way the overall aesthetic design is rendered in order to subtly, but precisely, remind viewers of the experience of viewing the first few films in the series outside of specific narrative references.

On categorising analytical readings of the purpose and structure of film remakes, Constantine Verevis writes:

More often, [...] film remakes are understood as (more particular) intertexutal 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. In addition, these intertextual structures (unlike those of genre) are highly particular in their repetition of *narrative units*, and these repetitions most often (though certainly not always) relate to the content ('the order of the message') rather than to form (or 'the code') of the film. (2006; 21) [emphasis and parenthesis in the original]

In the case of Friday the 13th (2009), the viewer is presented with a remake that repeats partial narrative units as well as partial form replication.

Despite the indication provided by the title[8] and the advertising campaign[9], the opening sequence contains a re-creation of the climax of the original <u>Friday the 13th</u>, shown between title cards. This sequence is shot in black and white, showing a young teenage girl in a tight yellow short sleeved shirt, reminiscent of a 1970s - 1980s camp counsellor uniform that can be seen in films like <u>The Burning</u>, running through the forest in the rain and crying. An older lady suddenly leaps out and attacks her with a knife, and backs her against the shore of Crystal Lake. The lady says, "Come here now. You're the last one. I've killed all the others. It'll be easier for you than it was for Jason." The girl cries, "Why are you doing this?" and the lady responds, "You need to be punished for what you did to him." The girl says, "I didn't do anything," and the lady retorts, "You let him drown. Jason was my son. You should have been watching him, every minute!" The lady draws back to stab the girl, but the girl suddenly brandishes a machete and decapitates her. After a series of shots showing the dead lady and her necklace sitting in the mud, a young boy's arm is shown picking up the necklace, cleaning it off, over which can be heard the voice of the lady saying, "Jason, my special, special boy. They must be punished, Jason, for what they did to you. For what they did to me. Kill for mother." A flash of lightning initiates a cut to the lake with still waters from a high angle shot, in black and white. The camera tilts up, the frame fills with colour, showing a green shore and trees with a cloudy blue-gray sky with yellow fleck of

---

[8] The original lobby film poster and general promotional materials such as cinema trailers and TV spots, present the title as simply <u>Friday the 13th</u>.

[9] The tagline on the U.S. release lobby poster is "Welcome to Crystal Lake," indicating an initial introduction. The poster also states, "From the producers of <u>The Texas Chainsaw Massacre</u>", which is a popular remake released in 2003. This is made apparent by the connection of the words "Chainsaw," as the original film's title reads: <u>The Texas Chain Saw Massacre</u>. This indicates the intent to promote <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u> as a reboot.

light shining through, and reflected in the water. A caption appears over this shot saying "Crystal Lake, Present Day".

This opening serves a similar narrative function to the opening clip sequences of <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u> and <u>The Final Chapter</u>, in which the story of Jason's mother from <u>Friday the 13th</u> is established as necessary background to launch the narrative of the rest of the film. The film resorts to this, instead of developing Jason on his own terms, or providing an alternate extended back story, as is developed in the remake of <u>Halloween</u> (2007; dir. Zombie). In this way, the establishment of narrative background and character motivation closely resembles that of a sequel. This has been noted by Sarah Wharton in a paper entitled "Evil is Not Enough: The Reimagining of Michael Myers", presented at the 56th Annual British Association of American Studies conference 2011 and will be included as part of her forthcoming thesis for the University of Liverpool. The rest of the film develops a separate narrative to any of the earlier <u>Friday the 13th</u> films, aside from the basic primary focus on Jason, a killer in a hockey mask, terrorizing teenagers. There is part of the film's form, however, that links it to the earliest instalments in the franchise.

Verevis, discussing genre in relation to remakes draws attention to both <u>Chinatown</u> (1974; dir. Polanski) and particularly <u>Body Heat</u> (1981; dir. Kasdan). Verevis writes, "A further connection between <u>Chinatown</u> and <u>Body Heat</u> can be found in the suggestion that the latter's anachronistic dialogue and ambiguous costumes and setting make it (metonymically) a *nostalgia film*." (117) [emphasis and parenthesis in the original] Frederic Jameson draws on the same film when he writes, "The insensible colonization of the present by the nostalgia mode can be observed in Lawrence Kazdan's (sic) elegant film <u>Body Heat</u>." (1984; 67) After a brief explanation of the narrative, Jameson focuses on the film's aesthetic:

The word 'remake' is, however, anachronistic to the degree to which our

awareness of the pre-existence of other versions, previous films of the

novel as well as the novel itself, is now a constitutive and essential part of

the film's structure: we are now, in other words, in 'intertextuality' as a

deliberate, built-in feature of the aesthetic effect, and as the operator of a

new connotation of 'pastness' and pseudo-historical depth, in which the

history of aesthetic styles displaces 'real' history.

Yet from the outset a whole battery of aesthetic signs begin to distance

the officially contemporary image from us in time: the art deco scripting

of the credits, for example, serves at once to programme the spectator for

the appropriate 'nostalgia' mode of reception [...] (67)

Dika, observing Jameson's argument, develops her own concept of nostalgia, stating

that "what is significant is not just that the nostalgia films return to old stories, but

that they also return to old film genres, and to those genres' imagistic and narrative

signifying systems. The past thus returns through the composite of an old generic

universe." (2003; 10) In other words, Dika claims that nostalgia films remind

viewers of old generic conventions, and establish and dispel expectations through

this.

These theories surrounding nostalgia in terms of form and content prove

useful when discussing Friday the 13th (2009). As I have established what I mean by

aesthetics early in this thesis, I will summarise, by stating that I am discussing

aesthetics as elements of stylistic development that contribute to the manner in which

a story is told, which communicate their own set of emotional and informational

codes. Nostalgia, however, I will use to denote a sensation of memory for a specific period, or even a specific film, indicating stylistic similarities between texts separated in time and contemporary styles. Combined, I will be using the phrase "Nostalgia Aesthetics" to indicate a stylistic design that differs from contemporary standards in some manner, and replaces them with stylistic conventions from a different period, or even, a different film with the ultimate aim of creating a sensation of said period or film to interact with the modern text. I will therefore adapt Dika's analysis for my specific purposes, to discuss how elements of the form and structure of past film texts are appropriated for use in later films to create an experiential tension through their juxtaposition by simultaneously reminding a viewer of a period or film while developing other elements according to contemporary standards.

Friday the 13th (2009), initiates an aesthetic game, swinging between subtle flecks of early 1980s form and a fiercely modern form. As an example, the shot following the establishment of present day Crystal Lake, a group of teenagers are shown hiking through the woods. While the events of the previous sequence could have occurred in the early 1980s, validating the clothes the girl was wearing, this group of present day teens, in some cases wear similar clothes. The character of Richie, for example, is wearing a t-shirt with a similar fit to the girl from the introductory sequence, and tighter fitting blue jeans than his contemporaries. Richie and Mike have longer hairstyles than most of the male characters in Freddy vs. Jason or even some of Friday the 13th (2009)'s closer contemporaries.[10] The same could be said of Clay and Nolan from the next group of teenagers. These hairstyles, however,

---

[10] See next chapter for consideration of these contemporaries.

share more in common with those of Jack, Ned Steve and Bill from <u>Friday the 13th</u> and even Paul, Ted, Mark, and Jeff from <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u>.

Fashion aside, moments of lighting and cinematography also create a form of nostalgia aesthetics. In the scene where Nolan and Chelsea take Trent's boat out for waterskiing, the brightly sunlit set piece is unusual for a death sequence in a modern slasher film. As the scene continues, the sun becomes a prominent part of the framing and composition. The colour is not muted or washed-out as would generally be expected, but it emits a bright golden-yellow hue. The sun itself and its reflection off the water frequently produce lens flares, which, while not unusual,[11] enhance the golden tint of the sun, reinforcing the unusual colour scheme for a sequence in a horror film of this period. This again, brings to mind <u>Friday the 13th</u>, in the scene where the counsellors are sunning themselves on the dock, and Ned pretends to drown, which uses similar sunlight colouring and lens flares. Contrast this sequence with the death of Lawrence, which uses shaky camerawork, fast cuts, and Jason's speedy chase, unlike the earlier franchise films.

In one sequence, the music overtly contributes to this nostalgic connection to the early 1980s. Wade, wearing a hairstyle and fashion that shares more with trends of 2009, contemporary to the film's release, is in the forest searching for growing marijuana, and is listening to headphones. What Wade is listening to is the loudest element of the soundtrack, which is a rock song: "Sister Christian" by Night Ranger (Keagy) which was released in 1983. This song is also the only pop song that is featured to such an extent in the film, creating a very specific auditory link to the early 1980s. The viewer is then presented with a song that was released more than

---

[11] See the cinematography of Janusz Kaminski in Stephen Spielberg's films which use harsh lens flares, mostly in washed-out whites, i.e.- <u>Saving Private Ryan</u>, <u>Minority Report</u> (2002), and <u>Munich</u> (2006)

twenty five years before the film, but we see Wade listening to the song on an mp3 player, which creates a vague tension, and aids the reading of <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u> as a late 2000s nostalgic film text.

This then leads to alternate readings by the new viewer and the franchise viewer. The franchise viewer has the opportunity to view the opening sequence as a reminder of Jason's background, immediately making a connection with the previous films, not allowing him/her to break from franchise familiarity. The new viewer, however, is presented with a brief background to understand why Jason kills during the opening credits, so that the foregoing narrative and the character of Jason does not seem motive-less.

Both the new and the franchise viewer, however, have the tools to make this association with the nostalgia aesthetics of <u>Friday the 13th (2009)</u>. While the franchise viewer, with the introduction, has an immediate reference for connection to the earlier period through <u>Friday the 13th</u>. The new viewer, based on his/her familiarity with films from the early 1980s, has the ability to link cinematographic and fashion elements to a period thirty years previous to the making of the film.

Through the <u>Friday the 13th</u> film series, the aesthetic design of the films, particularly the opening sequences, can be shown to either reward or inhibit the viewing experience based on the specific perspective of the viewer. The serialisation of the franchise appropriates an increasingly selective segment of the mythos/backstory, and how this segment is presented in each film provides distinct advantages and disadvantages for viewers based on their previous awareness and knowledge of the earlier films. The varying techniques of establishing previous character development and narrative and its relationship to the further narrative of a sequelized film can create different readings based on the viewer's previous

cinematic experiences. This indicates the central significance of aesthetic and formal design in the inclusion of the viewer within an ongoing serial narrative, and how they are positioned relative to the text. Reading and understanding therefore become subject to the film's form when garnering narrative meaning.

Chapter 6: Conclusion and Defence of Method

Having analysed the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films in detail, I will explicate my findings and my methodology, with the aim of concluding this thesis. Firstly, I will explain how perspective has proven significant for an understanding of the aesthetic pleasures inherent within the slasher subgenre of horror, as well as horror itself. I will also explain why the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films have proven a useful both for an understanding of the developments within the slasher and horror as a whole over the last thirty-plus years, but also as an exemplary case study to advocate the use of formalism. Finally, I will engage with writing that both opposes and supports my formalist methodology, which will ultimately explain why I not only selected, but champion formalism over other research and analytic methods.

Perspective and *Friday the 13th*

At its most basic level, perspective creates a framing element that dictates the viewer's experiential understanding of the narrative events. This is significant within the horror genre, as it is central to eliciting fear from the viewer, as it draws the viewer in, or in the rare case of omniscience, frustratingly separates the viewer from a threatening and/or traumatic event. However, there are subtler textures of this fear that are elicited, and the specific housing of perspective determines this necessarily controlled use of positioning. Individually, the reading of the aesthetic elements could be affected by chance: choosing the best of a series of bad takes, either on film or on the audio track, cutting short a great take to omit a mistake, and other potential circumstances that occur in the process of filmmaking. However, the combination of elements is by nature meticulously designed in order to create a

specific response in the viewer. Even films that intentionally remain ambiguous take great pains to organize the elements to fit this intent.

As illustrated in Chapter 1, the communication of perspective is essential to genres outside of horror. Although a direct incitement of fear may not be the goal of creating perspective in comedy, for instance, it can still be used to engender an inclusive immediacy either into the narrative as a whole, or as an isolated event. Ultimately it becomes both the catalyst for and the vessel of emotional affect. Perspective provides and monitors the emotional intensity not only from sequence to sequence, but moment to moment, as my discussion of the fluidity of perspective changes indicates.

Also, a filmmaker's awareness of the perspective of the viewer affects the overall design of the film and can, in turn, be used to influence the reading of a film. Here issues can arise surrounding 'target audiences' and context. A film like Triumph des Willens (Triumph of the Will) (1935; dir. Riefenstahl) was designed to inspire the German people of the late 1930s/early 1940s with hope and confidence in the ruling political party. Displacing this context to another country and/or accounting for historical hindsight greatly alters the meaning of the film to viewers. For the maker of a film sequel or remake, the filmmakers need to account for a minimum of two viewer perspectives: those familiar with previous entries in the series, and those unfamiliar with earlier films in the series. In some cases, perspectives that lie in between the two become factors: those who have only seen some of the earlier films, those who have seen none but are aware of the cultural and iconographic significance of the series, etc.

Friday the 13th, its sequels, the cross-franchise film, and the remake incorporates such a wide range and variety of perspective usages as well as aesthetic

developments that analysis of this can demonstrate, as I've done here, how the horror genre and the slasher sub-genre work, and how these aesthetic elements function within film. My analysis only reveals a small part of the potential that research on the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films can contribute to film studies in general. In order to understand this potential, it is of key significance to understand that the <u>Friday the 13th</u> films are not autonomous products; for the most part, they make attempts to engage simultaneously with their cultural, economic and artistic contexts as well as their viewers.

Paramount's <u>Friday the 13th</u> films and New Line Cinema's <u>Jason</u> films give to their generic contemporaries as much as they take from them, resulting in a group of cinematic articles that stand for the adaptability of a genre to contemporary trends while reconfiguring these trends in a unique manner emulated by subsequent motion pictures. These films have demonstrated the ability to develop and evolve while retaining the core generic elements successfully enough to warrant further entries in the franchise and repeated home video format releases. The <u>Friday the 13th</u> series has remained competitive with its generic contemporaries, and has influenced the form of slasher films throughout its thirty-plus year span.   Even the earlier <u>Friday the 13th</u> films make unique adaptations to both popular generic models as well as other films, like those in the giallo tradition, in order to feed viewer expectation, while advancing the aesthetics of horror.

In general, <u>Friday the 13th</u> provides an excellent model to analyse the trends of an extremely volatile genre, in terms of both financial success and formal construction. I assert that the series can be seen as a superior representative sample of the genre, which allows for examination, analysis, and research at a level not provided by any other franchise. The included arguments with respect to <u>A New</u>

Beginning also represent the potential for the creation of a difficult, challenging film to arise out of the strictures of a formulaic model and franchise continuity. These points regarding perspective all reveal significant yet fairly obvious observations with regards to the aesthetic treatment of horror and slasher films. More valuable observations can be made concerning the reading and analysis of the Friday the 13th films, and even the slasher sub-genre as a whole. In order to make these observations, the focus on perspective has provided the opportunity to breach an aesthetic analysis of these films, and has proved a useful and potent starting point for spearheading a formalist analysis.

Reviewing criticism and analysis of the Friday the 13th films, much written to date tends to place the series in a negative light. Much of the writing from theorists who focus on the message of a film, in terms of narrative, or even structural observations regarding politics, gender, psychoanalysis, and cultural representation, suggests that Friday the 13th, its sequels and the remake is of little or no value as an artistic artefact. Key theorists like Carol Clover and Robin Wood appear to make this very argument, and writers with a focus on narrative such as Kim Newman, while acknowledging the popularity of the series, seem to ignore the fact that these films provide anything significant or beneficial, and leave the franchise as little more than a series of fleeting references or footnotes. While these approaches can yield valuable results, the Friday the 13th series is left with little to recommend it from such writing. However, through a review of the work of someone like Vera Dika, who looks at the film from a genre theory perspective, breaking it down to a series of successful generic elements that have been used as a model of reproducing previous generic successes in a manner which provides enough variety to engage viewers, and brings them back to such texts repeatedly, the importance of the series becomes more

apparent. More recent work has been done focusing on the <u>Friday the 13th</u> series's significance as a motion picture business model, by writers such as J. A. Kerswell and Richard Nowell. This appears to be the beginning of an evaluation of these films outside of previous analytical traditions that begin to touch upon both their popularity and significance as film texts.

Throughout my research I have encountered others, such as Sarah Wharton at the University of Liverpool and Elizabeth Dixon of Sheffield Hallam University, who are engaging in textual analysis of the <u>Friday the13th</u> series in order to discover the popular appeal and the pleasure they provide viewers. This sort of analysis is contributing more towards situating this franchise within the realm of serious academic focus within film studies, and demonstrating how these films contribute to the understanding of film. This is a very general way of addressing these findings, which leads to more specific discoveries and conclusions within this research.

First, this formalist aesthetic analysis placed in comparison with its contemporaries has revealed how these films appeal to viewers based on aesthetic applications in response to trends in the market. By showing how the <u>Friday the 13th</u> both appropriated and ran contrary to generic trends at certain points in its history, one can obtain a clearer understanding of the elements to which viewers responded, which leads to the potential for further study of historical and cultural reasons behind these responses. For example, the extreme divergence from elements of traditional and popular contemporary horror aesthetics, while appropriating narrative elements of unsuccessful contemporaries resulted in relatively poor reception of <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u> and <u>Jason X</u>, and cannot be attributed to a wane in the popularity of the genre, as other franchises were created and thriving during this period.

Secondly, this tendency to respond to contemporary trends results in more complex aesthetic dynamics within the films. The New Blood is a muddle of alternating perspectives, while adopting a supernatural and psychical narrative, and simultaneously appropriating a darker, in terms of both emotional effect and cinematographic palette, sensibility. The original review in Variety (Variety Staff; 1987), Caryn James's contemporary review in The New York Times and Richard Harrington's contemporary review in The Washington Post (1988) are aimed to convince the reader that the film attempts to utilise elements of much better films and stories to keep the Friday the 13th fresh, but fails to provide an experience that is significantly new or entertaining. My research demonstrates that dismissing The New Blood as such misses valuable aesthetic complexity that may help to explain how the franchise retained its cultural significance to this point.

Finally, and in a similar vein, this analysis has allowed me to both discover and foreground the significance of Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning. A New Beginning is a unique artefact in the history of the slasher sub-genre, and at best, a significant overlooked text due to the complexity of its aesthetic and the relative superiority of its form worthy of note as an important film regardless of genre. Not only does A New Beginning make unique responses to contemporary and historical film trends, but it also manages to take unusual risks in response to its own franchise. Examples of this have been detailed in this thesis, and therefore do not need to be repeated here. However, only a small amount of its innovative approach to form has been covered, and there is still more to be found.

The distilled sum of these observations is very direct. Firstly, perspective is a significant part of the aesthetic creation of the cinematic experience. Secondly, the Friday the 13th franchise is a largely untapped resource that can be used to expand

the understanding of film aesthetics and the last thirty years of cinema history,
particularly within the horror genre. Despite being basic observations, they appear
necessary to initiate potentially significant discourse within Film Studies.

Form vs Theory

In the introduction, I outlined the different approaches to formalism, and how
I see my own work situated within the range of methods that the term "formalism"
encapsulates. I will now conclude my thesis by clearly outlining arguments against
this method, and why I not only continue utilising formalist analysis, but also why I
find it preferable to other methods.

As discussed in my introduction, the appearance of formalism in Berliner's
teaching methods brought some frustration and even anger to some of the students in
the class. This response is not limited to undergraduate students, as formalism has
become the subject of criticism from some writers who utilise other methodologies.
The major arguments against formalism, which I will now engage with, are:

1) Formalism is a method that is too cold, clinical, and dull for an approach to
   the arts, which are designed to elicit passion and emotion;

2) By its very nature, formalism cannot engage with questions of value, which
   is of utmost importance in discussing art;

3) By attempting not to adopt, bare, or communicate an ideology, formalism
   either works contrary to socio-political/economic positions that are more
   progressive, or, it upholds dominant ideologies;

4) By focusing on microcosmic elements of film form, formalists risk missing,
   and failing to engage with, the "big picture" or larger "meaning", even to the
   point where formalists ignore basic representative indicators (i.e.-this image

is a series of patterns, lines and colours, not a mountain at sunset).

Some of these arguments are accurate, and some either misrepresentative or

misunderstanding of the aims of formalism. To begin, I will show the research of

those who oppose formalism, how these arguments are framed, and ways in which

formalists respond to these accusations.

I have made reference throughout the thesis to interpretive criticism,

psychoanalytic reading, socio-political analysis, and sociocultural analysis, each time

positioning my work as providing an alternate reading to these previously utilised

methods. These methods are often referred to, usually by formalists, as "theory", a

categorisation which "theorists" seem uncomfortable with, as I will discuss in a

moment. As a result, the methodological argument tends to configure into a battle of

Form vs Theory. Currently, two of the most vocal and recognizable names engaging

in this debate are David Bordwell on the side of Form, and Slavoj Žižek on the side

of Theory.

Engaging in the debate between form and theory, or as Žižek dubs the

tension, "between Theory and Post-Theory," (2001) becomes problematic, as the two

sides of the argument rarely fully engage with each other. The only work on either

side that extensively engages in this is Bordwell and Carroll's anthology Post-

Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies (1996), which is comprised of multiple essays

arguing for ways to move forward from what is perceived as the demise of theory in

academia. However, one thing I have discovered throughout the course of my

studies is that theory is still prevalent amongst graduate students as well as

established academics, and both sides, assuming they are in opposition, continue to

carry the same misconceptions of both. Post-Theory, however, and the ensuing

debate between Bordwell and Žižek, seems to directly address concerns that are perceived by the dominance of theory and its inclusive methodological approaches.

Here, it is important to stress that the argument appears unfairly weighted on the side of Bordwell. As a result of the publication of Post-Theory, Žižek used a section of his monograph The Fright of Real Tears: Krzysztof Kieślowski between Theory and Post-Theory (2001) to respond to the arguments set out in Post-Theory. In turn, in Bordwell's own words, "I reply to those criticisms in the last chapter of *Figures Traced in Light* (pp. 260–264). But there is much more to say about *FRT* (The Fright of Real Tears), and this online essay supplements my remarks in *Figures*." (http://www.davidbordwell.net/essays/zizek.php; accessed 26-04-2013) What follows that statement is an extensive essay citing Žižek's arguments against Post-Theory, and highlights what Bordwell deems misinterpretations, glib paraphrasing, and missed opportunities for arguing against vulnerable points within the book.

Bordwell then intensifies the continuity of his argument by clearly stating the views presented in Post-Theory and strengthening the weak arguments Žižek has drawn out. What is significant about this debate is that the Post-Theory anthology is dedicated entirely to the defence of methodologies outside of what Žižek describes as "the deconstructionist/feminist/post-Marxist/psychoanalytic/sociocritical/cultural studies etc. approach, ironically nicknamed 'Theory' (which, of course, is far from a unified field- the above chain is more a series of Wittgensteinian 'family resemblances') by its opponents [...]" (2001; 1) [parentheses in the original, brackets mine] Žižek then continues to denounce what he sees as the claim made by proponents of Post-Theory that the theory movement has a centralised source around Lacanian psychoanalysis, which he then discounts throughout the introduction to his

book. Bordwell, however, takes issue with this, citing the only three points in <u>Post-Theory</u> where Lacan is evoked, and at these points, Bordwell argues, Lacan is more or less peripheral or at least minimal to the overall theses of the papers, or, in one case, confused with Freud.[1] This is a single example of the claim-response-rebuttal argument between Bordwell and Žižek. What I find particularly significant is that <u>Post-Theory</u> is a lengthy tome compiling multiple responses to theoretical methodologies, and Žižek's response is included in a shorter work that aims primarily to focus on the work of Krzysztof Kieślowski. In Bordwell's rebuttal essay on davidbordwell.net, he states, in critical form, that:

> Most of *FRT* offers standard film criticism, providing impressionistic readings of various Kieslowski films in regard to recurring themes, visual motifs, dramatic structures, borrowed philosophical concepts, and the like. Žižek also reiterates 1970s argument about how film editing "sutures" the viewer into the text. I'll have almost nothing to say about these stretches of *FRT*. But Žižek launches the book with an introduction and two chapters criticizing arguments made in a collection of essays edited by myself and Noël Carroll, [Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies](#) (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996). The subtitle of Žižek's book indicates the centrality of what he takes to be the Post-Theory movement, even though he doesn't pursue arguments about it through the book. Indeed, the first two chapters seem to me awkwardly welded onto a fairly conventional book of free-associative film

---

[1] This is a reference to the chapter in <u>Post-Theory</u> written by Stephen Prince "Psychoanalytic Film Theory and the Problem of the Missing Spectator" (Prince 1996; 71-86), see Žižek 2001; 1, 183

interpretation. (http://www.davidbordwell.net/essays/zizek.php; accessed

26-04-2013) [parentheses in original]

This is one extreme example of the manner in which Post-Theorists are consistently

defending their methodologies against attack from theorists.

Let's use the example of an essay written by Barry Salt (2009). Before he

can establish his argument about contemporary Hollywood aesthetic trends, he must

point out the fact that writing to date on P. T. Anderson's <u>Magnolia</u> (1999) failed to

acknowledge the uniqueness of the film's form, specifically in its use of long takes.

Berliner's <u>Hollywood Incoherent</u> (2010) dedicates the entire first chapter, and

the bulk of the first part of the book, defending his methodology and directly

responding to theorists and interpretive critics. In fact, as I have already

demonstrated, Berliner's entire academic platform is founded on his vociferous

denunciation of theory and interpretive criticism. This, again, is taken from Stephen

Booth[2] who similarly denounces such approaches, in defence of his own

methodology. However, Booth's defence is also framed as an attack on theory,

which theorists defend by making aggressive attacks on formalism, resulting in what

can be politely termed a dialogue.

Importantly, we find the same arguments repeated without being directly

addressed. Terry Eagleton, in his textbook <u>Literary Theory</u> (2008), dedicates only

five pages[3] in explaining, and summarily dismissing the Russian formalist movement

without demonstrating how this approach has evolved and developed since the turn

of the twentieth century. His opposition is founded on the argument that meaning is

---

[2]See Booth (1990) for an example of his work.

[3] Admittedly, references to formalism are later dotted throughout the text, but the bulk of engagement
with the method are contained within pages 2-7.

at least as important as style, where he interprets Russian Formalism as being concerned with style only, particularly as an identifier of the literary as set apart from everyday language. (7)   Without saying it outright, Eagleton, a staunch and vocal Marxist, appears to consider formalist methodologies not worth much inclusion in something resembling a textbook on literary analysis.

In his journal article "Theory and Film: Principles of Realism and Pleasure", (1976) Colin McCabe dismisses the formalists by identifying the allure of observing a text on its own, outside of its context, which he considers fallacious. McCabe writes, "The text has no separate existence and, for this reason, it is impossible to demand a typology of texts such as I proposed in my earlier article. Rather each reading must be a specific analysis which may use certain general concepts but these concepts will find their articulation within the specific analyses and not within an already defined combinatory." (McCabe 1976; 25)

Within this argumentation, McCabe fails to see, or at least address, the value of observing a text on its own terms; suggesting that the significance of a text is only understandable when social conditions and meanings are considered. It appears as though McCabe, and in turn, Žižek and Eagleton are claiming that displacing a text from its social context immediately diminishes its value, or at least its value must be reconsidered within a different social context.

Furthermore, the quote from McCabe is particularly revelatory in considering the opposing analytic philosophies. I have stated where Berliner overtly, and Bordwell and Thompson more implicitly, identify the utilisation of neoformalism as engaging with the text itself and on its own terms. However, McCabe here claims that the "already defined combinatory", or, as I understand it, the perceived rigidly inflexible parameters for analysis, becomes something outside the text that

neoformalists attempt to place onto a reading of the text. But with McCabe's vocal

identification with and application of Marxist criticism and "theory", it is difficult

not to make a similar accusation of him. The difference here is that McCabe and the

theorists, particularly sociopolitical theorists, use their ideology to deconstruct a text,

where neoformalists use their ideology to choose their methodology – a

methodology which attempts to view a film without an ideological tint, and

understand the film by an observation of its mechanics.

Additionally, theorists appear to consider ideological analyses key to

considering questions of value. See McCabe's more recent statement: "It is of

course the case that there are a variety of sociological and formal enquiries, from

Moretti's distant readings to Bordwell and Thomson's (sic.) statistical analysis of

classic Hollywood, which must, by their very methodology, ignore questions of

value." (McCabe 2011; 9) [parentheses mine] This is not only contrary to the

writing of Bordwell, for example[4], but Berliner's monograph is wholly dedicated to

observing form in order to understand why films are valued. As Berliner points out

in Hollywood Incoherent "if Francis Ford Coppola could take a book by Mario Puzo

commonly regarded as pulp (even by Puzo) and, with minimal thematic changes,

turn it into what most commentators and filmgoers consider one of the best movies

of the decade, then ideology and social relevance cannot be fundamental to artistic

value." (17) [parentheses in original]

What I find, to this point, to be the most scathing indictment of formalism can

be found in Matthew Flisfeder's work on Žižek's theory of film. While Flisfeder

evokes the cognitivist work of Carroll and Prince (2012; 36-39), the main source of

---

[4]See Bordwell's blog entry Unsteadicam Chronicles, where he observes the formal qualities of The
Bourne Ultimatum (2007; dir. Greengrass) as an intensification of the elements of intensified
continuity, and compares it to other texts to place a value judgement upon the film

friction between Žižek and the post-theorists is the work of Bordwell. Flisfeder writes:

 Although Žižek finds it necessary to address science as 'knowledge in the Real' (i.e., Marxism) and therefore criticizes some of the reigning practices in cultural studies, particularly a certain variety of historical relativism, he considers this silent passing over of the tough ideological questions by post-Theorists to be somewhat of a spontaneous ideological attachment to the reigning political power. (90) [parentheses in original]

Žižek applies this thinking in his criticism of Kathryn Bigelow's Zero Dark Thirty, arguing that the film endorses torture by not overtly condemning it, and opting instead to show torture coldly and clinically. (http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/jan/25/zero-dark-thirty-normalises-torture-unjustifiable; accessed 18-04-2013) In short, Žižek appears to believe that the biggest crime perpetrated by those that engage in an analysis of style without incorporating ideological frameworks is to risk supporting that which is morally wrong, or at least, the dominant ideology of the text and the institutional and cultural contexts of its production. Bordwell indirectly addresses this when he writes, "For our theorists, politics equals left politics equals the glory years of May 1968 theory. Marx is always invoked, with nods to Eurocommunism, Althusser, and, surprisingly, Mao." (http://www.davidbordwell.net/essays/zizek.php; accessed 26-04-2013) There are two responses to this particular accusation by Žižek. My own argument is that because one does not incorporate moral and political ideology into his/her analysis does not mean that said person is devoid of such opinion, nor does it make

them morally "bad". It can just mean that the writer intends to avoid having his/her

observations and conclusions t(a)inted by their worldview. The other response,

taking a cue from Bordwell's quote, would be: So what?

Wimsatt and Brooks provide what seems to be a useful summary of the

arguments against neoformalism, despite criticising formalist literary theory, writing,

> The theory, despite a more overt tendency to tautology than is apparent in
> most art theories, might be a good enough theory if it could be compelled
> to answer the question whether lines and colors ever have their complete
> 'significance' in a state purged entirely of our concrete optical experience
> – the resemblance of a circle to the sun and the moon and the wheel, the
> contrast between the geometrically ruled straight line and the whole
> world of organic nature. (1957, 490)

Essentially, Wimsatt and Brooks here claim that formalism ignores our familiarity

with the elements of our environment to viewing art as something wholly separate.

Again, although this addresses early formalist literary theory, the argument still

lingers amongst opponents of neoformalist film theory. This makes the assumption

that semiotics, among other things, are wholly done away with in the neoformalist

mindset. V. N. Voloshinov, a contemporary of the Russian formalists, addresses this

argument when he writes, "However far we go in analyzing all the properties of the

material and all the possible combination of those properties, we shall never be able

to find their aesthetic significance unless we slip in the contraband of another point

of view that does not belong within the framework of analysis of the material."

(1976; 158) It is also echoed by no less than Leon Trotsky, who spoke in careful

opposition to the method, writing, "The effort to set art free from life, to declare it a craft self-sufficient unto itself, devitalizes and kills art." (1923; 57) This statement, however, is complicated by the inclusion of cognitivism into modern formalism. While these arguments may have been more applicable within Russian formalism, and many environmental elements are discarded with an aim to objective analysis, formalists still use their knowledge of the world to understand how a text functions. In fact, the specific formalist modes of historical poetics and cognitivism require the understanding of other film texts and neurological response, respectively, to facilitate their approaches. Formalists, again, reject the idea of approaching a text in order to reinforce an ideological framework. This is counterproductive and taints something resembling objective analysis.[5]

Returning to questions of value, formalism and theory attribute the worth of a text using different criteria. Aside from the disparate conclusions I have drawn on Friday the 13th and Friday the 13th Part 2 to those of Robin Wood, you can see through the following analyses of The French Connection (1971; dir. Friedkin) how formalist analysis and the application of theory determine value in different ways. Michael Ryan and Douglas Kellner describe the famous car/train chase sequence culminating in 'Popeye' Doyle shooting the unarmed criminal in the back:

> The subjective camera lodged in Popeye's car identifies the audience
> with his point of view in a way that works against reflection on the
> motivation and consequences of his actions. The audience's desires are
> manipulated into the criminal, no matter what the cost in life or liberty

---

[5] I believe that objectivity is impossible, but formalism aims towards a general understanding and consensus, whereas theory and interpretation largely aim to provoke discussion, without being able to create a definitive understanding – interpretation becomes highly individualised.

(and Popeye almost does harm a number of people during the chase). When he finally does kill the hit man (unnecessarily; he could just as easily have wounded the disarmed man), the audience is prepared to desire the release of the tension that ensues. Police brutality is thus legitimated stylistically. (1988; 42) [parentheses in original]

This analysis is prefaced by describing it as one of "the other major conservative films of 1971..." (41) along with <u>Dirty Harry</u> (dir. Siegel).

Berliner, however, highlights the film's incidental focus on Doyle's indifference to the bystanders that are either killed or endangered by the surrounding events which are the focus of the narration. (2009; 108-9) Their very inclusion, Berliner argues[6], problematises any potential ideological readings, rendering such a focus superfluous. Instead, he stresses that ultimately, the film's form and narration are used to play with generic expectation to demonstrate that what we think we want from the genre is itself problematic. In his words, "That scene (in which Doyle and his partner are taken off the case) is one of many that prompt questions about the ethics of the film's hero and the ethos of the film itself." (108) [parentheses mine] This is the statement that leads into his analysis of the car chase. In his conclusion to the chapter, Berliner's point is made more overt: "The ending of the movie capitalizes on the fact that the stock virtues of a generic police detective have a darker side. In Doyle, these virtues emerge ambiguously as character flaws, the cause of his failure as a cop." (116) This is a clear exemplification of how, as Berliner says, "Cultural and ideological analysis may demonstrate the ways in which

---

[6] His argument is apparent throughout the chapter, as well as on a lecture of his that I attended that focused on this film as a subject, in 2001.

seventies films respond to the ideologies of the time, but it threatens to foul up aesthetic analysis." (17)

While I have, in some cases, bared my views throughout the explication of this tension between "theory" and formalism, I will here summarise this debate, and my position within it. Theorists warn against formalism as they disapprove of its nonadherence to an ideological position, its failure to account for receptive links outside of immediate aesthetic response – assuming it merely traces pattern and form and does not engage with the gathering of narrative "meaning" – and its inherent inability to gauge value. Formalists, in turn, largely attempt to point out the flaws in the methodological model of theorists, and seem to fail to fully respond to these accusations. The gap in the argument appears to be that, by virtue of their individual methodologies, theorists make broad, overarching accusations to come to grips with the scope of the ideals (or lack thereof) of the formalists, whereas the formalists dissect the minutiae of the arguments of the theorists. For example, see this claim made by Ryan and Kellner:

> The representational conventions include form as well as subject matter.
> The formal conventions – narrative closure, image continuity,
> nonreflexive camera, character identification, voyeuristic objectification,
> sequential editing, causal logic, dramatic motivation, shot centering,
> frame balance, realist intelligibility, etc. – help to instill ideology by
> creating an illusion that what happens on the screen is a neutral recording
> of objective events, rather than a construct operating from a certain point
> of view. (1988; 1)

Notice how "voyeuristic objectification" is sandwiched into this statement regarding Hollywood film form. This, coming from the methodologically telling title <u>Camera Politica</u>, demonstrates the lengths to which theoretical and interpretive analysts misrepresent, or possibly even misunderstand, the function of formalist analysis. Also, while my initial aim was not to disprove this statement, I hope I have managed to do just that: To demonstrate that the foundation of Hollywood film style is not to "creat(e) an illusion that what happens on screen is a neutral recording of objective events," [parentheses mine] but that Hollywood, and most particularly horror, thrives on the cognitive reception of events as, perhaps not a construct, but certainly "operating from a certain point of view." Ultimately, neither side appears equipped or fully engaged with the opposing theory to make an effective retort. To use an analogy, each is attempting to fight a battle against the other on a field where the enemy is not present.

I would argue, in response to the main complaints of Theorists, that: a) Formalists deem it necessary to abandon ideological positioning (of which there is a broad range amongst my formalist colleagues) in order to have something resembling an objective analysis of a film; b) Formalists do place import on gathering narrative meaning, both through reading a film as a series of base semiotic structures and visual/aural juxtaposition and absence – the primary difference to theoretical and interpretive narrative readings is that formalists do not see the significance nor the academic value in engaging with a film on an abstract level; and c) Formalists are also primarily concerned with understanding the value of a work of art, it is only that the formalist criteria of value differs entirely, and almost unrecognizably, from that of interpretive analysts and theorists.

In his book <u>Authorship and the Films of David Lynch: Aesthetic Receptions in Contemporary Hollywood</u>, Antony Todd takes an evenhanded, balanced view of both formalism and theory, while openly favouring formalism. He states, "While I too support the idea that understanding contextual factors is a necessity in getting to grips with what texts mean, I feel that the structural and thematic properties of poetic texts are of equal importance and must not be relegated as a result of historical imperatives." (2012; 8) While his view is admirable, I am not quite so generous. I do not wish to eradicate the practice of interpretation nor the application of theory. I do, however, favour formalist analysis, and feel that it is a valuable and under-utilised methodology, which I hope my thesis has both helped demonstrate and rectify, respectively.

Considering the primary accusations against formalism, this thesis has defended the methodology in a number of ways. First, let us consider the lighter complaint of formalism being cold, clinical, and dull. Clinical, it may be; Formalism must use a certain amount of precision to collect the data necessary to render its arguments, otherwise conclusions drawn can be easily and swiftly discredited. However, one need only read Berliner, Bordwell, or, I hope, this thesis, to see that formalist analysis is rooted in the pleasure and desire that artworks elicit, and the analysis can be engaging and exciting. But, even if the resulting work becomes difficult or tedious, the arguments, data, and conclusions are no less valid. Formalism, above all else, in interested in attempting to discover and trace objective, quantifiable elements and patterns that contribute to the understanding of film studies. I have done my best to describe accurately camera positionings, sound elements, and editing methods to draw attention to and support my arguments and conclusions in an engaging manner. Even so, by placing an aesthetic criteria on

academic work and decrying the method because it runs contrary to personal interest, one risks invalidating potentially useful information. As much as I have tried, I find economic theory ponderous and boring to read. It is still a subject of absolute necessity to everyone in some form or another.

No matter the amount of interest the subject holds for the reader, formalism, like theory, aims to attribute value to works of art, despite claims to the contrary. The difference lies in the criteria laid out by each method. Within this thesis I have utilised the criteria needed for a formalist analysis, and have come to certain conclusions, one of which attributes a large amount of value to Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning, and values some of the other films in the series rather highly, particularly in comparison with a number of their contemporaries.

This thesis does not, by design and by virtue of its analysis, respond overtly to the accusation that formalists either promote a problematic ideology or uphold dominant ideological frameworks. However, my findings have responded to this implicitly, in a way that ties in with my response to questions of artistic "value" and "worth". I have spent a great deal of this thesis addressing the Friday the 13th films, which have been assessed negatively, on primarily ideological grounds, by Robin Wood as I addressed in Chapter 2 . This assessment is founded on summaries of the narrative and the selective analyses of aesthetic devices, largely claiming that the first film upholds conservative and reactionary sociopolitical ideologies. However, I have shown that the first film, while retaining a spare and minimal narrative, manages to be progressive stylistically, through its utilisation of European horror, particularly Italian giallo, aesthetics, unlike the bulk of its contemporaries. Furthermore, I have, as my primary aim, demonstrated how the Friday the 13th film series has contributed to the aesthetic development of the slasher film with wider

implications for the way mainstream American film form has evolved over the last thirty-plus years. Whether or not aesthetic progressiveness can be considered indicative of sociopolitical progressiveness (a dubious claim, to be sure), it still warns of the dangers of dismissing certain film texts contrary to one's ideological positioning at the risk of understanding why films have become what they are. This argument, in turn, responds to the accusation from theorists that formalists, in their focus on microcosmic analysis, miss understanding the broader scope and implications of a film. While the formalist largely does not seek "meaning" outside of narrative information, there are broader trends to observe. Historical poetics looks at developing trends over a large period of time. There is a "big picture", to be seen, but formalists see a different image. Looking at the aforementioned Barry Salt article, he looks at smaller elements – i.e. average shot length – to understand how films communicate, and challenge viewers to understand, narrative information. I have consistently attempted, through this thesis, to relate the elements of film form to the communication of narrative information, specifically through the application of perspective. This also counters the argument that formalists only view artworks as processes of systems and mechanics. Formalists use these processes to explain how artworks communicate ideas, emotions, people, and objects that are familiar; this is what Aristotle refers to when he discusses "representation". Formalists largely refrain from extending the interpretation of representative elements into broader ideological trends and "meaning", which threatens to undercut the precision of the analyses and conclusions discussed earlier. These are the building blocks upon which interpretive criticism, should one opt to purse it, be founded. This is what Berliner points to when he says that theory threatens to "foul up aesthetic analysis."

And all this returns to debates regarding value, where a work that has a significant influence on cinema history or challenges the viewer to understand narrative information in a new or complex way in comparison to larger trends, and, with respect to broader readings, can therefore be deemed a work of value. This demonstrates that the system of defence in formalism is not cyclical, but interwoven, with these aims difficult to separate no matter what mode of formalism is utilised. Again, my thesis has not overtly responded to the accusation within my analysis, but it implicitly engages and contributes to these debates, and in some ways counters the accusations brought against formalism. With this as my methodological framework, I have illuminated the significance and usefulness of analysing the <u>Friday the 13th</u> film series to understanding modern horror aesthetics as well as modern mainstream cinema aesthetics. I have also demonstrated methods for rendering and communicating perspective, and how perspective creates narrative meaning and aids viewer understanding and emotional response. It would be almost impossible to reach these findings without utilising formalist analysis, therefore inherently providing a defence of the method.

Appendix 1

Plot Summaries for the *Friday the 13*^{*th*} Films

Friday the 13th (1980; dir. Cunningham)

Friday the 13th centres on the sinister events at a summer camp, called Camp Crystal Lake, in the forest. The story begins on a Friday the 13th of an unspecified month in 1950. Two young camp counsellors are interrupted while "making love" and subsequently killed by an unseen stalker. Thirty years later on a Friday the 13th in 1980, camp counsellors just arriving in preparation for the summer events are killed one at a time, again, by an unseen assailant. The sole survivor, Alice, is eventually confronted by the killer who introduces herself as Mrs. Voorhees, a former cook at the camp. Mrs. Voorhees, who initially appears as a comforting matronly figure, reveals that she killed the two counsellors in 1950 because her son, Jason, had drowned while they should have been watching him. She has since been hearing Jason's voice, which has instructed her to kill all of the counsellors of Camp Crystal Lake. Alice confronts Mrs. Voorhees and decapitates her. She then gets into a canoe and pushes out into the lake, then falls asleep. She awakes as the police arrive, and as she sits up to communicate with them, a deformed boy leaps out of the lake and pulls her under. Alice comes in the hospital, and in talking with a policeman asks what happens to the boy, who she refers to as Jason. The policeman reveals that they saw no sign of the boy, and the film ends with Alice stating, "Then he's still out there."

Friday the 13th Part 2 (1981; dir. Miner)

Friday the 13th Part 2 begins some time after the events of the first film. Alice, now living alone, still has nightmares about the events of the previous film. An unseen attacker enters her house and kills her. After this, another group of counsellors gather at Camp Crystal Lake to prepare for the arrival of the campers. They are told the story of Mrs. Voorhees and Jason, but suggest it is only a legend, and such superstition ought not to be believed. After a day of preparation, half of the counsellors go out drinking while the others remain at camp, and those who remain are murdered by a person with a bag covering his head, save for a hole cut out for one eye to see through. One of the counsellors, Ginny, and the head counsellor, Paul, return to find the remains of the victims before being attacked themselves by the assailant, whom Ginny correctly identifies as Jason. After a chase, Ginny discovers Jason's makeshift shack in the forest, which contains a shrine to his mother, on which Mrs. Voorhees's decapitated, rotting head is displayed. Ginny subdues Jason and runs away. In the final moments, as Ginny rests in her cabin, Jason, unhooded, bursts through the window and grabs her. The film ends with Ginny taken away in an ambulance.

Friday the 13th Part III 3-D (1982; dir. Miner)

The film centres on a teenage girl named Chris and a group of her friends visiting her family's vacation house near Crystal Lake. Chris, who was attacked by Jason two years before while visiting the same house, is returning to show herself there is no reason to be afraid. However, Jason returns and starts killing everyone visiting with her, and in the course of this he discovers and dons a hockey mask. She confronts Jason, hits him in the head with a hatchet, and gets into a canoe, echoing

what happens to Alice at the end of <u>Friday the 13th</u>. She awakes in the morning, and sees Jason in the window of her house. He seems to disappear into thin air, before the corpse of Mrs. Voorhees leaps out of the water and drags Chris under. At the end, the police have arrived, and are taking Chris away to safety, while Jason still lies apparently dead from the hatchet wound.

<u>Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter</u> (1984; dir. Zito)

<u>The Final Chapter</u> begins with Jason's supposed corpse being taken to the morgue at a hospital, yet Jason comes back to life, attacking hospital staff before disappearing. The story then moves back in time to a house by Crystal Lake, where a young boy, Tommy Jarvis, lives resides? with his mother and teenage sister. Concurrently a group of teenagers visit the cabin nextdoor to spend the weekend. Gradually, Jason kills everyone between the two houses except for Tommy and his sister. In the climax, Tommy bravely attempts to create a sympathetic connection in Jason by reminding him of the child he used to be, before furiously striking Jason repeatedly with his own machete. Jason is now dead, and Tommy and his sister are taken to the hospital. The film ends, implying that Tommy has been psychologically damaged and has the potential to become violent himself.

<u>Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning</u> (1985; dir. Steinmann)

Tommy Jarvis arrives at a new psychoanalytic institution in order to help cure him, as he is apparently still disturbed from the events of the previous film. He has bad dreams, rarely talks, and is antisocial. An altercation at the institution between two other patients results in one of them being violently killed, and the paramedics come to retrieve the body of Joey, the dead patient. Following this,

Jason-style murders begin occurring, and a man wearing a hockey mask is seen perpetrating these acts of violence. Although he is suspected, Tommy, it transpires, is innocent, and in the climax confronts the killer and despatches him. It is revealed that the killer was Roy, one of the paramedics sent to recover the body of Joey. Roy is said to have secretly been Joey's father, and was driven mad by the knowledge of his son's death. At the conclusion, Tommy is shown wearing the hockey mask and wielding a knife, again implying his violent potential.

Jason Lives! Friday the 13th Part VI (1986; dir. McLoughlin)

Jason Lives! again centres on Tommy. In the opening sequence, Tommy and a friend from the current institution where he resides covertly escape to see the grave of Jason. Tommy wants to make sure that Jason is, in fact, dead, and he proceeds to exhume Jason's body. The body is indeed still in the grave, rotting, and in a fit of rage, Tommy repeatedly stabs Jason with a metal fencepost. Lightning strikes the post, and Jason returns to life, immediately killing Tommy's friend. Tommy attempts to warn the local sheriff, who believes Tommy is either insane or playing a prank. Meanwhile, the sheriff's daughter is a counsellor at the recently re-opened Camp Crystal Lake. Jason attacks and kills locals as well as the camp counsellors. In the climax, Tommy attaches one end of a chain to a heavy rock and the other around Jason's neck, and proceeds to sink him to the bottom of Crystal Lake. Although Jason appears to struggle and drown, the final shot captures? shows Jason opening his eye.

Friday the 13th Part VII: The New Blood (1988; dir. Buechler)

The New Blood tells the story of Tina, a telekinetic teenage girl who is exploited by her therapist because of her abilities, a fact to which her well-meaning mother remains oblivious. Tina suffers from the guilt of knowing that she unintentionally caused the death of her father at their cabin by Crystal Lake, using her mind, causing the pier on which he was standing to collapse. Her therapist has taken Tina and her mother back out to the cabin under the guise of encouraging her to make peace with this part of her past, while secretly desiring to use her emotional fragility to cause greater telekinetic feats. At the same time, a group of teenagers visit a nearby cabin for the weekend. Tina, trying to bring her father back to life through telekinesis accidentally resurrects Jason, who begins killing the people in the area. The film climaxes with a confrontation between Tina and Jason, where Tina's father comes back from the dead to reattach the chain around Jason's neck.

Friday the 13th Part VIII: Jason Takes Manhattan (1989; dir. Hedden)

Jason Takes Manhattan begins with a boat floating on Crystal Lake near Jason's corpse. The anchor of the boat catches a nearby power cable and the surge of electricity into the water brings Jason back to life. Meanwhile, a group of high school teenagers board a boat to go on a school trip to New York City. One of the group, a girl named Rennie, had an encounter with a young Jason when she was first learning to swim. Since this point, she has had supernatural visions of him, sometimes foretelling danger. Jason finds his way onto the boat, and begins killing members of the group. The survivors make their way to New York City, with Jason in tow. Eventually, Rennie lures Jason into the sewers just before toxic waste is

scheduled to flood through the pipeline. Rennie escapes as Jason is dissolved by the waste material.

<u>Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday</u> (1993; dir. Marcus)

The film begins with Jason being destroyed by heavy gunfire and missiles in a United States Federal Bureau of Investigation sting operation. His remains are taken to the morgue, where the coroner impulsively eats Jason's still beating heart. He is then possessed by Jason's spirit, and begins killing. Jason's spirit then passes from person to person via a large worm-like parasite that leaves and enters bodies orally. Meanwhile, a bounty hunter named Creighton Duke publicly asserts that Jason isn't dead and will continue killing, and is offered money to stop him. Duke is aware of this spirit transference and claims that he can be restored to his true form if his spirit inhabits the body of a member of his family, and furthermore, asserts that the only thing which can truly kill him is a special dagger held by another member of his family. Living near Crystal Lake is a woman named Diana, whose daughter, Jessica, is coming to visit, bringing her newborn daughter, Stephanie. Diana, Jessica and Stephanie are part of Jason's family tree, so Jason, possessing other vessels, pursues them with Duke in close pursuit. He is able to impart his knowledge of Jason to Steven, Stephanie's father who is estranged from Jessica, before Duke is, himself killed by Jason. In the climax, Diana is killed, but the spirit of Jason is still able to enter her, resulting in a return to Jason's original form. The special dagger is discovered in Diana's basement, and Jessica uses it to kill Jason. Jason is then pulled underground by demonic hands, and the film ends with Jason's hockey mask being pulled underground by the hand of Freddy Krueger from the <u>A Nightmare on Elm Street</u> series.

<u>Jason X</u> (2001; dir. Isaac)

Ignoring the events of <u>Jason Goes to Hell</u>, <u>Jason X</u> begins in the year 2008, following the capture of Jason by authorities. He is placed in a research facility as previous attempts to enact capital punishment upon him have apparently proved unsuccessful. Researchers want to analyse Jason to see if they can discover information about body regeneration. One scientist, Rowan, believes he is dangerous, and that the only possibility of keeping society safe is to cryogenically freeze him. Jason escapes, kills several members of the research facility and begins to pursue Rowan. She leads Jason into a cryogenic container and turns it on, just before Jason stabs her through the protective cover of the container. This results in both Jason and Rowan going into accidental cryogenic hibernation. In the year 2455, a group of science students from 'Earth Two' are taken on an educational journey to Earth One, and discover the frozen bodies of Rowan and Jason. Rowan is revived and healed through the use of micro-technology, while Jason is pronounced dead and moved to a different room for observation. Jason once more returns to life and begins killing students and members of the crew. The ship's android eventually confronts Jason and destroys him using heavy weaponry, but Jason's body falls onto the micro-technology based medical station, and his body is regenerated to a more powerful state than before. The few remaining crew members lure him outside the ship as it re-enters Earth Two's atmosphere, and Jason appears to catch fire. The closing of the film implies that this still may not have killed Jason.

Freddy vs. Jason (2003; dir. Yu)

The film begins with Freddy Krueger lamenting that he has been forgotten for too long, making him weak. He wants the people of Elm Street to fear him once again, so in order to do that, Freddy resurrects Jason to kill for him. This would cause people to remember Freddy, giving him strength again. Jason then begins to kill the people of Elm Street, mainly teenagers, while others begin to have nightmares of Freddy. As people gradually remember Freddy, he becomes increasingly more powerful until he is brought back to life. However, Freddy can no longer control Jason, leading to a fight between the two of them to determine who will continue to kill. The fight ends inside Crystal Lake, as Jason emerges carrying Freddy's severed head. The film ends, however, with Freddy's head looking at the camera and winking.

Friday the 13th (2009; dir. Nispel)

Friday the 13th (2009) begins similarly to the denouement of Friday the 13th, with a teenage girl confronted by Mrs. Voorhees who says that the counsellors should have been watching Jason when he drowned. The girl decapitates Mrs. Voorhees and she runs away. After this, a hand is shown picking up the locket that was previously around Mrs. Voorhees's neck. An unspecified amount of time after these events, a group of teenagers go camping around Crystal Lake, and are all seemingly killed by Jason. Following this, a teenager named Clay arrives near Crystal Lake looking for his missing sister Whitney, who was part of the group that was just killed. Clay encounters another group of teenagers travelling to their friend Trent's parents' lake house for the weekend. Jason begins to kill each member one at a time, while Clay continues searching for Whitney, who it is eventually revealed

was kidnapped and being kept prisoner by Jason. Clay finds and rescues Witney, with Jason in pursuit. Clay and Whitney are eventually trapped, so they confront and subdue Jason, finally throwing his body into the lake. In the final moments, Jason emerges from the water to attack them both.

Appendix 2

List and Description of Characters in the *Friday the 13th* Films

In alphabetical order, omitting titles (i.e. – Mrs., Nurse, Sergeant, etc.)

Friday the 13th

- **Alice Hardy**: The "Final Girl". There is obvious romantic and sexual tension between her and the camp owner, Steve Christy. She kills Mrs. Voorhees, but is attacked by the boy Jason, but survives.

- **Annie**: The cook who is killed en route to the camp. She admits to wanting to work with children. Annie dies having her throat slit with a hunting knife after being chased through the forest.

- **Bill**: An attractive male counsellor, who proves adept at physically intensive tasks. His death is not seen, but his corpse is found suspended by several arrows to a door.

- **Brenda**: A tall, attractive female counsellor. She initiates a game of strip Monopoly with Alice and Bill. Brenda's death is not shown, but she is lured out to the archery range, and her body is later thrown through a window to frighten Alice.

- **Crazy Ralph**: The local "prophet of doom". He warns the counsellors that Camp Crystal Lake has a death curse.

- **Jack Burrel**: Boyfriend of Marcie Cunningham. He is killed lying on a bed, an arrow penetrating his neck from underneath.

- **Marcie Cunningham**: Girlfriend of Jack Burrel. She is killed by a hatchet in the girls' showers.

- **Ned Rubinstein**: A thin male who frequently makes jokes and plays tricks on his fellow counsellors. His death is not shown, but his body is seen on a bed, his throat cut.

- **Mrs. Pamela Voorhees**: A cook at Camp Crystal Lake in 1950. Her son, Jason, drowns in the lake while two counsellors were making love. She dispatches the two counsellors, and then, imagining Jason's voice telling her to kill, systematically murders the counsellors who are working at Camp Crystal Lake in 1980.

- **Steve Christy**: Head counsellor who has re-opened and is renovating Camp Crystal Lake for use. He is presumably killed by being stabbed in the stomach.

Friday the 13th Part 2

- **Alice Hardy**: Still alive after the previous film, she returns to her house to put her life back in order. Jason finds and kills her, stabbing her in the temple with an ice pick.

- **Crazy Ralph**: Still tries to warn the counsellors of potential danger, but is killed, strangled with barbed wire.

- **Ginny Field**: The "Final Girl". She studies psychology, and is in a relationship with the head counsellor, Paul Holt. She survives, but is taken away in an ambulance

- **Jason Voorhees**: Now an adult, and covering his head with a dirty sack with a singly eye hole cut out, he finds and kills Alice, then returns to Camp Crystal Lake to kill the new counsellors.

- **Jeff**: Boyfriend of Sandra. Is stabbed with a spear along with Sandra while having sex.

- **Mark**: Male counsellor with an interest in sports. He has lost the use of his legs in a motorcycle accident. He is killed with a machete to his head just prior to a rendezvous with Vickie.

- **Paul Holt**: Head counsellor. He mysteriously disappears after Jason's final appearance.

- **Sandra**: Girlfriend of Jeff. She, along with Jeff, is stabbed with a spear while having sex.

- **Scott**: Attractive male counsellor, who makes inappropriate sexual advances on Terry. He is strung up to a tree by his feet and his throat is cut.

- **Ted**: Close friend of Paul, Sandra and Jeff. He frequently makes and tells jokes. Ted survives, and the last time he is seen, he is drunk in the local bar.

- **Terry**: Attractive and sporty female counsellor. She is frequently the subject of attentions of Scott. Her death is not seen, but heavily implied.

- **Vicky**: Young female counsellor, who has a romantic interest in Mark. She is stabbed with a kitchen knife.

- **Deputy Winslow**: Investigating trespassing in the nearby forest, he discovers Jason's house, and is killed.

Friday the 13th Part III 3-D

- **Ali**: Tall, bald gang member. He attacks Shelly and Vera with a chain, though they get away. Ali is bludgeoned with a wrench immediately after the deaths of Fox and Loco, but returns in the climax only to be killed by a machete.

- **Andy**: Boyfriend of Debbie. He is cut in half by a machete while walking on his hands.

- **Chili**: Romantically linked to Chuck. She is killed with a hot fire poker.

- **Chris Higgins**: The "Final Girl". She has returned with some friends to her vacation house near Camp Crystal Lake where she was attacked by Jason. Chris is romantically linked with Rick. She survives and supposedly kills Jason, but it is implied that she is mentally disturbed by the events.

- **Chuck**: Frequently smokes marijuana, and is romantically linked to Chili. He is killed by electrocution when Jason throws him into the fuse box.

- **Debbie**: Pregnant girlfriend of Andy. She is killed with a kitchen knife in the back while lying in a hammock.

- **Edna**: Wife of Harold. She is stabbed through the back of the head with a knitting needle.

- **Fox**: Female gang member. She is stabbed through the neck with a pitchfork, and is suspended on a beam in the barn.

- **Harold**: Store owner and husband of Edna. He is killed with a meat cleaver to his chest.

- **Jason**: Attacks and kills most of the characters. He acquires Shelly's hockey mask after killing him.

- **Loco**: Shorter male gang member. He is stabbed in the stomach with a pitchfork.

- **Rick**: Local handyman and romantic interest of Chris. He is killed when Jason crushes his head.

- **Shelly**: A prankster who is sad and lonely. He is rejected by his blind date, Vera. Shelly is killed by having his throat cut, and his body is discovered by Chili.

- **Vera**: Brought along as a blind date for Shelly. She is killed by a harpoon shot through her eye.

Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter

- **Axel**: Womanizing male orderly with a particular interest in Nurse Morgan. His throat is cut with a saw and his head twisted off.

- **Doug**: Attractive male romantic interest of Sara. He is killed when is head is crushed against a wall, and stabbed through the throat with a spike.

- **Mrs. Jarvis**: Mother of Trish and Tommy. Her death is not shown, but is heavily implied.

- **Jimmy**: Shy, ineffectual young man who laments his poor sex life. His friend Ted calls him a "dead fuck". After having sex with one of the twins, Tina, he is killed with a meat cleaver and his body is later used to block a doorway.

- **Nurse Morgan**: Young female nurse who is subject to the attention of Axel, the orderly. She is stabbed with a scalpel.

- **Paul**: Boyfriend of Samantha, but flirts heavily with Tina. He is killed with a spear gun aimed at his groin.

- **Rob Dyer**: A rugged young man who is searching for Jason under the pretence of hunting for bear. He is killed with a garden harrow and thrown through a window to scare Trish and Tommy.

- **Samantha**: Girlfriend of Paul. She is killed while floating in a raft, impaled by a machete from underneath.

- **Sara**: Shy young girl, with a romantic interest in Doug. She is killed by an axe thrown through a door.

- **Ted**: An obnoxious womanizer who makes fun of his friend Jimmy's failed sexual conquests. He is stabbed in the back of the head through a small movie screen.

- **Terri**: One of the two identical twin girls. She refuses Ted's advances and leaves early. She is stabbed with a spear while unlocking her bike.

- **Tina**: One of two identical twin girls. She makes romantic advances on Paul, who turns her down, so she then resorts to having sex with Jimmy. Tina is killed by being thrown from a window on the second level of the house onto a car.

- **Tommy Jarvis**: A young boy who likes computer games and making monster masks and toys. He and his sister, Trish, are the central protagonists. Tommy kills Jason with a machete, and it is implied that he is mentally disturbed by the experience.

- **Trish Jarvis**: The "Final Girl" and Tommy's older sister. She shows romantic interest in Rob. Trish survives along with Tommy.

Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning

- **Anita**: Girlfriend of Demon. She is killed by having her throat cut.

- **Billy**: Van driver who transfers Tommy to Pinehurst. He is killed before his date with Lana, struck in the back of the head with an axe.

- **Demon**: Boyfriend of Anita and older brother of Reggie. He is impaled by a metal post through the back in an outhouse.

- **Duke**: A paramedic who is killed by having his throat cut.

- **Eddie**: Boyfriend of Tina and Pinehurst resident. His head is crushed with a leather strap tightened around a tree.

- **Ethel Hubbard**: Local woman who objects to Pinehurst's proximity to her own home. She is killed with a meat cleaver to her face swung through a window.

- **George**: Elderly cook for Pinehurst, grandfather of Reggie. His eyes are gouged out and he is thrown through a window to frighten Pam.

- **Jake**: Resident of Pinehurst with a stutter. He has romantic inclinations towards Robin. Jake is killed when he is struck in the face with a cleaver.

- **Joey**: A sweet but clumsy and annoying resident of Pinehurst. He is killed by Vic, who hits him in the back with an axe.

- **Junior**: Brutish, dim-witted son of Ethel. He is decapitated by a machete while riding on his motorbike.

- **Lana**: Attractive local waitress with plans to go on a date with Billy. She is hit in the chest with an axe.

- **Matthew Letter**: Head doctor at Pinehurst. He is killed by having his throat cut.

- **Pam Roberts**: The "Final Girl." She is a helper at the Pinehurst Youth Development Center where Tommy has been transferred. Pam survives, but is in danger from Tommy at the end of the film.

- **Pete**: Friend of Vinnie who goes into the woods while Vinnie is repairing the car. His throat is cut with a machete.

- **Raymond**: Hired hand for Ethel and Junior. He is stabbed in the stomach while watching Tina and Eddie having sex.

- **Reggie**: A young boy, grandson of the cook and younger brother of Demon. He survives along with Pam and Tommy.

- **Robin**: Redheaded female resident of Pinehurst. She is the object of romantic interest for Jake. Robin is stabbed with a machete through her mattress from below.

- **Roy**: Seeks revenge on Pinehurst residents in retribution for the murder of his son, Joey. He is the killer in the film, wearing a hockey mask and using similar methods of murder to Jason. He is killed when he is thrown from the top level of a barn onto a tractor harrow.

- **Tina**: Girlfriend of Eddie. She is killed by garden shears through her eyes while lying nude in the forest.

- **Tommy Jarvis**: Now a young man, he has been transferred from a mental institution to Pinehurst. He rarely talks and frequently sees Jason in his dreams and in hallucinations. He survives, but it is implied he has dangerous, violent potential.

- **Vic**: A Pinehurst resident with anger management problems. He impulsively kills Joey with an axe.

- **Vinnie**: A young man travelling with his friend Pete through the area. He tries to repair the car when it breaks down. Vinnie is killed when a road flare is shoved in his mouth.

- **Violet**: A Pinehurst resident who is a friend of Robin and enjoys dancing. She is stabbed in the stomach with a machete.

<u>Jason Lives! Friday the 13th Part VI</u>

- **Cort**: Male camp counsellor and boyfriend of Nikki. He is killed by Jason while driving a caravan.

- **Darren**: Travelling to camp with Lizabeth. Jason stabs him with a pole.

- **Jason**: Returns to life, though is largely decomposed. He begins to kill people in the woods surrounding Crystal Lake including the new camp counsellors. Jason is bested by Tommy and sunk to the bottom of Crystal Lake with a stone, but the closing shot reveals he is still alive.

- **Katie**: Confident female paintball-playing business executive. She is decapitated simultaneously with Stan and Larry.

- **Larry**: Clumsy paintball-playing business executive who is decapitated simultaneously with Stan and Katie.

- **Lizabeth**: Travelling to camp with Darren. Jason stabs her in the face with a pole.

- **Megan**: Daughter of Sherriff Garris who displays romantic and sexual interest in Tommy. She survives, protecting the children of the camp.

- **Sherriff Michael Garris**: Head law enforcement officer and father of Megan. He initially disbelieves Tommy's report of Jason's return to life. Sherriff Garris is killed when Jason breaks his back.

- **Nikki**: Girlfriend of Cort. She is killed when Jason crushes her face against the caravan wall.

- **Paula**: Female camp counsellor whose death is not explicitly shown, but it is implied she is hacked apart by a machete.

- **Roy**: Eager but ineffectual business executive playing paintball with his co-workers. He is killed by dismemberment.

- **Sissy**: Female camp counsellor who creates a card game called "Camp Blood". She is killed by having her head twisted off.

- **Stan**: Obnoxious, mouthy male paintball-playing business executive who is decapitated simultaneously with Larry and Katie.

- **Officer Thornton**: Works for Sherriff Garris. Jason kills him by throwing a knife at his head.

- **Tommy Jarvis**: Escapes from the mental institution to make sure Jason is dead, and inadvertently resurrects him. He survives, having defeated Jason by sinking him to the bottom of Crystal Lake.

Friday the 13th Part VII: The New Blood

- **Amanda Shepard**: Tina's mother. She has hired Dr. Crews and believes his false reports to her regarding Tina's progress. She is stabbed in the back by Jason.

- **Ben**: Party attendee and boyfriend of Kate. Jason crushes his head.

- **Dr. Crews**: An opportunistic doctor who, under the guise of trying to help Tina, tries to research her telekinetic abilities for his own professional benefit. Jason kills him using an electric saw.

- **Dan**: Male camper, boyfriend of Judy. Jason shoves his hand through Dan's back and then snaps Dan's neck.

- **David**: Attractive male partygoer who enjoys drinking and smoking marijuana. He is killed with a large kitchen knife after having sex with Robin.

- **Eddie**: Writer of science fiction stories, party attendee, and romantically interested in Melissa. He is killed with a machete off screen.

- **Jane**: Girlfriend of Michael who organised his birthday party. She is killed with a tent spike through her neck.

- **Jason**: Brought back to life by Tina, he begins to kill the locals. He is subdued by being pulled underwater by the resurrected John Shepard.

- **John Shepard**: Tina's father, who drowned in Crystal Lake when Tina, as a young girl, telekinetically collapses the pier on which he was standing. In the end, he returns and drags Jason back into the lake.

- **Judy**: Female camper, girlfriend of Dan. Jason picks her up in her sleeping bag and swings her into a tree.

- **Kate**: Party attendee and girlfriend of Ben. Jason shoves a party horn into her eye.

- **Maddy**: Shy, insecure party attendee with romantic interest in David. She is friends with Robin but feels betrayed when Robin seduced David. Her throat is cut with a sickle.

- **Melissa**: Attractive and cruel female attendee of Michael's party. Her unrequited interest in Nick is the impetus for her maltreatment of Tina. She is killed by an axe in her forehead.

- **Michael**: The young man whose birthday is the cause of the teenagers having a party near Crystal Lake. He is the brother of nick, and is killed when Jason throws a tent spike into his back.

- **Nick**: Brother of Michael and romantic interest of Tina. He survives along with Tina.

- **Robin**: Confident and flirty friend of Maddy, with sexual and romantic interest in David. She is thrown from a window on the second level of the house.

- **Russell**: Boyfriend of Sandra. He is hit in the face with an axe.

- **Sandra**: Party attendee and girlfriend of Russell. In a sequence recreated from Jaws (1976; dir. Spielberg), she is attacked and pulled underwater by Jason.

- **Tina Shepard**: A telekinetic and the "Final Girl". She survives after fighting Jason.

Friday the 13th Part VIII: Jason Takes Manhattan

- **Mr. Carlson**: First mate on Admiral Robertson's ship. He is harpooned in the back.

- **Charles McCulloch**: School administrator and Rennie's uncle and guardian. He is drowned in a barrel of sewage.

- **Colleen Van Deusen**: A high school teacher and school trip chaperone who has taken an interest in Rennie's potential and development. She is killed in an exploding car.

- **Eva**: Smart student who allows herself to be manipulated by Tamara. She is strangled by Jason in the dance room.

- **J. J.**: Aspiring guitarist and friend of Wayne. She is beaten to death with her guitar.

- **Jason**: Resurrected by an electric current in the water caused by a severed power cable. He attacks and kills people from Crystal Lake on a boat to New York, and is eventually killed by a flood of toxic waste.

- **Jim**: Boyfriend of Suzi, tells the background story of Jason. He is killed by a spear gun.

- **Julius**: Aspiring boxer. He challenges Jason to a boxing match wherein his head is punched off.

- **Miles**: Friend of Sean. He is killed when Jason throws him off the ship's mast.

- **Rennie Wickham**: The "Final Girl" who encountered Jason while learning to swim, and now has a vague psychic connection. She, along with Sean, her romantic interest, lures Jason into the sewers where he is killed by the flood of toxic waste.

- **Admiral Robertson**: Sean's father, who wants Sean to follow his own career path. Jason cuts his throat with a machete.

- **Sean Robertson**: Son of Admiral Robertson and romantic interest of Rennie. He and Rennie best Jason and survive.

- **Suzi**: Girlfriend of Jim. She is stabbed by a spear while hiding in a cargo hold.

- **Tamara**: Attractive and cruel student and friend of Eva who frequently manipulates people and blackmails Charles. Jason stabs her in the shower with a sharp piece of glass from the mirror.

- **Toby**: Rennie's dog.

- **Wayne**: Aspiring filmmaker, friend of J. J., and enamoured of Tamara. He is thrown into a control panel and electrocuted.

Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday

- **Alexis**: Teenage camper, friend of Deborah and Luke. She is killed with a scalpel.

- **Coroner**: Examines the remains of Jason after the FBI mission. While doing so, he is mesmerised by the still beating heart of Jason, and eats it, becoming the first person in the film to be possessed by Jason's spirit. The coroner passes the worm-spirit to Josh orally.

- **Creighton Duke**: A sadistic and wily bounty hunter who has acquired the secret of destroying Jason. He is killed when Jason squeezes his body, crushing his back.

- **Dana Kimble**: Mother of Jessica, grandmother of Stephanie and half sister of Jason. She is killed in a struggle between the possessed Josh and Steven by a knife sharpener in her back. However, in the climactic struggle, Jason's worm-spirit crawls into the vagina of her corpse, bringing Jason back to his original form, as she is part of his bloodline.

- **Deborah**: Teenage camper, girlfriend of Luke. While having sex with Luke, she is stabbed through the back.

- **Edna**: Girlfriend of Josh. She is killed by the possessed coroner by having her head crushed in a car door.

- **Jason**: Still undead and killing people near Crystal Lake, he is lured into a trap by the FBI and his body is destroyed. His spirit, however, survives in the form of a giant demonic worm and is passed from person to person, usually orally, but can possess another person by entering any bodily orifice. Jason is killed by a relative, Jessica, holding a mystical dagger, which according to legend, is the only way his spirit can be destroyed.

- **Jessica Kimble**: Estranged partner of Steven, mother of Stephanie, daughter of Dana and distant relative of Jason. She sends Jason's spirit to Hell by stabbing his with a mystical dagger and survives.

- **Joey B.**: Co-owner of the local diner and obese wife of Shelby. She is killed when her mouth is punched inwards by the possessed Robert.

- **Josh**: Police officer who receives Jason's spirit from the coroner, and passes it to Robert. Once the spirit passes to Robert, Josh's body melts.

- **Luke**: Teenage camper, boyfriend of Deborah. He is killed, but it is unseen.

- **Officer Randy Parker**: Local police officer and friend of Steven. He receives Jason's spirit from Robert, and is killed when his throat is cut with a machete and the spirit breaks out of his body through his neck.

- **Robert Campbell**: Anchor of the "infotainment" show "American Case File" and boyfriend of Jessica. Jason's spirit is transferred into him by Josh, and later, is passed from Robert into Randy, and Robert, like Josh before him, likely dies when Jason's spirit leaves him, though this is not shown.

- **Officer Ryan**: Police officer who helps Jessica at the station. She is killed by the possessed Robert when her head is crushed against a locker.

- **Shelby**: Co-owner of the local diner and diminutive husband of Joey B. He is killed when the possessed Robert pushes his head into the deep fryer.

- **Sheriff Ed Landis**: Local police Sherriff. Upon mistakenly suspecting that he might be possessed by the spirit of Jason, Jessica stabs him with the mystical dagger.

- **Stephanie Kimble**: The infant daughter of Steven and Jessica. She survives.

- **Steven Freeman**: Estranged partner of Jessica Kimble and father of Stephanie. He wants to reunite with Jessica, and upon discovering she is in

danger, goes to great lengths to try to save her and Stephanie. Steven survives.

- **Vicki**: Waitress at Joey B. and Shelby's diner. In trying to attack the possessed Robert, she is impaled on a skewer.

- **Ward**: Teenage son of Joey B. And Shelby who works in the diner. He is attacked by Jason and killed when he is thrown against the diner doors.

Jason X

- **Adrienne**: Professor Lowe's intern. Jason freezes her face in liquid nitrogen, the shatters it against a table.

- **Azrael**: A very clumsy and not particularly bright student, who makes friends with the security team, particularly Dallas. He is killed with a machete after a virtual reality game.

- **Sergeant Brodski**: A security officer aboard the spaceship, Grendel. He doggedly pursues Jason, and sacrifices himself in order to destroy Jason, by also burning up in Earth Two's atmosphere upon re-entry.

- **Condor**: A security officer with a preference for martial arts. He is pushed off of a platform and impaled by a large drill.

- **Crutch**: Grendel's engineer. He is electrocuted when his head is smashed against a control panel.

- **Dallas**: Large, muscular security officer. He is killed after playing a virtual reality game with Azrael by having his head bashed against a wall.

- **Geko**: Female security officer who discovers the bodies of Condor and Sven. Her death is not seen, but it is implied she is killed with a machete.

- **Janessa**: A smart, attractive student who is having an affair with Professor Lowe. She is killed when she is sucked through a grating surrounding a small breach in the ship's hull.

- **Jason**: Captured and held in Crystal Lake Research Facility, with an acknowledged ability for cellular regeneration. He is frozen by Rowan and reawakened by Professor Lowe, and proceeds to kill as many people as possible before being attacked and subjected to advanced regeneration. Jason then becomes Uber-Jason, a stronger and more powerful version of himself.

He is potentially killed when he travels through the atmosphere of Earth Two.

- **Kay-Em 14**: Android maintained by Tsunaron who resembles a tall, attractive female. She destroys the original Jason's boy with heavy firepower just before he is regenerated. Kay-Em 14 is still functional, although all that remains is her head.

- **Kinsa**: A student, and girlfriend of Stoney. Mentally broken after seeing Stoney killed by a surgical machete, she dies in trying to use an escape shuttle, which she crashes back into the ship, Grendel.

- **Fat Lou**: Grendel's pilot. He is killed with a surgical machete.

- **Professor Lowe**: Science professor who organises a field trip to Earth One for his students. He is having an affair with Janessa, and he consults with his financial backer to discover how valuable Jason's remains are. He is decapitated by a machete.

- **Rowan**: The "Final Girl". She is a researcher at Crystal Lake Research Facility who becomes cryogenically frozen and reawakened in the future along with Jason. She survives

- **Stoney**: Boyfriend of Kinsa. He is killed with a surgical machete.

- **Sven**: Blonde male security officer. Jason breaks his neck.

- **Tsunaron**: A student with an aptitude for electronics, as demonstrated by his maintenance of Kay-Em 14. He survives

- **VR Teen Girls**: Two holograms created to resemble attractive females at Camp Crystal Lake. Jason traps them in their sleeping bags and bashes them into a tree and each other.

- **Waylander**: A student with an aptitude for engineering. He is killed when he blows up a section of the Grendel containing both himself and Jason.

- **Dr. Wimmer**: Scientist at Crystal Lake Research Facility who undermines Rowan's authority and is determined to study Jason's regenerative abilities. He is stabbed in the back with a pole.

Freddy vs. Jason

- **Bill Freeburg "Freeburg"**: A student at the local school who enjoys smoking marijuana. He becomes possessed by Freddy, and is cut in half with a machete.

- **Blake**: Friend of Trey who is intended to be a blind date for Lori. He is killed with a machete.

- **Dr. Campbell**: Father of Lori who originally had Will committed, and might have killed his wife. He survives.

- **Charlie Linderman "Linderman"**: Socially awkward and bookish, he is the eventual romantic interest of Kia. He is killed by being thrown into a sharp metal wall fixture.

- **Freddy Krueger**: A child killer who attacks people in their dreams, but needs belief, fear and memory to make him strong. He resurrects Jason to kill for him until his own strength comes back, but is forced to fight Jason, when he proves to be Freddy's competition in killing. He is decapitated by Jason, but survives.

- **Gibb**: Friend of Lori and Kia and girlfriend of Trey who frequently drinks and smokes. She is impaled with a pipe by Jason.

- **Jason**: Resurrected by Freddy using the memory of his mother, and is forced into a fight with Freddy. He survives.

- **Kia Waterson**: Close friend of Lori, and eventual romantic interest of Linderman. She is stabbed with a machete and thrown into a tree.

- **Lori Campbell**: The "Final Girl". Believing her boyfriend, Will, had left her, she later discovers he was institutionalised. Lori is the first person to have nightmares about Freddy, and survives, along with Will.

- **Mark**: Friend of Will who was institutionalised at the same time. His older brother was killed by Freddy. Mark is killed in his sleep by being set on fire, and slashed with Freddy's razor glove.

- **Trey**: Domineering boyfriend of Gibb. He is repeatedly stabbed with a machete and folded in half backwards.

- **Will Rollins**: Institutionalised, along with his friend Mark, during a previous wave of attacks by Freddy, he has been trying to reunite with Lori. He survives along with Lori.

Friday the 13th (2009)

- **Amanda**: In the first group of teenagers and girlfriend of Richie. She is tied up in her sleeping bag and suspended over a campfire until she is roasted to death.

- **Bree**: Attractive female in the second group of teenagers. She is the object of attraction for multiple males in the group including Chewie and Trent. Trent eventually has sex with Bree, and afterwards, Jason kills her by stabbing her on a set of antlers mounted to the wall, then throwing her from a window on the second story of the house.

- **Chelsea**: In the second group of teenagers and girlfriend of Nolan. Hiding in the water under a small wooden pier, Jason stabs her in the head with his machete.

- **Chewie**: In the second group of teenagers, he is a close friend of Lawrence. He loves to drink and smoke marijuana, but is clumsy and laments his inability to find someone with whom to have sex. Chewie is killed when he is stabbed in the throat with a screwdriver.

- **Clay Miller**: An attractive young man, and eventual romantic interest of Jenna. He is searching for his missing sister, Whitney. Clay survives, but is in peril at the close of the film.

- **Donnie**: A local mechanic and farm worker who also sells marijuana. Jason cuts his throat with a machete.

- **Jason Voorhees**: Son of Pamela who witnessed his mother's murder, and kills anyone who comes near what he considers his territory. Clay and Whitney supposedly kill him and dump his body in the lake, but he returns in the final shot to attack them.

- **Jenna**: In the second group of teenagers, girlfriend of Trent, but eventual romantic interest of Clay. She is killed with a machete.

- **Lawrence**: In the second group of counsellors, and friend of Chewie. After finding Jason and Chewie in the shed, he is chased, and Jason throws an axe into Lawrence's back.

- **Mike**: In the first group of teenagers and boyfriend of Whitney. His death is not seen, but he is slashed multiple times by a machete and pulled underground through the floorboards of a house by Jason.

- **Nolan**: In the second group of teenagers and boyfriend of Chelsea. He is killed when Jason shoots an arrow through his head as he is driving the boat from which Chelsea is waterskiing topless.

- **Pamela Voorhees**: Mother of Jason, who seeks vengeance for her son's supposed death. She is decapitated in the opening of the film.

- **Richie**: In the first group of teenagers, boyfriend of Amanda. He gets his leg caught in a steel bear trap and is hit in the head with a machete.

- **Trent**: The arrogant and cruel son of wealthy parents who invites his friends to his parents' lavish house near Crystal Lake. His is Jenna's boyfriend, but eventually has sex with Bree. He is stabbed through the back with a spike on the back of a truck.

- **Wade**: In the first group of teenagers, he is knowledgeable on local folklore and is eager to find a nearby growth of marijuana plants. He is killed with a machete.

- **Whitney Miller**: In the first group of teenagers, sister of Clay and girlfriend of Mike. She is kidnapped by Jason, but is rescued by Clay and survives, though she is in peril at the close of the film.

Works Cited – Text and Online

Allen, Jr., J. L. (2004) "Week of Prayer for Christian Unity; Update on 'The Passion'; Caritas work in Bam, Iran; The Concert of Reconciliation; Anticipating a visit from Dick Cheney" in National Catholic Reporter, 3: 22 (2004), http://nationalcatholicreporter.org/word/word012304.htm Accessed: 7 May 2012

Altman, R. (1999) Film/Genre, London, BFI Publishing

Anonymous (1997) Blockbuster: All-Time Favorite Movies and Music, Toronto, Blockbuster Entertainment, Inc.

Anonymous (2000) The Burning VHS cover, Leyton, Video Instant Picture Company – Cult Classic

Anonymous (1990) The Greatest Movies of All Time: Blockbuster Video, Toronto, Blockbuster Entertainment Corporation

Anonymous (1960) "Peeping Tom" (Review) in Monthly Film Bulletin 27: 316 (1960): 65

Anonymous (1960) "Reviews" in Sunday Dispatch, 10 April 1960

Aristotle (c. 335 BCE) Poetics, Translated from ancient Greek by Kenny, A. (ed.), (2013), Oxford, Oxford University Press

Badley, L. (2010) "Bringing it All Back Home: Horror Cinema and Video Culture" in Conrich, I. (ed.), Horror Zone (2010), London, I. B. Tauris

Balázs, B. (1985) "Theory of the Film: Sound" in Weis, E. and J. Belton (eds.), Film Sound: Theory and Practice (1985), New York, Columbia University Press

Balio, T. (2002) "Hollywood Production Trends in the Era of Globalisation, 1990-99" in Neale, S. (ed.) Genre and Contemporary Hollywood (2002), London, BFI Publishing

Bazin, A. (1967) "The Evolution of the Language of Cinema", Translated from the French by Gray, H. (ed.) in Bazin, A. (1967) What is Cinema? Volume 1, (2005) London, University of California Press

Belton, J. (1985) "Technology and Aesthetics of Film Sound" in Weis, E. and J. Belton (eds.), Film Sound: Theory and Practice (1985), New York, Columbia University Press

Benjamin, R. (2004) "The Sense of an Ending: Youth Apocalypse Films" in Journal of Film and Video, 56:4 (2004): 34

Berliner, T. (2001) "The Pleasures of Disappointment: Sequels and The Godfather, Part II" in The Journal of Film and Video 53:2&3 (2001): 107-123

Berliner, T. (2010) Hollywood Incoherent, Austin, University of Texas Press

Booth, S. (1990) "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time and All Others", in Shakespeare Quarterly 41:2 (1990): 262-268

Bordwell, D. (1993) The Cinema of Eisenstein, London, Harvard University Press

Bordwell, D. (1996) "Convention, Construction, and Cinematic Vision" in Bordwell, D. and N. Carroll (eds.), Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies (1996), Madison, The University of Wisconsin Press

Bordwell, D. (1989) "Historical Poetics of Cinema" in Barton Palmer, (ed) The Cinematic Text: Methods and Approaches, New York, AMS Press

Bordwell, D. (2007) "Intensified Continuity Revisited" on David Bordwell's Website on Cinema, 27-05-2007; http://www.davidbordwell.net/blog/2007/05/27/intensified-continuity-revisited/, accessed 9-12-2011

Bordwell, D. (2005) "Slavoj Žižek: Say Anything" on David Bordwell's Website on Cinema, 04-2005; http://www.davidbordwell.net/essays/zizek.php, accessed 28-05-2013

Bordwell, D. (2007) "Unsteadicam Chronicles" on David Bordwell's Website on Cinema, 17-08-2007; http://www.davidbordwell.net/blog/2007/08/17/unsteadicam-chronicles/, accessed 9-12-2011

Bordwell, D. (2006) <u>The Way Hollywood Tells It: Story and Style in Modern Movies</u>, London, University of California Press

Bordwell, D. and N. Carroll (eds.) (1996) <u>Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies</u>, Madison, The University of Wisconsin Press

Bordwell, D. and K. Thompson (2004) <u>Film Art: An Introduction (Seventh Edition)</u>, London, McGraw Hill

Bordwell, D. and K. Thompson (1985) "Fundamental Aesthetics of Sound in the Cinema" in Weis, E. and J. Belton (eds.), <u>Film Sound: Theory and Practice</u> (1985), New York, Columbia University Press

Bottomore, S. (1990) "Shots in the Dark: The Real Origins of Film Editing" in Elsaesser, T. and A. Barker (eds.), <u>Early Cinema: Space – Frame – Narrative</u> (1990), London, BFI Publishing

Box Office Mojo- <u>Psycho</u> (1998),

http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=psycho98.htm accessed 02-01-2012

Bracke, P. (2005) <u>Crystal Lake Memories: The Complete History of Friday the 13th</u>, London, Titan Books

Bradley, D. (1996) <u>Sacred Monsters: Behind the Mask of the Horror Actor</u>, London, Titan Books

Branigan, E. (1984) <u>Point of View in the Cinema: A Theory of Narration and Subjectivity in Classical Film</u>, Berlin, Mouton

Briefel, A. (2008) "Monsters and Critics" in <u>Film Quarterly</u> 61:3 (2008): 92

Brophy, P. (2000) "Horrality- The Textuality of Contemporary Horror Films" in Gelder, K. (ed.), <u>Horror Reader</u> (2000), London, Routledge

Budra, P. (1998) "Recurrent Monsters: Why Freddy, Michael, and Jason Keep Coming Back" in Budra, P. and E. Schellenberg (eds.), <u>Part Two: Reflections on the Sequel</u> (1998), Toronto, University of Toronto Press

Budra, P. and E. Schellenberg (1998) <u>Part Two: Reflections on the Sequel</u>, Toronto, University of Toronto Press

Buscombe, E. (1986) "The Idea of Genre in the American Cinema" in Grant, B. K. (ed.), <u>Film Reader III</u> (2003), Austin, University of Texas Press

Calhoun, J. (2005) "Sleeping Terror" in <u>American Cinematographer</u> 86:8 (2005): 42-49

Carroll, N. (1999) "Film, Emotion, and Genre" in Carroll, N. and J. Choi (eds.), Philosophy of Film and Motion Pictures: An Anthology (2006), Oxford, Blackwell Publishing

Carroll, N. (1990) The Philosophy of Horror: Or, Paradoxes of the Heart, London, Routledge

Carroll, N. (2002) "Why Horror?" (extract) in Jancovich, M. (ed.), Horror, The Film Reader (2002), London, Routledge

Charlton, W. (1970) Aesthetics: An Introduction, London, Hutchinson & Co.

Cherry, B. (2005) "Broken Homes, Tortured Flesh: Hellraiser and the Feminine Aesthetic of Horror Cinema" in Film International 17 (2005): 10-16

Cherry, B. (2009) Horror, London, Routledge

Chion, M. (1994) Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen, Translated from French by Gorbman, C. (ed.), New York, Columbia University Press

Chion, M. (2002) Eyes Wide Shut Translated from French by Selous, T., London, BFI Publishing

Chion, M. (1982) The Voice in Cinema, Translated from French by Gorbman, C. (ed.), (1999), New York, NY, Columbia University Press

Christie, I. (1994) <u>Arrows of Desire: The Films of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger</u>, London, Faber and Faber

Christie, I. (ed.) (1978) <u>Powell, Pressburger and Others</u>, London, BFI Publishing

Christie, I. and A. Moor (2005) <u>The Cinema of Michael Powell: International Perspectives on an English Film-Maker</u>, London, BFI Publishing

Clair, R. (1929) "The Art of Sound" (extract) in Weis, E. and J. Belton (eds.), <u>Film Sound: Theory and Practice</u> (1985), New York, Columbia University Press

Clayton, W. (2003) "Another Cynical Stab at Scaring" (Film Review of <u>Freddy vs. Jason</u>) in <u>Danville Register and Bee</u>, 21 August 2003: 2C

Clover, C. (1992) <u>Men, Women and Chain Saws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film</u>, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press

Coombs, M. (2007) <u>Two Singular Men: An amateur's tribute to the films of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger</u>, Oxford, Self-published

Connolly, K. (2007) "From Final Girl to Final Woman: Defeating the Male Monster in <u>Halloween</u> and <u>Halloween H20</u>" in <u>Journal of Popular Film and Television</u> 1:35 (2007): 12-20

Conrich, I. (ed.) (2010) <u>Horror Zone</u>, London, I. B. Tauris

Conrich, I. (2003) "La Série des <i>Vendredi 13</i> et la Fonction Culturelle d'un Grand-Guignol Moderne" ("The <u>Friday the 13th</u> Films and the Cultural Function of a Modern Grand Guignol"), in LaFond, F. (ed.) <u>Cauchemars Américains: Fantastique et Horreur dans le Cinéma Moderne</u>, éd. du CeFal, 2003

Conrich, I. (2010) "The <u>Friday the 13th</u> Films and the Cultural Function of a Modern Grand Guignol" in Conrich, I. (ed.) <u>Horror Zone</u> (2010), London, I. B Tauris

Conrich, I. (2000) "Seducing the Subject: Freddy Krueger, Popular Culture and the <u>Nightmare on Elm Street</u> Films" in Silver, A. and J. Ursini (eds.), <u>Horror Film Reader</u> (2000), New York, Limelight Editions

Crane, J.L. (1994) <u>Terror and Everyday Life: Singular Moments in the History of the Horror Film</u>, Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publications

Deleuze, G. (2005) <u>Cinema 1</u>, Translated from French by Tomlinson, H. and B. Habberjam, London, Continuum

Dick, B. F. (1998) <u>Anatomy of Film</u> (3rd ed.), New York, St. Martin's Press

Dickstein, M. (1996) "The Aesthetics of Fright" in Grant, B.K. (ed.), <u>Planks of Reason: Essays on the Horror Film</u> (1996), London, The Scarecrow Press

Dika, V. (1990) <u>Games of Terror: Halloween, Friday the 13th and the Films of the Stalker Cycle</u>, London, Associated University Presses

Dika, V. (2003) <u>Recycled Culture in Contemporary Art and Film: The Uses of Nostalgia</u>, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Donnelly, K. J. (2009) "Saw Heard: Musical Sound Design in Contemporary Cinema" in Buckland, W. (ed.) <u>Film Theory and Contemporary Hollywood Movies</u> (2009), Abingdon, Routledge

Du Maurier, D. (1952) "Kiss Me Again, Stranger" in Du Maurier, D. (2009) <u>The Birds and Other Stories</u>, London, Virago Press

Eagleton, T. (2008) <u>Literary Theory: An Introduction (Anniversary Edition)</u>, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing

Edelstein, D. (2006) "Now Playing at Your Local Multiplex: Torture Porn" in New York Magazine online, http://nymag.com/movies/features/15622/, published 28/01/2006, accessed 13/11/2011

Eisenstein, S. (1943) <u>The Film Sense</u>, Translated from Russian by Leyda, J. (ed.), (1943) London, Faber and Faber

Eisenstein, S. (1923) "The Montage of Attractions" in Taylor, R. (ed.), <u>The Eisenstein Reader</u> Translated from Russian by Taylor, R. and W. Powell (1998), London, BFI Publishing

Eisenstein, S. (1987) <u>Nonindifferent Nature: Film and the Structure of Things</u>, Translated from Russian by Marshall, H., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Eisenstein, S., V. Pudovkin and G. Alexandrov (1928) "Statement on Sound" in Taylor, R. (ed.), <u>The Eisenstein Reader</u>, Translated from Russian by Taylor, R. and W. Powell, (1998), London, BFI Publishing

Fahy, T. (ed.) (2010) <u>The Philosophy of Horror</u>, Lexington, The University Press of Kentucky

Fischer, L. (1985) "<u>Enthusiasm</u>: From Kino-Eye to Radio-Eye" in Weis, E. and J. Belton (eds.), <u>Film Sound: Theory and Practice</u> (1985), New York, Columbia University Press

Fischer, L. and M. Landy (1982) "<u>Eyes of Laura Mars</u>: A Binocular Critique" in Waller, G (ed.), <u>American Horrors: Essays on the Modern American Horror Film</u> (1987), Urbana, University of Illinois Press

Flisfeder, M. (2012) <u>The Symbolic, The Sublime, and Slavoj Žižek's Theory of Film</u>, New York, Palgrave Macmillan

Frampton, D. (2006) <u>Filmosophy</u>, London, Wallflower Press

Freud, S. (2003) <u>The Uncanny</u>, Translated from German by McLintock, D., London, Penguin Books

Fuchs, M. (2010) "A Horrific Welcome to the Desert of the Real: Simulacra, Simulations and Postmodern Horror" in Eckhard, P., M. Fuchs and Hölbling (eds.), <u>Landscapes of Postmodernity: Concepts and Paradigms of Critical Theory</u> (2010), London, Transaction Publishers

Furby, J. and K. Randell (eds.) (2005) <u>Screen Methods: Comparative Readings in Film Studies</u>, London, Wallflower Press

Gelder, K. (ed.) (2000) <u>The Horror Reader</u>, London, Routlegde

Giannetti, L. (2008) <u>Understanding Movies</u> (11th Edition), Upper Saddle River, NJ, Pearson Prentice Hall

Grant, B.K. (ed.) (1996) <u>The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film</u>, Austin, University of Texas Press

Grant, B.K. (2007) <u>Film Genre: From Iconography to Ideology</u>, Chippenham, Antony Rowe Ltd.

Grant, B.K. (ed.) (2003) <u>Film Genre Reader III</u>, Austin, University of Texas Press

Grant, B.K. (ed.) (1996) <u>Planks of Reason: Essays on the Horror Film</u>, London, The Scarecrow Press

Grove, D. (2005) <u>Making Friday the 13th: The Legend of Camp Blood</u>, Surrey, Fab Press

Guins, R. (2005) "Blood and Black Gloves on Shiny Discs: New Media, Old Tastes, and the Remediation of Italian Horror Films in the United States" in Schneider, S. and T. Williams (eds.), <u>Horror International</u> (2005), Detroit, MI., Wayne State University Press

Gunning, T. (2005) "Cinema and its Ancestors: The Magic of Motion" on Research at Chicago, The University of Chicago:

http://research.uchicago.edu/highlights/show_transcript.php?id=13 ; accessed 09-12-2011

Gupta, U. (1978) "<u>The Eyes of Laura Mars</u>" (Review) in <u>Cineaste, Fall 1978, 9, 1</u>

Hall, S. (2002) "Tall Revenue Features: The Genealogy of the Modern Blockbuster" in Neale, S. (ed.) <u>Genre and Contemporary Hollywood</u> (2002), London, BFI Publishing

Hantke, S. (ed.) (2004) <u>Horror Film: Creating and Marketing Fear</u>, Jackson, University Press of Mississippi

Harman, J. (1960) "Unhealthy" in London Evening News, 7 April 1960

Harries, D. (2002) "Film Parody and the Resuscitation of Genre" in Neale, S. (ed.) Genre and Contemporary Hollywood (2002), London, BFI Publishing

Harrington, R. (1988) "Friday the 13th Part VII: The New Blood" (Review) in The Washington Post, May 14, 1988

Harrington, R. (1989) "Friday the 13th Part VIII: Jason Takes Manhattan" in The Washington Post, July 29, 1989

Harrington, R. (1993) "Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday" in The Washington Post, August 14, 1993

Hawkins, H. (1990) Classics and Trash: Traditions and Taboos in High Literature and Popular Modern Genres, Toronto, University of Toronto Press

Hayward, S. (2006) Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts (Third Edition), London, Routledge

Heffernan, K. (2004) Ghouls, Gimmicks, and Gold: Horror Films and the American Movie Business, 1953-1968, Durham, NC, Duke University Press

Hendrix, G., A. Jafar, J. Bell and T. Rayns (2006) "Vengeance is Theirs" in <u>Sight and Sound</u> 16:2 (2006): 18-21, 46

Hills, M. (2005) <u>The Pleasures of Horror</u>, London, Continuum

Hills, M. (2002) <u>Fan Cultures</u>, London, Routledge

Humphries, R. (1991) <u>The American Horror Film: An Introduction</u>, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press

Humphries, R. (2007) "University of Life III: <u>Bela Lugosi: Dreams and Nightmares</u>/<u>La Dolce Morte:Vernacular Cinema and the Italian Giallo Film</u>" (Review) in <u>Film Studies</u> 11 (2007): 67-69

Hutchings, P. (2004) <u>The Horror Film</u>, Harlow, Pearson Longman

Hutchinson, T. (2008) "<u>Peeping Tom</u>" (Film Review) in <u>Radio Times</u>, London/Anglia Midlands, 4-10 October: p. 44

James, C. (1988) "Friday the 13th Part VII - The New Blood (1988) Review/Film; A New 'Friday the 13th'" in <u>The New York Times</u>, 15/05/1988, <u>http://movies.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=940DE6DF163BF936A25756C0A96 E948260&partner=Rotten Tomatoes</u>, accessed 13/11/2011

James, H. (1898) <u>The Turn of the Screw</u>, in Curtis, A. (ed.), (1986) <u>The Aspern Papers and The Turn of the Screw</u>, London, Penguin Books

James, M. R. (2007) <u>Complete Ghost Stories</u>, London, Collector's Library

James, M. R. (1919) "The Story of a Disappearance and an Appearance" in James, M. R. (2007) <u>Complete Ghost Stories</u>, London, Collector's Library

Jameson, F. (1984) "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism" in <u>New Left Review</u>, 146 (1984): 53-92

Jameson, F. (1991) <u>Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism</u>, Durham, NC, Duke University Press

Jancovich, M. (ed.) (2002) <u>Horror, The Film Reader</u>, London, Routledge

Jess-Cook, C. (2009) <u>Film Sequels: Theory and Practice from Hollywood to Bollywood</u>, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press

Jess-Cook, C. and C. Verevis (2010) <u>Second Takes: Critical Approaches to the Film Sequel</u>, Albany, State University of New York Press

Johnson, K. (1993) "The Point of View of the Wandering Camera" in <u>Cinema Journal</u> 32:2 (1993): 49-56

Kant, I. (1790) <u>Critique of the Power of Judgement</u> Translated from German by Guyer, P. and E. Matthews, (2000), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Karnick, S. T. (2009) "Babes in the Woods: A Franchise of Fear" in National Review Online, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/226873/babes-woods-s-t-karnick accessed 7-02-2011

Kerins, M. (2011) <u>Beyond Dolby (Stereo): Cinema in the Digital Sound Age</u>, Bloomington, Indiana University Press

Kerswell, J. A. (2010) <u>Teenage Wasteland: The Slasher Movie Uncut</u>, London, New Holland Publishers

King, S. (1974) <u>Carrie</u>, New York, Doubleday

King, S. (1982) <u>Danse Macabre</u>, Warner Books, London

King, S. (2002) "Autopsy Room Four" in King, S. (2002) <u>Everything's Eventual</u>, London, New English Library, Hodder & Stougnton

Klady, L. (1994) "Scary Future for Horror Pix" in <u>Variety</u>, 354:10 (1994): 13

Klinger, B. (1994) <u>Melodrama and Meaning: History, Culture and the Films of Douglas Sirk</u>, Bloomington, Indiana University Press

Kolker, R. (2006) <u>Film, Form and Culture</u> (3rd Edition), London, McGraw Hill

Koven, M. (2008) <u>Film, Folklore, and Urban Legends</u>, Plymouth, The Scarecrow Press

Koven, M. (2006) <u>La Dolce Morte: Vernacular Cinema and the Italian Giallo Film</u>, London, The Scarecrow Press

Lapsley, R. and M. Westlake (1988) <u>Film Theory: An Introduction</u>, Manchester, Manchester University Press

Le Fanu, S. (1872) "The Room in The Dragon Volant" in Tracey, R., (ed.), (2008) <u>In a Glass Darkly</u>, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Lee, N. (2008) "Return of the Return of the Repressed! Risen From the Grave and Brought Back to Bloody Life: Horror Remakes from <u>Psycho</u> to <u>Funny Games</u>" in <u>Film Comment</u>, 44:2 (2008): 24-28

Lefevre, R. (1968) "From Voyeurism to Infinity" in Silver, A. and J. Ursini (eds.), <u>Horror Film Reader</u> (2000), New York, Limelight Editions

Leitch, T. (1987) "For (Against) A Theory of Rereading" in <u>Modern Fiction Studies</u>, 33:3 (1987): 491-508

Leroux, G. (1909-1910) <u>The Phantom of the Opera</u>, Translated from French by Mireille Ribière (2009), London, Penguin Books

Lowenstein, A. (1998) "Films Without a Face: Shock Horror in the Cinema of Georges Franju" in <u>Cinema Journal</u>, 37:4 (1998): 37-58

Marriott, J. (2004) <u>Horror Films</u>, London, Virgin Books Ltd.

Martin, B. (1980) "<u>Friday the 13th</u>: A Day for Terror" in <u>Fangoria</u> #6, June: pp. 14-16, 64

Mascelli, J. (1965) <u>The Five C's of Cinematography: Motion Picture Filming Techniques</u>, Los Angeles, California, Silman-James Press

McCabe, C. (1976) "Theory and Film: Principles of Realism and Pleasure" in <u>Screen</u>, 17:3 (1976): 7-28

McCabe, C. (2011) "Introduction – Bazinian Adaptation: <u>The Butcher Boy</u> as Example" in McCabe, C., K. Murray, and R. Warner (2011), <u>True to the Spirit: Film Adaptation and the Question of Fidelity</u>, Oxford, Oxford University Press

McCarty, J. (1984) <u>Splatter Movies: Breaking the Last Taboo of the Screen</u>, New York, St. Martin's Press

McLarty, L. (1998) "'I'll be back': Hollywood, Sequelization, and History" in P. Budra and E. Schellenberg (eds.), Part Two: Reflections on the Sequel, (1998), Toronto, University of Toronto Press

Metz, W. (2007) "Shark Porn: Film Genre, Reception Studies, and Chris Kentis's Open Water" in Film Criticism, 31:3 (2007): 36-58

Miller, T. and R. Stam (eds.) (2004) A Companion to Film Theory, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing

Mittell, J. (2009) "Previously On: Prime Time Serials and the Mechanics of Memory" on Just TV, posted: 03-07-3009: http://justtv.wordpress.com/2009/07/03/previously-on-prime-time-serials-and-the-mechanics-of-memory/ Accessed: 08-05-2012

Modleski, T. (2000) "The Terror of Pleasure: The Contemporary Horror Film and Postmodern Theory" in Gelder, K. (ed.), Horror Reader (2000), London, Routledge

Monaco, J. (1980) "Aaaiieeeaarrggh!!" in Sight and Sound, 49:2 (1980): 80-82

Morris, J. (2010) "The Justification of Torture-Horror: Retribution and Sadism in Saw, Hostel, and The Devil's Rejects" in Fahy, T. (ed.), The Philosophy of Horror. (2010) Lexington, The University Press of Kentucky

Mosley, L. (1960) "Peeping Tom" (Review) in Daily Express, 8 April 1960

Muir, J. K. (1998) <u>Wes Craven: The Art of Horror</u>, Jefferson, NC, McFarland and Company, Inc.

Mulvey, L. (2006) <u>Death 24x a Second: Stillness and the Moving Image</u>, London, Reaktion Books

Mulvey, L. (2000) "Death Drives: Hitchcock's <u>Psycho</u>" in <u>Film Studies</u>, 2 (2000): pp. 5-14

Mulvey, L. (2005) "The Light that Fails: A Commentary on <u>Peeping Tom</u>" in Christie, I. and A. Moor (eds.), <u>The Cinema of Michael Powell: International Perspectives on an English Film-Maker</u>, (2005), London, BFI Publishing

Mulvey, L. (1999) "<u>Peeping Tom</u>" in <u>Peeping Tom</u> DVD release, The Criterion Collection, Liner notes, U.S.A.

Mulvey, L. (1975) "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" in <u>Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings</u>, Braudy, L. and M. Cohen (eds.), (1999). New York, NY., Oxford University Press

Murch, W. (1994) "Foreword" in Chion M., <u>Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen</u>, Gorbman, C. (ed.), (1994), New York, Columbia University Press

Neale, S. (1980) <u>Genre</u>, London, BFI Publishing

Neale, S. (2000) <u>Genre and Hollywood</u>, London, Routledge

Neale, S. (1996) "<u>Halloween</u>: Suspense, Aggression and the Look" in Grant, B.K. (ed.), <u>Planks of Reason: Essays on the Horror Film</u> (1996), London, The Scarecrow Press

Nelmes, J. [ed.] (2004) <u>An Introduction to Film Studies (Third Edition)</u>, New York, Routledge

Nelson, R. (2009) "Friday the 13th" (Review) in <u>Variety</u>, Posted: 12-02-2009: http://www.variety.com/review/VE1117939668?refcatid=31 Accessed: 08-05-2012

Newman, K. (2009) "My Bloody Valentine 3-D" (Review) in <u>Sight and Sound</u> 19:3 (2009): 68-69

Newman, K. (2006) "Sequels, Series and Spin-Offs" in Williams, L. R. and M. Hammond (eds.), (2006), London, McGraw Hill Education

Newman, K. (2006) "Torture Garden" in <u>Sight and Sound</u>, 16:6 (2006): 28-31

Nowell, R. (2011) <u>Blood Money: A History of the First Teen Slasher Film Cycle</u>, London, Continuum

Nowell-Smith, G. (1996) The Oxford History of World Cinema, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Ouwendijk, D. (1961) "Peeping Tom, crime from mental illness" in De Linie, January 1961

Pally, M. (1984) "Double Trouble" in Knapp, L. F. (ed.), Brian De Palma Interviews (2003), Jackson, University Press of Mississippi

Pally, M. (1985) "I Witness, Eye Confess" in Film Comment, 21:2 (1985): 60-61

Perkins, V.F. (1972) Film as Film, London, Penguin Books Ltd.

Phillips, W. (2009) Film: An Introduction (4th Edition), Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan

Prawer, S. S. (1980) Caligari's Children: The Film as Tale of Terror, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Preston, S. (2007) "The Strange Pleasure of The Leopard Man: Gender, Genre and Authorship in a Val Lewton Thriller" in Cineaction, 71 (2007): 14-21

Pribram, E. D. (2004) "Spectatorship and Subjectivity" in Miller, T. and R. Stam (eds.), A Companion to Film Theory (2004), Oxford, Blackwell Publishing

Prince, S. (ed.) (2004) <u>The Horror Film</u>, London, Rutgers

Prince, S. (1996) "Psychoanalytic Film Theory and the Case of the Missing Spectator" in Bordwell, D. and N. Carroll (eds.), <u>Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies</u> (1996), Madison, The University of Wisconsin Press

Prince, S. (ed.) (2000) <u>Screening Violence</u>, New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press

Psycho (1998) Official Website, Behind the Scenes, <u>http://www.psychomovie.com/production/productionwhy.html, accessed 02-01-2012</u>

Pulleine, T. (1980) "Review of <u>Friday the 13th Part 2</u>", in <u>Monthly Film Bulletin</u>, 47: 558 (July): p. 138

Rebello, S. (1992) <u>Alfred Hitchcock and the Making of *Psycho*</u>, London, Mandarin

Reichardt, S. (2011) "Music, Madness and Modernity in Karl Freund's <u>Mad Love</u> (1935)" in <u>Horror Studies</u>, 2:1 (2011): 3-14

Rockoff, A. (2002) <u>Going to Pieces: The Rise and Fall of the Slasher Film, 1978 – 1986</u>, Jefferson, McFarland and Company

Rubinstein, R. (1973) "The Making of <u>Sisters</u>: An Interview with Director Brian De Palma" in Knapp, L. F. (ed.), <u>Brian De Palma Interviews</u>, (2003), Jackson, University Press of Mississippi

Ryan, M. and D. Kellner (1988) <u>Camera Politica: The Politics and Ideology of Contemporary Hollywood Film</u>, Bloomington, Indiana University Press

Salt, B. (2009) "The Shape of 1999: The Stylistics of American Movies at the End of the Century" in Buckland, W. (ed.), <u>Film Theory and Contemporary Hollywood Movies</u>, (2009), Abingdon, Routledge

Sanjek, D. (2000) "Fans' Notes: The Horror Film Fanzine" in Gelder, K. (ed.), <u>Horror Reader</u>, (2000), London, Routledge

Schneider, S. (2000) "Monsters as (Uncanny) Metaphors: Freud, Lakoff, and the Representation of Monstrosity in Cinematic Horror" in Silver, A. and J. Ursini (eds.), <u>Horror Film Reader</u>, (2000), New York, Limelight Editions

Schneider, S. (2004) "Toward an Aesthetics of Cinematic Horror" in Prince, S. (ed.), <u>The Horror Film</u>, (2004), London, Rutgers

Schneider, S. and T. Williams (eds.) (2005) <u>Horror International</u>, Detroit, Wayne State University Press

Schrader, P. (1979) "Paul Schrader's Guilty Pleasures" in <u>Film Comment</u>, 15:1 (1979): 61-62

Semeiks, J. (1986) "Book Review- <u>Dreadful Pleasures: An Anatomy of Modern Horror</u>" in <u>Criticism</u>, 28:4 (1986): 467-470

Sharrett, C. (1995) "The Myth of Apocalypse and the Horror Film: The Primacy of <u>Psycho</u> and <u>The Birds</u>" in <u>Hitchcock Annual 1995/1996</u>

Shary, T. (1997) "Teen Film and Its Methods of Study: A Book Review Essay" in <u>Journal of Popular Film and Television</u>, 25:1 (1997): 38-45

Shaviro, S. (1993) <u>The Cinematic Body</u>, London, University of Minnesota Press

Shklovsky, V. (1970) <u>Bowstring: On the Dissimilarity of the Similar</u>, Translated from the Russian by Avagyan, S., (2011), London, Dalkey Archive Press

Silver, A. and J. Ursini (eds.) (2000) <u>Horror Film Reader</u>, New York, Limelight Editions

Silver, A. and J. Ursini (1975) "Mario Bava: the Illusion of Reality" in Silver, A. and J. Ursini (eds.), <u>Horror Film Reader</u>, (2000), New York, Limelight Editions

Sipos, Thomas M. (2010) <u>Horror Film Aesthetics: Creating the Visual Language of Fear</u>, Jefferson, McFarland & Company Inc. Publishers

Skal, D. (2001) <u>The Monster Show (Revised Edition)</u>, New York, Faber and Faber

Sobchack, V. (2006) "Thoughts on Seeing (most of) <u>The Descent</u> and <u>Isolation</u>" in <u>Film Comment</u>,42:4 (2006): 38-41

Sontag, S. (1964) "Against Interpretation" in Sontag, S., <u>Against Interpretation and Other Essays</u>, (2009), London, Penguin Group

Spiegel, A. (1976) <u>Fiction and the Camera Eye: Visual Consciousness in Film and the Modern Novel</u>, Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia

Stam, R. (2000) <u>Film Theory: An Introduction</u>, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers

Stam, R., R. Burgoyne and S. Flitterman-Lewis (1992) <u>New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics: Structuralism, Post-structuralism and Beyond</u>, London, Routledge

Stilwell, R. J. (2005) "Sound and Empathy: Subjectivity, Gender and the Cinematic Soundscape" in Furby, J. and K. Randell (eds.), <u>Screen Methods: Comparative Readings in Film Studies</u>, (2005), London, Wallflower Press

Telotte, J. P. (1987) "Through a Pumpkin's Eye: The Reflexive Nature of Horror" in Waller, G. (ed.), <u>American Horrors: Essays on the Modern American Horror Film</u>, (1987), Urbana, University of Illinois Press

Time Out London- Film Reviews- The Burning;

http://www.timeout.com/film/reviews/68628/the-burning.html ; accessed 29-01-2010

Thompson, D. and I. Christie (eds.) (1996) Scorsese on Scorsese (Update), London, Faber and Faber

Thompson, K. (1988) Breaking the Glass Armour: Neoformalist Film Analysis, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press

Thompson, R. (1993) Grammar of the Edit, Oxford, Focal Press

Thornley, D. (2006) ''The Scream Reflex: Meta Horror and Popular Culture'' in Metro Magazine, 150 (2006): 140-147

Todd, A. (2012) Authorship and the Films of David Lynch: Aesthetic Receptions in Contemporary Hollywood, London, I. B. Taruis Publishers

Todorov, T. (1970) The Fantastic, Translated from French by Howard R., (1973), Ithaca, Cornell University Press

Toikkanen, J. (2011) ''Between the Sky and the Bestial Floor'' presented at The Monster Inside Us, The Monsters Around Us: Monstrosity and Humantiy at De Montfort University, Leicester, UK, 20/11/2011

Trencansky, S. (2001) "Final Girls and Terrible Youth: Transgression in1980s Slasher Horror" in Journal of Popular Film and Television, 29:2 (2001): 63-73

Trotsky, L. (1923) "The Formalist School of Poetry and Marxism" in Eagleton, T. and D. Milne (eds.) Marxist Literary Theory: A Reader, (1996), Oxford, Blackwell Publishing

Tudor, A. (2002) "From Paranoia to Postmodernism? The Horror Movie in Late Modern Society" in Neale, S. (ed.) Genre and Contemporary Hollywood, (2002), London, BFI Publishing

Tudor, A. (1989) Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie, Oxford, Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Tudor, A. (2002) "Why Horror? : The Peculiar Pleasures of a Popular Genre" (extract) in Jancovich, M. (ed.), Horror, The Film Reader, (2002), London, Routledge

Twitchell, J. (1985) Dreadful Pleasures: An Anatomy of Modern Horror, New York, Oxford University Press

Valentine, N. (2011) The Haunted, London, Sphere

Variety Staff (1980) "Friday the 13th" (Review);

http://www.variety.com/story.asp?1=story&r=VE1117791118&c31; accessed 18-03-2008

Variety Staff (1981) "Friday the 13th Part 2" (Review);

http://www.variety.com/story.asp?1=story&r=VE1117791119&c31; accessed 18-03-2008

Variety Staff (1982) "Friday the 13th Part III" (Review);

http://www.variety.com/story.asp?1=story&r=VE1117791120&c31; accessed 18-03-2008

Variety Staff (1987) "Friday the 13th Part VII: The New Blood" (Review) in Variety,

published 31-12-2011; http://www.variety.com/review/VE1117791123?refcatid=31;

accessed 13-11-2011

Variety Staff (1993) "Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday" (Review);

http://www.variety.com/story.asp?1=story&r=VE1117791130&c31; accessed 18-03-2008

Verevis, C. (2006) Film Remakes, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press

Vertov, D. (1922) "Kinoks: A Revolution" in Michels, A. (ed.), Kino-Eye: The

Writings of Dziga Vertov (1984), translated from the Russian by Kevin O'Brien,

London, University of California Press

Voloshinov, V. N. (1976) <u>Freudianism</u>, Translated from the Russian by I. R. Titunkik, London, Verso (2012)

Waller, G. (ed.) (1987) <u>American Horrors: Essays on the Modern American Horror Film</u>, Urbana, University of Illinois Press

Wee, V. (2006) "Resurrecting and Updating the Teen Slasher" in <u>Journal of Popular Film and Television</u>, 34:2 (2006): 50-61

Wee, V. (2005) "The Scream Trilogy, 'Hyperpostmodernism,' and the Late-Nineties Teen Slasher Film" in <u>Journal of Film and Video</u>, 57:3 (2005): 50-61

Weis, E. and J. Belton (eds.) (1985) <u>Film Sound: Theory and Practice</u>, New York, Columbia University Press

Wells, P. (2000) <u>The Horror Genre: From Beelzebub to Blair Witch</u>, London, Wallflower Press

Wharton, S. (2011) "Evil is Not Enough: The Re-Imagining of Michael Myers" presented at the 56th Annual British Association of American Studies conference at the University of Central Lancashire, 16/04/2011

White, D. (1971) "The Poetics of Horror: More Than Meets the Eye" in <u>Cinema Journal, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Spring)</u>

Wierzbicki, J. (2011) "Lost in Translation?: Ghost Music in Recent Japanese Kaidan Films and Their Hollywood Remakes" in Horror Studies, 1:2 (2010): 193-206

Williams, L. (2000) "Discipline and Fun: Psycho and Postmodern Cinema" in Reinventing Film Studies, Gledhill, C. and L. Williams [eds.] (2000), London, Arnold Publishers

Williams, T. (1996) Hearths of Darkness: The Family in the American Horror Film, London, Associated University Presses

Williams, T. (1996) "Trying to Survive on the Darker Side: 1980s Family Horror" in Grant, B.K. (ed.), The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film (1996), Austin, University of Texas Press

Williamson, J. (1993) Deadline at Dawn: Film Criticism 1980-1990, London, Marion Boyars Publishing

Wimsatt, Jr., W. K. and C. Brooks (1957) Literary Criticism: A Short History, New York, Random House

Wolfe, P. (1983) "The Critics Did It: An Essay Review" in Modern Fiction Studies, 29:3 (1983): 389-434

Wood, R. (1989) Hitchcock's Films Revisited, London, Faber and Faber Limited

Wood, R. (1986) Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan, New York, Columbia University Press

Wood, R. (2003) Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan…And Beyond, New York, Columbia University Press

Worland, R. (2007) The Horror Film: An Introduction, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing

Yeats, W. B. (1916) "The Magi" in Yeats, W. B., Reflections, (1916), New York, MacMillan

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

Zimmer, C. (2004) "The Camera's Eye: Peeping Tom and Technological Perversion" in Hantke, S. (ed.), Horror Film: Creating and Marketing Fear, (2004), Jackson, University Press of Mississippi

Žižek, S. (2001) The Fright of Real Tears: Krzysztof Kieślowski between Theory and Post-Theory. London, BFI Publishing

Žižek, S. (2000) "'In His Bold Gaze My Ruin Is Writ Large'" (extract) in Gelder, K. (ed.), Horror Reader, (2000), London, Routledge

Žižek, S. (2013) "Zero Dark Thrity: Hollywood's Gift to American Power" in The Guardian Online, 25 January 2013, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/jan/25/zero-dark-thirty-normalises-torture-unjustifiable, accessed: 18-04-2013

Works Cited – Music

Jackson, M. (1982) "Thriller", In <u>Thriller</u>, [LP], USA, Epic

Night Ranger (1983) "Sister Christian, In <u>Midnight Madness</u>, [LP], USA, MCA

Works Cited – Films

Ali. Dir. Michael Mann, Prod. Paul Ardaji / A. Kitman Ho / James Lassiter / Michael Mann / Jon Peters, Prod. Co. Columbia Pictures Corporation / Forward Pass Productions / Initial Entertainment Group / Moonlighting Films / Overbrook Entertainment / Peters Entertainment / Picture Entertainment Corporation, 2001, USA. Main Cast: Will Smith (Cassius Clay/Muhammad Ali), Jaime Foxx (Drew "Bundini" Brown), Jon Voight (Howard Cosell), Mario Van Peebles (Malcolm X).

Alien. Dir. Ridley Scott, Prod. Gordon Carroll / David Giler / Walter Hill, Prod. Co. Brandywine Productions / Twentieth Century – Fox Productions, 1979, USA / UK. Main Cast: Tom Skerritt (Dallas), Sigourney Weaver (Ripley), Veronica Cartwright (Lambert), Harry Dean Stanton (Brett).

Alien[3], Dir. David Fincher, Prod. Gordon Carroll / David Giler / Walter Hill, Prod. Co. Brandywine Productions / Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 1992, USA. Main Cast: Sigourney Weaver (Ellen Ripley), Charles S. Dutton (Dillon), Charles Dance (Clemens), Paul McGann (Golic).

Aliens. Dir. James Cameron, Prod. Gale Anne Hurd, Prod. Co. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation / Brandywine Productions / SLM Production Group, 1986, USA / UK. Main Cast: Sigourney Weaver (Ellen Ripley), Carrie Henn (Newt), Michael Biehn (Corporal Dwayne Hicks), Paul Reiser (Carter Burke).

<u>All About Eve</u>. Dir. Jospeh L. Mankiewicz, Prod. Darryl F. Zanuck, Prod. Co. Twentieth Century – Fox Film Corporation, 1950, USA. Main Cast: Bette Davis (Margo), Anne Baxter (Eve), George Sanders (Addison DeWitt), Celeste Holm (Karen).

<u>American Beauty</u>, Dir. Sam Mendes, Prod. Bruce Cohen / Dan Jinks, Prod. Co. Dreamworks SKG / Jinks/Cohen Company, 1999, USA. Main Cast: Kevin Spacey (Lester Burnham), Annette Bening (Carolyn Burnham), Thora Birch (Jane Burnham), Wes Bentley (Ricky Fitts).

<u>And Then There Were None</u>. Dir. René Clair, Prod. René Clair, Prod. Co. Popular Pictures Inc., 1945, USA. Main Cast: Barry Fitzgerald (Judge Francis J. Quinncannon), Walter Huston (Dr. Edward G. Armstrong), Louis Hayward (Philip Lombard), Roland Young (Detective William Henry Blore).

<u>Apollo 18</u>. Dir. Gonzalo López-Gallego, Prod. Timur Bekmambetov / Michele Wolkoff, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Bekmambetov Projects Ltd. / Apollo 18 Productions, 2011, USA / Canada. Main Cast: Warren Christie (Ben Anderson), Lloyd Owen (Nate), Ryan Robbins (John Grey).

<u>As Seen Through a Telescope</u>. Dir. George Albert Smith, Prod. George Albert Smith, Prod. Co. G. A. S. Films, 1900, UK. No credited cast.

<u>AVP: Alien vs. Predator</u>. Dir. Paul W. S. Anderson, Prod. Gordon Carroll / John Davis / David Giler / Walter Hill, Prod. Co. Twentieth Century Fox Film

Corporation / Davis Entertainment / Brandywine Productions / Charenton

Productions Limited / Impact Pictures / Inside Track 2 LLP / Zweite Babelsberg

Film GmbH, 2004, USA / Germany / Czech Republic / UK. Main Cast: Sanaa

Lathan (Alexa Woods), Raoul Bova (Sebastian de Rosa), Lance Henriksen (Charles

Bishop Weyland), Ewen Bremner (Graeme Miller).

Bay of Blood, A (**Twitch of the Death Nerve**) (**Reazione a Catena**). Dir. Mario

Bava, Prod. Giuseppe Zaccariello, Prod Co. Nuova Linea Cinematografica, 1971,

Italy. Main Cast: Claudine Auger (Renata), Luigi Pistilli (Albert), Claudio Volonté

(Simon), Anna M. Rosati (Laura).

Beetlejuice. Dir. Tim Burton, Prod. Michael Bender / Richard Hashimoto / Larry

Wilson, Prod. Co. The Geffen Company, 1988, USA. Main Cast: Alec Baldwin

(Adam Maitland), Geena Davis (Barbara Maitland), Michael Keaton (Beetlejuice),

Winona Ryder (Lydia Deetz).

Bird With the Crystal Plumage, The (**L'uccello Dalle Piume di Cristallo**). Dir.

Dario Argento, Prod. Salvatore Argento, Prod. Co. Central Cinema Company Film /

Glazier / Seda Spettacoli, 1970, Italy / West Germany. Main Cast: Tony Musante

(Sam Dalmas), Suzy Kendall (Julia), Enrico Maria Salerno (Inspector Morosini),

Eva Renzi (Monica Ranieri).

Black Christmas. Dir. Bob Clarke, Prod. Bob Clarke, Prod. Co. Film Funding /

Vision IV / Canadian Film Development Corporation / Famous Players, 1974,

Canada. Main Cast: Olivia Hussey (Jess), Keir Dullea (Peter), Margot Kidder (Barb), John Saxon (Lt. Fuller).

Black Christmas. Dir. Glen Morgan, Prod. Marty Adelstein / Steven Hoban / Glen Morgan / Dawn Parouse / Victor Solnicki / James Wong, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / 2929 Productions / Adelstein-Parouse Productions / Hard Eight Pictures / Hoban Segal Productions / Victor Solnicki Productions, 2006, USA / Canada. Main Cast: Katie Cassidy (Kelli Presley), Michelle Trachtenberg (Melissa), Mary Elizabeth Winstead (Heather Fitzgerald), Lacey Chabert (Dana).

Black Sabbath (**I Tre Volti Della Paura**). Dir. Mario Bava, Prod. Salvatore Billitteri / Paolo Mercuri, Prod. Co. Emmepi Cinematografica / Galatea Film / Societé Cinématographique Lyre, 1963, Italy / Fance / USA. Main Cast: Michèle Mercier (Rosy), Lidia Alfonsi (Mary), Boris Karloff (Gorca), Mark Damon (Vladimire d'Urfe).

Blair Witch Project, The. Dir. Daniel Myrick / Eduardo Sánchez, Prod. Robin Cowie / Gregg Hale, Prod. Co. Haxan Films, 1999, USA. Main Cast: Heather Donahue (Heather Donahue), Joshua Leonard (Josh Leonard), Michael Williams (Mike Williams).

Body Heat. Dir. Lawrence Kasdan, Prod. Fred T. Gallo, Prod. Co. The Ladd Company, 1981, USA. Main Cast: William Hurt (Ned Racine), Kathleen Turner (Matty Walker), Richard Crenna (Edmund Walker), Ted Danson (Peter Lowenstein).

Bride of Chucky. Dir. Ronny Yu, Prod. Grace Gilroy / David Kirschner, Prod. Co. Midwinter Productions Inc. / Universal Pictures, 1998, Canada / USA. Main Cast: Jennifer Tilly (Tiffany), Brad Dourif (Chucky), Katherine Heigel (Jade), Nick Stabile (Jesse).

Broadway Melody, The. Dir. Harry Beaumont, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1929, USA. Main Cast: Charles King (Eddie Kearns), Anita Page (Queenie Mahoney), Bessie Love (Hank Mahoney).

Burning, The. Dir. Tony Maylam, Prod. Harvey Weinstein, Prod. Co. Miramax Films / The Cropsy Venture, 1981, USA / Canada. Main Cast: Brian Matthews (Todd), Leah Ayres (Michelle), Brian Backer (Alfred), Larry Joshua (Glazer). With reference to the 2000 Vipco CultClassic VHS release, Leyton, London, UK.

Cabinet of Dr. Caligari, The (**Das Cabinet Des Dr. Caligari**)**.** Dir. Robert Wiene, Prod. Rudolf Meinert / Erich Pommer, Prod. Co. Decla-Bioscop AG, 1920, Germany. Main Cast: Werner Krauss (Dr. Caligari), Conrad Veidt (Cesare), Friedrich Fehér (Francis), Lil Dagover (Jane Olsen).

Candyman, Dir. Bernard Rose, Prod. Steve Golin / Alan Poul / Sigurjon Sighvatsson, Prod. Co. PolyGram Filmed Entertainment / Propaganda Films, 1992, USA. Main Cast: Virginia Madsen (Helen Lyle), Tony Todd (The Candyman), Xander Berkeley (Trevor Lyle), Kasi Lemmons (Bernie Walsh).

Cannibal Ferox. Dir. Umberto Lenzi, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Dania Film /
Meduza Produzione / National Cinematografica, 1981, Italy. Main Cast: John
Morghen (Mike Logan), Lorraine De Selle (Gloria Davis), Bryan Redford (Rudy
Davis).

Cannibal Holocaust. Dir. Ruggero Deodato, Prod. Franco Di Nunzio, Franco
Palaggi, Prod. Co. F. D. Cinematografica, 1980, Italy. Main Cast: Robert Kerman
(Harold Monroe), Francesca Ciardi (Faye Daniels), Perry Pirkanen (Jack Anders),
Luca Giorgio Barbareschi (Mark Tomaso).

Captivity. Dir. Roland Joffé, Prod. Mark Damon / Serge Konov / Gary Mehlman /
Leonid Minkovski, 2007, USA / Russia. Main Cast: Elisha Cuthbert (Jennifer),
Daniel Gillies (Gary Dexter), Pruitt Taylor Vince (Ben Dexter), Michael Harney
(Detective Bettiger).

Carrie. Dir. Brian De Palma, Prod. Paul Monash, Prod. Co. United Artists, 1976,
USA. Main Cast: Sissy Spacek (Carrie White), Piper Laurie (Margaret White), Amy
Irving (Sue Snell), William Katt (Tommy Ross).

Cat People. Dir. Paul Schrader, Prod. Charles Fries, Prod. Co. RKO Pictures /
Universal Pictures, 1982, USA. Main Cast: Nastassia Kinski (Irena Gallier),
Malcolm McDowell (Paul Gallier), John Heard (Oliver Yates), Annette O'Toole
(Alice Perrin).

Chinatown. Dir. Roman Polanski, Prod. Robert Evans, Prod. Co. Paramount
Pictures / Penthouse / Long Road Productions, 1974, USA. Main Cast: Jack
Nicholson (Jake Gittes), Faye Dunaway (Evelyn Mulwray), John Huston (Noah
Cross), Perry Lopez (Escobar).

Clockwork Oragne, A. Dir. Stanley Kubrick, Prod. Stanley Kubrick, Prod. Co.
Warner Bros. Pictures / Hawk Films, 1971, UK / USA. Main Cast: Malcolm
McDowell (Alex), Patrick Magee (Mr. Alexander), Michael Bates (Chief Guard),
Warren Clarke (Dim).

Cloverfield. Dir. Matt Reeves, Prod. J. J. Abrams / Bryan Burk, Prod. Co.
Paramount Pictures / Bad Robot, 2008, USA. Main Cast: Lizzy Caplan (Marlena
Diamond), Jessica Lucas (Lily Ford), T. J. Miller (Hud Platt), Michael Stahl-David
(Rob Hawkins).

Creepshow. Dir. George A. Romero, Prod. Richard P. Rubinstein, Prod. Co.
Creepshow Films, Inc. / Laurel Entertainment Inc. / Laurel-Show Inc. / Warner Bros.
Pictures, 1982, USA. Main Cast: Hal Holbrook (Henry Northrup), Adrienne
Barbeau (Wilma Northrup), Fritz Weaver (Dexter Stanley), Leslie Nielsen (Richard
Vickers).

Crime of M. Lange, The (**Le Crime De Monsieur Lange**). Dir. Jean Renoir, Prod.
None credited, Prod. Co. Films Obéron, 1936, France. Main Cast: René Lefèvre
(Amédée Lange), Florelle (Valentine), Jules Berry (Batala), Marcel Lévesque (The
Concierge).

Critters. Dir. Stephen Herek, Prod. Rupert Harvey, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Sho Films / Smart Egg Pictures, 1986, USA. Main Cast: Dee Wallace Stone (Helen Brown), M. Emmett Walsh (Harv), Billy Green Bush (Jay Brown), Scott Grimes (Brad Brown).

Curse of Frankenstein, The. Dir. Terence Fisher, Prod. Anthony Hinds / Max Rosenberg, Prod. Co. Hammer, 1957, UK. Main Cast: Peter Cushing (Victor Frankenstein), Hazel Court (Elizabeth), Robert Urquhart (Paul Krempe), Christopher Lee (Creature).

Dances With Wolves. Dir. Kevin Costner, Prod. Kevin Costner / Jim Wilson, Prod. Co. Tig Productions /Majestic Films International, 1990, USA / UK. Main Cast: Kevin Costner (Lieutenant Dunbar), Mary McDonnell (Stands With A Fist), Graham Greene (Kicking Bird), Rodney A. Grant (Wind In His Hair).

Dawn of the Dead. Dir. George A. Romero, Prod. Richard P. Rubinstein, Prod. Co. Laurel Group, 1978, Italy / USA. Main Cast: David Emge (Stephen), Ken Foree (Peter), Scott H. Reiniger (Roger), Gaylen Ross (Francine).

Deadly Blessing. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Patricia S. Herskovic / Max A. Keller / Micheline H. Keller, Prod. Co. Polygram Pictures / Inter Planetary, 1981, USA. Main Cast: Maren Jensen (Martha Schmidt), Sharon Stone (Lana Marcus), Susan Buckner (Vicky Anderson), Jeff East (John Schmidt).

Deep Red (**Profondo Rosso**). Dir. Dario Argento, Prod. Salvatore Argento, Prod. Co. Rizzoli Film / Seda Spettacoli, 1975, Italy. Main Cast: David Hemmings (Marcus Daly), Daria Nicolodi (Gianna Brezzi), Gabriele Lavia (Carlo), Macha Méril (Helga Ulmann).

Devil's Rejects, The. Dir. Rob Zombie, Prod. Mike Elliott / Andy Gould / Marco Mehlitz / Michael Ohoven / Rob Zombie, 2005, USA / Germany. Main Cast: Sid Haig (Captain Spaulding), Bill Moseley (Otis), Sheri Moon Zombie (Baby).

Die Hard. Dir. John McTiernan, Prod. Lawrence Gordon / Joel Silver, Prod. Co. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation / Gordon Company / Lawrence Gordon Productions / Silver Pictures, 1988, USA. Main Cast: Bruce Willis (Officer John McClane), Bonnie Bedelia (Holly Gennaro McClane), Reginald Veljohnson (Sgt. Al Powell), Paul Gleason (Deputy Police Chief Dwayne T. Robinson).

Do You Like Hitchcock? (**Ti Piace Hitchcock?**). Dir. Dario Argento, Prod. Carlo Bixio / Joan Antoni Gonzáles / Fabrizio Zappi, Prod. Co. Film Commission Torino-Piemonte / Genesis Motion Pictures / Institut Del Cinema Català / Opera Film Produzione / Rai Trade / Televisió de Catalunya, 2005, Italy / Spain. Main Cast: Elio Germano (Giulio), Chiara Conti (Federica), Elisabetta Rocchetti (Sasha), Cristina Brondo (Arianna).

Donnie Darko. Dir. Richard Kelly, Prod. Adam Fields / Nancy Juvonen / Sean McKittrick, Prod. Co. Pandora / Flower Films / Adam Fields Productions / Gaylord

Films, 2001, USA. Main Cast: Jake Gyllenhaal (Donnie Darko), Holmes Osborne
(Eddie Darko), Maggie Gyllenhaal (Elizabeth Darko).

Donnie Darko (Director's Cut). Dir. Richard Kelly, Prod. Adam Fields / Nancy
Juvonen / Sean McKittrick, Prod. Co. Pandora / Flower Films / Adam Fields
Productions / Gaylord Films, 2004, USA. Main Cast: Jake Gyllenhaal (Donnie
Darko), Holmes Osborne (Eddie Darko), Maggie Gyllenhaal (Elizabeth Darko).

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Dir. Rouben Mamoulian, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co.
Paramount Publix Corporation, 1931, USA. Main Cast: Fredric March (Dr. Henry
Jekyll/Mr. Hyde), Miriam Hopkins (Ivy Pearson), Rose Hobart (Muriel Carew),
Holmes Herbert (Dr. Lanyon).

Dracula. Dir. Tod Browning, Prod. Tod Browning / Carl Laemmle Jr., Prod. Co.
Universal Pictures Corporation, 1931, USA. Main Cast: Bela Lugosi (Count
Dracula), Helen Chandler (Mina), David Manners (John Harker), Dwight Frye
(Renfield).

Dressed to Kill. Dir. Brian De Palma, Prod. George Litto, Prod. Co. Filmways
Pictures Inc. / Cinema77/Film Group / Warwick Associates, 1980, USA. Main Cast:
Michael Caine (Doctor Robert Elliott), Angie Dickinson (Kate Miller), Nancy Allen
(Liz Blake), Keith Gordon (Peter Miller).

Escamotage d'Une Dame au Théâtre Robert-Houdin. Dir. Georges Méliès, Prod.
Georges Méliès, Prod. Co. Robert-Houdin Théâtre, 1896, France. Main Cast: Jeanne
d'Alcy (Woman), Georges Méliès (Magician).

Evil Dead, The. Dir. Sam Raimi, Prod. Robert Tapert, Prod. Co. Renaissance Pictures. 1981, USA. Main Cast: Bruce Campbell (Ash Williams), Ellen Sandweiss (Cheryl), Hal Delrich (Scott), Betsy Baker (Linda).

Evil Dead 2, The. Dir. Sam Raimi, Prod. Robert G. Tapert, Prod. Co. DeLaurentiis Entertainment Group / Renaissance Pictures, 1987, USA. Main Cast: Bruce Campbell (Ash Williams), Sarah Berry (Annie Knowby), Dan Hicks (Jake), Kassie Wesley (Bobby Joe).

Eyes of Laura Mars. Dir. Irvin Kershner, Prod. Jon Peters, Prod. Co. Columbia Pictures Corporation, 1978, USA. Main Cast: Faye Dunaway (Laura Mars), Tommy Lee Jones (John Neville), Brad Dourif (Tommy Ludlow), Rene Auberjonois (Donald Phelps).

Eyes Wide Shut. Dir. Stanley Kubrick, Prod. Stanley Kubrick, Prod. Co. Hobby Films / Pole Star / Stanley Kubrick Productions / Warner Bros. Pictures, 1999, UK / USA. Main Cast: Tom Cruise (Bill Harford), Nicole Kidman (Alice Harford), Madison Eginton (Helena Harford), Sydney Pollack (Victor Ziegler).

Eyes Without a Face (**Les Yeux Sans Visage**). Dir. Georges Franju, Prod. Jules Borkon, Prod. Co. Champs-Élysées Productions / Lux Films, 1959, France / Italy. Main Cast: Pierre Brasseur (Docteur Génessier), AlidaValli (Louise), Juliette Mayniel (Edna Grüber), Edith Scob (Christiane Génessier).

Fade to Black. Dir. Vernon Zimmerman, Prod. George G. Braunstein / Ron Hamady, Prod. Co. Leisure Investment Company / Movie Ventures, 1980, USA. Main Cast: Dennis Christopher (Eric Binford), Tim Thomerson (Jerry Moriarty), Gwynne Gilford (Officer Anne Oshenbull), Normann Burton (Marty Berger).

Final Destination 5 3-D. Dir. Steven Quale, Prod. Craig Perry / Warren Zide, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Practical Pictures / Zide Pictures / Jellystone Films, 2011, USA. Main Cast: Nicholas D'Agosto (Sam Lawton), Emma Bell (Molly Harper), Miles Fisher (Peter Friedkin), Ellen Wroe (Candice Hooper).

Fly, The. Dir. David Cronenberg, Prod. Stuart Cornfeld, Prod. Co. Brooksfilms, 1986, USA. Main Cast: Jeff Goldblum (Seth Brundle), Geena Davis (Veronica Quaife), John Getz (Stathis Borans), Joy Boushel (Tawny).

Fly II, The. Dir. Chris Walas, Prod. Steven-Charles Jaffe, Prod. Co. Brooksfilms, 1989, USA. Main Cast: Eric Stotlz (Martin), Daphne Zuniga (Beth), Lee Richardson (Bartok), John Getz (Stathis).

Frankenstein. Dir. Marcus Nispel, Prod. Marcus Nispel, Prod. Co. Flame TV / Flame Ventures / L. I. F. T. Production / USA Cable Network, 2004, USA. Main Cast: Parker Posey (Detective Carson O'Conner), Vincent Perez (Deucalion), Thomas Kretschmann (Victor Helios), Adam Goldberg (Detective Michael Sloane).

Freddy vs. Jason. Dir. Ronny Yu, Prod. Sean S. Cunningham, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Cecchi Gori Group Tiger Cinematografica / Avery Pix / Sean S.

Cunningham Films / WTC Productions / Yannix Technology Corporation, 2003, Canada / USA / Italy. Main Cast: Robert Englund (Freddy Krueger), Ken Kirzinger (Jason), Monica Keena (Lori Campbell), Jason Ritter (Will Rollins).

Freddy's Dead: The Final Nightmare. Dir. Rachel Talalay, Prod. Robert Shaye / Aron Warner, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Nicolas Entertainment, 1991, USA. Main Cast: Robert Englund (Freddy Krueger), Lisa Zane (Maggie Burroughs), Shon Greenblatt (John Doe), Lezlie Deane (Tracy).

Friday the 13th. Dir. Sean S. Cunningham, Prod. Sean S. Cunningham, Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures / Georgetown Productions Inc. / Sean S. Cunningham Films, 1980, USA. Main Cast: Betsy Palmer (Mrs. Pamela Voorhees), Adrienne King (Alice Hardy), Jeannine Taylor (Marcie Cunningham), Robbi Morgan (Annie).

Friday the 13th. Dir. Marcus Nispel, Prod. Michael Bay / Sean S. Cunningham / Andrew Form / Brad Fuller, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Paramount Pictures / Platinum Dunes / Crystal Lake Entertainment, 2009, USA. Main Cast: Jared Padalecki (Clay Miller), Danielle Panabaker (Jenna), Amanda Righetti (Whitney Miller), Travis Van Winkle (Trent).

Friday the 13th Part 2. Dir. Steve Miner, Prod. Steve Miner, Prod. Co. Georgetown Productions Inc., 1981, USA. Main Cast: Amy Steel (Ginny Field), John Furey (Paul Holt), Adrienne King (Alice Hary), Kirsten Baker (Terry).

Friday the 13th Part III 3-D. Dir. Steve Miner, Prod. Frank Mancuso Jr., Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures / Georgetown Productions Inc. / Jason Productions, 1982, USA. Main Cast: Dana Kimmell (Chris Higgins), Paul Kratka (Rick), Tracie Savage (Debbie), Jeffrey Rogers (Andy).

Friday the 13th Part III. Dir. Steve Miner, Prod. Frank Mancuso Jr., Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures / Georgetown Productions Inc. / Jason Productions, 1982, USA. Main Cast: Dana Kimmell (Chris Higgins), Paul Kratka (Rick), Tracie Savage (Debbie), Jeffrey Rogers (Andy).

Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter. Dir. Joseph Zito, Prod. Frank Mancuso Jr., Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures, Georgetown Productions Inc., 1984, USA. Main Cast: Kimberly Beck (Trish Jarvis), Peter Barton (Doug), Corey Feldman (Tommy Jarvis), E. Erich Anderson (Rob Dyer).

Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning. Dir. Danny Steinmann, Prod. Timothy Silver, Prod. Co. Georgetown Productions Inc. / Paramount Pictures / Terror Inc., 1985, USA. Main Cast: Melanie Kinnaman (Pam Roberts), John Shepard (Tommy Jarvis), Shavar Ross (Reggie), Richard Young (Matthew Letter).

Friday the 13th Part VII: The New Blood. Dir. John Carl Buechler, Prod. Iain Paterson, Prod. Co. Friday Four Films / Paramount Pictures, 1988, USA. Main Cast: Lar Park-Lincoln (Tina Shepard), Terry Kiser (Dr. Crews), Kane Hodder (Jason Voorhees), Susan Blu (Mrs. Amanda Shepard).

Friday The 13th Part VIII: Jason Takes Manhattan. Dir. Rob Hedden, Prod. Randolph Cheveldave, Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures / Horror Inc., 1989, USA. Main Cast: Kane Hodder (Jason Voorhees), Jensen Daggett (Rennie Wickham), Peter Mark Richman (Charles McCulloch), Scott Reeves (Sean Robertson).

Gate, The. Dir. Tibor Takács, Prod. John Kemeny, Prod. Co. New Century Entertainment Corporation / The Vista Organization Ltd. / Alliance Entertainment / Gate Productions, 1986, Canada / USA. Main Cast: Stephen Dorff (Glen), Christa Denton (Al), Louis Tripp (Terry Chandler), Kelly Rowan (Lori Lee).

Girl Who Knew Too Much, The (**La Ragazza Che Sapeva Troppo**). Dir. Mario Bava, Prod. Massimo De Rita, Prod. Co. Galatea Film / Coronet S. R. L., 1963, Italy. Main Cast: Letícia Román (Nora Davis), John Saxon (Dr. Marcello Bassi), Valentina Cortese (Laura Craven-Torrani), Titti Tomaino (Inspector).

Going To Pieces. Dir. None credited, Prod. Rachel Belofsky / Rudy Scalese, Prod. Co. Starz Entertainment / thinkfilm / Candy Heart Productions, 2006, USA. Main Cast: Ed Green (Narrator), John Carpenter (Himself), Wes Craven (Himself), Herb Freed (Himself).

Grandma's Reading Glass. Dir. George Albert Smith, Prod. George Albert Smith, Prod. Co. G. A. S. Films, 1900, UK. Main Cast: Harold Smith (Willy – the little grandson).

Great Train Robbery, The. Dir. Edwin Porter, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Edison Manufacturing Company, 1903, USA. Main Cast: None credited.

Halloween. Dir. John Carpenter, Prod. Debra Hill, Prod. Co. Compass International Pictures, Falcon International Pictures, 1978, USA. Main Cast: Donald Pleasance (Dr. Sam Loomis), Jaime Lee Curtis (Laurie Strode), Nancy Loomis (Annie Brackett), P. J. Soles (Lynda van der Klok). With reference to the 25th Anniversary Edition, Divimax, released by Anchor Bay, 2003, Troy, MI, USA.

Halloween. Dir. Rob Zombie, Prod. Malek Akkad / Andy Gould / Rob Zombie, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Nightfall Productions / Spectacle Entertainment Group / Trancas International Films / The Weinstein Company, 2007, USA. Main Cast: Malcolm McDowell (Dr. Samuel Loomis), Scout Taylor-Compton (Laurie Strode), Tyler Mane (Michael Myers), Daeg Faerch (Michael Myers, Age 10).

Halloween: The Curse of Michael Myers. Dir. Joe Chappelle, Prod. Paul Freeman, Prod. Co. Halloween VI Productions / Miramax Films / Nightfall, 1995, USA. Main Cast: Donald Pleasance (Dr. Sam Loomis), Paul Stephen Rudd (Tommy Doyle), Marianne Hagan (Kara Strode), Mitchell Ryan (Dr. Terence Wynn).

Halloween: Resurrection. Dir. Rick Rosenthal, Prod. Paul Freeman / Michael Leahy, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Nightfall Productions / Trancas International Films, 2002, USA. Main Cast: Jamie Lee Curtis (Laurie Strode), Brad Loree (Michael Myers), Busta Rhymes (Freddie Harris), Bianca Kajlich (Sarah Moyer).

Halloween H20: 20 Years Later. Dir. Steve Miner, Prod. Paul Freeman, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Nightfall Productions, 1998, USA. Main Cast: Jamie Lee Curtis (Laurie Strode/Keri Tate), Josh Hartnett (John Tate), Adam Arkin (Will Brennan), Michelle Williams (Molly Cartwell).

Halloween II. Dir. Rick Rosenthal, Prod. John Carpenter / Debra Hill, Prod. Co. DeLaurentiis / Universal Pictures, 1981, USA. Main Cast: Jamie Lee Curtis (Laurie Strode), Donald Pleasance (Sam Loomis), Charles Cyphers (Leigh Brackett), Jeffrey Kramer (Graham).

Halloween II. Dir. Rob Zombie, Prod. Malek Akkad / Andy Gould / Rob Zombie, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Spectacle Entertainment Group / Trancas International Films, 2009, USA. Main Cast: Sheri Moon Zombie (Deborah Myers), Chase Vanek (Young Michael), Scout Taylor-Compton (Laurie Strode), Brad Dourif (Sheriff Lee Brackett).

Halloween III: Season of the Witch. Dir. Tommy Lee Wallace, Prod. John Carpenter, Debra Hill, Prod. Co. Dino De Laurentiis Company / Universal Pictures, 1982, USA. Main Cast: Tom Atkins (Dr. Dan Challis), Stacey Nelkin (Ellie Grimbridge), Dan O'Herlihy (Conal Cochran), Michael Currie (Rafferty).

Halloween 4: The Return of Michael Myers. Dir. Dwight H. Little, Prod. Paul Freeman, Prod. Co. Trancas International Films, 1988, USA. Main Cast: Donald Pleasance (Dr. Sam Loomis), Ellie Cornell (Rachel Carruthers), Danielle Harris (Jamie Lloyd), George P. Wilbur (Michael Myers).

Halloween 5: The Revenge of Michael Myers. Dir. Dominique Othenin-Girard, Prod. Ramsey Thomas, Prod. Co. Magnum Pictures Inc. / The Return of Myers / Trancas International Films, 1989, USA. Main Cast: Donald Pleasance (Dr. Sam Loomis), Danielle Harris (Jamie Lloyd), Ellie Cornell (Rachel Carruthers), Beau Starr (Sheriff Ben Meeker).

Happy Birthday to Me. Dir. J. Lee Thompson, Prod. John Dunning / Andre Link, Prod. Co. Canadian Film Development Corporation / Columbia Pictures Corporation / Famous Players / The Birthday Film Company, 1981, Canada. Main Cast: Melissa Sue Anderson (Virginia Wainwright), Glenn Ford (Dr. David Faraday), Lawrence Dane (Hal Wainwright), Sharon Acker (Estelle Wainwright).

Haunting, The. Dir. Robert Wise, Prod. Robert Wise, Prod. Co. Argyle Enterprises, 1963, USA / UK. Main Cast: Julie Harris (Nell Lance), Claire Bloom (Theo), Richard Johnson (Dr. John Markway), Russ Tamblyn (Luke Sanderson).

Hell Night. Dir. Tom DeSimone, Prod. Bruce Cohn Curtis / Mark L. Rosen / Irwin Yablans, Prod. Co. B. L. T. Productions / Media Home Entertainment, 1981, USA. Main Cast: Linda Blair (Marti Gaines), Vincent Van Patten (Seth), Peter Barton (Jeff Reed), Kevin Brophy (Peter Bennett).

Henry: Portrait of a Serial Killer. Dir. John McNaughton, Prod. Lisa Dedmond / Steven A. Jones / John McNaughton, Prod. Co. Maljack Productions, 1986, USA.

Main Cast: Michael Rooker (Henry), Tom Towles (Otis), Tracy Arnold (Becky), David Katz (Henry's Boss).

Hidden Fortress, The (**Kakushi-Toride No San-Akunin**). Dir. Akira Kurosawa, Prod. Sanezumi Fujimoto / Akira Kurosawa, Prod. Co. Toho Company, 1958, Japan. Main Cast: Toshirô Mifune (General Rokurota Makabe), Minoru Chiaki (Tahei), Kamatari Fujiwara (Matashichi), Susumu Fujita (General Hyoe Tadokoro). With Reference to DVD released by The Criterion Collection, 2001, New York City, NY, USA.

Hills Have Eyes, The. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Peter Locke, Prod. Co. Blood Relations Co., 1977, USA. Main Cast: John Steadman (Fred), Janus Blythe (Ruby), Arthur King (Mercury), Russ Grieve (Big Bob Carter).

Hills Have Eyes, The. Dir. Alexandre Aja, Prod. Wes Craven / Peter Locke / Marianne Maddalena, Prod. Co. Craven-Maddalena Films / Dune Entertainment / Major Studio Partners, 2006, USA. Main Cast: Aaron Stanford (Doug Bukowski), Kathleen Quinlan (Ethel Carter), Vinessa Shaw (Lynn Carter), Emilie de Ravin (Brenda Carter).

Hills Have Eyes II, The. Dir. Martin Weisz, Prod. Wes Craven / Samy Layani / Peter Locke / Marianne Maddalena, Prod. Co. Fox Atomic / Craven-Maddalena Films / Dune Entertainment, 2007, USA. Main Cast: Michael McMillian (Napoleon), Jessica Stroup (Amber), Jacob Vargas (Crank), Flex Alexander (Sarge).

Hills Have Eyes Part II, The. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Barry Cahn / Peter Locke, Prod. Co. V. T. C., 1985, UK / USA. Main Cast: Tamara Stafford (Cass), Kevin Blair (Roy), John Bloom (The Reaper), Colleen Riley (Jane).

Hitcher, The. Dir. Dave Meyers, Prod. Michael Bay / Andrew Form / Brad Fuller / Alfred Haber / Charles Meeker, Prod. Co. Focus Features / Intrepid Pictures / Platinum Dunes, 2007, USA. Main Cast: Sean Bean (John Ryder), Sophia Bush (Grace Andrews), Zachary Knighton (Jim Halsey), Neal McDonough (Lt. Esteridge).

Hostel. Dir. Eli Roth, Prod. Chris Briggs / Mike Fleiss / Eli Roth / Philip Waley, Prod. Co. Hostel LLC / International Production Company / Next Entertainment / Raw Nerve, 2005, USA. Main Cast: Jay Hernandez (Paxton), Derek Richardson (Josh), Eythor Gudjonsson (Oli), Barbara Nedeljakova (Natalya).

Hostel Part II. Dir. Eli Roth, Prod. Chris Briggs / Mike Fleiss / Eli Roth, Prod. Co. Lionsgate / Screen Gems / Next Entertainment / Raw Nerve / International Production Company, 2007, USA. Main Cast: Lauren German (Beth), Roger Bart (Stuart), Heather Matarazzo (Lorna), Bijou Phillips (Whitney).

Hostel Part III. Dir. Scott Spiegel, Prod. Chris Briggs / Mike Fleiss / Scott Spiegel, Prod. Co. Raw Nerve / Stage 6 Films / RCR Media Group, 2011, USA. Main Cast: Kip Pardue (Carter McMullen), Brian Hallisay (Scott), John Hensley (Justin), Sarah Habel (Kendra).

House. Dir. Steve Miner, Prod. Sean S. Cunningham, Prod. Co. New World Pictures, 1986, USA. Main Cast: William Katt (Roger Cobb), George Wendt (Harold Gorton), Richard Moll (Big Ben), Kay Lenz (Sandy Sinclair).

House of Wax. Dir. André DeToth, Prod. Bryan Foy, Prod. Co. Bryan Foy Pictures / Warner Bros. Pictures, 1953, USA. Main Cast: Vincent Price (Prof. Henry Jarrod), Frank Lovejoy (Lt. Tom Brennan), Phyllis Kirk (Sue Allen), Carolyn Jones (Cathy Gray).

House of 1,000 Corpses. Dir. Rob Zombie, Prod. Andy Gould, Prod. Co. Spectacle Entertainment Group / Universal Pictures, 2003, USA. Main Cast: Sid Haig (Captain Spaulding), Karen Black (Mother Firefly), Bill Moseley (Otis), Sheri Moon (Baby).

How it Feels to Be Run Over. Dir. Cecil M. Hepworth, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Hepworth, 1900, UK. Main Cast: May Clark (Passenger) Cecil M. Hepworth (Driver).

Human Centipede, The (First Sequence). Dir. Tom Six, Prod. Ilona Six / Tom Six. Prod. Co. Six Entertainment, 2009, Netherlands. Main Cast: Dieter Laser (Dr. Heiter), Ashley C. Williams (Lindsay), Ashlynn Yennie (Jennie), Akihiro Kitamura (Katsuro).

I Know What You Did Last Summer. Dir. Jim Gillespie, Prod. Stokely Chaffin / Erik Feig / Neal H. Moritz, Prod. Co. Columbia Pictures / Mandalay Entertainment /

Summer Knowledge LLC, 1997, USA. Main Cast: Jennifer Love Hewitt (Julie James), Freddie Prinze Jr. (Ray Bronson), Sarah Michelle Gellar (Helen Shivers), Ryan Phillippe (Barry William Cox).

I Still Know What You Did Last Summer. Dir. Danny Cannon, Prod. William S. Beasley / Stokely Chaffin / Erik Feig / Neal H. Moritz, Prod. Co. Mandalay Entertainment / Summer Knowledge LLC, 1998, USA. Main Cast: Jennifer Love Hewitt (Julie James), Freddie Prinze Jr. (Ray Bronson), Brandy (Karla Wilson), Mekhi Phifer (Tyrell).

Invisible Man, The, Dir. James Whale, Prod. Carl Laemmle Jr., Prod. Co. Universal Pictures, 1933, USA. Main Cast: Claude Rains (The Invisible Man), Gloria Stuart (Flora Cranley), William Harrigan (Dr. Arthur Kemp), Henry Travers (Dr. Cranley).

Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday. Dir. Adam Marcus, Prod. Sean S. Cunningham, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Sean S. Cunningham Films, 1993, USA. Main Cast: John D. LeMay (Steven Freeman), Kari Keegan (Jessica Kimble), Kane Hodder (Jason Voorhees), Steven Williams (Creighton Duke).

Jason Lives! Friday the 13th Part VI. Dir. Tom McLoughlin, Prod. Don Behrns, Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures, Terror Films Inc., 1986, USA. Main Cast: Thom Mathews (Tommy Jarvis), Jennifer Cooke (Megan Garris), David Kagen (Sheriff Michael Garris), Renee Jones (Sissy Baker).

Jason X. Dir. James Isaac, Prod. Noel Cunningham, Prod. Co. Crystal Lake Entertainment / Friday X Productions / New Line Cinema, 2001, USA. Main Cast: Kane Hodder (Jason Voorhees/Uber-Jason), Lexa Doig (Rowan), Jonathan Potts (Professor Lowe), Lisa Ryder (Kay-Em 14). With reference to the New Line Platinum DVD release, 2004, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

Jaws. Dir. Steven Spielberg, Prod. David Brown / Richard D. Zanuck, Prod. Co. Zanuck/Brown Productions, 1975, USA. Main Cast: Roy Scheider (Chief Martin Brody), Robert Shaw (Sam Quint), Richard Dreyfuss (Matt Hooper), Lorraine Gary (EllenBrody).

Lady in the Lake. Dir. Robert Montgomery, Prod. George Haight, Prod. Co. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1947, USA. Main Cast: Robert Montgomery (Phillip Marlowe), Audrey Totter (Adrienne Fromsett), Lloyd Nolan (Lt. DeGarmot), Tom Tully (Capt. Kane).

Last Laugh, The (**Der Letzte Mann**). Dir. F. W. Murnau, Prod. Erich Pommer, Prod. Co. Universum Film, 1924, Germany. Main Cast: Emil Jannings (Hotel Porter), Maly Delschaft (His Niece), Max Hiller (Her Bridegroom), Emilie Kurz (Bridegroom's Aunt).

Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III. Dir. Jeff Burr, Prod. Robert Engelman, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema, 1990, USA. Main Cast: Kate Hodge (Michelle), Ken Foree (Benny), R. A. Mihailoff (Leatherface 'Junior' Sawyer), William Butler (Ryan).

Leprechaun. Dir. Mark Jones, Prod. Jeffrey B. Mallian, Prod. Co. Trimark Pictures, 1993, USA. Main Cast: Warwick Davis (Leprechaun), Jennifer Aniston (Tori Reding), Ken Olandt (Nathan Murphy), Mark Holton (Ozzie).

M. Dir. Fritz Lang, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Nero-Film AG, 1931, Germany. Main Cast: Peter Lorre (Hans Beckert), Ellen Widmann (Frau Beckmann), Inge Landgut (Elsie Beckmann), Otto Wernicke (Inspector Karl Lohmann).

Mad Love (**The Hands Of Orlac**). Dir. Karl Freund, Prod. John W. Considine Jr., Prod. Co. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1935, USA. Main Cast: Peter Lorre (Doctor Gogol), Frances Drake (Yvonne Orlac), Colin Clive (Stephen Orlac), Ted Healy (Reagan, the American Reporter).

Magnolia. Dir. Paul Thomas Anderson, Prod. Paul Thomas Anderson / JoAnne Sellar, Prod. Co. Ghoulardi Film Company / New Line Cinema / The Magnolia Project, 1999, USA. Main Cast: Julianne Moore (Linda Partridge), William H. Macy (Donnie Smith), John C. Reilly (Officer Jim Kurring), Tom Cruise (Frank T. J. Mackey).

Make Them Die Slowly (**Cannibal Ferox**). Dir. Umberto Lenzi, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Dania Film / Medusa Produzione / National Cinematografica, 1981, Italy. Main Cast: John Morghen (Mike Logan), Lorraine De Selle (Gloria Davis), Bryan Redford (Rudy Davis), Zora Kerowa (Pat Johnson).

Man Who Knew Too Much, The. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Gaumont British Picture Corpn. Ltd., 1934, UK. Main Cast: Peter Lorre (Abbott), Leslie Banks (Bob Lawrence), Edna Best (Jill Lawrence), Frank Vosper (Ramon).

Man Who Knew Too Much, The. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures, 1956, USA. Main Cast: James Stewart (Dr. Benjamin McKenna), Doris Day (Josephine Conway McKenna), Brenda de Banzie (Lucy Drayton), Bernard Miles (Edward Drayton).

Maniac. Dir. William Lustig, Prod. Andrew Garroni / William Lustig, Prod. Co. Magnum Motion Pictures Inc., 1980, USA. Main Cast : Joe Spinell (Frank Zito), Caroline Munro (Anna D'Antoni), Gail Lawrence (Rita), Kelly Piper (Nurse).

Maniac Cop 3: Badge of Silence. Dir. William Lustig, Prod. Michael Leahy / Joel Soisson, Prod.Co. NEO Motion Pictures / First Look Pictures / Overseas FilmGroup, 1993, USA. Main Cast: Robert Davi (Det. Sean McKinney), Robert Z'Dar (Matt Cordell), Caitlin Dulany (Dr. Susan Fowler), Gretchen Becker (Katie Sullivan).

Masters of the Universe. Dir. Gary Goddard, Prod. Yoram Globus / Menahem Golan, Prod. Co. Golan-Globus Productions / Edward R Pressman Film Corporation / The Cannon Group, 1987, USA. Main Cast: Dolph Lundgren (He-Man), Frank Langella (Skeletor), Meg Foster (Evil-Lyn), Billy Barty (Gwildor).

Minority Report. Dir. Steven Spielberg, Prod. Jan De Bont / Bonnie Curtis / Gerald R. Molen / Walter F. Parkes, Prod. Co. Twentieth Century Fox / DreamWorks Pictures / Cruise/Wagner / Blue Tulip Productions / Ronald Shusett/Gary Goldman, 2002, USA. Main Cast: Tom Cruise (Chief John Anderton), Max von Sydow (Director Lamar Burgess), Steve Harris (Jad), Neal McDonough (Fletcher).

Munich. Dir. Steven Spielberg, Prod. Kathleen Kennedy / Barry Mendel / Steven Spielberg / Colin Wilson, Prod. Co. DreamWorks SKG / Universal Pictures / Amblin Entertainment / The Kennedy/Marshall Company / Barry Mendel Productions / Alliance Atlantis Communications / Peninsula Films, 2006, USA / Canada / France. Main Cast: Eric Bana (Avner), Daniel Craig (Steve), Ciarán Hinds (Carl), Mathieu Kassovitz (Robert).

My Bloody Valentine. Dir. George Mihalka, Prod. John Dunning / Andre Link / Stephen Miller, Prod. Co. Canadian Film Development Corporation / Famous Players / Paramount Pictures / Secret Films, 1981, Canada. Main Cast: Paul Kelman (T. J. Hanniger), Lori Hallier (Sarah), Neil Affleck (Axel Palmer), Keith Knight (Hollis).

My Bloody Valentine 3-D. Dir. Patrick Lussier, Prod. Jack L. Murray, Prod. Co. Lionsgate, 2009, USA. Main Cast: Jensen Ackles (Tom Hanniger), Jaime King (Sarah Palmer), Kerr Smith (Axel Palmer), Betsy Rue (Irene).

New Nightmare. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Marianne Maddalena, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema, 1994, USA. Robert Englund (Himself/Freddy Krueger), Heather

Langenkamp (Herself/Nancy Thompson), Miko Hughes (Dylan Porter), David Newsom (Chase Porter).

<u>Nightmare on Elm Street, A</u>. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Robert Shaye, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Media Home Entertainment / Smart Egg Pictures / The Elm Street Venture, 1984, USA. Main Cast: John Saxon (Lt. Donald Thompson), Ronee Blakley (Marge Thompson), Heather Langenkamp (Nancy Thompson), Amanda Wyss (Tina Gray).

<u>Nightmare on Elm Street, A</u>. Dir. Samuel Bayer, Prod. Michael Bay / Andrew Form / Bradley Fuller, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Platinum Dunes, 2010, USA. Main Cast: Jackie Earle Haley (Freddy Krueger), Kyle Gallner (Quentin Smith), Rooney Mara (Nancy Holbrook), Katie Cassidy (Kris Fowles).

<u>Nightmare on Elm Street Part 2, A: Freddy's Revenge</u>. Dir. Jack Sholder, Prod. Robert Shaye, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Heron Communications / Smart Egg Pictures / Second Elm Street Venture, 1985, USA. Main Cast: Mark Patton (Jesse Walsh), Kim Myers (Lisa Webber), Robert Rusler (Ron Grady), Clu Gulager (Ken Walsh).

<u>Nightmare on Elm Street Part 3, A: Dream Warriors</u>. Dir. Chuck Russell, Prod. Robert Shaye, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Heron Communications / Smart Egg Pictures / Third Elm Street Venture, 1987, USA. Main Cast: Heather Langenkamp (Nancy Thompson), Craig Wasson (Dr. Neil Gordon), Patricia Arquette (Kristen Parker), Robert Englund (Freddy Krueger).

<u>Nightmare on Elm Street Part 4, A: The Dream Master</u>. Dir. Renny Harlin, Prod. Robert Shaye / Rachel Talalay, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Heron Communications / Smart Egg Pictures, 1988, USA. Main Cast: Lisa Wilcox (Alice Johnson), Andras Jones (Rick Johnson), Danny Hassel (Dan Jordan), Rodney Eastman (Joey Crusel).

<u>Nightmare on Elm Street Part 5, A: The Dream Child</u>. Dir. Stephen Hopkins, Prod. Rupert Harvey / Robert Shaye, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Heron Communications / Smart Egg Pictures / The Fourth New Line-Heron Joint Venture, 1989, USA. Main Cast: Robert Englund (Freddy Krueger/Featured Maniac), Lisa Wilcox (Alice Johnson), Kelly Jo Minter (Yvonne), Danny Hassel (Dan Jordan).

<u>North By Northwest</u>. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1959, USA. Main Cast: Cary Grant (Roger O. Thornhill), Eva Marie Saint (Eve Kendall), James Mason (Phillip Vandamm), Jessie Royce Landis (Clara Thornhill).

<u>Nosferatu</u> (**<u>Nosferatu, Eine Symphonie Des Grauens</u>**). Dir. F. W. Murnau, Prod. Enrico Dieckmann / Albin Grau, Prod. Co. Jofa-Atelier Berlin-Johannisthal / Prana-Film GmbH, 1922, Germany. Main Cast: Max Schreck (Graf Orlok/Nosferatu), Gustav v.Wagenheim (Hutter), Greta Schroeder (Ellen Hutter), Alexander Granach (Knock).

Notorious. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. RKO Radio Pictures, 1946, USA. Main Cast: Cary Grant (Devlin), Ingrid Bergman (Alicia Huberman), Claude Rains (Alexander Sebastian), Louis Calhern (Paul Prescott).

Opera. Dir. Dario Argento, Prod. Dario Argento, Prod. Co. ADC Films, Cecchi Gori Group Tiger Cinematografica, 1987, Italy. Main Cast: Cristina Marsillach (Betty), Ian Charleson (Marco), Urbano Barberini (Inspector Alan Santini), Daria Nicolodi (Mira).

Paradise Lost (**Turistas**). Dir. John Stockwell, Prod. Marc Butan / Scott Steindorff / John Stockwell / Bo Zenga, Prod. Co. Fox Atomic / 2929 Productions / Stone Village Pictures / BoZ Productions, 2006, USA. Main Cast: Josh Duhamel (Alex), Melissa George (Pru), Olivia Wilde (Bea), Desmond Askew (Finn).

Passion of the Christ, The. Dir. Mel Gibson, Prod. Bruce Davey / Mel Gibson / Stephen McEveety, Prod. Co. Icon Productions, 2004, USA. Main Cast: Jim Caviezel (Jesus), Maia Morgenstern (Mary), Christo Jivkov (John), Francesco De Vito (Peter).

Peeping Tom. Dir. Michael Powell, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Michael Powell (Theatre), 1960, UK. Main Cast: Carl Boehm (Mark Lewis), Moira Shearer (Vivian), Anna Massey (Helen Stephens), Maxine Audley (Mrs. Stephens).

People Under the Stairs, The. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Stuart M. Besser / Marianne Maddalena, Prod. Co. Alive Films, Universal Pictures, 1991, USA. Main Cast:

Brandon Adams (Fool), Everett McGill (Man), Wendy Robie (Woman), A. J. Langer (Alice).

Pieces (**Mil Gritos Tiene La Noche**). Dir. Juan Piquer Simón, Prod. Dick Randall, Prod. Co. Almena Films / Film Ventures International / Fort Films / Montoro Productions Ltd., 1982, Spain / USA / Puerto Rico. Main Cast: Christopher George (Lt. Bracken), Linda Day (Mary Riggs), Frank Braña (Sgt. Holden), Edmund Purdom (The Dean).

Poltergeist. Dir. Tobe Hooper, Prod. Frank Marshall / Steven Spielberg, Prod. Co. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer / SLM Production Group, 1982, USA. Main Cast: Craig T. Nelson (Steve Freeling), Jobeth Williams (Diane Freeling), Beatrice Straight (Dr. Lesh), Dominique Dunne (Dana Freeling).

Poltergeist II: The Other Side. Dir. Brian Gibson, Prod. Michael Grais / Mark Victor, Prod. Co. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1986, USA. Main Cast: Jobeth Williams (Diane Freeling), Craig T. Nelson (Steve Freeling), Heather O'Rourke (Carol Anne Freeling), Oliver Robbins (Robbie Freeling).

Predator. Dir. John McTiernan, Prod. John Davis / Lawrence Gordon / Joel Silver, Prod. Co. Amercent Films / American Entertainment Partners L. P. / Davis Entertainment / Lawrence Gordon Productions / Silver Pictures / Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 1987, USA. Main Cast: Arnold Schwarzenegger (Dutch), Carl Weathers (Dillon), Elpidia Carillo (Anna), Bill Duke (Mac).

Predator 2. Dir. Stephen Hopkins, Prod. John Davis / Lawrence Gordon / Joel Silver, Prod. Co. Davis Entertainment / Lawrence Gordon Productions / Silver Pictures / Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 1990, USA. Main Cast: Kevin Peter Hall (The Predator), Danny Glover (Lieutenant Mike Harrigan), Gary Busey (Peter Keyes), Ruben Blades (Danny Archuleta).

Prom Night. Dir. Paul Lynch, Prod. Peter Simpson, Prod. Co. Quadrant Trust Company / Simcom Limited, 1980, Canada. Main Cast: Leslie Nielsen (Mr. Hammond), Jamie Lee Curtis (Kim), Casey Stevens (Nick), Eddie Benton (Wendy).

Prom Night. Dir. Nelson McCormick, Prod. Toby Jaffe / Neal H. Moritz, Prod. Co. Alliance Films / Newmarket Films / Original Film, 2008, USA / Canada. Main Cast: Brittany Snow (Donna Keppel), Scott Porter (Bobby), Jessica Stroup (Claire), Dana Davis (Lisa Hines).

Psycho. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Shamley Productions, 1960, USA. Main Cast: Anthony Perkins (Norman Bates), Vera Miles (Lila Crane), John Gavin (Sam Loomis), Janet Leigh (Marion Crane).

Psycho. Dir. Gus Van Sant, Prod. Brian Grazer / Gus Van Sant, Prod. Co. Universal Pictures / Imagine Entertainment, 1998, USA. Main Cast: Vince Vaughn (Norman Bates), Julianne Moore (Lila Crane), Viggo Mortensen (Samuel Loomis), Anne Heche (Marion Crane).

Psycho II. Dir. Richard Franklin, Prod. Hilton A. Green, Prod. Co. Universal

Pictures / Oak, 1981, USA. Main Cast: Anthony Perkins (Norman Bates), Vera

Miles (Lila Loomis), Meg Tilly (Mary Loomis), Robert Loggia (Dr. Bill Raymond).

Psycho III. Dir. Anthony Perkins, Prod. Hilton A. Green, Prod. Co. Universal

Pictures, 1986, USA. Main Cast: Anthony Perkins (Norman Bates), Diana Scarwid

(Maureen Coyle), Jeff Fahey (Duane Duke), Roberta Maxwell (Tracy Venable).

Pulp Fiction. Dir. Quentin Tarantino, Prod. Lawrence Bender, Prod. Co. A Band

Apart / Jersey Films / Miramax Films, 1994, USA. Main Cast: John Travolta

(Vincent Vega), Samuel L. Jackson (Jules Winnfield), Tim Roth (Pumpkin/Ringo),

Amanda Plummer (Honey Bunny/ Yolanda).

Raging Bull. Dir. Martin Scorsese, Prod. Robert Chartoff / Irwin Winkler, United

Artists / A Robert Chartoff-IrwinWinkler Production, 1980, USA. Main Cast:

Robert De Niro (Jake La Motta), Cathy Moriarty (Vickie La Motta), Joe Pesci

(Joey), Frank Vincent (Salvy).

Rear Window. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Paramount

Pictures / Patron Inc., 1954, USA. Main Cast: James Stewart (L. B. "Jeff"

Jefferies), Grace Kelly (Lisa Carol Fremont), Wendell Corey (Det. Lt. Thomas J.

Doyle), Thelma Ritter (Stella).

Road Kill (**Joy Ride**). Dir. John Dahl, Prod. J. J. Abrams / Chris Moore, Prod. Co.

Regency Enterprises / Epsilon Motion Pictures / New Regency Pictures / Bad Robot

/ LivePlanet, 2001, USA. Main Cast: Steve Zahn (Fuller Thomas), Paul Walker (Lewis Thomas), Leelee Sobieski (Venna), Jessica Bowman (Charlotte).

Saving Private Ryan. Dir. Steven Spielberg, Prod. Ian Bryce / Mark Gordon / Gary Levinsohn / Steven Spielberg, Prod. Co. Amblin Entertainment / DreamWorks SKG / Mark Gordon Production / Mutual Film Company / Paramount Pictures, 1998, USA. Main Cast: Tom Hanks (Capt. John H. Miller), Tom Sizemore (Sgt. Mike Horvath), Edward Burns (Pvt. Richard Reiben), Barry Pepper (Pvt. Daniel Jackson).

Saw. Dir. James Wan, Prod. Mark Burg / Gregg Hoffman / Oren Koules, Prod. Co. Evolution Entertainment / Saw Productions Inc. / Twisted Pictures, 2004, USA / Australia. Main Cast: Leigh Whannell (Adam Faulkner-Stanheight), Cary Elwes (Dr. Lawrence Gordon), Danny Glover (Detective David Tapp), Ken Leung (Detective Steven Sing).

Saw II. Dir. Darren Lynn Bousman, Prod. Mark Burg / Gregg Hoffman / Oren Koules, Prod. Co. Twisted Pictures / Evolution Entertainment / Got Films / Lions Gate Films / Saw 2 Productions, 2005, USA / Canada. Main Cast: Tobin Bell (Jigsaw/John Kramer), Shawnee Smith (Amanda Young), Donnie Wahlberg (Eric Matthews), Erik Knudsen (Daniel Matthews).

Saw III. Dir. Darren Lynn Bousman, Prod. Mark Burg / Gregg Hoffman / Oren Koules, Prod. Co. Twisted Pictures / Evolution Entertainment / Saw 2 Productions, 2006, USA / Canada. Main Cast: Tobin Bell (Jigsaw/John), Shawnee Smith (Amanda), Angus Macfadyen (Jeff), Bahar Soomekh (Lynn).

Saw IV. Dir. Darren Lynn Bousman, Prod. Mark Burg / Gregg Hoffman / Oren Koules, Prod. Co. Twisted Pictures, 2007, USA / Canada. Main Cast: Tobin Bell (Jigsaw/John Kramer), Costas Mandylor (Lt. Mark Hoffman), Scott Patterson (Agent Peter Strahm), Betsy Russell (Jill Tuck).

Saw V. Dir. David Hackl, Prod. Mark Burg / Gregg Hoffman / Oren Koules, Prod. Co. Twisted Pictures, 2008, USA / Canada. Main Cast: Tobin Bell (Jigsaw/John), Costas Mandylor (Mark Hoffman), Scott Patterson (Agent Strahm), Betsy Russell (Jill).

Saw VI. Dir. Kevin Greutert, Prod. Mark Burg / Oren Koules, Prod. Co. Twisted Pictures / A Bigger Boat / Saw VI Productions, 2009, Canada / USA / UK / Australia. Main Cast: Tobin Bell (Jigsaw/John), Costas Mandylor (Mark Hoffman), Mark Rolston (Dan Erickson), Betsy Russell (Jill Tuck).

Saw 3-D, Dir. Kevin Greutert, Prod. Mark Burg / Oren Koules, Prod. Co. Twisted Pictures / A Bigger Boat / Serendipity Productions, 2010, Canada / USA. Main Cast: Tobin Bell (Jigsaw/John Kramer), Costas Mandylor (Det. Mark Hoffman), Betsy Russell (Jill Tuck), Cary Elwes (Dr. Lawrence Gordon).

Scream. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Cathy Konrad / Cary Woods, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Woods Entertainment, 1996, USA. Main Cast: Drew Barrymore (Casey), Neve Campbell (Sidney), Skeet Ulrich (Billy), Courteney Cox (Gale Weathers).

Scream 2. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Cathy Konrad / Marianne Maddalena, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Konrad Pictures / Craven-Maddalena Films / Maven Entertainment / Miramax Films, 1997, USA. Main Cast: Neve Campbell (Sidney Prescott), Liev Schreiber (Cotton Weary), Courteney Cox (Gale Weathers), David Arquette (Dewey Riley).

Scream 3. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Cathy Konrad / Marianne Maddalena / Kevin Williamson, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Konrad Pictures / Craven-Maddalena Films, 2000, USA. Main Cast: Neve Campbell (Sidney Prescott), Courteney Cox Arquette (Gale Weathers), Parker Posey (Jennifer Jolie), Emily Mortimer (Angelina Tyler).

Scream 4. Dir. Wes Craven, Prod. Wes Craven / Iya Labunka / Kevin Williamson, Prod. Co. Dimension Films / Corvus Corax / Outerbanks Entertainment / The Weinstein Company, 2011, USA. Main Cast: Neve Campbell (Sidney Prescott), Courteney Cox (Gale Weathers-Riley), David Arquette (Dewey Riley), Emma Roberts (Jill Roberts).

Sisters. Dir. Brian De Palma, Prod. Edward R. Pressman, Prod. Co. American International Pictures / Pressman-Williams, 1973, USA. Main Cast: Margot Kidder (Danielle Breton/Dominique Blanchion), Jennifer Salt (Grace Collier), Charles Durning (Joseph Larch), Bill Finley (Emil Breton).

Sleepaway Camp, Dir. Robert Hiltzik, Prod. Jerry Silva / Michele Tatosian, Prod. Co. American Eagle, 1983, USA. Main Cast: Felissa Rose (Angela), Jonathan Tierston (Ricky), Karen Fields (Judy), Christopher Collet (Paul).

Slumber Party Massacre, The. Dir. Amy Jones, Prod. Amy Jones, Prod. Co. New World Pictures, 1982, USA. Main Cast: Michele Michaels (Trish Devereaux), Robin Stille (Val Bates), Michael Villela (Russ Thorn), Debra Deliso (Kim Clarke).

Sorority House Massacre. Dir. Carol Frank, Prod. Ron Diamond, Prod. Co. Concorde Pictures, 1986, USA. Main Cast: Angela O'Neill (Beth), Wendy Martel (Linda), Pamela Ross (Sara), Nicole Rio (Tracy).

Specialist, The, Dir. Luis Llosa, Prod. Jerry Weintraub, Prod. Co. Iguana Producciones / Jery Weintraub Productions / Warner Bros. Pictures, 1994, Peru / USA. Main Cast: Sylvester Stallone (Ray Quick), Sharon Stone (May Munro aka Adrian Hastings), James Woods (Ned Trent), Rod Steiger (Joe Leon).

Star Wars. Dir. George Lucas, Prod. Gary Kurtz, Prod. Co. A Lucasfilm Limited Production / Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 1977, USA. Main Cast: Mark Hamill (Luke Skywalker), Harrison Ford (Han Solo), Carrie Fisher (Princess Leia Organa), Peter Cushing (Grand Moff Tarkin).

Stepfather, The. Dir. Joseph Ruben, Prod. Jay Benson, Prod. Co. ITC Productions, 1987, UK / USA. Main Cast: Terry O'Quinn (Jerry Blake), Jill Schoelen (Stephanie), Shelley Hack (Susan), Charles Lanyer (Dr. Bondurant).

Sunset Boulevard. Dir. Billy Wilder, Prod. Charles Brackett, Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures, 1950, USA. Main Cast: William Holden (Joe Gillis), Gloria Swanson (Norma Desmond), Erich von Stroheim (Max Von Mayerling), Nancy Olsen (Betty Schaefer).

Suspiria. Dir. Dario Argento, Prod. Claudio Argento, Prod. Co. Seda Spettacoli, 1977, Italy. Main Cast: Jessica Harper (Suzy Bannion), Stefania Casini (Sara), Flavio Bucci (Daniel), Miguel Bosé (Mark).

Talented Mr. Ripley, The. Dir. Anthony Minghella, Prod. William Horberg / Tom Sternberg, Prod. Co. Miramax International / Paramount Pictures / Mirage Enterprises / Tinnick Films, 1999, USA. Main Cast: Matt Damon (Tom Ripley), Gwyneth Paltrow (Marge Sherwood), Jude Law (Dickie Greenleaf), Cate Blanchett (Meredith Logue).

Taxi Driver. Dir. Martin Scorsese, Prod. Julia Phillips / Michael Phillips, Prod. Co. Columbia Pictures / Bill/Phillips / Italo/Judeo Productions, 1975, USA. Main Cast: Robert DeNiro (Travis Bickle), Jodie Foster (Iris), Cybill Shepherd (Betsy), Peter Boyle (Wizard).

Tenebrae. Dir. Dario Argento, Prod. Claudio Argento, Prod. Co. Sigma Cinematografica Roma, 1982, Italy. Main Cast: Anthony Franciosa (Peter Neal), Christian Borromeo (Gianni), Mirella D'Angelo (Tilde), Veronica Lario (Jane McKerrow).

Terror Train. Dir. Roger Spottiswoode, Prod. Harold Greenberg, Prod. Co. Astral Bellevue Pathé / Sandy Howard Productions / Triple T Productions, 1980, Canada / USA. Main Cast: Ben Johnson (Carne), Jamie Lee Curtis (Alana Maxwell), Hart Bochner (Doc Manley), David Copperfield (Ken the Magician).

Texas Chain Saw Massacre, The. Dir. Tobe Hooper, Prod. Tobe Hooper, Prod. Co. Vortex, 1974, USA. Main Cast: Marilyn Burns (Sally Hardesty), Allen Danziger (Jerry), Paul A. Partain (Franklin Hardesty), William Vail (Kirk).

Texas Chainsaw Massacre, The. Dir. Marcus Nispel, Prod. Michael Bay / Mike Fleiss, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Focus Features / Radar Pictures / Platinum Dunes / Next Entertainment / Chainsaw Productions LLC, 2003, USA. Main Cast: Jessica Biel (Erin), Jonathan Tucker (Morgan), Erica Leerhsen (Pepper), Mike Vogel (Andy).

Texas Chainsaw Massacre, The: The Beginning. Dir. Jonathan Liebesman, Prod. Michael Bay / Mike Fleiss / Andrew Form / Brad Fuller / Kim Henkel / Tobe Hooper, Prod. Co. New Line Cinema / Platinum Dunes / Next Entertainment / Vortex/Henkel/Hooper / Texas Chainsaw Productions, 2006, USA. Main Cast: Jordana Brewster (Chrissie), Taylor Handley (Dean), Diora Baird (Bailey), Matt Bomer (Eric).

Texas Chainsaw Massacre, The: The Next Generation (**The Return of the Texas Chainsaw Massacre**). Dir. Kim Henkel, Prod. Kim Henkel, Prod. Co. Genre

Pictures / Return Productions / Ultra Muchos Productions, 1994, USA. Main Cast: Renee Zellweger (Jenny), Matthew McConaughey (Vilmer Slaughter), Robert Jacks (Leatherface Slaughter), Tonie Perenski (Darla).

Texas Chainsaw Massacre 2, The. Dir. Tobe Hooper, Prod. Yoram Globus / Menahem Golan, Prod. Co. Cannon Films, 1986, USA. Main Cast: Dennis Hopper (Lieutenant "Lefty" Enright), Caroline Williams (Vanita "Stretch" Brock), Jim Siedow (Drayton Sawyer, the Cook), Bill Moseley ("Chop-Top" Sawyer).

Thing, The. Dir. John Carpenter, Prod. David Foster / Lawrence Turman, Prod. Co. Universal Pictures / Turman-Foster Company, 1982, USA. Main Cast: Kurt Russell (R. J. MacReady), A. Wilford Brimley (Dr. Blair), T. K. Carter (Nauls), David Clennon (Palmer).

Toolbox Murders, The. Dir. Dennis Donnelly, Prod. Tony DiDio, Prod. Co. Cal-Am Productions / Tony DiDio Productions, 1978, USA. Main Cast: Cameron Mitchell (Vance Kingsley), Pamelyn Ferdin (Laurie Ballard), Wesley Eure (Kent Kingsley), Nicolas Beauvy (Joey Ballard).

Trauma. Dir. Dario Argento, Prod. Dario Argento, Prod. Co. ADC Films / Overseas FilmGroup, 1993, Italy / USA. Main Cast: Christopher Rydell (David Parsons), Asia Argento (Aura Petrescu), Piper Laurie (Adriana Petrescu), Frederic Forrest (Dr. Judd).

Triumph of the Will (**Triumph Des Willens**). Dir. Leni Riefenstahl, Prod. Leni Riefenstahl, Prod. Co. Leni Riefenstahl-Produktion / NSDAP Reichspropagandaleitung Hauptabt. Film, 1935, Germany. Main Cast: Adolf Hitler (Himself).

Troll. Dir. John Carl Buechler, Prod. Albert Band, Prod. Co. Empire Pictures / Altar Productions, 1986, USA / Italy. Main Cast: Noah Hathaway (Harry Potter Jr.), Michael Moriarty (Harry Potter Sr.), Shelley Hack (Anne Potter), Jenny Beck (Wendy Anne Potter).

TrollHunter. Dir. André Øvredal, Prod. Sveinung Golimo / John M. Jacobsen, Prod. Co. Filmkameratene A/S / Film Fund FUZZ, 2010, Norway. Main Cast: Otto Jespersen (Hans, trolljegeren), Glenn Erland Tosterud (Thomas), Johanna Mørck (Johanna), Tomas Alf Larsen (Kalle).

Urban Legend. Dir. Jamie Blanks, Prod. Gina Matthews / Michael McDonnell / Neal H. Moritz, Prod. Co. Canal+ Droits Audiovisuels / Original Film / Phoenix Pictures, 1998, USA / France. Main Cast: Jared Leto (Paul Gardener), Alicia Witt (Natalie Simon), Rebecca Gayheart (Brenda Bates), Michael Rosenbaum (Parker Riley).

Urban Legends: Final Cut. Dir. John Ottman, Prod. Gina Matthews / Neal H. Moritz / Richard Luke Rothschild, Prod. Co. Original Film /Phoenix Pictures, 2000, USA. Main Cast: Jennifer Morrison (Amy Mayfield), Matthew Davis (Travis

Stark/Trevor Stark), Hart Bochner (Professor Solomon), Loretta Devine (Reese Wilson).

Valentine, Dir. Jamie Blanks, Prod. Dylan Sellers, Prod. Co. Warner Bros. Pictures / Village Roadshow Pictures / NPV Entertainment / Cupid Productions, 2001, USA. Main Cast: Denise Richards (Paige Prescott), David Boreanaz (Adam Carr), Marley Shelton (Kate Davies), Jessica Capshaw (Dorothy Wheeler).

Vertigo. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Paramount Pictures / Alfred J. Hitchcock Productions, 1958, USA. Main Cast: James Stewart (John "Scottie" Ferguson), Kim Novak (Madeleine Elster/Judy Barton), Barbara Bel Geddes (Midge Wood), Tom Helmore (Gavin Elster).

When a Stranger Calls. Dir. Fred Walton, Prod. Doug Chapin / Steve Feke, Prod. Co. Columbia Pictures Corporation / Melvin Simon Productions, 1979, USA. Main Cast: Carol Kane (Jill Johnson), Rutanya Alda (Mrs. Mandrakis), Carmen Argenziano (Dr. Mandrakis), Kirsten Larkin (Mandy).

When a Stranger Calls Back, Dir. Fred Walton, Prod. Tom Rowe, Prod. Co. Krost/Chapin Productions / MTE Inc. / Pacific Motion Pictures / Privilege Productions / The Producers Entertainment Group Ltd., 1993, USA. Main Cast: Carol Kane (Jill Johnson), Charles Durning (John Clifford), Jill Schoelen (Julia Jenz), Gene Lythgow (William Landis).

Wolf Creek. Dir. Greg Mclean, Prod. David Lightfoot / Greg Mclean, Prod. Co. The FFC Australian/Film Finance Corporation / The South Australian Film Corporation / 403 Productions / True Crime Channel, 2005, Australia. Main Cast: John Jarratt (Mick Taylor), Cassandra Magrath (Liz Hunter), Kestie Morassi (Kristy Earl), Nathan Phillips (Ben Mitchell).

Wolf Man, The. Dir. George Waggner, Prod. George Waggner, Prod. Co. Universal Pictures Company Inc., 1941, USA. Main Cast: Lon Chaney (The Wolf Man), Claude Rains (Sir. John Talbot), Ralph Bellamy (Col. Montford), Warren William (Dr. Lloyd).

Wolfen. Dir. Michael Wadleigh, Prod. Rupert Hitzig, Prod. Co. Orion Pictures Corporation / King-Hitzig Productions, 1981, USA. Main Cast: Albert Finney (Dewey Wilson), Diane Venora (Rebecca Neff), Edward James Olmos (Eddie Holt), Gregory Hines (Whittington).

You Only Live Once. Dir. Fritz Lang, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Walter Wagner Productions, 1937, USA. Main Cast: Sylvia Sidney (Joan Graham), Henry Fonda (Eddie Taylor), Barton MacLane (Stephen Whitney), Jean Dixon (Bonnie Graham).

51st State, The (**Formula 51**), Dir. Ronny Yu, Prod. Jonathan Debin / Andras Hamori / Malcolm Kohll / Seaton Mclean / David Pupkewitz, Prod. Co. Alliance Atlantis / Focus Films / Fifty First Films / National Lottery / Artists Production Group / Canadian Film or Video Production Tax Credit / Film Council / The Film

Consortium, 2001, UK / Canada. Main Cast: Samuel L. Jackson (Elmo McElroy), Emily Mortimer (Dakota Parker), Meat Loaf (The Lizard), Robert Carlyle (Felix DeSouza).

8 ½. Dir. Federico Fellini, Prod. Angelo Rizzoli, Prod. Co. Cineriz / Francinex, 1963, Italy / France. Main Cast: Marcello Mastroianni (Guido Anselmi), Claudia Cardinale (Claudia), Anouk Aimee (Luisa Anselmi), Sandra Milo (Carla).

400 Blows, The (**Les Quatre Cents Coups**). Dir. François Truffaut, Prod. None credited, Prod. Co. Les Films du Carrosse / Sédif Productions, 1959, France. Main Cast: Jean-Pierre Léaud (Antoine Doinel), Claire Maurier (Gilberte Doinel-le mere d'Antoine), Albert Rémy (Julien Doinel), Guy Decomble ("Petite Feuille", the French teacher).